Innovative Perspectives on Tourism Discourse

Magdalena Bielenia-Grajewska
University of Gdansk, Poland

Enriqueta Cortes de los Rios
Almeria University, Spain

IGI Global
DISSEMINATOR OF KNOWLEDGE

For electronic access to this publication, please contact: eresources@igi-global.com.

Chapter 1
Cultural E-Tourism Depicted by Digital Discourse:
Innovative Mobilities at Urban E-Heritage Networks

Pedro Andrade
University of Minho, Portugal

ABSTRACT

This chapter aims to reflect on cultural e-tourism and the regimes of innovative discourses about this process. Cultural e-tourists look for fruition in what regards the cultural e-heritage, which means the cultural heritage propagated through the discourses of digital media and cyberspace, but in connection with physical mobilities and urban institutional discourses. Mobilities refer to processes, actors and things that are on the move within our contemporary society, namely across social and discursive networks. The author also presents some previous personal research about leisure, tourism, urban cultures and arts, that compared pre-modern, modern, and post-modern configurations of tourism's processes. Projects on this subject should be more debated among social science scientists, tourism professionals, and citizens. In particular, projects about innovative mobilities and cultural e-heritage discourses at diverse localities, where local public policies intend to constitute them as smart cities and as UNESCO Creative cities.

INTRODUCTION

Everything is on the move. When tourists travel among localities, they translate their departure's working timetables into destination's leisure rhythms. When they return to their home, tourists undertake the inverse process, that is, they impregnate their countries and cultures with foreign sensibilities. Those permuted spaces and times themselves are also being displaced via the tourists imaginary, before, during, and after the actual voyage. And, last but not the least, society itself is changing owed to the pressure of cyberspace phenomena. One of such metamorphoses is the emerging e-tourism phenomenon. The

present essay aims to circumscribe its cultural dimension, i.e., cultural e-tourism, and the innovative discourses on that subject.

For these aims, firstly this chapter includes a theoretical background that identifies the state of the art of core discussions on concepts associated with *mobilities*. This is one of the most influent social processes and sociological notions that contextualize *cultural e-tourism* activated within the Internet, and the *innovative discourses* produced and reproduced on this subject.

Next, the chapter's main focus is concentrated on the debate about *cultural e-tourism and heritage*. Controversies relevant to this theme articulate tourism with *new media and social networks*. And some suggestions about solutions and recommendations involve the articulation of Tourism Studies' projects to new contemporary processes and sociological methods activated by cyberspace and social networks.

Some paramount ideas and works of this area are convoked especially those authors who develop and clarify the meaning of the core concepts that structure the present object of studies. For example, *mobilities* refer to processes, actors, and things that are currently on the move within our contemporary society, such as tourists, capitals, workers, images, heritage, places, etc. A core concept associated with mobilities is *cultural e-tourism;* i.e., a genre if tourism activated by new media and cyberspace flows and travels. Cultural e-tourists look for fruition in what regards the *cultural e-heritage*. This notion means the cultural heritage propagated through digital media and across the Internet, at web pages, wikis, digital networks, etc. (Andrade, 2013a). For instance, *digital art* is emerging as a growing niche in tourism demand, through performances at public city spaces (museums, etc.). Particularly, artistic works using digital mobile devices are frequent since some years ago, following a recent exponential increase of tourism activities in Portugal and in specific Portuguese cities, such as Lisbon, Porto and Braga.

Such cultural e-tourism is being practised through *discursive digital networks,* which may be understood as webs of social meanings disseminated through languages, messages, and campaigns promoted by some type of *e-institution*. This genre of institution operates in cyberspace under specific circumstances, such as the location of its own company headquarters inside the WWW. Yet, when discursive networks users apply a critique posture, they may create *discursive innovations*, which are social or institutional processes including the communication of conditions, objectives, means, methods and effects regarding creative cultural transformations but also social inclusion (Andrade, 2015).

Moreover, discursive digital networks intensively apply *Internet marketing* for tourism businesses. The articulation of digital culture, e-tourism and managerial strategies is debated in Lytras (2011). And Susan Sweeny (2000) suggests diversified practical and most useful strategies for each market niche, from bed and breakfast, or country inns, to tour operators, motels, and hotels, and not even forgetting theme parks and outdoor adventures promoters.

In a global context, discursive digital webs often reformulate social and semantic *meanings of intercultural and even transcultural* nature, inside a *post colonialist* global world (Andrade, 2014).

Sometimes, discursive digital webs mix the two precedent strategies, such as applying *tourism marketing* to non-Western societies and cultures. E.g. Faraj (2014) analyses e-tourism in Lebanon, concretely through preferences expressed by tourism industry, travel agencies and consumers, and by reflecting on the possible cooperation among these stakeholders.

The present chapter also introduces a former research undertaken by this chapter's author about leisure, tourism, urban cultures and arts, developed for several years, that compared *pre-modernity, modernity, and post-modernity expressions of tourism* social contexts, agents, and practises (see below Andrade, 1986, 1993).

Such projects used, among other methodologies, a *Hybrid Discourse Analysis* (HDA) method for interpreting content and discourses circulating in texts, images, and videos (Andrade, 2016b).

In sum, the objective of the present chapter is to underline and debate some relevant *configurations of innovative discourses* produced and reproduced on *cultural e-tourism*, associated with urban and cyberspace *mobilities.*

About new concepts, especially those that have a technological dimension, some are developed in the next sub-chapters, others are defined in the Glossary. In what regards more complex terms (e.g. HAD) they are explained and applied within the cited works.

BACKGROUND: MOBILITIES AND ASSOCIATED IDEAS

The precedent considerations at the Introduction may work as a somewhat 'paratext', like Gerard Gennette would put it; i.e., an aperitif to the following state of the art on the mobilities' semantic field, that contextualizes the core present debate on e-cultural tourism and its innovative discourses.

