



TOURISM AND GLOCALIZATION “Local” Tour Guiding

Noel B. Salazar

University of Pennsylvania, USA

Abstract: In tourism studies globalization and localization are often conceived of as a binary opposition. The ethnography of an Indonesian group of tour guides presented here illustrates how the global and the local are intimately intertwined through what has been described as the process of “glocalization”. The guides studied are remarkable front-runners of glocalization. They fully participate in global popular culture and use new technologies in their private lives. While guiding, however, they skillfully represent the glocalized life around them as a distinctive “local”, adapted to the tastes of different groups of international tourists. It is concluded that tourism offers excellent opportunities to study globalization, but that more grounded research is needed. **Keywords:** globalization, glocalization, tour guides, anthropology, ethnography. © 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Résumé: Tourisme et glocalisation: Guides « locales ». Beaucoup d’études sur le tourisme, sont axées sur l’opposition entre globalisation et localisation. L’ethnographie d’un groupe de guides indonésiens complète notre compréhension de l’interrelation qui s’établit entre le global et le local, à travers de ce qui est décrit comme “glocalisation”. Les guides participent à la culture populaire globale et utilisent les nouvelles technologies dans leur vie privée. Cependant, en effectuant leur travail de guide, elles représentent habilement la vie glocalisée autour d’eux comme quelque chose authentiquement “locale”, adaptée aux goûts de différents groupes de touristes. Le travail débouche sur la conclusion que l’activité touristique représente un excellent support pour étudier les processus de globalisation, mais que des recherches complémentaires sont nécessaires. **Mots-clés:** Mondialisation, glocalisation, guides touristiques, anthropologie, ethnographie. © 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

While the ongoing process of economic globalization is made possible by the drive of capitalism to expand and grow, and by the pervasiveness of new technologies in communications and transport (Appadurai 1996:1–26; Hannerz 1996:19), international tourism is one of the important beneficiaries and vehicles of its expression (Meethan 2001; Wahab and Cooper 2001). The World Travel and Tourism Council claims that tourism has become the world’s largest industry. This lobby group points out that the industry generates more than 10% of global economic output and employment (WTTC 2003). According to the

Noel Salazar is a PhD Candidate in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania (University Museum, Philadelphia PA 19104-6398, USA. Email <nsalazar@sas.upenn.edu>). His tourism research interests include ethnographic and sociolinguistic approaches to the global-local nexus, transnational networks, development, and tour guiding. His multi-sited dissertation focuses on the ongoing “glocalization” of tourism and culture in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, and Arusha, Tanzania.

World Tourism Organization, international arrivals passed the 700 million mark in 2002. Although there was a decrease of 1.2% in 2003, it predicts that arrival volume will reach 1.56 billion by the year 2020, pushing annual revenues to US\$1.550 billion, nearly four times more than the current earnings (WTO 2001, 2003, 2004). This kind of statistical data is often used by scholars as a pretext to validate their research. However, there is much more to tourism that makes its thorough study a justified enterprise. After all, it is more than an ensemble of economic practices solely driven by capitalist interests; it is a global, dynamic sociocultural phenomenon.

Various anthropologists and sociologists have theorized the sociocultural aspects of globalization (Appadurai 1996; Arizpe 1996; Bauman 1998; Eriksen 2003; Featherstone, Lash and Robertson 1995; Friedman 1994; Hannerz 1996; Inda and Rosaldo 2002; Lewellen 2002; Tomlinson 1999; Waters 2001). Globalization is often described as a process by which events, decisions, and activities in one part of the world can come to have significant consequences for individuals and communities in quite distant parts of the globe (Giddens 1990). This situation of growing global interconnectedness and interdependency is opening up the cross-cultural production of local meanings, self-images, representations, and modes of life typical of various groups and individuals (Appadurai 1996). In other words, the sociocultural impact of globalization first and foremost comes out of the transformation of localities themselves (Miller 1995; Wilson and Dissanayake 1996). Paradoxically, the increased interest in global forces and flows has pushed notions of the local more than ever to the forefront of scholarly analyses. "The local" not only refers to a spatially limited locality; it is, above all, a space inhabited by people who have a particular sense of place, a specific way of life, and a certain ethos and worldview.

Ethnographies reveal how people experience and express their being different from others (Geertz 1983). A great deal of scholarly energy has been devoted to showing that the local is not and never was the passive, bounded, and homogeneous entity it is frequently assumed to be (Clifford 1997; Gupta and Ferguson 1997; Low and Lawrence-Zúñiga 2003). However, ideas of cultures existing in some primordial and static form are often reiterated in the context of tourism. Through their discourse and narratives, local tour guides are key actors in the process of "localizing"—folklorizing, ethnicizing, and exoticizing—a destination. They are often the only group at a destination with whom tourists interact for a considerable amount of time. They are entrusted with the public relations mission "to encapsulate the essence of place" (Pond 1993:vii) and to be a window onto a site, region, or even country. However, guiding is not just about giving people facts and figures about a destination. Scholars have long recognized this, and the role of guides in conveying information, offering explanations, and developing narratives has become a research theme in and of itself (Ap and Wong 2001; Cohen 1985; Dahles 2002; Holloway 1981; Pearce 1984).

Although emphasized in much of the literature, the goal of guides is not necessarily to become a bridge actor, cultural translator, or someone who flattens cultural differences. One can also look at them as

being small entrepreneurs who, not always successfully, sell their services to a varied group of tourists (Dahles and Bras 1999b). Some guides are even engaged in the art of deception and may, for example, be focused on taking tourists to specific souvenir shops, in order to receive commissions. In other words, guides are not necessarily altruistic mediators by vocation, nor can they be expected to submit blindly to government rules and regulations exacting them to tell prefabricated stories (Bras 2000). While some really take pride in representing and explaining their natural and cultural heritage, others are much more business-oriented and merely interested in selling images, knowledge, contacts, souvenirs, access, authenticity, ideology, and sometimes even themselves (through prostitution).

