
Article:
Hoogendoorn, G. and Hammett, D. (2021) Resident tourists and the local 'other'. Tourism Geographies, 23 (5-6). pp. 1021-1039. ISSN: 1461-6688

https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1713882

"I live here but have never seen what happens on the street!": Reflections on 'resident tourists' in the Johannesburg inner city

Gijsbert Hoogendoorn
Department of Geography, Environmental Management and Energy Studies
University of Johannesburg
Email: ghoogendoorn@uj.ac.za

Daniel Hammett
Department of Geography
University of Sheffield
Email: d.hammett@sheffield.ac.uk

Abstract

Recent years have witnessed growing numbers of residents exploring their own cities as tourist destinations. This phenomenon challenges academic understandings and definitions of who is defined as a tourist, and what differentiates tourists from residents when both display the same behaviours linked with spectacle and consumption. Of particular interest in these developments are situations where the emergence of 'resident tourists' involves residents transgressing boundaries of territorial stigma and fear to visit previously-avoided urban areas. Safety and security concerns and continued territorial stigma towards the Johannesburg inner city has isolated a generation of suburbanites from this urban space. Recent years have witnessed the emergence of various – often online – social media-(particularly *Instagram*)driven initiatives to bring these suburbanites into the inner city as resident tourists. Drawing survey data from 200 such visitors to Johannesburg's inner city, this paper reflects on the implications for defining (proximate) tourism in terms of social or psychological rather than spatial (Euclidian) distance/proximity. In so doing, we reflect upon the role of new touristic gaze practices, inspired not only by curiosity but by a concern with self-promotion and social media self-branding. Our argument is that by rethinking emergent practices of collective consumption (facilitated in this instance by social media), we can understand how new forms of tourism occur *within* the locale of residence. These challenge trends towards the enclaving of daily life and mediated tourist consumption.

Keywords: South Africa, resident tourism, branding, poverty, social media, walking tour, tourist gaze

Introduction

Recent years have witnessed a reinvigoration of debates surrounding the definition of who is a 'tourist'. The traditional definition from the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) has come under increasing scrutiny, challenged by evolving forms of domestic tourism. Richard's (2016) reflections on '*Tourists in their own city*'[1], challenge the dominant conceptual dichotomy of 'tourist' and 'local'. These reflections draw upon ideas from the mobilities, performative and creative turns to argue that traditional definitions fail to encompass the increasing heterogeneity of touristic practices and encounters. These concerns resonate with a growing body of scholarship arguing for the disconnection of geographical distance from definitions of tourism (Jeuring and Diaz-Soria, 2017), the recognition of how changing mobilities result in a rescaling of tourism (Jeuring, 2018) and that the performativity of being – of acting as – a tourist can happen locally (Diaz-Soria, 2017). While these complexities have led to some authors adopting the term 'visitors' rather than 'tourists' (see for example Encalada et al., 2017), the majority of scholars have opted to continue to use the root-term 'tourist'. Building upon this work, we seek to offer further nuance to understandings and uses of this term.

Emerging from these provocations are calls for conceptual work to (re)scale understandings of tourism and tourists in relation to practices of self-identification as, and meanings associated with, the term 'tourist' (Diaz-Soria, 2017; McCabe, 2005; Singh and Krakover, 2015a; Yu et al., 2012). Such rescaling also demands recognition of micro-level tourism – the 'tourist in their own city' of Richards' (2016) concern, and conceptualised as 'proximity tourism' by Jeuring (2018). Underpinning these moves is an argument that in an ever-more globalised and interconnected world, people are increasingly observing their everyday surroundings with a touristic gaze, thus converting 'public space into exhibited space' as "city dwellers become… tourists in their own city" (Bergers, 2000: 156; see also Shaw et al., 2000). The marketisation of these trends is evident in many cities around the world, with the rapid emergence of walking tours and other touristic and travel opportunities marketed to both locals and (traditional) tourists. Consider, for instance, *#SeeYourCity: NYC The Official Guide* – a company promoting opportunities for both tourists and locals to explore five boroughs of New York City, namely The Bronx, Manhattan, Queens, Brooklyn and Staten Island. Elsewhere, *Free Walking Tours* offers tourists and locals opportunities to explore a variety of cities such as Lisbon, Warsaw,

[1] The concept of 'tourists in their own city' was developed by Van Driel and Blokker in 1997 in a cartoon strip where an unemployed Amsterdammer explores his own city like a tourist donned in a safari outfit (Richards, 2016).