The emergence of digital and mobile devices for touristic practises is overwhelming, partly due to the fact that, within contemporaneity, everything seems to flow and move. The *mobilities paradigm,* advocated by John Urry (2007) in order to cope with this issue, has had a huge influence on both theoretical and methodological studies in the Social Sciences, and particularly concerning Tourism Studies. Some core concepts within our main goal, articulated with mobilities, will be presented in this state of the art.

Within our contemporary world, global/local mobilities influence, in a determinant way, both social institutional contexts and individual action. Our everyday lives became *mobile lives* (Elliot and Urry, 2010).

In effect, everyone and all things apparently are or may become mobile. Mimi Scheller and John Urry (2004) noted that not just tourists, but also capitals, workers, images, heritage and even places are redefined through mobilities and performances undertaken by social actors. Places are often related to other places, what gives them a peculiar motion. Specifically, tourist consumption and performances include a plethora of mobilities, such as walking, shopping, eating, and drinking local foods, sleeping at hotels, photographing memories, sunbathing, diving, swimming, trips in local boats and ships, etc.

The same happen with the *technologies of the city* (Scheller and Urry, 2006). Among these, mobile communications and surveillance systems found emergent domination modes, which involve novel ways of being in co-presence and moving across the urban space, but also implement social exclusion and lack of privacy.

The challenge underlying mobilities pertains as well to what regards *methodology* (Büscher & Urry, 2011). Scientists have their lives mobilized by general urban flows. And social scientists are more and more trying to understand the multiple and different mobilizations that are displacing other social actors, when these use innovative mobile everyday methods, such as photographing a fire or a riot.

When applying mobile methods to research on tourism, it is necessary to be attentive to the following epistemological precaution: the relative ephemeral permanence and limited mobility of a tourist in a destination place, doesn't facilitate his contact with the visited population, and also affects the relation between the researcher and the tourist. Moreover, the researcher has to consider the advantages and weaknesses of the *virtual fieldwork* he activates within the cyberspace, sometimes to compensate this lack of physical contact with the tourist (Hall, 2011). In what regards other methodology to be used with mobile methods, such as *qualitative research* techniques (biographies, diaries, participant observation and visual interpretation, etc.), they are stimulant to mobilities and tourism studies (Goodson, 2004).

Moreover, *visual research methods* in tourism employ the analysis of brochures, postcards including localities and people, personal drawings, advertising photographs, videos, and websites relating to touristic travel (Rakic, 2012). Recently, *tracking technologies* on pedestrians and motorized vehicles made possible to use more objective measures of tourist mobilities, but they often pose ethical and legal issues (Sheller, 2013).

Mobilities are also connected with multiple other social processes. *Lifestyle mobilities* are one of the most notorious, as our contemporary lifestyle in the metropolis includes an easier physical access to transportations and a virtual growing speed in using digital information and knowledge (Cohen, 2013). Social actors, through bodily activation of urban lifestyle, perform everyday routines that model their possible mobilities and immobilities.

Closely associated with lifestyle processes, work and leisure activities constitute a dichotomy that must be deconstructed as well through mobilities. People moves are conditioned by their professional time during everyday actions, that often coincide with their leisure locations; e.g., when a city inhabitant or a tourist answers to a mobile phone call from his(her) boss during holidays. Thus, lifestyles may be reconstructed through such *leisure mobilities* (Rickly, 2016).

Political and demographic mobilities are as well of paramount importance. Ginnete Verstraete (2009) depicts the contemporary Europe conjuncture where tourism, migrations and novel borders controls meet together. European imaginary, discourses and policies for free movement of people, goods, capital and services, should conduct to borderless travels and a unity-in-diversity society. However, today they are no longer sustainable. Such borderless space of mobility is nowadays contradicted by the violence of migrations, new conflicts, politics of exclusion within national territories, cultural localities, and religious divides; and, last but not the least, electronic surveillance for what could be named as *frontiers autism*.

Scott Cohen (2014) argues that tourism industry is contributing to change economy in a global scale, and has a real impact in an unattended dimension, climate change. This is partly due to new technologies applied to the tourism industry, which can also be used to combat such issues. Government's policies must inform tourists and other social agents to such low perceived danger.

Events mobilities are a relevant sub-field inside mobilities paradigm (Hannam, 2016). This concept translates a connection between individual networks and community networks. In other words, people travel to cultural places where they use their bodies to perform some practises that allow them to integrate (i.e. embody) cultural events occurred in foreign societies, such as an art exhibition. Such events are mobile (exhibitions may be shown in different places) and they affect the mobility of art as a whole. Extraordinary or everyday events may be understood as political, as they may conduct to mobility or immobility inside a given society and culture.

Moreover, tourism mobilities may be less cadenced, as in *slow travels* (Fullagar, 2012). This mode of social flow is often associated with the respect of nature inside ecotourism, social ethics and political movements as slow food, or other concerns like quality of life and leisure, embodied experiences of places, and travel as an experience to enhance information, culture, and knowledge regarding a given place.

Mobile devices and social networks are also transforming *togetherness* (Molz, 2014). *Interactive travel* is the norm to stay in touch with friends or with strangers, either in the form of a simple e-mail and a post in Facebook, or in a more intense or original mode, as 'location-aware navigating', 'travel blogging', 'flash packing' and 'couch surfing'. In this Molz interesting book, classical *concepts within Mobilities and Tourism Studies*, such as 'hospitality', 'authenticity', 'escape' and even the seminal term 'tourism gaze' coined by John Urry, are criticized and sometimes substituted by these new ones, originated in cyberspace virtual mobilities: 're-enchantment and embrace', 'smart tourism', 'mobile conviviality', and

'mediated gaze'. Therefore, in the present chapter's author perspective, the meanings inside these new social and semantic fields are deconstructing and reconstructing what could be nominated *novel ontologies of mobilities*. Please note that an 'ontology', in contemporary social sciences' and Digital Humanities' connotations, mean a set of concepts connected through relations within a specific knowledge area.