If a careful analysis of the professional activities of guides reveals the use of strategies of localization, where and how do processes of globalization come in, and how do the two interact? Using the case study of a small but remarkable group of tour guides in Yogyakarta, Indonesia (a popular cultural heritage destination) this paper analyzes the ways in which globalization and localization are ultimately intertwined. This becomes particularly clear when using the theoretical lens of what has been described as “glocalization” (Robertson 1994, 1995). Placing the daily practices of the guides under study within the broader socio-cultural context in which they operate is instrumental to learning more about the pervasiveness of glocalization processes, inside as well as outside the tourism industry. The micro-analysis presented here thus also sheds light on the subject of the local-global nexus in general.

GLOCAL TOUR GUIDES IN YOGYAKARTA

The notion of glocalization helps one to grasp the many interconnections between the global and the local. The concept is modeled on the Japanese notion *dochakuka* (becoming autochthonous), derived from *dochaku* (aboriginal, living on one’s own land). This originally referred to the agricultural principle of adapting farming techniques to local circumstances. In the 80s, the term was adopted by Japanese business people to express global localization or “a global outlook adapted to local conditions” (Tulloch 1991:134). The concept soon spread worldwide. The American multinational Coca Cola, for example, promoted its own version of glocalization with the slogan “We are not multinational, we are multilocal” (Featherstone 1996:64). Robertson (1994, 1995) widely popularized the concept within the social sciences. He argues against the tendency to perceive globalization as involving only large-scale macrosociological processes, to the neglect of how they are localized. In other words, this process always takes place in some locality, while at the same time the local is (re)produced in discourses of globalization. The local contains much that is global, while the latter is increasingly penetrated and reshaped by many locals.

The concept of glocalization captures the dynamic, contingent, and two-way dialectic between the two realms (Swyngedouw 1997, 2004). Robertson’s stance is similar to other models of cultural globalization

exploring global-local intersections (Appadurai 1996; Friedman 1994; Hannerz 1996; Nederveen Pieterse 2004). Tourism offers many possibilities to study its process, especially where international tourists meet local manufacturers, retailers, and service providers in the production and sale of glocalized goods and services (Cawley, Gaffey and Gillmor 2002; Yamashita 2003). Without using the theoretical framework of globalization, geographers studying tourism have repeatedly stressed the importance of the global-local nexus. Chang, Milne, Fallon and Pohlmann, for example, argue that “the global and the local should be enmeshed in any future theoretical frameworks that are developed to help understand the processes and outcomes of [urban heritage] tourism” (1996:285). Similarly, Teo and Li state that “for tourism, the global and the local form a dyad acting as a *dialectical process*” (2003:302, original emphasis).

Scholars studying the sociocultural aspects of tourism have mainly relied on the “host-guest paradigm”, focusing on local impacts (Smith 1989; Smith and Brent 2001). Favoring a static and exclusionary vision of cultures and localities, this model does not fully address the complex interactions between people and their glocalized environments (Aramberri 2001; Franklin and Crang 2001; Sherlock 2001). Many have difficulty interpreting globalization because they are trapped in the false binary opposition between globalization and localization. Nurjanti (1996), for example, points out that studies of cultural tourism are often characterized by a series of perceived contradictions between the power of tradition (the local), which implies stability or continuity, and tourism (a global force), which involves change. Wood was among the first to criticize researchers for using a “billiard ball model” (1980:565) of cultures as separate, uniform, and passive units being changed by tourism. Instead, he argues that the latter is often appropriated by people in their symbolic constructions of culture, tradition, and identity (Wood 1993).

To a considerable extent, globalization involves the construction of increasingly differentiated and distinct consumers, or the creation of new consumer traditions. This goes hand in hand with global marketing strategies which rely on the philosophy that “diversity sells”. The marketing of cultural and heritage tourism, which promotes the experience of so-called “authentic traditional cultures”, vividly illustrates this. Interestingly, it is precisely in the field of culture and heritage that global-local dynamics have been most researched (Teo and Li 2003:290). Whereas in its original micromarketing meaning globalization referred to tailoring global products to particular circumstances, in the case of tourism and guiding, it involves tailoring local (and localized) products (representations of heritage and culture) to changing global audiences (international tourists coming from various parts of the world and with different preferences). Just as global marketing companies have to deal with the specific rules and conditions of each country or region in which they operate (Svensson 2001), successful guides skillfully adapt to the specific expectations of different groups. It is important to note that “local” tour guides are not necessarily natives of a destination (although they are often perceived as such by

international tourists). They might, for example, be citizens from the country visited, but come from another region or belong to a different ethnic group (Hitchcock 2000:205).

Study Methods

The research on which this paper is based was undertaken during the summer of 2003 in and around the city of Yogyakarta, on the Indonesian island of Java. The author already had pre-knowledge of the site, because he visited the region in the summer of 2000. The methodology used involves a hybrid qualitative and ethnographic approach that has been characterized as “fast and dirty” (Hampton 2003:88; Hitchcock 2000:206). The method can also be described as “pre-fieldwork” (Michaud 1995:682) since it involves a visit lasting only ten weeks, as opposed to ethnographic fieldwork which is usually conducted over a much longer period. Background literature research was undertaken in the libraries of Gadjah Mada University, Sanata Dharma University, and the Stuppa Indonesia Foundation for Tourism Research and Development. Secondary sources such as websites and Indonesian newspapers (Bernas, Kedaulatan Rakyat, Kompas, and The Jakarta Post) and magazines (Tempo, Inside Indonesia, and Latitudes), were also consulted.

