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Abstract: This paper suggests that the investigation of tourism-induced seasonal retirement migration can shed new light on issues of anti-tourism, social distinction, and authenticity. Interviews conducted with Swedish retirees, spending their summers in Sweden and their winters in Spain, showed that anti-tourism may involve distinctions from devalued forms of tourism, and also distinctions based on different social roles and positions. The respondents attempted to create a social space for themselves between, on the one hand, tourists and tourism, and on the other hand, the Spanish, Spanishness, and norms of integration. These attempts also produced constructions of authenticity and normality, which challenge traditional conceptions within tourism research. Keywords: retirement migration, anti-tourism, social categorization, social distinction, authenticity.

INTRODUCTION

In today’s world, people sometimes move around in ways that question traditional identifications and categorizations based on, for example, tourists and tourism. As Williams and Hall (2000:20) point out, research has paid little attention to “the gray zone of the complex forms of mobility which lie on a continuum between permanent migration and tourism”, although these practices may be of great interest for tourism analysis as well as for social science more generally.
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This paper investigates the experiences, self-perceptions, and distinctive strategies of a group of people pursuing one such form of mobility—Swedish retirees spending their summer seasons in Sweden and their winters in Spain.

This case of tourism-induced seasonal retirement migration evokes several topical issues. Retirement migration to southern Europe, and to Spain in particular, is, to a large extent, the result of mass tourism and involves a range of economic, sociocultural, and demographic considerations (Barke and France 1996; King, Warnes and Williams 1998; Rodríguez, Fernández-Mayoralas and Rojo 1998). On the micro level, the experiences of the retirees highlight issues of social categorization and self-identification, which refer, in important ways, to tourism. These latter issues will be the focus of this paper.

In spite of the magnitude of tourist flows and the resulting cultural and economic influences in contemporary society, both tourism and tourists are often accompanied by ambivalence, disparagement, and even hostility. “Anti-tourism” is widespread within social science as well as among the general public, with conceptions of tourism ranging from the trivial and artificial to the vulgar or barbarian, and with common stereotypes depicting the industry as exploiting and destroying local cultures, providing but superficial experiences of “sun, sea, and sand” (Crick 1989; Jacobsen 2000). Two interrelated explanations for anti-tourist attitudes and practices are often suggested—one concerns social distinction, the other authenticity.

The first explanation holds that anti-tourism reflects hierarchies within tourism and strategies of social distinction (Jacobsen 2000:287; Munt 1994). Arguments along these lines understand tourism in terms of consumption, as a way of acquiring or maintaining “cultural capital” in order to achieve social distinction (Bourdieu 1984). People strive to perform (or consume) those kinds of tourism that are relatively highly valued, while dissociating themselves from socially and culturally devalued tourist activities and orientations. Munt (1994) suggests that with increasing economic resources and improved facilities for long-distance journeys, tourism has become a critical component of the “classificatory struggles” in contemporary Western society, especially among the middle classes. This first explanation suggests that anti-tourists do not necessarily despise tourism in general, but certain forms of it, notably mass tourism. Yet, the fact that tourism is often produced for and consumed by the masses does not seem to entirely explain the persistence of anti-tourist sentiments. In order to understand what makes tourism such an efficient vehicle for social distinction, the second explanation—authenticity and rupture with normality—should also be considered.

Common definitions of tourism emphasize the distinction between the ordinary and the extraordinary (or nonordinary). The temporary escape from everyday life, with activities, locations, settings, and a “gaze” contrasting with normality, is crucial to the tourist experience (Crick 1989:332; Urry 1990:2–3). Yet, the search for the extraordinary brings along the paradox of authenticity, widely discussed within the field. MacCannell (1976) suggests that the essence of tourism is the
search for authenticity not found in people’s ordinary life, but that destinations often offer a “staged authenticity” rather than a true one. Indeed, MacCannell claims that “[t]he term ‘tourist’ is increasingly used as a derisive label for someone who seems content with his [sic] obviously inauthentic experiences” (1976:94).

However, this second explanation of anti-tourism has been subject to much debate. The underlying assumption—that some settings or activities are authentic whereas others are not—has been criticized by social constructionists arguing that authenticity is, to a great extent, constructed by the perspective and the interpretations of the observer (Crick 1989:336–337; Wang 1999:353–356). For example, Cohen (1988:374) questions MacCannell’s notion of authenticity by claiming that it implicitly equates the authentic with “the pristine, the primitive, the natural, that which is as yet untouched by modernity”, and treats authenticity as an objective quality, searched for by every inhabitant of modern society. Cohen suggests that authenticity is socially constructed and its social connotations are thus negotiable, and that people may differ a lot with regard to how much of it they demand (Pearce and Moscardo 1985; Urry 1995:137–139; in later editions of his book, MacCannell also seems to acknowledge some of these points). The latter argument parallels the conception of tourism as a form of socially stratified consumption (Jacobsen 2000:297), as it suggests that claims of authenticity may be a strategy of social distinction and thus one reason why (some) people do not want to be “tourists”.