Barcelona, Bucharest, Cape Town and Rome (see for instance Hoogendoorn and Gregory, 2016; Hoogendoorn and Giddy, 2017).

Taking these theoretical interventions which are rooted in touristic experiences within the global north (primarily Spain (Diaz-Soria, 2017), the Netherlands (Jeuring and Haartsen, 2017; Richards, 2016), Israel/Palestine (Singh and Krakover, 2015a, 2015b), and the USA (Johninke, 2018)) as our starting point, this article draws upon the experience of tourism in a global south city; Johannesburg, South Africa. Johannesburg hosts the most tourists of any locality in South Africa (Rogerson and Hoogendoorn, 2014; Rogerson and Rogerson, 2017) despite extensive sections of the city being popularly perceived as off-limits for casual and local visitors. In recent years, Johannesburg has witnessed an unexpected diffusing of touristic spaces, driven by the opportunities afforded by new communication technologies promoting events such as Instameets and Free Walking Tours. Instameets are meetings or gatherings organised, either formally or informally, via the social media platform Instagram (the term is thus a contraction of Instagram (Insta) and meeting (meet) = Instameet). An Instameet can either happen spontaneous and informally, such as those by 'resident tourists' being discussed in this paper in order to explore the Johannesburg inner city, or may be organised as promotional or branding events by large companies such as clothing brands and banks. Such openings have, in Johannesburg, encouraged and facilitated both residents (as tourists) and non-resident tourists to visit former perceived 'no-go' zones including the inner city (Hoogendoorn and Gregory, 2016; Hoogendoorn and Giddy, 2017; Richards, 2016; Visser et al., 2017).

Working with the call to rescale understandings of tourism, we focus upon the implications for defining (proximate) tourism in terms of social or psychological, rather than spatial (Euclidian) distance/proximity. In so doing, we reflect upon the role of new touristic gaze practices, and the emergence of social media as a key driver of proximate tourist activities in Johannesburg is a crucial aspect of these developments. We contend that practices of collective consumption by a social media–based creative class play a vital role in driving new spatialities and scales of tourism. These trends, we argue, are simultaneously driven by – and give rise to – a new form of tourist gaze inspired not only by curiosity but also by a concern with self-promotion and social media self-branding. In making these arguments, we rethink how emergent practices of collective consumption (facilitated by social media) create new forms of tourism which occur *within* the locale of residence and which disrupt well-documented trends towards the enclaving of daily life and mediated tourist consumption. In making this argument, we stop short of Shaw's et al.'s (2000: 267) argument that the dissolving of boundaries of tourism as a specific

set of activities and practices is leading to the 'end of tourism', but instead argue for "greater attention to the multiple scales and forms of tourist and tourism".

Defining who is a 'tourist'

In thinking about who is a 'tourist', we can approach this term in a variety of ways. Typically, a common starting point for these discussions is the UNWTO definition of a tourist as being someone "taking a trip to a main destination outside his/her usual environment, for less than a year, for any main purpose (business, leisure or other personal purpose) other than to be employed by a resident entity in the country or place visited… A visitor (domestic, inbound or outbound) is classified as a tourist (or overnight visitor) if his/her trip includes an overnight stay, or as a same-day visitor (or excursionist) otherwise" (UNWTO, 2010: 10). This definition is commonly used to differentiate tourists from same-day visitors, leisure day-visitors, commuters and residents. Yet, numerous ambiguities remain, including mismatches between typologies of who counts as a tourist, how tourists self-define and how non-tourists define and identify tourists – not least in the irrelevance of differentiating between 'an excursionist' and 'a tourist' in public perception (McCabe, 2005; Yu et al., 2012: 454).