This study forms part of a larger, multi-sited comparative project, involving similar research with a group of tour guides in Arusha, Tanzania. The groups of guides in both Yogyakarta and Arusha are linked to a loosely organized transnational network of “Traveler’s Bars” (a pseudonym), with other branches in Senegal, Mali, Nepal, Honduras, Nicaragua, Argentina, Belgium, and Spain. The bars of Yogyakarta and Arusha became operational in 1995 and 2000, respectively. Of the whole network, only the guides working for these two bars have had a chance to meet one another in person (giving the researcher an exceptional opportunity to study more aspects of glocalization). They were invited by the European section of the network for a one-month visit in the spring of 2002. During this period, they underwent an intense two-week experience as international tourists in Western Europe—a kind of role reversal exercise—and also participated in a two-week interactive course on guiding and intercultural communication. It should be noted that not many guides in Indonesia or Tanzania are offered this kind of opportunity, which makes the group studied very unique. An indepth comparison between the two groups lies outside the scope of this paper. Future research will entail long-term return visits to both sites and an ethnographic study of the Traveler’s Bar administrative headquarters in Europe.

As the research in Indonesia took place during the height of the tourism season, the researcher had multiple opportunities to engage in participatory observation and interviewing. Throughout his stay, he observed the daily activities of the five guides contracted by the Yogyakarta Traveler’s Bar. His daily presence in and around the bar made it easy to integrate and be accepted by the group of guides.

The author accompanied each guide at least once on a “village tour” and on one of the other tours offered by the bar. Each guide also agreed to have two semistructured indepth and multiple shorter, open-ended interviews. Additional short semistructured interviews, were conducted with the owner of the bar, other personnel (including cooks, servers, and drivers) and Indonesians, expatriates, and tourists who frequented the bar. Most of these conversations took place on the quiet terrace of the guesthouse adjacent to the bar.

In order to better situate the practices of the guides under study within the broader context of Yogyakarta, background information was obtained from semistructured indepth interviews undertaken with public servants working for the *Dinas Kebudayaan dan Pariwisata DIY* (Yogyakarta Provincial Culture and Tourism Office)—recently renamed as *Badan Pariwisata Daerah* (Yogyakarta Tourism Board)—the Yogyakarta director of the *Himpunan Pramuwisata Indonesia* (Indonesian Guide Association), the Yogyakarta director of the Association of the Indonesian Tours and Travel Agencies, a representative of the *Perhimpunan Hotel dan Restoran Indonesia* (Indonesian Hotel and Restaurant Association), the director of the *Badan Pengembangan Industri Pariwisata Yogyakarta* (Yogyakarta Tourism Development Board), the director and various researchers of the *Pusat Studi Pariwisata* (Center for Tourism Studies) at Gadjah Mada University, and various licensed and unlicensed guides, travel agencies, local people, and international tourists. Most interviews were conducted in English, some in Dutch (the researcher’s native tongue), and some in Indonesian or Javanese (usually with the help of a research assistant).

All primary qualitative data (the researcher’s fieldnotes, the interviews, and the audio recordings of the guides while guiding), were analyzed and interpreted with the help of *Atlas.ti*, a popular software package for visual qualitative data analysis (Muhr 1997). In an attempt to operationalize the theoretical concept of glocalization, the author examined how certain markers such as discourse, language (English), dress, and the use of information and communication technologies were manipulated by the guides and adapted to different groups of tourists. In other words, both verbal and nonverbal practices were taken as possible indicators of glocalization. The analysis of the raw empirical data was greatly enhanced by embedding the practices of the guides within the broader sociocultural framework.

Setting the Scene

Yogyakarta is the name of both a Javanese province and its capital, a middle-sized city with a population reaching half a million. Recently, “Jogja” has been introduced as a brand name to market the region since the letter “Y” was believed to be a more difficult alphabetical start for most international audiences (*The Jakarta Post* 2001, 2002). This brand name also appears in “Jogja, never ending Asia”, the catchphrase currently used by the local government to attract investors, traders, and tourists to the region. With this promotional line, Jogja joins

other destinations in Southeast Asia. Singapore and Malaysia, for example, have been using “New Asia” and “Truly Asia” as their respective promotional slogans. Linking particular Asian destinations to Asia as a whole is itself an excellent example of a glocal marketing strategy. Since the development of tourism, Jogja has been promoted by the Indonesian government as “the cultural heart of Java” (or even Indonesia), and an ideal destination for both domestic and international markets (Dahles 2001). The region’s main product is heritage (Wall 1997). Its most important attractions include the 8th century Buddhist stupa of Borobudur and the 10th century Hindu temple complex of Prambanan (both recognized as “World Heritage” by UNESCO in 1991).

The city of Jogja is often characterized as a big village, because the majority of its buildings are single-story structures and many people live in *kampung*, a kind of off-street urban neighborhood (Sullivan 1992:3). Economically, Jogja is marked by small-scale enterprises, cottage industries, and self-employed people (Sullivan 1992:113). Lacking any substantial industrial infrastructure, the region’s prosperity greatly depends on its ability to capitalize on its cultural heritage. The city, with its *Kraton* (the 18th century walled palace where the Sultan resides) cherishes its Javanese roots, attracting a large number of painters, dancers, and writers. Jogja is also famous for crafts such as *batik* (textile design), silverware, pottery, clothing, woodcarving, and *wayang* (puppets). Jogja has been actively participating in international tourism for over 20 years, and has become a mass destination (Sofield 1995:692). However, growth rates were declining in the 90s (Dahles 2001:93), and the economic crisis of 1997 and the political turmoil of 1998 further slowed it. (Timothy 1999). More recently, the Bali bomb blast in 2002 and the outbreak of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in 2003 have had major negative impacts on the region. The bomb indirectly affected Jogja because Bali is one of the main entry gates for inbound tourism. The other, the international airport of Solo, was affected by SARS, as many flights coming from SARS-affected Singapore (the major Southeast Asian connection hub) were cancelled.

