



*Working Papers in*  
**Urban Language &  
Literacies**

---

Paper **219**

**Tourism and postcolonial  
performativity**

Raymund Vitorio (*King's College London*),

2017

This paper is the early draft of a chapter to appear in A. Storch and A. Mietzner (eds.) (forthcoming)  
*Entanglements, Emblematic Codes and Linguaging in Tourism*, Channel View Publications

# Tourism and postcolonial performativity

Raymund Vitorio

National University of Singapore and King's College London  
raymund\_victor.vitorio@kcl.ac.uk

## Abstract

Colonialism tends to be an inevitable component of heritage tourism in postcolonial contexts. In this paper, I investigate how tour guides respond to the colonial aspects of the “tourist gaze” (Urry, 1990; Urry & Larsen, 2011), the collection of normative and social expectations of tourists when they take part in the activity of tourism. I argue that their strategic use of multimodal and stylistic resources should be approached using the framework of postcolonial performativity (Pennycook, 2001), which highlights the “...historical understanding of language use, a non-essentialist stance emphasizing appropriation and hybridity, and focus on local contexts of language” (p. 68). As a framework, postcolonial performativity highlights the types of imperialist oppression that emerges in the context of tourism, without assuming rigid structural relations or complete freedom of agents. Instead, it foregrounds the performativity of language and discourse as playing a key role in reproducing and transforming colonial relations. This allows us to appreciate the possibilities available to tour guides to resist the seemingly oppressive and colonial backdrop of the tourist gaze. Using an ethnographic approach, this paper examines one tour guide in Intramuros, a Spanish heritage city in the City of Manila. I argue that the multimodal and metalinguistic resources allow tour guides to surreptitiously index their own postcolonial stances as they simultaneously respond to the demands of the tourist gaze.

## 1. Introduction

Heritage tourism is an indispensable aspect of the tourism industry, especially in postcolonial countries. It relies on many professional practices which capitalize on the consumption of history as an aesthetic and sensory experience, and is situated in various interfaces: the domestic and the foreign, the past and the present, and the global and the local. Colonial history simultaneously serves as a backdrop and resource for the active construction of the country as a marketable tourist destination. Images of colonialism and postcolonialism are integrated in banal forms of interaction in the tourism activity, which are integral to how tourists consume heritage tourism attractions. As Thurlow and Jaworski (2010: 9) argue, “it is at the level of the interpersonal, everyday exchange of meaning where the global and the local interface are negotiated and resolved, be it through processes of cultural absorption, appropriation, recognition, acceptance, or resistance.” These processes of reconciling the global and the local are enacted by the stakeholders involved in the tourism activity.

In this paper, I investigate how tour guides—a primary stakeholder in the tourism activity—employ various sociolinguistic strategies in order to construct the identity of an effective tour guide. Despite the rapid increase of substitutes for tour guides, such as websites, travel books, and crowdsourced forums among tourists, tour guides remain an essential part of the tourism activity. They serve as primary mediators between the global and the local, and function as a bridge between tourists and tourist destinations (Bruner, 2005; Reisinger & Steiner, 2006; Salazar, 2005; 2006). By looking at tour guides in the Philippines, a country which has a long colonial history and a budding tourism industry, I aim to show how tour guides strategically

manipulate aspects of colonialism in their guided tours as their way of responding to the “tourist gaze” (Urry, 1990; Urry & Larsen, 2011)— the visual, sensory and performative “‘discursive determinations’, of socially constructed seeing or ‘scopic regimes’” (Urry & Larsen, 2011: 2) in the activity of tourism that organizes how tourists view and interact with the “other” (p. 14). I will investigate the narrative and linguistic aspects of the tour guide performances of tour guides, and how their emblematic use of linguistic resources translate into postcolonial forms of resistance, and how these allow them to construct a strategic position for themselves in the tourism activity. Following the framework of postcolonial performativity (Pennycook, 2001), I argue that while systems of colonialism and oppression may remain strong in the context of heritage tourism, tour guides are not completely devoid of avenues to formulate forms of resistance, even though they may not necessarily be able to completely reconfigure or dismantle the system. These sociolinguistic practices can be construed as a form of semiotic mobility that allows tour guides to develop their own voices with respect to the tourist gaze.

## **2. Sociolinguistics, postcolonialism and the tour guide**

While earlier research on the role of language and tourism has focused on intercultural communication and on the brokering of cultural exchanges (e.g. Clyne, 1981; Cohen & Cooper, 1986; Ferguson, 1971; Smith, 2001;) and on attempts to establish the “language of tourism” as an object of inquiry (e.g. Dann, 1996; Pritchard & Morgan, 2005), more recent research on the “sociolinguistics of tourism” (Thurlow & Jaworski, 2010: 1) has paid more attention to the activity of tourism not just in terms of communicative efficiency but also in terms of how it is embedded in different structures of power, inequality, and resistance in light of the changes brought about by globalization. The richness of semiotic resources in tourism has been approached in various ways, such as in the study of the linguistic features of tourism in marketing (e.g. Dann, 1996; Thurlow & Aiello, 2007); tourism-oriented language learning (e.g. Dörnyei & Csizér, 2005; Phipps, 2007; Thurlow & Jaworski, 2010); authenticity (Coupland & Coupland, 2014; Duchêne & Heller, 2012; Pietikäinen & Kelly-Holmes, 2011); place-making (e.g. Gao, 2012; Kelly-Holmes & Pietikäinen, 2014); linguistic landscapes (e.g. Milani & Levon, 2016; Moriarty, 2015); and the commodification of language (Heller, 2003; Heller, Pujolar, & Duchêne, 2014).

These studies are based on a few key premises. First, the “language of tourism” should not be viewed in the traditional sense of “language,” which is just a collection of linguistic units, but as a collection of multimodal resources which are linked to human activity. Second, language is not a neutral instrument that merely functions as a tool for communication; rather, it is a semiotic resource that is laden with political struggles and embedded in the different scales of interactional activity. Third, the material conditions of the globalized tourism industry spell out new ways of viewing language from the perspectives of the stakeholders of the tourism industry, especially in terms of how it constructs, perpetuates, or challenges structures of difference and inequality. Finally, multilingualism has become an important resource in the management of diversity and the construction of various ideologies and identities.

### *Tourism, Oppression, and Resistance*

The tourism industry has been criticized for being involved in the propagation of colonial values, such as misrepresenting local cultures for the sake of pleasing the colonizing eyes of

Western tourists. In a sense, tourism, colonialism, and capitalism are inextricably tied to one another. According to d’Hauteserre (2004):

“Tourism, like postcolonialism, has its roots in colonialism, both as a theoretical construct and as a perceptual mechanism (cf. Temple, 2002). Tourism development, through its approach to Third World destinations (in the form of, for example, resort enclaves and “international standard” hotels), perpetuates colonial forms of interaction that treat the exotic as inferior. Exotic places are controlled by being familiarized and domesticated through a language that locates them in a “universal” (meaning Western) system of reference that visitors recognize and can communicate about. Tourist representations draw heavily upon cultural memories produced elsewhere, even though the destination is layered with indigenous cultural inscriptions...Colonial and, today, tourist narratives have strategically functioned to produce geopolitical myths about destinations” (p. 237).