In a later text, Cohen (1995) goes even further in questioning the notion of tourism as a search for authenticity and extraordinariness. He suggests that in contemporary society, the quest for authenticity associated (by MacCannell and others) with modernity is gradually being replaced by a “postmodern” tourist ethos, which implies a playful search for enjoyment that blurs the distinction between authentic and “contrived” settings (Feifer 1986:259–271). Similarly Ritzer and Liska (1997), following postmodern arguments about the attraction of simulations, claim that much contemporary tourism appears to be a search for inauthenticity rather than authenticity. Many tourists, Ritzer and Liska argue, also seem to prefer highly predictable and controlled vacations, thus following the same rationality and indeed experiencing much the same things as they do in their everyday life. Tourism, seen from this perspective, no longer represents any fundamental rupture with normality; this postmodern challenge of the paradox of authenticity in fact questions the very distinctions of authenticity/inauthenticity and ordinary/extraordinary (Wang 1999).

In spite of this criticism, the concept of authenticity has proved useful in research. Tourists often seem to value destinations perceived to provide authentic settings and experiences. At the same time, their activities are often associated with a lack of authenticity and the very presence of tourists in a place may make people (including the tourists themselves) perceive it as being less authentic (Jacobsen 2000; Waller and Lea 1999). This association with inauthenticity appears to be an important explanation for the persistence of anti-tourist sentiments. However, in order to understand the views and experiences of the
Swedish winter residents in Spain—the focus of this paper—their ambivalent social position as seasonal migrants also needs to be taken into account. In their everyday life in Spain, they do not unequivocally belong either to the local Spanish community or to the tourism community. In addition, many researchers claim that today’s society is marked by growing (and increasingly diverse forms of) human mobility and migration (Castles and Miller 1998), and by the emergence of new transnational ways of life (Pries 1999). Norms, values, and common understandings of mobility and territorial “roots” are destabilized by this development (King et al 1998; Malkki 1992). On the one hand, traditional understandings within social science regard migration and human mobility as an exception to a normality of immobility, social cohesion, and cultural homogeneity; migration is supposed to be a unidirectional movement followed by integration in the destination society. On the other hand, more recent perspectives understand migration as an ongoing process, involving continuous flows of people, social interaction, and cultural expressions.

Seasonal retirement migration, and the social roles and positions that it creates, conform well to these latter perspectives but may come into conflict with traditional understandings of migration and norms of integration. This conflict was, at times, highly apparent in the accounts of the Swedish winter residents in Spain. It will be argued here that the interviewees occupied a marginal social and symbolic space between tourists and local Spanish residents, but also between common understandings of tourism and migration, and that this marginality provides important contextual explanations for their views of tourists and tourism.

The purpose of this paper is to examine what strategies the winter residents used in their dissociation from tourists and tourism, to explain this dissociation and to analyze its implications with regard to anti-tourism, social distinction, and authenticity. In particular, this will involve the investigation of how the interviewees regarded tourists, the local Spanish population, and their own relationship(s) with these two groups.

EXPERIENCES OF SEASONAL RETIREMENT MIGRATION

Large-scale tourism from northern Europe to the Mediterranean started in the 50s and boomed in the 60s, with Spain becoming the very symbol of international mass tourism (Williams 1996). From the 60s onwards, tourism also brought with it a substantial flow of foreign retirement migration to the Spanish tourist areas (King et al 1998; Rodríguez et al 1998; Williams, King and Warnes 1997). Britons and Germans were among the first and still make up the largest foreign (European) populations (INE 2000; O’Reilly 2000; Svensson 1988:15), but Swedes and other Scandinavians soon followed suit, in search of a more favorable climate and sometimes also fiscal or other economic advantages (Källström 1997; Rising 1970). Some have settled permanently, some spend part(s) of the year in Spain, some use their Spanish residence only as a holiday accommodation for a few weeks each year.
The very scarce evidence available suggests that they are mostly upper middle class, often former executives, entrepreneurs, employers, or professionals (Rodríguez et al. 1998; Sydkusten 2000; Törnberg 1999). The largest Swedish communities are located in the coastal areas of mainland Spain—Costa del Sol and Costa Blanca in particular—but significant numbers of Swedish retirees are also to be found on the Balearic Islands and the Canaries.

The largest Swedish communities are located in the coastal areas of mainland Spain—Costa del Sol and Costa Blanca in particular—but significant numbers of Swedish retirees are also to be found on the Balearic Islands and the Canaries.

The exact numbers of Swedes living in Spain are difficult to grasp, as they often have residences in both countries, between which they may move in a highly flexible manner (O’Reilly 2000:39–59). In addition, many of them do not apply for residence permits, and are thus invisible in Spanish population statistics (Jägerhorn 1996a; Westman 1999). According to Spanish statistics (INE 2000), about 8500 Swedish citizens were residents in Spain by the end of 1999. Källström (1997:16) estimates that somewhere between 25 000 and 35 000 Swedes can be found in just the Costa del Sol and Costa Blanca areas, and approximations of somewhere over 40 000 Swedes living in Spain are common (Gustafsson 1999; Westman 1999). However, in these latter cases the requirements for being considered as “living” in Spain are not defined, and none of the above sources specifies the proportion of retirees.