The development of international tourism, together with the steady increase of Jogja’s student population and the massive arrival of migrants from conflict zones on other Indonesian islands over the last decade, has changed the appearance of the city. In a certain sense, it is losing some of its village-like character and, in the process, has also widened the gap between the small capitalist economic sector and the vast informal economy. The impact of a foreign-oriented consumer culture is clearly visible in the city center (Mulder 1994). Apart from many locally owned hotels and *losmen* (guesthouses), the city now also has star-rated transnational chain hotels (Hyatt, Sheraton, Quality Hotel, Melía, Novotel, and Ibis). Malioboro Street is the major shopping area with various supermarkets, department stores, and shopping malls selling global brand names, restaurants with international menus, and transnational fastfood chains (including McDonalds, Pizza Hut, Wendy’s, Dunkin’ Donuts, and Kentucky, Texas and California

Fried Chicken). While this clearly points to the influence of globalization, the trade in regional products and food in street stalls continues in an almost undisturbed manner. Glocalization becomes visible in the fact that the success of transnational fastfood outlets inspired entrepreneurs to start glocal copycat restaurants such as “Kentukku Fried Chicken” (*kentukku* means let’s buy in Javanese) and “McPitik” (*pitik* means chicken in Javanese).

Although processes of glocalization are clearly visible in many domains of daily life, the current tourism discourse (as uttered by the government, travel agencies, and guides) is only focusing on a few selected heritage sites and traditional arts and crafts performed or produced in the city itself or in its vicinity. While Jogja is depicted by marketers as the center of timeless tradition, in reality it is the Indonesian pacesetter for the progressive and the populist. It is home, for example, to the *Institut Seni Indonesia* (Indonesian Institute of Fine Arts) and one of the most active contemporary art scenes in Indonesia, giving space to young artists to experiment both with visual expressions and interpretations of current events (through public murals and exhibitions in art galleries). The city is also a major Indonesian center of higher education, with over 30 universities and more than 70 institutes of higher learning, and an estimated student population of around 200,000 (Hampton 2003:93). This young—both temporary and contemporary—population is heavily influencing Jogja’s cityscape and facilitating the inflow of global popular culture and new technologies. With only 30 to 40% of the city’s current inhabitants belonging to the ethnic group of the Javanese (Guinness 1986), Jogja is the playground of various tensions among global, national, and local interests: processes of globalization, nationalization, and localization.

Informal Glocal Tourism

The strength of Jogja’s tourism lies in informal small-scale businesses: the *losmen*, the inexpensive *warung* (food stalls), and the transport facilities situated and operating in the *kampung* (Dahles 2001:20). In the 70s, a number of *kampung* in the inner city received new impetus from the advent of international backpackers. Some neighborhoods have been profoundly changed by tourism, like Sosrowijayan, (near the main train station and Malioboro Street), and Prawirotaman, (an old middle-class neighborhood south of the city center which has become the more upmarket backpacker’s enclave). In the latter, a mixed community has emerged, consisting of expatriates, long-term tourists, backpackers, *kampung* dwellers, students, and migrants from all over the Indonesian archipelago. This community, embedded in the partly informal economy, grew in an unplanned and uncontrolled manner. The Prawirotaman neighborhood has a lively market and a variety of small businesses offering accommodation, restaurants, coffeshops, travel agents, *batik* and souvenir shops, second-hand bookshops, traditional massage and beauty salons, *warnet* (Internet cafés), and other associated touristic services. Many international tourists are attracted

to these glocal(ized) quarters of the city because they find both Western amenities and what they believe is authentic local life.

The authorities at the local, regional, and national levels do not recognize the strengths and potentialities of this informal sector (Hamp-ton 2003:95). For a long time, they attempted to control the growth of informal activities by licensing, training, sweepings, and enclosing attractions (Dahles 2001:97). However, these measures have proven to be far from successful. An official tour guide license, for example, is expensive and does not guarantee a job. The Yogyakarta director of the *Himpunan Pramuwisata Indonesia* (Indonesian Guide Association) admitted that, under the present conditions, *guide liar* (unlicensed guides) often have more work—and sometimes do a better job—than guides with a license. This paradoxical situation is probably linked to the lack of flexibility of the officially recognized tourism industry to adapt its existing range of products to the rapidly changing tastes and preferences of tourists. In response to the current situation, the authorities are issuing fewer licenses and adopting new strategies to handle the tension between the licensed and unlicensed guides. Whereas before they tried to formalize the informal sector, they now somehow tend to “informalize” the formal sector, by loosening regulations.

Glocal Tour Guides

During his stay in Jogja, the author observed a group of Indonesian guides contracted by the Traveler’s Bar, a European-run meeting spot in Prawirotaman for tourists and people living in Jogja. Apart from serving both local and international food and drinks, the bar provides a variety of services, including a regularly updated reading corner with books and documentation folders on Indonesian culture and tourism. It also offers a wide range of cultural tours in and around Jogja, and promotes courses in batik painting, the art of making silver jewelry, a brief introduction to *Bahasa Indonesia* (the Indonesian language), Javanese cooking, and a treatment in a traditional beauty salon (Chin 2002). Through the courses and tours, tourists are given ample opportunity to interact with local people. Partly because of the positive evaluation it received in popular travel guides such as the Lonely Planet and due to connections with tour operators in Australia and Europe, the bar has become extremely popular.

The Traveler’s Bar employs 18 people, mostly native women of Jogja. Femininity in Javanese culture is traditionally associated with the domestic sphere and women encounter ambiguous and contradictory messages as they seek employment in tourism (Kindon 2001). As a result, they are often forced into the informal sector, where they work as casual, short-term, and seasonal wage laborers, street traders, or home workers. In particular, many work as unpaid labor in family businesses connected with small-scale production, as masseuses, hair braiders, beach sellers, receptionists (Dahles and Bras 1999b), or they move into prostitution. Those working in the Traveler’s Bar are fortunate because

the owner, herself a woman, highly values feminism and fair business. As a consequence, all employees have fixed contracts and salaries and good working conditions. Further, the five guides employed by the bar are women (a sixth guide, who is male, is actually more a driver). They all share a similar socioeconomic profile: single young women between 20 and 32 years old (one is a single mother); coming from lower middle-class families who live in the outskirts of the city or the villages surrounding it (only one comes from an adjacent Javanese province); living with their parents, relatives, or in a boarding house; and having studied foreign languages (mostly English) or tourism at high school level (one guide has a degree in English literature).