This logic is shared by Nash (1989) when he calls tourism a form of neocolonialism. Palmer’s (1994) study of the tourism industry of the Bahamas affirms this idea by claiming that “by relying on the images of a colonial past, the tourism industry merely perpetuates the ideology of colonialism and prevents the local people from defining a national identity of their own” (p. 792). She argues that the tourism industry seems to compel local stakeholders in the Bahamas to feel that they have to rely on colonialism in order to effectively stylize themselves as a tourist destination, which comes at the expense of their autonomy to come up with a national identity that works for them.

This is reminiscent of Rosaldo’s (1989: 68-90; cf. Bruner, 2001) notion of “imperialist nostalgia”—which he characterizes as the “process of yearning for what one has destroyed as a form of mystification” (p. 71). Bruner (2001) follows this point when he claims that “Tourism performances, throughout the world, regularly reproduce stereotypic images, discredited histories, and romantic fantasies. The past is manipulated to serve the expectations of the tourists and the political interests of those in power...” (p. 886). These criticisms are reasonable given that tourism, especially in postcolonial settings, involves the asymmetrical positioning of the tourist and the host community—with the host community usually being pushed to a disenfranchised position.

These criticisms result in a few questions. First, is there a way for structures of colonialism, capitalism, and othering to be contested by the local community? Second, assuming that they can be contested, up to what extent can this happen? Third, given that the local community tends to be in a less ideal position than the tourists in terms of the capitalist setup of the tourism activity, what resources can the local community use in order to contest these structures?

Bruner’s (2001; also in 2005: 33-100) study on three different tourism sites in Kenya shows different extents of the agency of the people involved in the tourism activity to reinforce or resist the structures mentioned above. His first field site, run by a private tour company, aims to provide a sense of realism about the history of the local community of the Maasai. They aim to portray the local community by constructing a “...binary opposition...between the African primitive and the civilized Englishman” (2001: 897). This involves explicitly differentiating the tourist and the local community—they do not interact, and the tourists just observe how the Maasai live based on how it was presented by the company. He explains this

using the notion of “imperialist nostalgia” discussed above. However, his two other field sites provide more space for the local community to resist the nostalgia. His second field site, run by the government, uses tour performances not just to please the imperialist nostalgia of the tourists, but to show nationalism by highlighting how different Kenyans of today are from those of the past (pp. 886-890). This allows the stakeholders in that field site to have more pride in their work as Kenyans of today, which is arguably better than the first field site. Finally, his third field site, run by another private company which specializes in luxury tours, provides a “postmodern image” (p. 897). This image is constructed by dissolving the divide between the tourist and the local community in many ways, such as making them interact without pressuring the local community to perform “the illusion of wildness” (p. 892) that was the highlight of the tour in his first field site. Moreover, the performances do not just show what the local community was supposed to be like—they mesh this with performances which are not from the local community (e.g. Hakuna Matata, from the Hollywood film “Lion King” and a Jamaican reggae version of the song “Kum Ba Yah,” which is now ingrained in the popular culture of the United States despite its African roots)—which blurs the line “. . .between us and them, subject and object, tourist and native” (p. 893).

This study shows the importance of being critical of tour performances while understanding the logic of the local context where they operate in. This is consistent with Heller *et al.*'s (2014) reminder to examine how language paves the way for the assertion of agency and resistance vis-à-vis the seemingly oppressive demands of the tourist gaze. They argue:

“...within otherwise normative practices and hegemonic arrangements, there are always opportunities for participants (hosts, locals and tourists alike) to ‘speak out’ and to ‘speak back’. Within the constraints of tourism discourse – its economic structures – there is necessarily room for creativity by which, for example, local communities may promote their own political and personal agendas and may find ways to resist (or just rework) the hierarchies of the symbolic marketplace” (p. 448)

This shows that even though tourism is a highly commercial and capitalist activity, it can also be contested by people who may not necessarily have overt economic power through creativity. People are not devoid of agency to find strategic positions for themselves in tourism; they can “speak out” and “speak back” (cf. Ashcroft, *et al.*, 1989) even though they may not be able to totally reconfigure or dismantle the structures of the tourism industry. As Pennycook (2001: 65) argues, “. . .a critical aspect of critical theorizing needs to incorporate the notion of resistance, ways in which people are not mere respondents to the dictates of social structure and ideology but rather are social actors who also resist sites of oppression.” This gives us leeway to understand how the Other can speak back in tourism (cf. Aitchison, 2001).

### *Tour Guides as Agents*

In this paper, I investigate how tour guides come up with performances that allow them to resist the seemingly oppressive structures of tourism mentioned above. Tour guides are a central focus in many research on language and tourism. Earlier works on tour guides problematize their role in the tourism industry (e.g. Cohen, 1985; Holloway, 1981; Pond, 1993), mostly in terms of their status as the professional source of information, socialization, communication, and entertainment and as “language brokers” (Cohen & Cooper, 1986).

Cohen (1985) identifies four major functions of tour guides: Originals, Animators, Tour Leaders, and Professionals. Originals are tour guides who primarily cover the basic tasks of guiding, which involve ensuring that tourists find their target destinations and their way back home. Animators are involved in socializing with tourists and making sure that they can effectively connect with them. Tour Leaders assist tourists in intermingling with the people in the local destination. Finally, Professionals take charge in giving nuanced information about the destination and in appreciating the local destinations, practices, and experiences of the activity.

More recent research aim to go beyond the communicative and pragmatic utility of tour guides by examining how they actually serve as intermediary between the tourist and the destination. For instance, Reisinger and Steiner's (2006) study enriches earlier works on the communicative aspect of tour guiding by highlighting the role of tour guides in the construction of the feeling of authenticity (e.g. how some tourists feel that they are authentic tourists and not just members of a tour group). This has been picked up by research on the sociolinguistics of tourism (e.g. Hall-Lew, Fairs, & Lew, 2015; Jack & Phipps, 2005; Jaworski & Pritchard, 2005; Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010; Thurlow & Jaworski, 2010). These studies show the imperative to problematize the supposed roles of tour guides, and why it is important to see tour guides not just as passive participants of the tourism activity but as active frontrunners who strive to assert their own voices. While these works effectively illustrate the forms of communication that take place during the tourism activity and their relevance to tourism discourse, they do not necessarily pay attention to the agentive performances of tour guides.