In areas with high concentrations of expatriates, a considerable Swedish–Spanish infrastructure has developed. Scandinavian clubs and associations flourish and provide a wide range of activities for the retired residents. Newspapers from Sweden are widely accessible, as well as Swedish radio and television broadcasts, transmitted via satellite. In some areas, Swedish residents also have access to locally produced radio programs and news magazines in Swedish. In mainland Spain, a large number of companies owned by Swedes or with Swedish-speaking personnel provide all kinds of goods and services to the expatriates (Källström 1997:341–369).

Study Method

The empirical data used in this paper is a set of qualitative interviews with Swedish retirees spending the winter seasons in Spain and the summers in Sweden. The sample consisted of 46 respondents—22 married or co-habiting couples and two women living alone—and ranged in age from 55 to 88 years. They all spent at least three months per year in each country. In Spain, 19 of them lived on Gran Canaria and 27 on the mainland, mostly on the Costa del Sol. The respondents were generally recruited through personal contacts and “snowball” sampling. As Biernacki and Waldorf (1981) point out, this sampling procedure entails certain methodological problems, particularly with regard to the researcher’s control of the referral chains involved and the assessment of whether the respondents reflect the general characteristics of the group being studied. However, the purpose here was not to obtain a statistically representative sample, but to find respondents sharing the experience of having chosen, after retirement, to live in two different countries, and to describe and analyze how they

Taped interviews, generally lasting for about two hours, were made during the summer season of 1999, usually in the Swedish homes of the respondents. The couples were interviewed together. The interviews were semi-structured, with questions focusing on the respondents’ experiences of living in two different countries and with some emphasis on their life in Spain. Verbatim transcripts were made of the interviews, although accounts that were clearly beside the subject were omitted, and the transcripts were then coded and analyzed using the NVivo software for computer-aided qualitative data analysis (Richards 1999). The analysis was inspired by theoretical questions about mobility, multiple place attachment, and transnationality, as well as by empirical themes emerging during the interviews (Layder 1998). One such theme was the interviewees’ strong dissociation from tourism, examined in this paper.

**Dissociation from Tourists**

The places where the respondents lived, on the Costa del Sol and Gran Canaria, were highly influenced by tourism and the interviewees had usually been there as tourists before acquiring their residences (King et al 1998). Not surprisingly then, they were still often taken for tourists, by local residents and by other Swedes (Swedish tourists in Spain and friends and relatives in Sweden). Yet, during the interviews, most of them more or less emphatically rejected this categorization. Several explicitly pointed out that they were not tourists in Spain and that they did not want to be regarded as such. They might be irritated or even hurt when their friends in Sweden considered their winter season in Spain to be somewhat touristic (Williams, King, Warnes and Patterson 2000:41), as one interviewee expressed it: (F corresponds to female respondent, M to male respondent, and I to interviewer).

F: I write less and less [to friends in Sweden], because I have had enough of sending some 30 or 35 postcards and letters to people who never write back. I mean, we live down there for six months, and if I send them a greeting, it’s not because I am there as a tourist, it’s because I want to maintain contact with those back home in Sweden.

Some admitted that, although they did not regard themselves as tourists, the Spanish could easily see from their appearance and hear from their stumbling Spanish that they were foreigners, and thus often treated them so. However, they were still annoyed about it and attempted, during the interviews, to construct a distinction:

I: Do you think of yourselves as tourists during these six months?
F: Oh no, we don’t, but we’re still far from being Spaniards. I mean, we know that the Spanish regard us as [tourists], whatever we do. I don’t think you can hide that.
M: But there are different types of tourists. I mean, there are tourists who come down a week or two. After all, we live there for about half the year.

Indeed, one of the respondents, who had had a residence on the Costa del Sol for over 30 years and also had children and grand children living in the area, explicitly pointed out even to the local population that he was not a tourist. He always told the local shopkeepers that “I am not a tourist, I’m a *Los Bolichero* [inhabitant of Los Boliches]. I have lived here for many years, so I shall have ten percent off the price, you see.” He may be an extreme case, because of his long history in Spain and his social ties there; yet, most of the respondents wanted, during the interviews, to make a distinction between themselves and tourists. The strategies that they used to achieve this did in fact have important similarities with earlier theoretical and empirical research about tourism and anti-tourism.

To begin with, the three quotations above contained, in one way or another, *temporal* distinctions from tourists; the respondents referred to the continuity of their life in Spain, while tourism is generally taken to be of a short-term and temporary nature (Urry 1990:3). Several respondents also suggested that tourists often were in a hurry, trying to get the most out of their short holiday in the sun, whereas the winter residents lived their life at a slower pace, adapting to what the interviewees perceived to be a relaxed Spanish lifestyle (Rodríguez et al 1998). In addition, tourists did not have the time to discover the “real” Spain:

M: The tourists who come down go to Playa Ingles or to Mogan or Puerto Rico or something, and they see nothing there. They only see this, the beach, the hotel and so on, they don’t get any further. They are there for two weeks, they don’t have the time to go off and see anything. But there is much, much more.