Apart from their jobs, most guides have a busy social life. Nevertheless, they can often be found hanging around the bar, even when not working. Before starting their current job, most had other working experience in the tourism industry, for example in restaurants or hotels. Many were introduced to the owner of the Traveler's Bar by a friend who was already employed at the bar and started working as cooking aids or servers. None with formal guide training, they were chosen and privately instructed by the owner because of their foreign language proficiency, self-confidence, and sense of initiative. They started building up their guiding skills by specializing in one particular tour. In addition, each guide has another responsibility (such as the planning of the week, bookkeeping, or the decoration of the bar) and they all occasionally help as servers. In this way, the owner wants to stimulate the guides' creativity and sense of entrepreneurship. Although none of them has a license, they can certainly not be categorized as *guide liar* (unlicensed street guides). After all, the Traveler's Bar—itsself having a restaurant and tour operator license—guarantees them a fixed contract and salary. In other words, the guides studied occupy a very unique place on the continuum between licensed and unlicensed guides in Jogja.

Changing Roles

The Traveler's Bar guides offer a good example of how glocalization operates because they use multiple glocalizing strategies. In various ways, they are much less local than the tourists perceive them to be. At the same time, it is true that all of them are deeply rooted in Javanese life and tradition (Javanese being their first language). This became evident, for example, when they shared their views on moral and ethical issues. However, these young women are very much up-to-date with trends in global popular culture and technology. They listen to Western (Norah Jones) as well as Asian (F4) and Latin American (Ricky Martin) music, watch Latin-American sitcoms (Carita de Angel) and Hollywood or Bollywood movies, keep track of international sport events, and are aware of the latest international fashion trends. Most guides have a cell phone and all regularly surf the Internet at one of the many *warnet*. The contacts with foreign friends through electronic messaging and chatting, and with the expatriates who habitually have

lunch or dinner at the bar greatly help the guides to better situate themselves, their cultural tradition, and their job within a global context.

The owner of the Traveler's Bar regularly organizes meetings with the guides in order to discuss their work and evaluate their professional progress. This is important, as none of the women actually studied to become a guide. The maintenance of the bar's reading corner gives them an extra opportunity to place their own work within the broader context of tourism worldwide. What is more, these guides have had the unique opportunity to experience firsthand how it feels to be an international tourist. As part of their ongoing training, the whole group was offered a kind of European internship in 2002. Together with a group of guides from Arusha, Tanzania, they underwent an intense two-week experience as international tourists. The trip was organized by the European part of the Traveler's Bar network, with the aim of giving the guides more insight in to European culture, in order to better understand the behavior of the people they guide for. The whole group also participated in a two-week interactive course on guiding and intercultural communication. Some guides have made other journeys abroad. Wiendu (pseudonym), for example, is a passionate indoor climber and has the opportunity to participate in climbing competitions abroad. Rulia used to work as a translator for a Scandinavian anthropologist during fieldwork in Jogja. A few months after the fieldwork was finished, the anthropologist invited the young woman for a three-month stay in Norway to help him translate the transcripts of the interviews he had recorded.

The lifestyle of the guides is very similar to that of their own-age peers in Jogja. In other words, in their free time they lead the kind of life most of their friends lead. What sets them apart, however, is that the guides use their unique global connectedness and experience when interacting with international tourists. Paradoxically, their success as guides seems closely related to *not* showing their global side. As Thornton argues, "overt glocalization does not sell in a global market that trades on the romance of difference, so the "g" in glocal must remain silent" (2000:84). Dahles and Bras (1999a:282), for example, describe how some guides in Jogja or Lombok introduce themselves as local boys who never have left the place where they work as guides, because they think this is what the tourists want to hear. The Traveler's Bar guides behave as the locals that many people expect and perceive them to be. When guiding a group of European tourists, for example, they will seldom tell them that they themselves have been in Europe or that they also speak the native tongue of the tourist (given it is not English).

The Traveler's Bar guides not only perform their role as locals, during tours they also give international tourists detailed explanations about the Javanese cultural heritage. While narrating, they focus on aspects particularly different from the tourists' own culture and traditions. Again, they are only able to do this because they are familiar with the culture of their tourists. Although the guides certainly use their knowledge about Europe when guiding European tourists, they

will usually not verbally share this knowledge with the tourists. They also subtly adapt the depth of information provided during the tours to the average intellectual level of the group. Their ever-changing (re)presentation of the local culture (always fine-tuned to the specific group) is a good example of glocalization. It is their knowledge of the global which helps them to present their glocal reality to tourists as distinctively local.

The language of contact between guides and tourists (an Indonesian form of international English) is one of the clearest glocal markers of the interaction. In some cases, guides will downplay their language proficiency a little, especially when they notice that people have problems speaking and/or understanding English. Other markers, such as clothing or the use of modern technology, are much more ambiguous. The Traveler's Bar guides do not wear uniforms and do not have to adhere to a strict dress code. The owner of the bar told the author that she only recommends her personnel not to wear too sexy outfits, in order to avoid problems with male tourists or other men the guides encounter during the tours. In their free time, the guides usually wear trendy clothes, each woman having a personal style and preference. While guiding, however, they are dressed in a rather neutral way (nothing extravagant). They might take their cell phones with them while guiding, but will use them mostly in unguarded moments, when the tourists are engaged in activities which do not require the guide's attention.