Salazar's (2005; 2006; among others) works on tourism in Tanzania are good examples of how local stakeholders in the tourism industry exercise agency—albeit momentarily. He argues that tour guides are “key actors in the process of folklorizing, ethnicizing, and exoticizing a destination” (2006: 834; cf. 2005) and are “remarkable front-runners of glocalization” (2005: 628). He examines the professional tour guide training that Tanzanian students receive vis-à-vis their actual performances when dealing with foreign tourists, and reports that these students often resort to creative manipulations of the scripts that they learned from their training by shifting their alignments to the “local” community and the “global” tourism market, which can be seen as empowering because it shows that their agency as tourism frontrunners manifests itself in the actual interaction. He (2006) further argues:

“Although their performance is often staged and routinized, the reproduction of the rehearsed discourses is never complete or devoid of deviation. Tourism tales are not fixed, but are the site of constant contestation of meaning... Guides do not blindly copy the learned canons but use their agency to position themselves strategically on the “us” vs. “them” continuum which is so prevalent in all tourist imaginaries... Even if both tourists and guides are active players in the reproduction of the tourism tautology, there is mediation at every level, and there is always room for alternative or counter-discourses” (p. 847).

By examining the different semiotic resources that tour guides employ in their performances, I will demonstrate how their sociolinguistic appropriation of postcolonialism serves as a source and product of their agency which allows them to carve a strategic position for themselves in the tourism industry. I argue that that strategic use of sociolinguistic resources

can be approached well using the framework of postcolonial performativity (Pennycook, 2001: 68), which will be discussed below.

### **3. Postcolonial performativity and the global spread of English**

Pennycook (2001:46-71) proposes the framework of postcolonial performativity as a critical lens in understanding the global spread of English. He envisages postcolonial performativity as a corrective to the insufficiencies of existing frameworks for understanding the global spread of English. He enumerates five existing frameworks (i.e. colonial celebratory, laissez-faire liberalism, linguistic imperialism, language ecology and language rights, and linguistic hybridity) in sociolinguistics that are used to reach this understanding, which can be viewed as parts of a conservatism-liberalism spectrum of how English should be embraced, resisted, or interrogated. In this section, I will provide an overview of postcolonial performativity, and how this approach allows us to understand how the tour guide in the study enacts forms of resistance to the seemingly oppressive demands of the tourism industry.

The first two frameworks can be regarded as liberal approaches because they tend to celebrate the spread of English at the expense of its negative consequences. The first framework is “colonial celebratory,” which is premised on the inherent importance of English which justifies the need to spread it everywhere, and problematically puts English in a superior position compared to all other languages. The second framework is “laissez-faire liberalism,” which espouses the need to make English accessible to people who have desires to do so. Inasmuch as this framework can be construed as less supercilious to other languages than the first framework, it tends to take its functionalism superficially by ignoring the structures of inequality that are inextricably entangled in the politics of English.

The next two frameworks rest on the more conservative end of the spectrum because they tend to see the global spread of English in a rather pejorative way, which has a tendency to romanticize “languages” per se and discount actual effects of English on people’s lives. The third framework is “linguistic imperialism,” which typically views English as a detrimental force to less dominant languages and cultures, which Pennycook criticizes as being fixated on “structural power” (p. 59) without examining potential implications to agency. Similar to linguistic imperialism, the fourth framework—“language ecology and language rights”—views English as a threat to the linguistic ecologies of communities. While this is arguably a less conservative view than linguistic imperialism since it advocates for the language rights of less dominant languages, it reaffirms the perspective that “languages” in their pure form are the bedrock of identity.

The fifth framework, “linguistic hybridity,” rests somewhere in the middle of the spectrum. This view is dominant in the World Englishes paradigm and celebrates the pluralism of languages in certain contexts because of the natural adaptation that happens once the languages interact. However, Pennycook argues that this view has a “weak theorization of hybridity” and that it tends to put legitimate risks of hybridity on the margins of analysis.

The framework of postcolonial performativity aims to address the gaps of the five frameworks. The liberal frameworks above tend to not appreciate structures of struggle and inequality in their celebration of the global spread of English, while the conservative frameworks tend to focus on the rhetoric of activism and oppression at the expense of the possibilities of agency and mobility despite the backdrop of inequality. Postcolonial

performativity aims to achieve a level of self-criticality by refusing to romanticize both traditional concepts in sociolinguistics (e.g. communicative competence may need to be revisited in relation to the power structures in the contexts of inquiry) and more recent analytical perspectives (e.g. hybridity needs to be interrogated and not be automatically assumed as inherently emancipatory). It aims to do so by following three key principles: “the need for a historical understanding of language use, a view of culture, identity and global politics that avoids essentialism and instead looks at forms of resistance and appropriation, and a need to always work contextually” (p. 72). This approach emphasizes the need to pay attention to actual linguistic activities of language users, their performative underpinnings and value, and the critical understanding of the local context of language use. Starting the analysis from non-essentialist notions with a sensitivity to the reproduction of inequality, this framework opens up possibilities for concrete action and reform by looking at how language use can lead to the creation of third spaces (cf. Kramsch, 1993 in Pennycook, 2001) where forms of resistance can take place. This allows us to recognize “the possibilities of using language against the grain, of taking up and using a language that has been a tool of oppression, colonialism, or rigid identity and turning it against itself” (Pennycook, 2001: 69). This framework also interrogates what language use actually means to people in relation to the material conditions surrounding the linguistic activity.

In this paper, I explore the potency of postcolonial performativity as a framework for understanding the global spread of English in the context of heritage tourism in the Philippine tourism industry. As a framework, postcolonial performativity highlights the types of imperialist oppression that emerges in the context of tourism, without assuming rigid structural relations or complete freedom of agents. Instead, it foregrounds the performativity of language and discourse as playing a key role in reproducing and transforming colonial relations. The Philippines is a good site of study because of its rich colonial history (i.e. former colony of Spain and the United States, and occupied by Japan during the Second World War) and postcolonial struggle (i.e. post-war efforts to create an independent and national identity). I will explore how tour guides take a postcolonial stance in their performances as a semiotic device, such as how they simultaneously discuss and challenge colonialism. I will also tackle how that allows them to strategically position themselves in the tourism industry, which can be viewed as a form of resistance.

#### **4. The ethnographic fieldwork: Charles in Intramuros, Manila**

The data that I discuss here are part of the ethnographic fieldwork that I conducted in three fieldwork sites in 2012. This fieldwork was conducted in three of the most important tourism hubs in the Philippines: Manila, Boracay Island, and Puerto Princesa City. Recordings of performances of and interviews with ten Filipino tour guides from the said tourism hubs comprise the data. However, in this paper, I focus on one tour guide, Charles (pseudonym), who conducts tours in Manila, the capital city of the Philippines. His tours are famous in the country; he attracts both local and foreign tourists who are interested in heritage tourism.