F: …you cannot see it all in one or two weeks, that’s impossible. And we, for our part, try to find new places when we go on journeys. As you say, there are tourist traps, and we stay away from them. We know them now. We have been tourists ourselves, but that isn’t exciting any more.

Such accounts of a more genuine Spain, off the tourist tracks, also point to *spatial* distinctions, which were of central importance to the interviewees. Tourism implies traveling, leaving one’s home in order to visit other places which, in addition, are often adapted to tourism and the “tourist gaze” (Cohen 1995:23; Urry 1990). However, these latter adaptations, together with the presence of large numbers of tourists in a place, usually give rise to anti-tourist sentiments and are taken to signify a lack of authenticity (Barke and France 1996:301; Jacobsen 2000; Waller and Lea 1999). Thus, although the winter residents lived in tourism regions, they often argued that they did not go to the same places—beaches, hotels, touristic restaurants and shops—as the tourists. Such places were described as busy and noisy (Rodríguez et al 1998:193), commercialized, overcrowded with tourists—“there are often whole busloads of them”—and often somewhat inauthentic, such as when the waiter at a restaurant brings in a menu in Swedish and
with typically Swedish dishes. To quote a male respondent, “We avoid restaurants which are too touristy. I mean we do try to find places where they don’t say [in Swedish] Welcome, we have meat balls”.

Visits to “touristy” settings highly increase the risk of being so defined; the respondents described their avoiding such places and instead searching for genuine Spanish settings unaffected by the industry (O’Reilly 2000:106–107; Williams et al 1997:129). Another spatial distinction was, of course, the fact that tourists stayed in hotels or temporarily rented apartments, whereas the interviewees usually had their own “home in Spain” (Svensson 1988). Some of them also emphasized that their house or apartment was situated some distance from the touristic areas.

Distinctions in time and space were closely interwoven with those related to activity and behavior. Just as tourism is associated with specific locations and settings, it is associated with certain leisurely activities that mark the inversion of ordinary life (Urry 1990), often devalued and regarded as inauthentic (Crick 1989). Respondents frequently identified certain activities as touristic in nature and thus defined them as less relevant to winter residents. Whereas tourists spend a lot of time on the beach, swimming and sun-bathing, one interviewee pointed out that “a month may pass” before he got to the beach, and several others claimed that they were never sun-bathing as the tan “comes automatically” (see O’Reilly 2000:110). Whereas tourists go sightseeing, the respondents described staying away from local attractions. Some even argued, somewhat derisively, that one could see by the way people dressed if they were tourists or winter residents:

F: In the evening, a Spaniard wears warm clothing, a long-time resident like us puts on a sweater, but a tourist turns up dressed in T-shirt and shorts (laughs).
M: And shivers with cold!
F: Yes, and shivers with cold. But that’s the way they are. Once they are down there, they never wear anything but T-shirt and shorts. The rest of us [winter residents] dress according to the temperature and the conditions.

This and earlier statements also point to another important theme in the interviews, that of knowledge and abilities. Whereas organized tourism, at least in an anti-tourist interpretation, “seem[s] to provide protection against the experience of foreignness, and to accept non-involvement in local cultures” (Jacobsen 2000:288; see also Crick 1989:331), most interviewees emphasized their knowledge about Spain and the region or town where they lived (such as knowing where to go and which places to avoid), and their ability to adapt to local conditions (like wearing appropriate clothes). These accounts often, implicitly or explicitly, reinforced the distinction between winter residents and tourists.

Thus, the respondents used distinctions with regard to time, space, activities, behavior, knowledge, and abilities in their accounts, all in order to dissociate themselves from tourists. These strategies of distinction mirror common scientific as well as lay understandings of tourism and also, to some extent, anti-tourist attitudes and the devaluation of
those kinds of mass tourism that predominate in the Spanish coastal areas (Barke and France 1996). However, in addition, they involve claims about the winter residents’ relationship to Spain and to the local Spanish populations.

Social Categorization and Norms of Integration

Why was the dissociation from tourists so important to the winter residents? The question requires several answers. To begin with, the dissociation from tourists reflected the ambivalent social position of foreign winter residents in Spain. In their accounts, they often referred not only to tourism but also to norms and images related to migration and integration, as well as to notions of Spanishness and the Spanish. It will be argued in this section that these accounts reflected problems of social categorization, which had considerable influence on the dissociation winter residents wanted to make.

Migration and Integration. In social science research, Swedish and other foreign expatriates in Spain are usually described as migrants; the common keyword is “retirement migration”. However, Swedish retirees in Spain—and winter residents in particular—challenge traditional conceptions of migration as unidirectional movement from one country to another, quickly followed by social, cultural, and political integration in the receiving country. In addition, current understandings of migration in western Europe are, to a great extent, based on refugees and labor migrants who come to Western countries from relatively poor countries (Hansen 1995; Miles and Thränhardt 1995).