Other important concept inside the mobilities social and semantic fields here discussed is *sacred mobilities*. In particular, the sacred is often related to fixity and immobility, and profane daily life is more associated with mobile flows. However, nowadays, even sacred beliefs are more fluid, e.g. due to new movements and emplacements that substitute the ancient pilgrimages, and organize religious tourism to new spiritual places (Maddrell, 2015).

Furthermore, mobilities are not just studied by scientists, but scientists themselves are doing travels in the course of their research. Some examples of this *scientific tourism* are university academics displacements to locations related with community projects, archeological and geographic studies, ecotourism and NGOs activities (Slocum, 2015).

Other type of tourism explained through mobilities is *cultural heritage tourism*, which has emerged for some years as one of the preferred niches by tourists (Kaminski, 2014). This is partly caused by cultural curators' efforts to convey new experiences within *leisure mobilities*, via both special exhibitions and events, and an easier access to heritage web sites. In fact, cultural tourism is more and more connected with socio-economic development, regeneration of cities and sustainable cultural impact on contemporary mobile and digital societies.

A such social trend is legitimated by a sociological intention to update methods in this area of *social memories* and heritage tourism (Hanna, 2015). As above mentioned, quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies may be applied in order to grasp memories in connection with their remembering through the visit of specific cultural places.

A recent synthesis of the keywords in this field undertakes a critical analysis on its relations with the core concept 'mobility' and about their possible uses in research. Some examples of such terms are: capital, cosmopolitanism, freedom, gender, immobility, and motility (Salazar, 2016).

MAIN FOCUS: CULTURAL E-TOURISM AND HERITAGE

The mobilities social process, discussed *supra*, constitute one of the pedestals of emerging touristic phenomena such as cultural e-tourism and of one of its main targets: cultural e-heritage.

Cultural tourism relevance is increasing within global tourism industry, as mentioned above. In fact, tourists, and specially those belonging to middle classes, having more time at their disposal to spend in leisure (McCannell, 1976), in their travels prefer, more and more, to develop cultural practises than just recreational activities. Tourist cultural experience is often motivated by a *quest of meaning*, be it the meaning of cultural artefacts or events that the tourist sees at his destination place, or the meaning of his own imagined identity or difference. Thus, it is possible to argue that this type of traveller is searching both the *authenticity* of the cultural space he is visiting, and his own perceived authenticity as a tourist in relation with the destination scape. More recently, another important study confirms this trend for Europe: Greg Richards's transnational inquiry (1996) shows why cultural heritage can be considered as a major generator of cultural tourism industry.

About the genealogy of cultural tourism since *pre-modernity*, a central process to understand is *popular tourism*, a phenomenon frequent some years ago in Lisbon and in some other parts of Portugal and

Spain. It consisted in a collective travelling and ceremonial meals undertaken by the auto-organised and self-called 'Excursionists/Dinner Groups'. They have also developed an original form of art, exhibited at cafes and taverns, where their associations were located (Andrade, 1980, 1986, 1991).

Cultural meaning of tours can also be detected through the new strategies inherent to the clash between *modernity and post-modernity*, in contemporary intercultural societies. Sociology of Travel can be reconstructed to cope with this contentious and dialectical ground. Through comments on the works of John Urry, Dean McCannell, Erik Cohen and others, it is possible to forge new concepts like '*inter-travel*' (a fusion of several types of trips, that characterizes post-modernity); '*critical tourist*' (the tourist that develops a reflexivity posture regarding his own 'touristic society'); and '*counter-tourist*' (a local inhabitant or citizen from an Occidental or non-Occidental country who suggests an inverse or reverse view of the visitor by the visited) (Andrade, 1993, pp. 68, 74).

Within such intercultural context, one of the most prominent cultural places for *tourist experience is the museum*, as Nelson Graburn stated in a seminal study (1977). In fact, the museum stands as a fundamental place for visiting and experimenting cultural heritage, which has a close relationship with specific and interrelated urban destination spaces at a worldwide level. This relation 'global/local' is debated in detail concerning the production or the *mobilities of imaginaries*, and regarding the meaning of past and future through tour guides (Salazar, 2010). Pre-announcing some of these studies, art museums in Europe were analyzed in depth in the paradigmatic study by Pierre Bourdieu and Alain Darbel (1966).

However, such articulation between cultural tourism and museum practises is a complex process, connected with many other economic, political, and discursive phenomena. For instance, Johnson and Thomas (1992) state that tourism and cultural industries may have a huge impact in local economies, namely in employment. Lucy Lippard (2000) delimits a *political economy of leisure places*, inquiring the influence of tourism on local communities and arguing for a community activism, artists included, to respond to some effects of this process. For instance, she notes that antique shops are often converted in populist museums; a commodification of indigenous cultures is happening; and sometimes the common citizen is a tourist in our own home.

This political view is important in our intercultural world. Tourism sometimes is connected to a new domination within *postcolonial societies*. In a conjuncture where transnational mobilities, such as migrations and tourism, are the rule, tourism is seen sometimes as a postcolonial cultural form (Hall; Tucker, 2004). Cultural policies may be relevant strategies in this process of regulation of world heritage in connection with cultural tourism (Harrison; Hitchcock, 2005).

In particular, our globalized world or 'world economy' according to Immanuel Wallerstein, conditions the contemporary museum, cultural heritage, and strategies of display, creating public cultures through collaboration. However, globalization also causes frictions and contradictions (Buntinx et al, 2006).

Such strategies of heritage display at museums take a central role in *public's seduction*. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998) analyzes heritage production by museums, that often compete with tourism industry. This is done through meaning display/show processes, like the 'meaning performances' subjacent to the mere fact of collecting collections or showing exhibitions. Museums create a self-image of tourism attractions, and tourism transforms locations into destinations. Briefly, heritage became nowadays a new mode of cultural production.