Charles has more than ten years of tour guiding experience in Intramuros, a walled city in downtown Manila which was built by Spanish colonizers in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. He identifies as part of the middle class and has a fairly privileged background—he went to an expensive private school, completed his degree at the country’s premier university, and has an extensive travel and migration history. His historical knowledge is also backed by his research experience at the Heritage Conservation Society. His involvements in culture and the arts also

enabled him to go to different events overseas. He has “maximum competence” in English and Tagalog and has “minimal competence” in Spanish (see Blommaert & Backus, 2013 for their discussion of levels of competence), and he has extensive theater training which made it easy for him to change accents. He is also known in the country as a political activist. The popularity of his tours and civic involvement was recognized by the city government of Manila and made him the city’s tourism consultant in 2013. He is probably the most famous tour guide in the Philippines.

In this paper, I focus on Charles in order to come up with a more ethnographically informed analysis of his performances. Even though Charles’ background and style are unusual among the other tour guides in the study, his performances strongly highlight the issues of the imperialist tourist gaze that tour guides need to deal with. Hence, focusing on Charles can be a good way of studying the range of strategies that tour guides may adopt through postcolonial performativity.

Intramuros is in the central area of the City of Manila, which is one of the comprising cities of what is now known as the National Capital Region (NCR)—the economic and political center of the Philippines. It was constructed to be the seat of the Spanish government in the then Province of Manila. The walls were supposed to defend the city from natural disasters, local insurgents, and other foreign colonizers. Most of Intramuros was destroyed during World War II; thus, most of what is left in Intramuros were reconstructed after the war.

Intramuros is regarded as the historical center of Manila and NCR, and now hosts several universities, government buildings, museums, restaurants, and churches—including the famous and grand Manila Cathedral, and the San Agustin Church, which is one of the baroque churches in the Philippines which are collectively declared as UNESCO World Heritage Sites. Because of its rich history and geographic accessibility, Intramuros is one of the most popular tourist destinations in Manila, and it happens to still have a vibrant tour guiding industry. Given that Intramuros is a site of heritage tourism, tourists tend to benefit from joining guided tours because of the historical explanations that go with them. This shows that tour guides in Intramuros such as Charles mediate structures of colonialism in the tourism activity. Because of this status, Intramuros is a relevant site for an investigation of how postcolonial stances relate to challenging the tourist gaze.

## **5. Props, costumes, and the multimodal performance of (post)colonialism**

In this section, I will zoom into the multimodal resources that Charles uses in his tours. He uses a relatively uncommon strategy, at least in the Philippine tourism industry, of using costumes and props in his tours to emphasize his points on Philippine colonial history. He is the only tour guide in my fieldwork who used costumes and props, since all the other tour guides just wore their company or personal clothes. Charles uses them as explicit cultural markers that reflect the different periods of Philippine history. This can be seen in the pictures below.



*Picture 1 Spanish Era*



*Picture 2 American Era*



*Picture 3 Japanese Era*



*Picture 4 American Flags during the American Era discussion*

In Picture 1, Charles discussed the situation of the Philippines during the Spanish colonial era, while wearing a modern remake of the Barong Tagalog, the national costume of the Philippines which is associated with the Spanish Era in terms of origin, and a hat which is distinctly European in origin. When he transitioned to the discussion of the American era (as seen in Picture 2), he replaced his hat with one that has the American flag on it, which is reminiscent of the iconic hat that the famous character Uncle Sam wears. In the last part of his tour (as seen in Picture 3), Charles talked about the Japanese occupation of the Philippines, while noticeably taking off his Barong Tagalog, replacing his American hat with a military hat, and putting a tobacco pipe in his mouth. In Picture 4, Charles took off his Uncle Sam hat but he installed two American flags as a backdrop. These costume shifts are noteworthy because it is an uncommon performative strategy in the Philippine tourism industry. His costume changes were done in a highly reflexive way—he unequivocally diverted the audience’s attention to the new items that he wears. Charles does not explicitly talk about the costumes; he just uses non-verbal cues to allude to the costumes in order to call attention to them. For instance, he changed his hats very slowly and playfully so that everyone in the tour group would notice it. He also occasionally stopped during the discussion of the Japanese Era so that he could pretend that he is smoking his tobacco pipe

while repeatedly raising his eyebrows until tourists laugh at what he was doing, which serves as an acknowledgement that the tourists received the message that he was trying to convey. Throughout the tour, Charles uses a compilation of pictures of prominent historical figures (e.g. Philippine war heroes, King of Spain) and landmarks (e.g. Manila Cathedral, Intramuros), as seen in the clear folder that he flashes in Picture 4. These props enable Charles to tap on the sensory nature of the tourist gaze by making tourists actually see what he is talking about.

Charles uses multimodal resources to index different colonial periods, which was the governing content and structure of his tour. The costumes and props (i.e. outfit, hats, tobacco pipe, American flag, pictures of prominent places and people) become salient representations of the colonial periods of Philippine history. Given that Charles does not explicitly explain the rationale behind the costumes, he relies on the background knowledge of tourists to understand it. The periodic shifts reflected in the costume changes were well-received by the tourists based on their reactions during the tour, such as their moments of laughter each time Charles would allude to the costumes and props.

Charles does not only use multimodal resources to index the different colonial periods of Philippine History; he also uses them to make markers of local Filipino identity salient. For instance, he began the tour by asking the tour group to sing the Philippine National Anthem with him. This invitation to participate in the multimodal performance of singing the National Anthem is an important interactional activity. It establishes the interactive nature of his tour, which allows him to fulfill the four different functions of tour guides that Cohen (1985) enumerates—especially the function of being a Professional by making tourists appreciate the local context during his performance. This also provides a reversal of the “imperial nostalgia” (Rosaldo, 1989: 68-90; cf. Bruner, 2001). Instead of presenting tourists with performances of the culture that colonialism has destroyed, he presents them with a strong symbol of the beginning of Philippine independence and postcolonialism: after all, the Philippine National Anthem, written for the proclamation of independence of the Philippines from Spain, condemns colonialism. However, this performance does not explicitly dwell on the postcolonial aspect of the national anthem—especially for the international tourists who do not understand the National Anthem because it was sang in Tagalog. Hence, the singing of the National Anthem enables Charles to allude to colonialism not through the language of the anthem per se, but through its performance and what it entails. It is comparable to Bruner’s (2001: 897) point on how performances can construct a “postmodern image”—by providing interactions that blur the lines between the local and the foreign, and by extension, the colonial and the postcolonial. The focus of the singing was not to explicitly condemn colonialism; rather, the point was to get all the tourists, local and foreign alike, to equally partake in the performance—even though they are from different backgrounds. Hence, the linguistic features of the National Anthem become less important in taking this postcolonial stance; the multimodal nature of actually singing the song fulfills this performative function, which serves as an introductory device for Charles to perform particular stances towards colonialism as he interacts with the tourists.