Obviously, retired residents in Spain diverge in several respects from these dominant images of international migration. Their migration is not permanent, but seasonal, with more or less regular travel between Sweden and Spain. The Swedish environments in Spain (associations, businesses, news media, etc.) allow them to live a highly “Swedish” life, if they desire to do so. Integration in Spanish society is not a necessity but an individual choice; indeed it is a decision that requires considerable effort and ability (King et al 1998:102). Further, they are generally well-to-do retirees from rich countries who go to Spain by their own choosing, to enjoy a pleasurable life rather than to escape unemployment, poverty, or political persecution. There, they also receive far better treatment than immigrants from non-Western countries (Dahl, Romero and Stierna 1995).

Because of these divergences, the position, social categorization, and self-identification of the winter residents may at times be problematic. As for the respondents in the present study, few actually referred to themselves as immigrants in Spain, and those who did usually made some reservation. Few interviewees intended to settle permanently in Spain; on the contrary, most of them declared that they would probably “move home” to Sweden when their health no longer permitted the seasonal journeys to Spain (Williams et al 1997:117). Still, the
norms of integration inherent in dominant understandings of migration were clearly visible in the respondents’ accounts, just as they are in handbooks for Swedes settling in Spain, which strongly encourage expatriates to learn Spanish and to understand “the Spanish lifestyle” (Hampshire 2000: 187–188; Källström 1997). Although the ambitions and achievements in this regard varied substantially among the interviewees, they all regarded some degree of integration and familiarity with Spanish society as desirable. Arguably, the problematic social categorization of the winter residents, and the issue of integration in particular, provides one explanation for the interviewees’ attempted dissociation from tourists. This is indicated by their accounts of negative Swedish popular and media images of winter residents in Spain.

In accordance with earlier research on retirement migration to Spain (Rodríguez et al 1998; Warnes, King, Williams and Patterson 1999), the respondents generally gave a very positive image of their life there. During the interviews, it gradually became clear that one reason for this was their belief that the Swedish public sometimes held negative opinions of them. Several claimed that Swedish newspaper reports and television programs had propagated strongly negative images of them in Spain (Källström 1997:12–13; Larsson 1989:43). Early media reports, according to the respondents, had focused on tax evasion and cheap alcohol; a more consistent theme in negative public and media images seemed to be the expatriates’ lacking integration in Spanish society. According to this theme, they did not learn the language, they did not partake in the host civic life, they followed Swedish rather than Spanish customs, and so forth, which led to isolation and boredom. Their lack of integration might at times also be associated with withdrawal from social and political life, and thus be regarded as something almost immoral (Barke and France 1996:300). One respondent referred to writings a few years earlier in a Swedish newspaper where, in one article, the journalist quotes the mayor of a Costa del Sol municipality as complaining about Swedish expatriates:

People live here as on an island. The Swedes buy Swedish goods, live like in Sweden, use Swedish doctors, go to Swedish restaurants, socialize only with other Swedes, and send their children to Swedish schools. They do not want to integrate (Jägerhorn 1996b:A6).

In another article, the same journalist goes even further, claiming that the entire lifestyle of the expatriates is abnormal. They “have escaped from reality, from politics and work, from everything that reminds them of everyday life” (Jägerhorn 1996a:A10). Several respondents explicitly criticized these and similar media reports during the interviews and tried to defend themselves, arguing that they were quite ordinary people, with sound habits, who were living a good life in Spain. Although some admitted that such negative media images were not totally groundless, the vast difference between these images and the retirees’ highly positive overall judgement of their life in Spain is striking, and not limited to the Swedish residents—O’Reilly (2000)
reports a similar pattern among British residents on the Costa del Sol (see also Williams et al 1997:131).

Clearly, negative media images and norms about migration and integration were sensitive issues among the winter residents, and it is suggested here that this was also one reason for their dissociation from tourism. Such distancing reflected their desire to present themselves as integrated and knowledgeable about Spanish society—at least more so than tourists—and to demonstrate that they were indeed living a normal life in Spain rather than escaping from reality.

Ambivalent Spanishness. Issues of migration and integration also point at another important relationship with regard to social categorization: that between winter residents and the local Spanish populations. When the former discussed differences between themselves (as Swedes) and the Spanish, their accounts often contained a certain amount of ambivalence. First, the distinction drew, explicitly or implicitly, on two different, although not always mutually exclusive, notions of Spanishness—one traditional and one modern. The traditional notion was often based on perceived differences between northern and southern Europe in terms of the characteristic traits and behaviors of the population, and tended to construct Spain as idyllic, exotic, and at times a bit backward when compared to Sweden. Accounts of modern Spain, on the other hand, described it as a country undergoing rapid modernization, annihilating many traditional differences with northern Europe. Whereas traditional accounts constructed the Spanish as “others”, notions of modern Spain downplayed differences between the two countries.