In fact, museum professionals (curators, managerial staff) act as art intermediaries ('*art gatekeepers*' in Howard Becker's words) between the artist and the public. This constitutes a clear power relationship; e.g., the strategies involving art works display, often convey implicit assumptions on culture and society (Lavine, 1991).

Therefore, studying cultural and tourism publics and the manners visitors move and flow across the museum, is crucial to understand cultural tourism mobilities. Priscilla Boniface and Peter Fowler (1993) reflected on national heritage within our global world (exemplifying with Tower of London versus Disneyland) and showed how this heritage is presented to different segments of tourism audiences.

Within this perspective, a relevant process for understanding cultural tourism flows is *museability* (Andrade, 2003, p.9), which can be defined as the intersection of economic, political, and cultural factors that condition the practice of musealization. And *musealization* is the set of professional activities deployed at the museum, in order to translate an expert knowledge (scientist's or artist's) to a common language, understandable by most segments of non-expert museum publics.

In such regard, within public exhibition social spaces, and in the context of curator propositions and other mediating entities, it is credible to state that art audiences and publics, like cultural tourists, aren't always passive. In fact, they often engage their own identity, or construct their difference, through several art reception strategies and adaptation of art works to their own perspectives, during their visit to an artistic space. One trait of such a transformation is the critical use of new media. This is a process that contributes profoundly to the *shift from cultural tourism into e-cultural tourism*. Recall that e-cultural tourism means a novel mode of enjoying cultural heritage through new media and cyberspace. An example is art experimentation and participation by the tourist and by other art publics at museums or at other touristic places, using intermedia devices such as *interactive digital tables* and *virtual reality viewers,* allowing the interactive manipulation of art works and of their underlying knowledge (Andrade, 2016a, pp. 149-250).

At the museum, such knowledge acquisition and meaning search are often pursued through *semi-formal or informal learning*, a process intrinsically different, in many ways, from the formal learning experienced at school. Under this pedagogical point of view, among other writings and activities on Sociology and Anthropology of leisure, urban cultures, arts and knowledge, it is important to also consider *scientific-technological literacy* in the case of science museums (Andrade, ed., 2012).

Thus, the above-mentioned alliance and/or conflict between tourism and museums are closely associated with global transformations in the twenty-first century. In particular, the articulation between *information and communication technologies* with *tourism* was underlined at several International conferences in 1994, 1998, etc. (Buhalis; Tjoa; Jafari).

However, some years before the generalization of Internet, information tours were already relevant:

Theoretically, liberal societies do not deny the benefits of computer buttons, screens, telephonic lines that connect terminals to international databases. (...) Social methods of information use 'raw data', to which all other information genres are or will be translated, because raw data, as it may relate to all other languages, turns to be more easily adaptable to telematics needs (more able to be uniformly memorized and processed by the computer, and transportable with fewer expenses) (...) a new type of reflexion [emerges], the data-knowledge, discourse on the informative discourse, a knowledge of software's type, a set of methods and procedures to control the information in general (Andrade, 1985, p.426).

These information travels connect all spheres in society, particularly all types of media and cultures:

Such cultural trajectories unfold several manifestations such as the quest for documentary information in libraries and documentary centres and the consultation of databases, avoiding often any physical

travel (…), or [e.g..]the mass-mediated journey, a virtual itinerary mediating public and private spaces (Andrade, 1993, p.63).

In fact, in the 20th century nineties, '*cyber-travel'* was already a frequent reality within networks:

Contemporaneity is transforming itself gradually into a reticular epoch. In other words, nowadays social relations take the form of a generalized network (…) Cyber-travel suggests not exactly a pre-establish way, but multiples possibilities of journeys within the network. In cyber-tourism, we move within the image of the touristic travel. From the act of searching information for travelling, we evolved to the voyage within the information itself (Andrade, 1997: 121-122).

In effect, within their quest for meaning through experience and imaginary at destination countries, tourists relate *'cyber trips'* to a 'cyber-language' where journey metaphors are frequent: instead of representing life, cyber-tourists and other cyber-travellers engage in a life reduced to representations or to simulacra of the voyage itself (*Idem, Ibidem*, p.122-123).

CONTROVERSIES: TOURISM, NEW MEDIA, SOCIAL NETWORKS AND MOBIL(ITI)ES

Considering the above-debated connection between the *cultural museum* and *e-tourism*, Ylva French and Sue Runyard (2011) state the following: reading and viewing patterns are changing, due to the advent of online and mobile media; and publics are being transformed as well with the emergence of new museum segments like immigrants and others. A such situation requires new museum's and cultural tourism's strategies, but also novel Tourism Studies approaches.

On his turn, Graham Black (2012) argues that, in the present funding crisis, museums must essay imaginative solutions to attract audiences. He associates the public fidelity with more participation and collaboration through the use of *social and new media*, like on-site, on-line, and mobile media. This strategy should engage communities, schools, families, or other public segments through conversations and dialogues on museum collections, in a more dialogic education at and through the museum.

In a word, digital technologies and social media may develop an inedited tourist cultural experience, providing that in his quest for meaning and knowledge, he uses these digital devices within a critical and democratic posture. Indeed, cultural experience is also part of *a cultural citizenship,* even and especially inside a visited country.

A such tendency is defining *e-cultural tourism* and the respective *discourses and counter discourses* in new ways. Alternative discourses within cultural e-tourism networks may be analyzed from the *Actor Network Theory* suggested by Bruno Latour, among other relevant reflective postures. Latour (2007, p. 57) states that, in addition to social scientists, social actors can also develop theories concerning their own action, for example in these terms: "(…) they will not only enter into the controversy over which agency is taking over but also on the ways in which is making its influence felt."