## **6. Metalinguistic humor and stylization**

In this section, I will examine the different metalinguistic strategies that Charles uses in his tour in order to take up postcolonial stances: specifically, the use of metalinguistic narratives (i.e. actual discussions about language) and metalinguistic humor (i.e. humor generated



English, and he simultaneously indexes difference and local authenticity by emphasizing the Philippine-ness of his speech, which becomes even more salient by the context of the singing of the national anthem, which could be viewed as an activity that makes the local salient. After all, the Philippine National Anthem was written for the proclamation of independence of the Philippines from Spain. The production of the message was informed by his knowledge that Philippine English can be used to both appeal to the global and local scales, and at the same time, create a coherent humorous message that can be received well in that particular tour group. The stylization can be seen as effective because he was able to evoke humor from the tourists, which complemented the activity of singing the national anthem. He also employs two famous essentialist jokes in this extract. The first one is that Filipinos are good at and/or love singing, and alludes to another point that Filipinos just randomly break out into songs. The second, which would only be understood by Filipino tourists, is that Filipinos usually get the title of the national anthem wrong. This “pop quiz” style is quite humorous because it is common knowledge that most Filipinos think that the title of the national anthem is “Bayang Magiliw,” the first line of the song, instead of “Lupang Hinirang.” This invitation to sing the national anthem sets the tone for the rest of the tour in a variety of ways: first, tourists can expect that the tour will be about Philippine history and identity; second, it draws the tourists’ attention to Charles’ accent shifts, so that they can stay focused on his stylistic construction and parody of groups throughout the rest of the tour; third, they also become attuned to Charles’ mixing of humor and critical commentary.

In addition to his accent shifts, Charles also directly uses metalinguistic discussions in his speeches to create humor. In a way, these jokes function because they lay out some informative value about the periods of Philippine history without explaining their political aspects in depth. This is comparable to how Charles uses costumes and props in the discussion above. He comes up with narratives that are explicitly about the relationship between colonialism and the linguistic situation in the Philippines, and he does so in lighthearted and playful ways. For instance, he discusses the linguistic influences of Spanish and American English on Philippine English and Tagalog. He names different places in the Philippines which all start with “*Santa*” or “*Santo*” (i.e. Spanish words for “saints”) in a Spanish accent, as well as different everyday objects like “*papel*” (“paper”), “*lapis*” (“pencil”), “*bombilla*” (“light bulb”), “*tenidor*” (“fork”), and “*cuchara*” (“spoon”)—all of which were Spanish words which were lexicalized into Tagalog. Similarly, he demonstrates the influence of American English on Philippine English by enumerating names of places, such as *Forbes Park*, *McKinley Road*, *Taft Avenue*, *Dewey Avenue*—which all allude to key persons of American colonialism in the Philippines—and adds that “we even have a *Beverly Hills* in Antipolo (i.e. a city east of Manila).”

In a way, Charles highlights the entanglement of Philippine English, and even Tagalog, in both global and local scales. He later on makes fun of, with his exaggerated Philippine English accent, how Philippine English uses many generic brand names as part of its lexicon, such as the use of “*Kodak*” to refer to “picture” (noun and verb forms), “*Coke*” to refer to “soda,” “*Frigidaire*” to refer to “refrigerator,” and “*Colgate*” to refer to “toothpaste.” He later on states in his tour that “just by the way that we speak, that history (i.e. Philippine colonial history) is made evident once again.”

Charles does not only provide examples of the lexical borrowings of Tagalog from colonial languages. He later on explicitly draws a connection between language and colonialism. He does not only use style shifting for humor; he uses it as an important resource for displaying

his political stance towards colonialism. This can be seen in the following extract, where Charles discusses the role of English in Philippine society.

**Extract 2:** Charles' language ideologies (**Bold: American English accent, Italics: Spanish Accent, Underline: Philippine English Accent, no format: default way of speaking**)

1 And one could look at the presence of English in this country in a good way!  
2 And...in a bad. Because in a good way, thanks to them, I'm now speaking  
3 to you in English today! And that's why you understand me in English,  
4 and why the Philippines is the third largest English-speaking country in  
5 the world. And that is also the reason why the Philippines is fast  
6 becoming the call center of planet Earth. That's our number one job  
7 growth industry here, just call AT&T or Pizza Hut, you  
8 don't talk to an American, you talk to one of us! You're talking to some  
9 man from Malabon in a building in Makati at midnight, **pretending to**  
10 **have a midwestern accent, sir. And we could not get an outsourcing**  
11 **job unless we spokening (sic) in English\*, but now the Filipino is**  
12 **speaking in English and no longer speakening (sic) in Spanish\*.**  
13 Suddenly any emotional, spiritual or cultural connection we ever could  
14 have developed with our Spanish past (unintelligible) 'cause when  
15 Filipinos lost the Spanish language, *we would lose the words of*  
16 *Cervantes, the poetry of Pablo Neruda, the movies of Almodovar,* the  
17 original novels of Jose Rizal. They are now inaccessible to you today.  
18 Because we lost our connection to Hispanic culture, and now that we  
19 were being taught American English, which is apparently completely  
20 different from what they speak in England, I hear. It was really only the  
21 culture of the Hollywood USA that would become the most readily  
22 available cultural canon to the average Filipino, who would literally bid  
23 *Adios, Cervantes!* And hello, *Caridad,* who's really pretty.

In this extract, Charles explains the role of American colonization in the embedding of English into Philippine society. He initiates his discussion by hyping the commercial value of English. It should be noted that Charles did not seem to be sarcastic in lines 1-3, as well as in his justification of the benefits of English being imposed on the Filipino people by the American colonizers in lines 4-8. He argues that English paved the way for the transformation of the Philippines as the “call center of planet Earth” (line 6), which he associates with American colonialism. He implicitly claims that Filipinos have started to own English by being good at this industry, which is why he said that “you don’t talk to an American, you talk to one of us!” (lines 7-8), which is complemented by his stylized American English accent in lines 9-11. However, as Charles says in lines 1 and 2, the prevalence of English in the Philippines can be seen in a bad way as well. He starts doing this in lines 9-12. The accent shifts that happens in lines 9-12 reflects his evaluative shift of the prevalence of English in the Philippines. In lines 9 and 10, he uses his American accent to suggest that Filipinos can indeed use English to gain economic benefits. In lines 11 and 12, he reverts to the stereotypical, basilectal Philippine English accent—even intentionally using “spokening” and “speakening”—common stereotypical features of basilectal Philippine English—in order to show that the prevalence of English comes with a cost, such as Filipinos having to struggle to work with English and Filipinos losing their access to Spanish. In these

lines, we can see how Charles' accent shifts are consistent with his value judgement of the English situation in the Philippines.