Guiding Tourists during a Glocalized Village Tour

Perhaps the best illustrations of how glocalization operates in tour guiding are the guiding practices and discourse during so-called "village tours" (Bambang 2004; Directorate General of Tourism 1999; Kartana 2001). These exceedingly popular tours give tourists a chance to "experience" several aspects of the "traditional" Javanese daily life—as described in the classic ethnographies—in the villages around Jogja: the cycle of a *padi* (rice field); the making of clay bricks; the functioning of a village school; the village cemetery; home-industries producing food such as *tempe* (fried fermented soybean cakes) and *krupuk* (shrimp wafers) or *jamu* (medicinal drinks); and craftsmen making *batik* (textile designs), silverware, *wayang* (puppets), or other crafts which are identified as typical for the Yogyakarta region. Interestingly, the village experience can be as "exotic" for the tourists as for the tour guides themselves. After all, many guides live in the city and are not necessarily familiar with the daily life of villagers visited.

The Traveler's Bar village tour, the first of its kind in Jogja, was conceptualized in 1998 by the European owner and some Indonesians working in the tourism industry. Villages were chosen primarily because of their location (distance from the bar) and after reaching an agreement with the village communities. The small-scale businesses visited during the tours receive a small financial reward from the guide after each visit (to compensate for the time lost while explaining and demonstrating their work). The fact that there is no fixed circuit allows

the guides to create multiple tours by visiting different families and villages. This helps to distribute the little extra income more evenly among villagers. On top of this, a delegation of the Traveler's Bar pays a yearly visit to all villages included in the tours during the Muslim celebration of Eid Al-Fitr (the end of Ramadan), in order to give presents to the villagers.

A typical village tour lasts half a day and usually starts early in the morning (around 8:00), in order to avoid the heat of the afternoon. Before leaving the Traveler's Bar, the guide usually gives the tourists a brief overview of how the tour will look like and distributes drinking water and a little snack. Young people do the tour on bicycle while older people are transported in an *andong* (a traditional Javanese horse cart). Using these means of transport gives the tourists ample opportunities to stop whenever and wherever for taking pictures. Apart from the planned attractions and activities, people sometimes have special requests, for example to visit a village school. On the way in between villages, guides make occasional stops to explain something about the vegetation, fruits, or crops on the route. Whenever the tourists feel like it, a larger stop is made to eat the snacks provided.

Although certainly not all tourists visiting Jogja actually want to meet local people, often it is the human contact, the close encounter with people, which remains strongly etched in tourists' minds and keeps surfacing in anecdotes of their trips. Helping old village women plant rice, standing barefoot in thick mud, for example, is often reported to be one of the highlights of the tour. Apparently, the feeling that one is actively participating in the lived life—albeit for a very short time—makes these tours exciting. It is important to note that, for tourists, the local usually refers to an often pre-imagined authentic, exotic, traditional (not to say primitive) way of life. In other words, the local is much more than just a different space or place. The guides facilitate the tourist's experiential process by themselves blending in with the village life that is displayed. For example, during the tours some of the guides wear a traditional conic straw hat which is also worn by many of the villagers working in the fields (attire guides would never wear when they are not working). By doing this, the guides subtly portray themselves as more local than they really are.

From a sociolinguistic point of view, the village tours are always a multilingual experience. The tourists receive explanations and instructions from the guide in an Indonesian version of international English, with occasionally the use of an Indonesian or Javanese word, for example to indicate a certain local craft, food, or plant. Among each other, tourists naturally speak their native tongue (if the group shares a common language) or English (if the group is mixed or has English as a native tongue). Groups normally contain not more than 15 people. Whenever possible, big groups are split up in smaller ones, each with a guide. If these groups meet during their tours, the Javanese guides communicate with each other in Indonesian (their second language). This allows people who use Indonesian phrasebooks and have learned some to interact with them, often in a playful way. With the villagers, however, the guides speak Javanese (which most of the tourists take

to be a version or dialect of Indonesian as well). Given the language barrier, the direct contact between tourists and villagers is minimal.

During the tour, it is remarkable that the majority of villagers encountered are old men and women, and young children. The older children and adolescents are at school and many of their parents work in Jogja or frequently travel to the city in order to sell their produce or craftwork. This constant interaction with the city enables the villagers to engage in their own process of glocalization, albeit at a different pace than in the city. In other words, the local is already glocal and this is far from being a recent phenomenon (Geertz 1963). For example, many Javanese farmers nowadays use imported machinery to help them with the rice planting process. However, as argued before, tourists mainly want to experience the pre-imagined local. Therefore, the guides only show those rice fields where the planting still happens in the traditional way. The whole tour experience is professionally framed and manipulated by the guides. Even if they would like to, the guides cannot go much beyond a commoditized, reductionist, touristic representation of village life because that is not what the tourists came to hear or see. Village tourism around Jogja is not about how the local is currently being lived and internalized by villagers. Rather, it gives tourists exactly what they want: a “mythologized” (Barthes 1972) version of village life.

CONCLUSION

Thinking of globalization and localization as being opposed to each other is not very helpful in understanding and explaining contemporary tourism (Teo and Li 2003). The constant (re)shaping of the local is in many respects part of and simultaneously occurring with the globalizing process itself (Miller 1995; Wilson and Dissanayake 1996). Glocalization processes are certainly not limited to tourism. However, using the theoretical concept of glocalization proves to be very instructive in understanding the sociocultural dynamics of tourism. It helps one realize, for example, that this is taking place not so much through ironing out cultural and other differences as through allowing in and reinforcing these differences. At the same time, it is important to note that the glocalization construct provides only an analytical perspective, not a decisive theory.

By carrying out research on the contact zone between the global tourism system and particular destinations, ethnographies (such as the one outlined in this paper), contribute to dynamic tourism studies. As Yamashita states, “what cultural anthropology today should illuminate is the realm which lies between the global and the local” (2003:148). The anthropology of tourism presents scholars with a challenge to do just this. One cannot deny that tourism is a global source of income and employment, a globalized trade in services (Hampton 2003; Mowforth and Munt 2003). However, tourism should be seen not only as an economic instrument, but also as a part and expression of increasingly glocalized cultures, often by commoditizing them. In this context, it is very telling that a country such as Indonesia, which

thrives on its cultural heritage, has a Ministry of Tourism and Culture, by necessity combining the two fields when developing policies.