Nowadays, tourism industry is using more and more *web technologies for marketing*, such as Travel Recommendations Systems directed to on line communities (Sharda, 2010). Various new *theoretical tendencies and practical applications* of such processes are discussed in Matsuo (2015), including the

use of social media, a method for interactive travel preparation, collaborative tourism planning and personalized transportation guidance.

More recent *digital technologies for e-tourism* are covered in collective discussions such as Tussyadiah (2015), for example, the use of mobile computing, mobile sensors, geo-social services, augmented reality, wearable computing and smart tourism. A recent book (Katsoni, 2016) has the advantage of describing multiple sources of tourism research linked with culture and innovation, not just academic studies but as well quests made by government and industry professionals. Their themes delimit tourism policies, governance, marketing, virtual visitors, digital museum and heritage collections, etc.

An overview on *methodology* regarding social memory and heritage tourism in this recent conjuncture, was discussed in a collective book (Hanna, 2015), where it is recommended a fruitful triangulation among qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods.

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: NETWORKED TOURISM STUDIES

To apply the theoretical reflexions discussed until now, it is useful to identify, even synthetically, their possible practical impact on Tourism Studies and on some near disciplines.

Our contemporary world is a webbed world. However, social networks have always proliferated within the social fabric, since the dawn of human societies. Therefore, tourism cannot just ignore this multi-secular reality informed by complex modes and genres of social networked relationships. Within such perspective, some of these network phenomena will be introduced here, as a necessary condition for understanding the contemporary touristic processes and the reflection on them, within both *pre-digital* and *digital social networks.* In what regards digital social networks, some are eminently collaborative, as those inside the so-called Web 2.0 or Social Web. Others are both participative and socio-semantic directed, e.g. within the Web 3.0 or Semantic Web. However, all these types of networked regimes can be studied through Critical *Semantic-Logical Sociology*, among other Sociological perspectives. The following paragraphs aim to clarify what this means.

Firstly, a quick note on pre-digital networks. Social networks, according to Georg Simmel (1972), are human groups connected by some interaction or relationship, often in co-presence. In particular, travellers and tourists, being foreigners, or strangers in a stronger or weaker level, may feel the necessity to participate, with more or less intensity, in local social networks at the places they visit, in order to not be marginalized or even aggressed.

Secondly, social digital networks are a specific type of social networks including groups of people who operate and communicate by connecting their computers inside the Internet. Some of these social digital networks belong to the so-called Web 2.0. This Social Web is understood a second age of the Internet, that had a notable development after 2001, and where users became apparently more active than in the precedent decade. That is, besides reading information, they write content, for instance posts and comments in blogs, or messages to other users within social networks (Facebook Twitter, Instagram, Pintrest, etc.). This is the reason why Web 2.0 is also called '*reading/writing Internet*'. Sometimes these writing activities may include the production of '*folksonomies*', which are delimited as constellations of concepts forged by common people, e.g., the 'tags' or keywords associated with a post's content in a blog on tourism.

Nowadays, it is possible to perceive some signs of another way of flowing in the Internet, the *Web 3.0*. This is censed to be a new style of reception and production of information, knowledge, and meaning. It is often nominated *Semantic Web*, because its main aim is to construct social semantic sites and networks where their own underlying model of meaning and knowledge is manifest and described.

How is this working? Here is an example of a *social semantic web site on tourism*: a site producer can indicate, to a tourist user, a relationship between a page entitled 'Cultural tourism' and other page named 'art museum visiting', by showing him a link with one of that names. This is a simple relationship, a hierarchy between two familiar concepts. 'Cultural tourism' is a more general concept, and so it stays, within a knowledge model, in a higher level than 'art museum visiting'. It is possible to organise a set of concepts inside adequate structures, e.g., a list, an outline or a visual map with links. If, for instance, the user enters in the page 'art museum visiting' and wants to see more related information, the site software should be able to extract, automatically, the pages which content is more specific or associated with that information class and content, such as 'guided visits'. Other related data should be as well easily accessible.

In other words, within these semantic sites, the meaningful relationships among pieces of information, or among parts of knowledge, are explicit. For the last years, some of these relationships are already being made manually at Web 2.0, as noticed above; e.g., a *tag* (a descriptive concept, term, or word) that a user often associates to some text in a web page, to a post in a blog or to entire pages or sites. These *tags* constitute *metadata*, which are data about data. In the Semantic Web, the use of metadata is more generalized than in Web 2.0. Nowadays, one can find several examples of semantic sites at cyberspace and within *cybertime*, such as *FreeBase*, *Semantic Media Wiki*, etc.Incidentally, cybertime is defined as the set of temporalities and rhythms that users activate when they travel through cyberspace, like synchronic time at virtual chats or non synchronic communication at blogs, web pages, etc. (Andrade, 1996).

Therefore, common citizens are not just immersed in a network society, as Manuel Castells (1996) puts it, but as well in a somewhat *research society* (Andrade, 2008c. p. 311). In effect, most people are doing searches at Google using keywords/concepts for retrieving not just information but knowledge sources, a practise only pursued by scientists and other specialists some decades ago; common people are also defining concepts at *Wikipedia*, a skill traditionally reserved to experts; using video camcorders and mobile phones, ordinary citizens can collect data as classical researchers used to do, although not always with similar methodological concerns.

Naturally, this doesn't mean that with Web 2.0 everybody becomes (always) active *(citizens and tourist) users,* and that inside Web 3.0 everyone may reach knowledge about everything. It is necessary not just to take a participatory posture and pursuit a hermeneutics of social meaning, but also be critical to the games of power and domination that underlie every social practise and every deconstruction and reconstruction of knowledge.

One way to do so is through a Sociology that articulates critical thought to the *semantic-logical turn* that is emerging within our contemporary society, that Web 2.0, and mainly Web 3.0, are two of the most relevant manifestations.