In lines 15-19, he explains that the move to English meant that Filipinos lost access to Spanish-language literature and media, such as the works of Cervantes, Neruda, and Almodovar. He complements this by mimicking the Spanish accent. In lines 19-23, he argues that Filipinos now can just access (American) English literature and media, and even provides a quick critique of American English in lines 19 and 20, when he says that American English is "different from what they speak in England, I hear."

While Charles' tour can be seen as very informative and fact-based all throughout the tour, his expression of his political stances was gradually developed in his tour. The metalinguistic jokes built up on each other and allowed him to gradually develop his own political opinions throughout the tour. It is only towards the middle when Charles' own opinions started to manifest themselves in his performance. In a way, it seems that the metalinguistic jokes became the foundation of his eventual critique of colonialism and other ideologies he disagrees with in the Philippines, such as theocracy and colonial mentality.

In my interview with Charles after the tour, he told me that he does not consider his tours as just a typical tour that allows tourists to get to know a certain place; rather, he considers it as a performance that allows him to use history to try to "bring the unknown parts of Manila's history, so making what is invisible visible, trying to change the way Manila looks through the way that you look at Manila." He did this by linking the history of Manila to its current sociopolitical landscape. Doing so gave him enough space to include his own opinions and political stances in his performance, which makes his tour guiding identity a conglomeration of the tour guide functions that Cohen (1985) discusses. This means that Charles is veering away from just being a source of information about the colonial heritage of Intramuros and the Philippines as a whole; rather, he wants to present a critical way of making the tourists learn and understand such information.

One of the most recurrent themes of Charles' tour is the role of the [Philippine] Catholic Church in Philippine history. He approaches this theme from different angles—from the neutral discussion of how Catholicism was one of the driving reasons behind Spanish colonialism, to positive comments about the beauty of Catholic architecture, to highly critical comments about the involvement of the Church in the matters of the state. Throughout the tour, he vehemently expressed his critical stance against the [Philippine] Catholic Church—which he consistently called the "Catholic Taliban."

This critical view of the Church and of colonialism as a whole is not just delivered in terms of content; they are reflected in his linguistic choices as well. Charles does several accent shifts again in a mocking style, which can be seen in the following extract where he discusses another aspect of Spanish Catholicism.

**Extract 3.** Charles' discussion of Catholicism and the Spanish Era (*Italics* = Spanish accent, **boldface** = exaggerated stereotypical Philippine English accent, underline = local Philippine language accent, broken underline = American accent, no formatting = unmarked Philippine English accent)

- 1 The Philippines was just literally given away to the Catholic Church.  
And

2 that's why we don't speak Spanish. Alright, Spanish colony without  
the  
3 Spanish language, how did that happen?  
4 And that's because to speak Spanish has always been a King thing.  
5 it's never been a Church thing.  
6 As a matter of fact, the king ordered the friars to  
7 teach Filipinos Spanish since the 18<sup>th</sup> century.  
8 But the priests of Manila said, <shouts> *forget it!*  
9 'Cos there really weren't enough priests here to do the job.  
10 But more importantly, language is power.  
11 And it was the Catholic Church's way of creating a Catholic  
kingdom...  
12 *at the end of the sea.*  
13 So instead of teaching Filipinos Spanish, those priests would instead  
learn  
14 **Tagalog, Bicolano, Ilocano, Ilonggo, Tagalog, Bisaya, Kankanaey,**  
15 **Waray, Pampangueño, Bisaya, Hiligaynon, Ilonggo.**  
16 Those priests would learn every local dialect and those priests would  
help  
17 save the Philippine languages. Which is one of the reasons  
18 why we still speak them. But now it created a very strange situation—  
19 wherein the priest could now understand us <laughs> and  
20 **we could not understand the priests.** And now more importantly,  
21 **we now could not understand the king.**  
[ ,ander'stand da]  
22 **Because if we understood the king better,**  
[ ,ander'stud da]  
23 **we'd see that the king was on our side**  
[dat da]  
24 **because the king never wanted the Philippines—**  
[da] [da]  
25 *there's no gold, what's your point?* And even told those friars—  
26 *“oh yeah, you friars, who are wasting my money building those seven*  
27 *churches from Intramuros. I should see those seven churches*  
28 *from Madrid, punyeta (i.e. expletive).”*  
29 And the King of Spain would spend an edict to the Philippines to let it  
go,  
30 and the edict will get hijacked by priests. And right in Manila,  
definitely.  
31 So you can see that the Philippines was really created and controlled  
more  
32 by a parochial friar class than anything else.  
33 Controlled by the 18<sup>th</sup> century **Catholic Taliban.**

In this extract, Charles was able to use five distinctly identifiable accents, which on the surface, fulfills certain functions. He uses his unmarked Philippine English accent as the base accent in this extract, and uses the four others in marked ways. His use of Spanish to mimic the Spanish king and friars to perform the colonizer, and he seems to have more disdain for the friars than the king. His extended use of the Spanish accent in lines 25-28 to mimic the king constructs an image of the king which the audience found funny. This simultaneously

makes the king appear to be ineffective, which is why he was manipulated by the friars. His use of the exaggerated Philippine English accent evokes self-deprecating humor, as seen in lines 20-24. This accent aids the construction of the image of the Filipino as helpless (“we could not understand the king” in line 21) and dispensable (“the king never wanted the Philippines” in line 24). The American accent is used to make “matter of fact” assertions, and his unmarked Philippine English accent as the base accent of such hybridity. However, there is more to this style-shifting: these are enactments of different identities which are linked to his own political ideologies about the identities concerned. The complex combination of these style-shifts does not only enable Charles to construct different identities for himself, but to articulate his own postcolonial parody and critique.

He also used these accent shifts in other parts of his tour. As a staunch critic of colonialism and the Catholic Church, Charles codeswitches to Spanish when he wants to create a parody of the Catholic Church. He also switches to an American-accented English when he wants to index the perceived stupidity of Americans (e.g. when he was discussing the failures of the American government during World War II). Finally, he switches to a heavily Philippine-accented English when he wants to criticize the attitudes and mindsets of Filipinos that he does not subscribe to (e.g. colonial mentality). It is also worth noting that in line 33, he says “Catholic Taliban” in a basilectal Philippine English accent, which seems to hype the postcolonial aspect of his parodic critique given that he is using the local variety to do so.

Charles’ accent shifts can be construed as a form of parody. Hutcheon (1989) describes parody as follows:

“As a form of ironic representation, parody is doubly coded in political terms: it both legitimizes and subverts that which it parodies. This kind of authorized transgression is what makes it a ready vehicle for the political contradictions of postmodernism at large” (p. 101).