By studying the daily practices of guides and the way they (re)present and actively (re)construct local culture for a diversified global audience, one can learn about how globalization and localization are intimately intertwined and how the former—through tourism and other channels—is transforming culture. The small-scale activities in which the Traveler's Bar guides in Jogja are engaged illustrate the increasing complexity of global tourism and its sociocultural dynamics. Through their daily work, the guides actively help to (re)construct, folklorize, ethnicize, and exoticize the local, “authentic” distinctiveness and uniqueness of Jogja that is constantly being fragmented by outside influences (global popular culture and tourism being two obvious examples). By reformulating what counts as culture and heritage to include the everyday and that which has not yet been memorialized in guidebooks and official histories, another kind of Javanese experience is constructed and becomes available to the tourist. However, through both their discursive and nonverbal practices, the guides present a commoditized and mystified version of the glocal, represented and packaged as local for global export.

Of course, one has to acknowledge that the guides studied here are real front-runners of glocalization. Stimulated by their European employer and their personal experiences abroad, their glocal lifestyle is clearly different from the unlicensed guides who have fewer opportunities to develop their professional skills, and it is certainly different from the daily life as lived and internalized by the villagers they regularly visit. In other words, not everything and everybody is always and everywhere glocal in Jogja. However, the whole sociocultural environment is undergoing some form of qualified glocalization or the other, and the guides are well-placed actors to play a key role in this process. A long-term return visit will allow the author to empirically better substantiate the theoretical framework laid out here (including identification of more markers of glocalization). Future research will also determine the extent to which some of the findings of this paper can be generalized to other sociocultural contexts.

In sum, the complex process of glocalization needs to be understood through the means of grounded and critical research: detailed, fine-grained explorations of the everyday cultural practices, symbolic imaginaries, and social relationships that reproduce glocal processes linking distant and diverse sites. This involves exploring how global markets interact with political rule, social forms, and the production of cultural values across uneven geographies and histories. This multidimensional approach cuts against the grain of recent tendencies to map, unproblematically, the economic onto the global and the cultural onto the local. Important in a more holistic analysis is the attention given to details, situated practice, everyday knowledge, and cultural difference. Informed research pursuits will disentangle how and under whose authorship certain aspects of daily life are being glocalized, and how this process of glocalization—which differs from place to place—seriously influences culture as well as tourism. **A**

Acknowledgements—Partial funding for this research project was provided by the Department of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania. Thanks to Kathleen Adams, Peggy Sanday, Sandra Barnes, Jean-Marc de Grave, Nelden Djakababa, Vida Bajc, and Monica Espinoza for their comments. The author is indebted to Martina Slamet Riyadi, Robert Suharyanto, Yusuf Suharyono, Mie Cornoedus, Rita Daneels, Wiendu Nuryanti, Vita Ferida, Hendrie Kusworo, Hainullah Gazali, Destha Raharjana, James Spillane, Paul Sunarpadmo, Arinto Prakoso, and the whole team of the “Traveler’s Bar”. Terima kasih!

REFERENCES

- Ap, J., and K. Wong
 2001 Case Study on Tour Guiding: Professionalism, Issues and Problems. *Tourism Management* 22:551–563.
- Appadurai, A.
 1996 *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Aramberri, J.
 2001 The Host Should Get Lost: Paradigms in the Tourism Theory. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28:738–761.
- Arizpe, L., ed.
 1996 *The Cultural Dimensions of Global Change: An Anthropological Approach*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Bambang, M.
 2004 Sleman, Home of a Thousand Tourist Villages. *The Jakarta Post*, Jakarta (3 January):17.
- Barthes, R.
 1972 *Mythologies*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Bauman, Z.
 1998 *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bras, K.
 2000 *Image-Building and Guiding on Lombok: The Social Construction of a Tourist Destination*. PhD dissertation in leisure studies. Katholieke Universiteit Brabant, The Netherlands.
- Cawley, M., S. Gaffey, and D. Gillmor
 2002 Localization and Global Reach in Rural Tourism: Irish Evidence. *Tourist Studies* 2:63–86.
- Chang, T., S. Milne, D. Fallon, and C. Pohlmann
 1996 Urban Heritage Tourism: The Global-Local Nexus. *Annals of Tourism Research* 23:284–305.
- Chin, M.
 2002 Close Encounters of the Third Kind in Jogjakarta. *Latitudes. Magazine* 18:26–31.
- Clifford, J.
 1997 *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, E.
 1985 The Tourist Guide: The Origins, Structure and Dynamics of a Role. *Annals of Tourism Research* 12:5–29.
- Dahles, H.
 2001 Tourism, Heritage and National Culture in Java: Dilemmas of a Local Community. Richmond: Curzon-IIAS.
 2002 The Politics of Tour Guiding: Image Management in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29:783–800.
- Dahles, H., and K. Bras
 1999a Entrepreneurs in Romance Tourism in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26:267–293.
- Dahles, H. and K. Bras, eds.
 1999b *Tourism and Small Entrepreneurs: Development, National Policy and Entrepreneurial Culture: Indonesian Cases*. New York: Cognizant.