This may lead to the restructuration and reinvention of our scientific and epistemological universe of theory and methods for searching/researching meaning, e.g. through social semantic webs constituted through metadata defined for such a purpose, that the author named *transchotomies* (Andrade, 2007). Briefly, transchotomies are concept constellations usually including three or more ideas, that differ and must be understood beyond, simultaneously: (1) from dichotomies, hierarchies and taxonomies, which are some of the dominant concept webs within the modernity knowledge paradigm; and (2) from

folksonomies, i.e., the predominant conceptualization paradigm of post-modernity, especially within cyberspace. We noted above that folksonomies are non-expert or 'folk' concepts produced within social networks, such as the 'tags'. An example of transchotomies is a 'trichotomy', which simply means an articulation of three concepts, or a social situation characterized by three core agents. E.g., the 'love triangle' observed in cinema. In a couple situation, the relative stability of a two-person relationship, may be disturbed and transformed by a third person; e.g., a lover of one of the precedent social actors.

FUTURE RESEARCH: MOBILITIES AND DISCOURSES WITHIN NETWORKS OF E-HERITAGE AND TOURISM

Finally, it is crucial to try to foresee some of the actual core tendencies in Tourism Studies. Innovative Tourism Studies must consider transformations introduced by novel trends of innovative tourism, such as cultural e-tourism. The viability of this future research's directions should be tested with pertinent, concrete and empirical projects.

One of the main questions and issues to be discussed is the role that cultural e-tourism may fulfil, in order to encourage innovation of practices and discourses about e-cultural heritage and the corresponding social inclusion within communities. Such innovative processes can be developed partially through mobilities processes, undertaken by the inhabitants of specific regions, who can act either as tourists or as *tourism publics* (Andrade, in press). Tourist audiences may be defined as citizens who are participating in tourism activities and are exposed to discourses on tourism, in this case, actions and discourses related to e-cultural tourism. Such publics may also develop critical comments, or even counter-discourses on their own practises within tourism contexts, including inside the cyberspace public sphere.

In other words, regarding this process of e-tourism, and in a context of interculturalism and transculturalism, the role of communities is central. For example, *open tourism* (Egger, 2016) is a process developed by local stakeholders and citizens that often leads to *open innovation*, through strategies 'bottom-up' such as crowdsourcing and *co-creation* producing rich tourism initiatives and impact across the social and cultural fabric.

In effect, tourists use, more and more, computers and mobile devices (a cell phone, an iPhone, a digital watch, etc.), investing often in the following strategies, in a daily basis:

1. To find *general everyday information,* relating to places they explore, tourists may consult: (a1) a web page for basic information; (a2) a blog for dialogic content (posts and respective comments); or (a3) *Wikipedia* content for common terms definitions.
2. In order to search more *specific information*, *or even specialized data (economic, political, cultural, etc.),* for instance to look for artistic and leisure spots, like a museum, and find data relating to artworks or other content to see/observe, tourists may try: (b1) a portal or a search engine (e.g., *Google*) to preform and perform a term search; or (b2) a directory (such as Yahoo) to find data organized by subject areas.
3. When tourists want to *situate themselves* inside a given locality, they may use a GPS system for consulting a city map in order to choose: (c1) a route or a street; (c2) a restaurant or a hotel, etc.
4. If they prefer to *participate* more deeply in the inner life of a visited country, they even have the power to: (d1) receive/send e-mails; (d2) share news (RSS); and (d3) exchange comments through

a social network (*Facebook, Twitter*), both with their destination ground and/or their departure societies.

These discursive networks may operate through three core discursive strategies and tactics:

1. Writing and reading tourist *messages and campaigns disseminated on paper*, such as brochures, catalogues or other tourist documentation provided by travel agencies;
2. Argumentation and interpretation actions through the *mass media of modernity*, such as newspapers, radio and television. *Travel journalism* (Hanush, 2014) is a new field of reflexion in Communication Studies that include the importance that mass media and journalists give to the production of information and meaning for tourists, within several global and local contexts.
3. Rhetoric and hermeneutic practises using the *e-territories of advanced modernity* or post modernity, such as cyberspace. In this last context, two other genres of webs within the Internet emerge as media players and as social cultural intermediation, as above noted.
   a. Digital social networks belonging to the so-called *Web 2.0 or Social Web*; e.g., *Flickr, Instagram, You Tube, Vimeo*.
   b. Digital locations within *Web 3.0 or Social Semantic Web*. Wikipedia is just one of the earliest emerging poles of Web 3.0. In other words, *social capital* that is so important within Web 2.0's social networks actions and discourses, in Web 3.0 is partially substituted by *cultural capital* and, even more deeply, through the *knowledge capital* and power deployed by users sharing and transferring knowledge. For more details in these matters, please consult a recent reflexion about the novel *digital public sphere* (Andrade, 2013b), and a sketch of a *Semantic-Logic Sociology* that is being built based on several theoretical interpretations and empirical analysis of the Web 2.0 and Web 3.0 ground, such as *Second Life* and *Wikipedia*. These reflections were empirically corroborated through a study on tourists and other publics visiting in 2010 an exhibition of Joana Vasconcelos art works at the Museum Coleção Berardo in Lisbon (Andrade, 2011).

CONCLUSION

Every conclusion is incomplete, and it works as a departure for other studies. Thus, the following brief clues are just an exercise of dialogue directed to researchers, eventually interested in pursuing the travel across a particular new route of Tourism debates, the discussion on cultural e-Tourism.

This chapter argued for the necessity of taking seriously the challenge that cyberspace is putting to Tourism Studies. It described the sociological narratives that take such challenge into consideration, departing from the paramount idea of mobilities, but confronting it with other recent theoretical, conceptual, and empirical postures.

The main theme, cultural e-tourism, and its discourses, was delimited, and its advantages and issues were underlined, in what regards: (a) the main debates on this subject; (b) the chapter author purposes and views; and (c) the broad and stimulant theme of tourism innovation.