In the examples above, Charles uses different accents to represent various personas, such as those of the Spanish king, friars, Americans, and Filipinos. These representations happen in the supposedly “factual” context of his historical tour. On the surface, it seems that Charles was just delivering a historical account of what happened in Intramuros and the Philippines in general during the colonial age. However, a closer introspection of his performance would reveal that his representations are rather ironic and critical. Following Hutcheon’s point above, when he represents different types of people by mimicking their accents, he simultaneously legitimizes and subverts them. He does not just use accents to create authenticity; he uses the authenticity he creates to go against it, and to insert his political opinions and critique of colonialism into his representations.

The framework of postcolonial performativity allows us to understand how this strategy works as a form of resistance. Postcolonial performativity compels us to break away from essentialist assumptions about language and understand what language means to its users and to its local context. The examples above show that Charles capitalizes on his historical understanding of the role of the languages and accents that he uses in his tours in the Philippine setting. He uses them as remarkable markers of colonialism. Moreover, he relies on essentialist notions about the accents that he uses in his tours, but also goes against those essentialist values by critiquing what the accents are supposed to represent. Hence, Charles does not only use the resources mentioned above to create “authentic” or “neutral” markers of the colonial periods of the Philippines; rather, he is using those resources which have

“...been a tool of oppression, colonialism, or rigid identity and turning it against itself” (Pennycook, 2001: 69). Charles’ initial discussions and costume shifts make it seem that he does not have any ulterior motive of criticizing colonialism, especially because his costume changes can be construed as ornamental and his accent shifts can be viewed as just playful shifting. However, a historical understanding of how this language use operates and an investigation of how this simultaneously affirms and challenges essentialist notions would reveal that his performances use the language of the colonizers in reconciling the global and the local, and in the eventual construction of his political stances.

These strategies enable Charles to voice his own political beliefs during the tour, such as his support for the then Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Bill (RH Bill) that is now enacted as law, his criticism against the Church for opposing the bill, and his overall disdain for Filipinos who do not see any problem with the Church meddling with the affairs of the state. He also repeatedly criticizes Filipinos who say negative things about Manila and the Philippines (about e.g. it lacking historical architecture compared to other Spanish colonies or Asian countries, about not being able to speak Spanish, about the Philippines not being a good country and that it would have been better off if it had not asked for independence from America) without understanding history and its complex impact on the current state of affairs in the country.

Amidst all these critical condemnations, Charles also clearly expressed his love for the Philippines, especially the hybrid identity of the Filipino people which resulted from the country’s long colonial history. He ended his tour by treating the tourists to a serving of *halo-halo* (transliteration: “mixed together”), a Filipino dessert which is a mix of various ingredients like red beans, jelly, banana, corn, sweet potato, topped with shaved ice, milk, and yam. He told the tourists that the Filipino is a *halo-halo*:

**Extract 4:** The Philippines as a *halo-halo* (double underline = American accent)

- 1 ‘...because of all the intermingling of races, cultures, religions, events,
- 2 and chromosomes, because of Manila's rich history as a gateway
- 3 between the East and West, we can truly see that by the 20th century,
- 4 Manila became Asia's first multi-cultural society.
- 5 Manila became the only city in the Far East
- 6 where you could own an Indian-style bazaar that sold Italian jewelry.
- 7 You had Malay skin, you had Chinese eyes, you spoke in Spanish,
- 8 while deep in your heart, [pause] you just wanted to be an American.
- 9 <laughter>
- 10 The Filipino had truly and successfully become what we call, a halo-
- 11 halo.
- 12 And with that, ladies and gentlemen, we end the journey.
- 13 And I hope that I've let you all know just a little bit about the enigma
- 14 that is very misunderstood city of Manila,
- 15 please use what you've learned, fellow Filipinos,
- 16 to improve the image of Manila, okay?
- 17 Because if you really wanna truly change the way that Manila looks,
- 18 then
- 19 then what you gotta do
- 20 is start changing the way that you look at Manila.’

Even though Charles' political views against colonialism and theocracy are very resonant in his performances, his love of country remains his most valued, and actually highlighted, advocacy. In the conclusion of his tour, Charles says that people should question the "legacy" of colonial history in order to better appreciate the Philippines. In Extract 4, he summarizes his argument that the core tenet of being Filipino is its diversity brought about by Philippine history.

In Lines 4-8, Charles resorts to using an enumeration of the different cultures that makes Manila "Asia's first multi-cultural society." In Line 8, he once again shifts to an American accent which evoked laughter in Line 9. This is another attempt at parody because the context of the preceding topic was colonial mentality, specifically the running desire of many Filipinos to be American. He uses the *halo-halo* as a concluding metaphor to make tourists understand the Philippines better—to make them understand why the Philippines does not have a singular distinctive and unified cultural image, which he contrasts with Thailand, China, and Malaysia; rather, the Philippines has always been about the hybridity of the colonizer and the colonized, and by extension, of the global and the local.

The tourists were later on surprised when Charles' assistants started serving *halo-halo*, which makes the metaphor more effective because the tourists actually got to try the dessert while listening to Charles' discussion. What is important to note here is that while the actual consumption of the *halo-halo* is not strictly a linguistic activity, it still brings into being certain relations and perspectives on colonialism through the audience's participation. It complements both the multimodal and linguistic strategies enumerated above. In Bruner's (2005: 33) words, "tourism gives tribalism and colonialism a new space by bringing them back as representations of themselves and circulating them within an economy of performance." This is what Charles does—he capitalizes on the entanglement of colonial history with the current material conditions surrounding the Philippines and its tourism industry in his performances. This allows him to perform an identity for himself as a tour guide who does not only reaffirm the colonial aspect of his heritage tour, but also as a tour guide who consistently questions that aspect, and uses it to "speak back" (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989) for his advantage—both in terms of coming up with tours that give him commercial success as a tour guide and by allowing him to integrate his own political stances such as his condemnation of colonialism and his love of country. This becomes his competitive advantage. He does not directly dismantle the structures of colonialism; he uses them against themselves as a form of postcolonial resistance.

## 7. Conclusion

While it is easy to fall into the trap of blindly celebrating this phenomenon as a success of Charles' linguistic performances, we need to remember that postcolonial performativity emphasizes the need to critically evaluate this process and to avoid the danger of romanticizing such perceived success. Inasmuch as this shows us that the tourist gaze has cracks and gaps that can be exploited by agents like Charles, it does not mean that heritage tourism in the postcolonial world has become an equal space in terms of mobility. Charles comes from a position of privilege unlike most tour guides in the Philippines. Moreover, it would be inaccurate to claim that the colonial aspect of heritage tourism becomes totally dismantled: it is still very much alive, but it can be contested, albeit momentarily or "fleetingly" (cf. Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010)—which shows that the tourism activity becomes a third space (Kramsch, 1993 in Pennycook, 2001). On the other hand, it would also be

unwise to dismiss the idea that this is empowering. This is how the framework of postcolonial performativity provides its value as an interpretive lens: a historical understanding of the linguistic resources that Charles uses in his tours allows us to make sense of how he employs pastiche and parody in his enactment of “strategic use of essentialism” (Spivak, 1993) and how these linguistic performances work in the local context of the tourism activity. Postcolonial performativity allows us to appreciate the situatedness of agency and mobility in the structures of colonialism and inequality, which is essential to a better understanding of the sociolinguistics of tourism.