Second and more importantly, the very distinction between the Spanish and the winter residents was, at times, counteracted by the norms of integration and by the respondents’ strategies for distinguishing themselves from tourists. Although they agreed that they differed in various respects from the Spanish, they seldom put any strong emphasis on these distinctions, and they were careful not to make overly negative generalizations about the host. On the contrary, they argued (in accordance with norms of integration) that they should accept Spanish manners and customs—even though they might not always like them—and adapt to local conditions rather than attempting to “change things”:

M: It’s very important, if you move out like that, to another country, that you follow the rules. You shouldn’t try to change things because that’s the way it is back home, that doesn’t work. You have to follow the rules.

In addition, the interviewees’ accounts of tourists and tourism often contained claims about Spanishness—the winter residents ascribing themselves more or less “Spanish” traits in order to distinguish themselves from tourists—that ran counter to strong distinctions between the winter residents and the Spanish. The respondent claiming to be “a Los Bolichero” provides a good illustration of this tendency.
Social Categorization and Dissociation from Tourists. In being thus caught up between tourists and local Spanish populations, between dissociation from tourism and ambivalence with regard to Spanishness and integration, the interviewees even had difficulties in finding a word for the social category to which they belonged. The expression employed here—“winter residents”—was in fact not used by any of the respondents, but was considered a useful descriptive term in the present study, as it contains no direct reference to tourism, migration, or Spanishness. The respondents used several different labels to categorize themselves: “stationary residents”, “long-time residents”, “winter Spaniards”, “almost indigenous”, “migratory birds”, “nomads”, “partly residents in Spain and Sweden”, “half residents”, “Swedish Spaniards”, “long-time tourists”, “winter season tourists”. However, except for “migratory birds”, which appeared twice in the interview transcripts, none of these expressions was used more than once.

This striking lack of consensus aptly illustrates the problematic social categorization of the winter residents. Dominant understandings of socio-spatial existence posit immobility, homogeneity and integration as the norm. Migration, taking the shape of unidirectional movement followed by integration, is an accepted temporary deviation from that norm; another well-established deviation is tourism. However, the interviewees’ accounts indicate that the social and symbolic space between these two accepted deviations is very narrow, often questioned, often ambivalent:

M: We don’t really feel like, like… We cannot say, we’re not real Spaniards, we’re not real tourists…

Several interviews contained, more or less explicitly, these two distinctions: one between winter residents and tourists, the other between winter residents and Spaniards. Yet, the distinctions differed in important respects. They generally considered themselves more Swedish than Spanish and were often recognized as foreigners in Spain. They had lived most of their lives in Sweden, they had residences in Sweden where they spent several months each year, and most of them wanted to return to Sweden permanently in the case of deteriorating health. They did not consider it possible—and in most cases not desirable—to opt for full integration in Spain. Therefore, the distinction from the Spanish was to a large extent taken for granted by the interviewees.

On the other hand, they had a lot in common with tourists. As one couple pointed out, “[w]e have been tourists ourselves” (see King et al 1998), and with hindsight, several respondents described a process through which they had gradually left the status of tourists. However, their new status remained indistinct and precarious—they still ran the risk of being defined as tourists in many everyday situations in Spain, and sometimes also in their contacts with Swedish acquaintances. Thus, the distinction from tourists was much more important to the interviewees than the distinction from the Spanish.
Mass Tourism, Authenticity and Normality

The ambivalent social categorization of winter residents described above provides a set of contextual reasons for the interviewees’ strong dissociation from tourists and tourism. However, these were not the only explanations that appeared in the analysis.

Mass Tourism and Social Distinction. In their distinctions from tourists and tourism, as already noted, several respondents expressed more or less “anti-tourist” sentiments (O’Reilly 2000; Rodríguez et al 1998: 193). Tourists were sometimes described as careless, ignorant, stupid, vulgar, noisy, and so forth; and tourism was equated with commercialization and the exploitation of local settings. Several respondents also associated tourists with heavy drinking, bad manners, and hence a bad reputation, which they feared might spill over to the winter residents. Such stereotyped views of tourism might certainly be one reason for some respondents’ dissociation from tourists.

It was argued previously that the winter residents’ accounts reflected their ambivalent social position in Spain, being neither tourists nor permanent migrants. However, their dissociation from tourists may also reflect hierarchies within tourism (Jacobsen 2000; Munt 1994; Pearce and Moscardo 1985). The distinctions made by the interviewees were primarily directed against mass tourism, based on sun, beaches, nightlife, and commercialism, whereas they sometimes implicitly supported the ideals of more prestigious forms of tourism. When describing their relationship to Spain and their activities there, the respondents often talked about culture, history, and the unspoiled natural environment. These are precisely the qualities that tourism authorities and entrepreneurs on the Costa del Sol have tried to promote since the late 80s, in order to confront the “negative external image” created by mass tourism (Barke and France 1996:300–302; Rodríguez et al 1998:184). In some respects then, the winter residents’ dissociation from tourists may be interpreted as a distancing from some forms of tourism, in order to avoid the devaluation of their “cultural capital” (Bourdieu 1984), rather than as a rejection of tourism altogether.