In short, cultural e-tourism may constitute a powerful future mode and strategy to improve discursive innovation within e-heritage networks, and, in so doing, motivate future innovative research by Tourism Studies. Moreover, it would be certainly useful to compare specific case studies with other similar cases across Europe or globally.

REFERENCES

Andrade, P. (1980). *Les groupes 'Excursionistes'-'De Déjeuners' Portugais et leur Art. Thèse de Diplôme d´ Études Approfondis, orientation: Marc Ferro.* Paris: École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales.

Andrade, P. (1985). Para uma Sociologia da Documentação: sensibilização à necessidade da sua construção. Actas do 1º Congresso Nacional de Bibliotecários, Arquivistas e Documentalistas 'A informação em tempo de mudança' (pp. 421-450). Lisboa: BAD.

Andrade, P. (1986). A arte Excursionista. *Colóquio-Artes,* (68), 5-11.

Andrade, P. (1991). A Taberna mediática, local reticular de negociações sociais e sociológicas. *Revista Critica de Ciencias Sociais*, (33): 265–286.

Andrade, P. (1993). Sociologia da viagem: Deslocações diárias e anti-quotidiano nómada. *Revista Critica de Ciencias Sociais*, (37): 51–77.

Andrade, P. (1996). Sociologia (Interdimensional) da Internet. *Actas do 3º Congresso Português de Sociologia*. (CD-ROM)

Andrade, P.(1997). Navegações no cibertempo: viagens virtuais e vitualidades da ciberviagem. *Atalaia*, (3), 111-124.

Andrade, P.(2003). A museabilidade da Ciência: consumo, cidadania, cultura e comunicação. *Atalaia/Intermundos*, (12/13), 9-29.

Andrade, P. (2007). *Imagem e Web 2.0: algumas redes sócio-conceptuais mediadoras da Wikipédia.* Paper presented at Conferência Internacional 'Imagem e Pensamento'. Centro Cultural de Belém, Lisboa, Portugal.

Andrade, P. (2008a). *Web 2.0 and Digital Museums.* Paper presented at XX Congress International Association of Empirical Aesthetics, IEAE, Chicago, IL.

Andrade, P. (2008b). *A Comunicação Pública da Arte: o caso dos museus de arte locais/globais.* Paper presented at VI Congresso Português de Sociologia 'Mundos sociais: saberes e práticas'. FCSH/UNL, Lisboa, Portugal.

Andrade, P. (2008c). A sociedade da investigação e do jornalismo: boas práticas de cidadania participativa através da internet móvel e do social bookmarking. In *Anuário Internacional de Comunicação Lusófona* (pp. 307–312). Braga: SOPCOM.

Andrade, P. (Ed.). (2010). *Museus, Públicos e Literacia Científico-Tecnológica: Redes de Comunicação de Significados no Espaço Interdimensional do Museu.* Lisboa: Edições Colibri.

Andrade, P. (2011). *Sociologia Semântico-Lógica da Web 2.0/3.0 na sociedade da investigação: significados e discursos quotidianos em blogs, wikis, mundos/museus virtuais e redes sociais semântico-lógicas*. Lisboa: Edições Caleidoscópio.

Andrade, P. (2013a). Sociologie Sémantico-Logique des Ruines: Pour une Hermeneutique Hybride de la Ruine à la Web 2.0 et à la Web 3.0. *Sociétés*, *120*(115), 105–119. doi:10.3917/soc.120.0105

Andrade, P. (2013b). Sociological Ontology of the digital public sphere: the case of Web 2.0/3.0. *Revista de Comunicação e Sociedade 'Esfera Pública Digital: fragilidades e desafios',* (23), 202-216.

Andrade, P. (2014). Post-Colonial Co-Ordinary Literature And Web 2.0/3.0: thinking back within transmediatic knowledge. In M. Cornis-Pope (Ed.), *Literature and Multimedia in late 20th and 21st Century Europe* (pp. 17, 123–144, 389–390, 427, 437). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Andrade, P. (2015). 'Arts Numériques et Musées Virtuels', 'Jeux Sociologiques', 'Hybridologie', 'Ontologies Visuelles'. In M. Veyrat (Ed.), 110 Notions sur les Arts Numériques (pp. 127-8, 155-6, 179-80, 185-6). Paris: Les Éditions de l'Immatériel.

Andrade, P. (Ed.). (2016a). *Comunicação Pública da Arte: o caso dos museus de arte locais e globais*. Lisboa: Edições Caleidoscópio.

Andrade, P.(2016b). GeoNeoLogical Novel and other Hybrimedia Experiments: or how to use Hybrid Methods such as Hybrid Discourse Analysis (HDA) within a Knowledge Base. *MATLIT*, *4*(2), 157-181.

Andrade, P. (in press). Tourism Communication at Web 2.0/3.0: Some Reflexions applying Semantic-Logic Sociology and Methodology. *Mondes du Tourisme, Paris.*

Black, G. (2012). *Transforming Museums in the Twenty-first Century*. London: Routledge.

Boniface, P., & Fowler, P. (1993). *Heritage and Tourism in The Global Village*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P., & Darbel, A. (1966). *L'Amour de l'art: Les musées et leur public*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.

Buhalis, D., Tjoa, A., & Jafari, J. (1998). Information and communication tecnologies in tourism 1998*: Proceedings ogf the International Conference in Istambul*. Berlin: Springer.

Buntinx, G. (2006). *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books.

Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Cohen, S. (2013). *Lifestyle mobilities: intersections of travel, leisure and migration*. Farnham, MA: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Cohen, S. (Ed.). (2014). *Understanding and governing sustainable tourism mobility: Psychological and behavioural approaches*. London: Routledge.