- Directorate General of Tourism
1999 Community and Village-Based Tourism in Indonesia. Jakarta: Ministry of Tourism, Art and Culture.
- Eriksen, T., ed.
2003 *Globalisation: Studies in Anthropology*. London: Pluto Press.
- Featherstone, M.
1996 Localism, Globalism, and Cultural Identity. *In* *Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary*, R. Wilson and W. Dissanayake, eds., pp. 46–77. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Featherstone, M., S. Lash, and R. Robertson, eds.
1995 *Global Modernities*. London: Sage.
- Franklin, A., and M. Crang
2001 The Trouble with Tourism and Travel Theory? *Tourist Studies* 1:5–22.
- Friedman, J.
1994 *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. London: Sage.
- Geertz, C.
1963 *Peddlers and Princes: Social Change and Economic Modernization in Two Indonesian Towns*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1983 *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Giddens, A.
1990 *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford University Press: Stanford.
- Guinness, P.
1986 *Harmony and Hierarchy in a Javanese Kampung*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Gupta, A., and J. Ferguson
1997 *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hampton, M.
2003 *Entry Points for Local Tourism in Developing Countries: Evidence from Yogyakarta, Indonesia*. *Geografiska Annaler B* 85:85–101.
- Hannerz, U.
1996 *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London: Routledge.
- Hitchcock, M.
2000 *Ethnicity and Tourism Entrepreneurship in Java and Bali*. *Current Issues in Tourism* 3:204–225.
- Holloway, J.
1981 *The Guided Tour: A Sociological Approach*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 8:377–402.
- Inda, J., and R. Rosaldo, eds.
2002 *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Kartana, S.
2001 *Yogyakarta Village Promotes Innovative Cultural Tourism*. *The Jakarta Post*, (27 January):9.
- Kindon, S.
2001 *Destabilizing “Maturity”*: Women as Producers of Tourism in Southeast Asia. *In* *Women as Producers and Consumers of Tourism in Developing Regions*, Y. Apostolopoulos, S. Sönmez and D. Timothy, eds., pp. 73–91. Westport: Praeger.
- Lewellen, T.
2002 *The Anthropology of Globalization: Cultural Anthropology Enters the 21st Century*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey.
- Low, S., and D. Lawrence-Zúñiga
2003 *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Meethan, K.
2001 *Tourism in Global Society: Place, Culture, Consumption*. New York: Palgrave.
- Michaud, J.
1995 *Questions about Fieldwork Methodology*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 22:681–684.

- Miller, D., ed.
1995 *Worlds Apart: Modernity through the Prism of the Local*. London: Routledge.
- Mowforth, M., and I. Munt
2003 *Tourism and Sustainability: Development and New Tourism in the Third World* (2nd ed.). Routledge: London.
- Muhr, T.
1997 *Atlas.Ti. User's Manual and Reference*. Scientific Software Development: Berlin.
- Mulder, N.
1994 *Inside Indonesian Society: An Interpretation of Cultural Change in Java*. Bangkok: Editions Duang Kamol.
- Nederveen Pieterse, J.
2004 *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Nuryanti, W.
1996 *Heritage and Postmodern Tourism*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 23:249–260.
- Pearce, P.
1984 *Tourist-Guide Interaction*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 11:129–146.
- Pond, K.
1993 *The Professional Guide: Dynamics of Tour Guiding*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Robertson, R.
1994 *Globalization or Glocalization?* *Journal of International Communication* 1:33–52.
1995 *Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity*. In *Global Modernities*, M. Featherstone, S. Lash and R. Robertson, eds., pp. 25–44. London: Sage.
- Sherlock, K.
2001 *Revisiting the Concept of Hosts and Guests*. *Tourist Studies* 1:271–295.
- Smith, V.
1989 *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Smith, V., and M. Brent, eds.
2001 *Hosts and Guests Revisited: Tourism Issues of the 21st Century*. New York: Cognizant.
- Sofield, T.
1995 *Indonesia's National Tourism Development Plan*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 22(3):690–694.
- Sullivan, J.
1992 *Local Government and Community in Java: An Urban Case-Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Svensson, G.
2001 *"Glocalization" of Business Activities: A "Glocal Strategy" Approach*. *Management Decision* 39:6–18.
- Swyngedouw, E.
1997 *Neither Global nor Local: "Glocalization" and the Politics of Scale*. In *Spaces of Globalization: Reasserting the Power of the Local*, K. Cox, ed., pp. 137–166. New York: Guilford.
2004 *Globalisation or "Glocalisation"? Networks, Territories and Re-Scaling*. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17:25–48.
- Teo, P., and L. Li
2003 *Global and Local Interactions in Tourism*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 30:287–306.
- The Jakarta Post
2001 *Yogyakarta Goes International*. *The Jakarta Post*, Jakarta (30 April):2.
2002 *Yogyakarta, Yogya, Jogja or Jogya?* *The Jakarta Post*, Jakarta (21 January):17.
- Thornton, W.
2000 *Mapping the "Glocal" Village: The Political Limits of 'Glocalization'*. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 14:79–89.

- Timothy, D.
1999 Participatory Planning: A View of Tourism in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26:371–391.
- Tomlinson, J.
1999 *Globalization and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tulloch, S., ed.
1991 *The Oxford Dictionary of New Words: A Popular Guide to Words in the News*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wahab, S., and C. Cooper
2001 *Tourism in the Age of Globalisation*. London: Routledge.
- Wall, G.
1997 Linking Heritage and Tourism in an Asian City: The Case of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *In Quality Management in Urban Tourism*, P. Murphy, ed., pp. 137–148. New York: Wiley.
- Waters, M.
2001 *Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Wilson, R., and W. Dissanayake, eds.
1996 *Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Wood, R.
1980 International Tourism and Cultural Change in Southeast-Asia. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 28:561–581.
1993 Tourism, Culture, and the Sociology of Development. *In Tourism in South-East Asia*, M. Hitchcock, V. King and M. Parnwell, eds., pp. 48–70. London: Routledge.
- WTO
2001 *Tourism 2020 Vision*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
2003 *Tourism Highlights. Edition 2003*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
2004 *WTO World Tourism Barometer, Vol. 2, No. 2*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- WTTC
2003 *Progress and Priorities 2003/04*. London: World Travel and Tourism Council.
- Yamashita, S.
2003 *Bali and Beyond: Explorations in the Anthropology of Tourism*. New York: Berghahn.

Submitted 30 March 2004. Resubmitted 4 June 2004. Resubmitted 27 September 2004. Accepted 11 October 2004. Final version 8 November 2004. Refereed anonymously. Coordinating Editor: Heidi Dahles

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