In fact, the interviewees did not necessarily dislike tourists. Although some of them did indeed express anti-tourist attitudes, several respondents pointed out that they did not mind the tourists coming down for a week or two and having a good time. Most winter residents had their own previous experiences in Spain; in addition, some tourists were friends and relatives who came down for a visit. Rather than despising or ridiculing, what mattered to the interviewees was to make a distinction—to draw a boundary between themselves and the tourists (and the kinds of tourism) that they met in their everyday life in Spain.

Claims of Authenticity. An important, and interrelated, aspect of the winter residents’ accounts was the recurrent claim of access to the “genuine”, “real” or “natural” Spain. Their knowledge of local conditions and their long periods of residence in the country enabled them, so they argued, to discover the real Spain, go to genuine Spanish
places, and (in some cases at least) pursue activities reflecting a genuinely Spanish lifestyle. Tourism, on the other hand, was often described as inauthentic in terms of time, space, activities, and local knowledge, and this seems to be one reason for their dissociation from tourism.

However, the claims of authenticity and the relationship between tourists and the “real Spain” contained a certain amount of ambivalence, resulting from a tension in the interviewees’ views of Spain and Spanishness—that between tradition and modernity (Cohen 1988). In many accounts, authenticity was associated with traditional Spain, with continuity, and often with somewhat stereotyped images and expectations of Spanishness (Wang 1999:355). Accounts based on notions of modern Spain, on the other hand, were more ambivalent. As several respondents pointed out, modernization and internationalization in the coastal areas of Spain have been closely connected with tourism. This was sometimes perceived as a threat to the genuine Spain and thus to the authenticity that the winter residents valued. According to one respondent spending his winters on the Costa del Sol,

M: It becomes over-exploited, unfortunately. He [the Spanish mayor] has great plans and so on, but he doesn’t care about…, he doesn’t think the way we do, that the idyll disappears. They just try to make it as good as they can for as many tourists as possible.

In some cases, however, interviewees accepted modernization and internationalization, regarded it as beneficial to the Spanish as well as to themselves, and described the “real” Spain in terms of development and increasing prosperity rather than as continuity and tradition. These two views were not mutually exclusive in the interviews. Indeed the descriptions of Spain and Spanishness were sometimes ambivalent with regard to tradition and modernity, and thus with regard to the foundation for the respondents’ claims of authenticity. This also influenced their view of tourism. In most accounts, it was regarded as inauthentic and even as bringing about the destruction of authentic Spanish settings and life forms (Crick 1989). Yet in those (relatively few) accounts celebrating modern Spain, tourism was rather seen as bringing about development and prosperity, and in these cases the distinctions from tourists relied less on claims of authenticity.

**Claims of Normality.** When describing tourists and tourism, the respondents implicitly gave strong support to those notions that stress the inversion of normality and the search for the extraordinary. However, such notions are often based on a work/leisure dichotomy (Urry 1990:2–3), which has limited relevance for retirees. This, together with the winter residents’ position between temporary tourists and local Spanish populations, made issues of normality problematic but, at the same time, open for differing interpretations among the respondents.

The interviewees consistently depicted tourism as being deviant from ordinary life, in terms of time, space, activities, and so forth. On the other hand, and partly in opposition to media images of retirees having “escaped from reality”, the winter residents pointed out that their own life in Spain was full of everyday routines—cooking, shopping, clean-
ing, washing—just as in Sweden. Although they, like the tourists, went to Spain to experience something that differed from Sweden, primarily a warmer climate, they claimed strongly that their life in Spain was an ordinary life.

Yet, the normality of the winter residents’ life in Spain might be constructed in different ways (Gustafson 2001). Some appreciated the cultural differences between Sweden and Spain, and tried to live a “Spanish” life while there. They described changing their daily habits (taking siesta, eating typically Spanish food), striving to learn Spanish, and trying to make contacts with the local population (although the latter often proved difficult). They might also comment adversely on those winter residents who went to Spain only to “enjoy the weather and the golf courses”. Others valued precisely the possibility, offered by the Swedish environments in Spain, of maintaining a predominantly Swedish lifestyle. In these cases, living an ordinary life in Spain meant doing much of the same things as in Sweden rather than adapting to a Spanish normality. However, whether the respondents pursued a Swedish lifestyle in Spain or wanted to adapt to a host lifestyle (or tried to find a suitable mix of these two strategies), they all claimed that their life away from home was, in important respects, a normal, ordinary life. They associated this normality with authenticity and opposed it to the extraordinary and hence inauthentic nature of tourism.

CONCLUSION

The main argument of this paper is that the study of tourism-induced seasonal retirement migration provides new understandings and interpretations of anti-tourism, social distinction, and authenticity. Previous research has regarded anti-tourism as an attempt at a distinction from devalued forms of the industry or as a more general rejection of the inauthenticity associated with the tourist role. The present study of retired Swedish winter residents in Spain showed that anti-tourist attitudes and practices might involve not only distinctions between different forms of tourism, but also distinctions referring to other social categories (such as seasonal migrants and local resident populations). In academic as well as in lay understandings, tourism is commonly conceived as a temporary escape from the normality of everyday life, whereas migration is often expected to be a unidirectional movement followed by integration in the receiving society. The seasonal retirement migration examined here fitted neither of these images, and thus the social position and categorization of the winter residents became ambivalent. This ambivalence was reflected in the interviewees’ experiences of being neither tourists nor Spaniards, and in their strategies of distinction from these two social categories.