-----

## References

- Aitchison, C. (2001). Theorizing Other discourses of tourism, gender and culture. Can the subaltern speak (in tourism)? *Tourist Studies*, 1 (2), 133-147.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., and Tiffin, H. (1989) *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. and Backus, A. (2013) Superdiverse repertoires and the individual. In I. de Saint-Georges and J.J. Weber (eds) *Multilingualism and Multimodality: Current Challenges for Educational Studies* (pp. 11-32). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Bruner, E. (2001) The Maasai and the Lion King: authenticity, nationalism, and globalization in African tourism. *American Ethnologist*, 28 (4), 881-908.
- Bruner, E. (2005) *Culture on Tour: Ethnographies of Travel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clyne, M.G. (1981) Introduction. *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 1981 (28), 5-7.
- Cohen, E. and Cooper, R.L. (1986) Language and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 13 (4), 533-563.
- Cohen, E. (1985) The tourist guide: The origins, structure and dynamics of a role. *Annals of Tourism Research* 12 (1), 5-29.
- Coupland, B. and Coupland, N. (2014) The authenticating discourses of mining heritage tourism in Cornwall and Wales. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 18 (4), 495-517.
- d’Hauteserre, A. (2004) Postcolonialism, Colonialism, and Tourism. In A. Lew, C.M. Hall, and A. Williams (eds) *A Companion to Tourism* (pp. 235-245). Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Dann, G.M.S. (1996) *The Language of Tourism. A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Oxon, CAB International.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Csizér, K. (2005) The effects of intercultural contact and tourism on language attitudes and language learning motivation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 24 (4), 327-357.
- Duchêne, A. and Heller, M. (eds) (2012) *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit*. New York, Routledge.
- Ferguson, C.A. (1971) Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity: A study of normal speech, baby talk, foreigner talk, and pidgins. In D. Hymes (ed) *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages* (pp. 141-150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gao, S. (2012) Commodification of place, consumption of identity: The sociolinguistic construction of a ‘global village’ in rural China. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 16 (3), 336-357.

- Hall-Lew, L., Fairs, A. and Lew, A.A. (2015) Tourist attitudes towards linguistic variation in Scotland. In E. Torgersen, S. Hårstad, B. Mæhlum and U. Røyneland (eds) *Language Variation – European Perspectives V, Studies in Language Variation (SILV)* series (pp. 99-110). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Heller, M. (2003) Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7 (4), 473-492.
- Heller, M., Jaworski, A. and Thurlow, C. (2014) Introduction: Sociolinguistics and tourism – mobilities, markets, multilingualism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 18 (4), 425-566.
- Heller, M., Pujolar, J. and Duchêne, A. (2014) Linguistic commodification in tourism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 18 (4), 539-566.
- Holloway, J. (1981) The guided tour: A sociological approach. *Annals of Tourism Research* 8 (3), 377-402.
- Hutcheon, L. (1989) *The politics of postmodernism*. London: Routledge.
- Jack, G. and Phipps, A. (2005) *Tourism and Intercultural Exchange. Why Tourism Matters*. Clevedon and Buffalo, Channel View.
- Jameson, F. (1984) Postmodernism or the cultural logic of late capitalism. *New Left Review* 146, 53-92.
- Jaworski, A. and Pritchard, A. (eds) (2005) *Discourse, communication, and tourism*. Clevedon and Buffalo: Channel View.
- Jaworski, A. and Thurlow, C. (2010) Language and the globalizing habitus of tourism: towards a sociolinguistics of fleeting relationships. In N. Coupland (ed.) *The Handbook of Language and Globalization* (pp. 255-286). Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kelly-Holmes, H. and Pietikäinen, S. (2014) Commodifying Sámi culture in an indigenous tourism site. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 18 (4), 518-538.
- Kramsch, C. (1993) *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Milani, T. and Levon, E. (2016) Sexing diversity: Linguistic landscapes of homonationalism. *Language & Communication* 51 (2016), 69-86.
- Moriarty, M. (2015) Indexing authenticity: The linguistic landscape of an Irish tourist town. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2015 (232), 195-214.
- Nash, D. (1989) Tourism as a form of imperialism. In V. Smith (ed) *Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism* (pp. 179-202) (2nd edn). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Palmer, C. (1994) Tourism and Colonialism. The Experience of the Bahamas. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21 (4), 792-811.
- Pennycook, A. (2012) *Language and Mobility: Unexpected Places*. Bristol and Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.
- Phipps, A. (2007) *Learning the Arts of Linguistic Survival: Linguaging, Tourism, Life*. Clevedon and Buffalo: Channel View.
- Pietikäinen, S. and Kelly-Holmes, H. (2011) The local political economy of languages in a Sámi tourism destination: Authenticity and mobility in the labelling of souvenirs. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15 (3), 323-346.
- Pond, K. (1993) *The Professional Guide: Dynamics of Tour Guiding*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Pritchard, A. and Morgan, N. (2005) Representations of ‘ethnographic knowledge’: early comic postcards of Wales. In A. Jaworski and A. Pritchard (eds) *Discourse, Communication, and Tourism* (pp. 53-78). Clevedon and Buffalo: Channel View.

- Reisinger, Y. and Steiner, C. (2008) Reconceptualising interpretation: the role of tour guides in authentic tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism* 9 (6), 481-498.
- Rosaldo, R. (1989) *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Salazar, N. (2006) Touristifying Tanzania. Local guides, global discourse. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33 (3), 833-852.
- Salazar, N. (2005) Tourism and glocalization. "Local" tour guiding. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (3), 628-646.
- Smith, V.L. (2001) The culture brokers. In V.L. Smith and M. Brent (eds) *Hosts and Guests Revisited: Tourism Issues of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (pp. 275-282). Elmsford: Cognizant.
- Spivak, G.C. (1993) *Outside in the teaching machine*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Tayao, M.L. (2004) The evolving study of Philippine English phonology. *World Englishes* 23 (1), 77-90.
- Temple, P. (2002) *The Last True Explorer*. London: Godwit.
- Thurlow, C. and Aiello, G. (2007) National pride, global capital: A social semiotic analysis of transnational visual branding in the airline industry. *Visual Communication* 6 (305), 305-344.
- Thurlow, C. and Jaworski, A. (2010) *Tourism Discourse: Language and Global Mobility*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Urry, J. (1990) *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London and Newbury Park: Sage.
- Urry, J. and Larsen, J. (2011) *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.