Egger, R. et al. (Eds.). (2016). *Open tourism: open innovation, crowdsourcing and co-creation challenging the tourism industry*. Berlin: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-54089-9

Elliot, A., & Urry, J. (2010). *Mobile Lives*. London: Routledge.

Faraj, R. (2014). *E-tourism Revolutionary Effect Studying E-tourism in Lebanon*. Saarbrucken: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.

French, Y., & Runyard, S. (2011). *Marketing and Public Relations for Museums, Galleries, Cultural and Heritage Attractions*. London: Routledge.

Fullagar, S., Markwel, K., & Wilson, E. (Eds.). (2012). *Slow travel and tourism: experiences and mobilities*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Goodson, L. (Ed.). (2004). *Qualitative research in tourism: ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*. London: Routledge.

Graburn, N. (1977). The Museum and the Visitor Experience. *Roundtable Reports,* 1-5. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40479310

Hall, C. (2011). *Fieldwork in tourism: methods, issues and reflections*. London: Routledge.

Hall, M., & Tucker, H. (2004). *Tourism and Postcolonialism: Contested Discourses, Identities and Representations* (M. Hall & H. Tucker, Eds.). London: Routledge.

Hanna, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Social memory and heritage tourism methodologies*. London: Routledge.

Hannam, K., Mostafanezhad, M., & Rickly-Boyd, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Event Mobilities: Politics, Place and Performance*. Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis.

Hanusch, F., & Fursich, E. (Eds.). (2014). *Travel journalism: exploring production, impact and culture*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9781137325983

Harrison, D., & Hitchcock, M. (Eds.). (2005). *The Politics of World Heritage: Negotiating Tourism and Conservation*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Johnson, P. & Thomas, B. (1992). *Tourism, Museums and the Local Economy: The Economic Impact of the North of England Open Air Museum at Beamish*. Camberley, UK: Edward Elgar Pub.

Kaminski, J., Benson, A., & Arnold, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Contemporary issues in cultural heritage tourism*. London: Routledge.

Katsoni, V., & Stratlgea, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Tourism and culture in the age of innovation: second International Conference IACuDiT, Athens 2015*. Berlin: Springer.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998). *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the Social*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Lavine, S. (1991). *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Books.

Lippard, L. (2000). *On the Beaten Track: Tourism, Art, and Place*. New York: The New Press.

Lytras, M. (2011). *Digital culture and e-tourism: technologies, applications and management approaches*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-61520-867-8

MacCannell, D. (1976). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken Books.

Maddrell, A., & Terry, A. (2015). *Sacred mobilities: journeys of belief and belonging*. Farnham, MA: Ashgate.

Matsuo, K. (Eds.). (2015). *Tourism Informatics: Towards Novel Knowledge Based Approaches*. Berlin: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-47227-9

Molz, J. (2014). *Travel connections: Tourism, technology and togetherness in a mobile world*. London: Routledge.

Rakic, T., & Chambers, D. (2012). *An introduction to visual research methods in tourism*. London: Routledge.

Richards, G. (1996). *Cultural Tourism in Europe*. Wallingford: CABI.

Rickly, J., Hannam, K., & Mostafanezhad, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Tourism and Leisure Mobilities: Politics, Work, and Play*. London: Routledge.

Salazar, N. (2010). *Envisioning Eden: Mobilizing Imaginaries in Tourism and Beyond*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Salazar, N., & Jayaram, K. (Eds.). (2016). *Keywords of mobility: critical engagements*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Sharda, N. (2010). *Tourism informatics: visual travel recommender systems, social communities, and user interface design*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-60566-818-5

Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2004). *Tourism mobilities: Places to play, places in play*. London: Routledge.

Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). *Mobile Technologies in the City*. London: Routledge.

Sheller, N., & Isaacson, M. (2013). *Tourist mobility and advanced tracking technologies*. London: Routledge.

Simmel, G., & Levine, D. (Eds.). (1972). *Georg Simmel on Individuality and Social Form*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Slocum, S., & Kline, C. (Eds.). (2015). *Scientific tourism: Researchers as travellers*. London: Routledge.

Sweeney, S. (2000). *Internet marketing for your tourism business: Proven techniques for promoting tourist-based businesses over the Internet*. Chicago: Maximum Press.

Tussyadiah, I., & Inversini, A. (Eds.). (2015). Information and communication technologies in tourism 2015: Proceedings of the international conference in Lugano, Switzerland, February 3-6. Berlin: Springer.

Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Verstraete, G. (2009). *Tracking Europe: Mobility, diaspora, and the politics of location*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Cultural E-Tourism: A genre of tourism including cyberspace flows and travels where tourists look for fruition regarding cultural e-heritage.

Cultural E-Heritage: Cultural heritage propagated across new media, cyberspace and digital networks.

Cyber-Trip: A travel across cyberspace and cybertime.

Cybertime: The rhythms that a internet user activates when (s)he explores digital network territories within cyberspace.

Discursive Innovation: Social or institutional discursive processes including the communication of conditions, objectives, meanings, methods and effects regarding creative cultural transformation but also social inclusion.

Discursive Network: Webs of social meanings disseminated through languages, messages, and campaigns promoted by some type of e-institution.

E-Institution: An institution operating in cyberspace under specific circumstances, like the location of its own company headquarters inside the WWW.

Mobilities: A process that refers to other processes, actors, and things that are often on the move within our contemporary society, such as tourists, capitals, workers, images, heritage and even places.

Web 2.0: The so-called second age of the internet, that had a notable development after 2001, and where users became apparently more active than in the precedent decade. That is, besides reading information, they write content, e.g., posts and comments in blogs or messages to other users in social networks (Facebook, etc.). That's why Web 2.0 is also named '*reading/writing internet*'.

Web 3.0: This network mode is censed to foster a new style of reception and production of information, knowledge, and meaning. It is often nominated *Semantic Web*, because its main aim is to construct social semantic sites and networks where their own underlying model of meaning and knowledge is manifested and described.