The distancing from tourists was often stronger and more important to the respondents than the distinctions from the Spanish, and several reasons for this were identified. First, their dissociation from tourism reflected their inability to live up to the norms of integration (in Spanish society) present in common understandings of international migration. By comparing themselves with tourists rather than with
immigrants or with local Spanish populations, they made their sometimes limited efforts of integration appear in a more favorable light. Second, the winter residents were often taken to be tourists in their everyday life in Spain, whereas they ran little risk of being confused with the local Spanish population; hence their distinctions from tourists became more important. Third, their accounts also represented attempts at dissociation from those socially and culturally devalued mass tourism types that predominate in the Spanish coastal areas and thus reflected the hierarchic valuation of different forms of tourism. These explanations clearly show that anti-tourism may reflect several social distinctions, depending both on the forms of tourism and on the social groups or categories involved.

Jacobsen (2000) distinguishes between anti-tourist attitudes and practices, suggesting that the former are expressed by those who visit places where they meet a lot of tourists, but feel uneasy about doing so, whereas the latter imply tourism during off-peak seasons or at destinations attracting few tourists. In the present study, strategies related to time, space, activities, behavior, knowledge, and abilities were used in the respondents’ attempts to distinguish themselves from tourists. The analysis of these strategies demonstrates that both anti-tourist attitudes and practices may be found in settings marked by tourism, although the anti-tourist practices in that case are necessarily more fine-grained than the radical temporal and spatial distancing suggested by Jacobsen.

The winter residents’ claims of authenticity and normality provided another expression of their specific social position in Spain. Although constructed in different and sometimes ambivalent ways, these claims converged in two respects. One, the respondents claimed access to some kind of authentic Spanishness that was inaccessible to tourists; two, they defined their own life in Spain in terms of normality, in opposition to the extraordinary situation of tourists. These findings represent an additional explanation for the winter residents’ strong dissociation from tourism; they also throw an interesting sidelight on the issue of tourism and authenticity.

To begin with, they lend support to constructionist propositions about authenticity (Cohen 1988). The interviewees’ accounts of tourism, Spanishness and their own life in Spain, the claims of authenticity made in these accounts, and their importance for social distinction aptly demonstrate that notions of authenticity are socially constructed and their meanings negotiable. The analysis showed, just as Cohen suggests, that authenticity may be constructed differently, even among the winter residents themselves, and that some people demand more than others. However, the interviewees generally regarded authenticity as something desirable and also regarded tourism as inauthentic and as a divergence from normality. Despite the alleged emergence of a postmodern tourist ethos (Cohen 1995; Ritzer and Liska 1997), the present study suggests that distinctions of authenticity/inauthenticity and ordinary/extraordinary may still be highly relevant in popular understandings of tourism, and useful in tourism-related strategies of social distinction.
Yet, the interviewees’ claims of authenticity and normality did indeed challenge the paradox of authenticity, although from a different perspective than the research cited in the paper. The respondents claimed to have access to authentic Spanishness while living an ordinary life—indeed because they lived an ordinary life—whereas they regarded tourism as extraordinary and hence inauthentic. By dissociating authenticity from the extraordinary, they could, in their distinctions from tourism, simultaneously make claims of authenticity and normality. In doing so, they questioned the very foundation of MacCannell’s (1976) argument—the assumption that ordinary life in contemporary Western society is necessarily inauthentic. This questioning was partly made possible by the respondents’ position as retirees, as the work/leisure dichotomy was of limited relevance to most of them. Indeed, as large numbers of tourists today are retirees, this points towards a limitation in common theoretical arguments about authenticity, which is rarely discussed in the literature. In addition, as the present analysis demonstrated, the winter residents’ specific claims of authenticity and normality were also heavily influenced by their seasonal migration between Sweden and Spain, by their ambivalent social categorization in Spain, and by their distinctive strategies vis-à-vis tourists. Thus, the social construction of authenticity in tourist settings is highly dependent on the social groups involved and on their strategies for social distinction.

More generally, this paper supports the argument made by Williams and Hall (2000), that tourism research may benefit from studies of those forms of mobility that lie between tourism and permanent migration. The distinctive strategies examined here, as well as the constructions of authenticity and normality, reflect the efforts of the respondents to define and defend a social and symbolic space for themselves between tourism and migration, and between the well-established social categories of tourists and Spaniards. Tourism, migration, and various intermediary or mixed forms of human mobility in contemporary society bring along problems and ambiguities with regard to social roles, social categorization, and self-identification and, as a consequence, various individual and collective strategies for dealing with these problems. In a world where mobility and transnationalism appear as increasingly important social forces, these issues constitute a fruitful area for further research, within this and other fields of social science.
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