Govers et al. (2008) further argue that this definitional approach is simultaneously conceptually vague *and* operationalized in highly specific (but inconsistent) ways by national governments, statistical bureaus and tourism agencies. This specific operationalisation is commonly manifest in the setting of distances which must be travelled from 'home' – or 'usual environment', understood as being a subjective set of places constructed through individual's experiences and sense of space as being familiar (for a detailed critical engagement with this term see Govers et al., 2008) – for someone to be classified as a (domestic) tourist. Not only is there no universal agreement on what this distance should be, but the use of a Euclidian distance to define when someone is outside of their 'usual environment' is conceptually vague and inherently problematic. As the term 'usual environment' is commonly understood as where someone 'feels at home', an individual's usual environment comprises their collection of daily action spaces (places of residence, work, recreation, landmarks) and spaces of flow or connection between them (Govers et al., 2008). In a Euclidian sense, an 'unusual' or 'other' environment may also be very close to home – in other words, the 'unusual' environment may be spatially proximate but socially, culturally or psychologically distanced. Such thinking is particularly important when reflecting on the implications of the compartmentalisation of daily life, wherein everyday routines are performed within discrete securitised bubbles amidst a local, but unfamiliar, landscape.

Manifestations of such enclaving of daily life have been identified across the globe, as residents (with the means to do so) have selectively removed themselves from fear-filled spaces and instead inhabit bubbles of security – moving between houses in gated communities to places of work and recreation in securitised malls via personal vehicles (for instance Lemanski, 2004, 2006; Richards, 2016). As a result, modern urbanites have become increasingly estranged from their city of residence (Richards, 2016). Johannesburg is no exception to such trends – an expanding urban area increasingly marked by fortified residential estates, carceral shopping malls and the massive presence of private security which increases the insularity of locals moving between localities (Hook and Vrdoljak, 2002; Murray, 2013). Thus, when residents undertake touristic activities (examined below) outside of these securitised spaces – for instance by undertaking walking tours in the inner city – we can consider them as being outside of their 'usual environment' and thus interacting and consuming as tourists within their own city.

This argument holds true if we consider other important aspects of defining a tourist linked to behaviours and dispositions. The activities, dispositions and drivers of resident tourists frequently replicate and embody those commonly associated with traditional classifications of tourists. Beginning with the assumption that '[t]ourism is imbued with imaginaries of escaping the mundanity of everyday life and engaging with otherness" (Jeuring and Haartsen, 2017: 119) we can understand that 'otherness' is not always physically distant but may be physically proximate yet socially, culturally and psychologically distant.

On a conceptual level, this blurring of boundaries through which tourists and locals are differentiated has been extensively discussed. Richards (2016) argues that traditional definitions of 'tourist' and 'tourism' fail to encompass the increasing heterogeneity of these practices and encounters. Specifically, he contends that there is a blurring of the behaviours and practices of social reproduction and consumption by tourists and residents, resulting in local residents socially reproducing the actions of, and consuming in similar ways to, tourists (traditionally defined) while accessing and interacting with urban spaces. Thus, as Bergers' (2000: 156) argues, people are increasingly observing their everyday surroundings with a touristic gaze, leading to a conversion of "public space into exhibited space" as "city dwellers become… tourists in their own city" (see also Shaw et al., 2000). The core idea here is that it is "possible to attribute otherness to and experience unfamiliarity in a geographically proximate environment, close to what we call 'home'", and that this requires a deeper understanding of

the blurring of tourism and quotidian life and the multiple ways in which meaning is constructed in relation to the immediate environment (Jeuring and Diaz-Soria, 2017).

The upshot of these practices is that understanding resident or proximate tourism requires a nuancing of Urry's convention of tourism as involving a "journey and stay [as being] to, and in, sites which are outside the normal places of residence and work… [involving a] gaze directed to features of landscape and townscape which separate them off from everyday and routine experiences… they are taken to be in some sense out-of-the-ordinary" (Urry, 1990a: 26–7). Thus, whereas the 'journey' has previously been seen as involving a notable spatial distance, there is a growing understanding that the 'journey' may not extend beyond physically proximate space, but instead be across a social or other distance. The tourist gaze, therefore, can be upon a local space which lies outside of the everyday lived experience of the resident: the resident can gaze upon a local but different or exceptional scene or landscape with intent and curiosity, thereby behaving like a tourist and (re)discovering their hometown or immediate environments from a different perspective (Diaz-Soria, 2017). Jeuring (2018: 147) thus argues for the concept of 'proximity tourism' as revolv[ing] around the notion that in a hypermobile world where everybody has become a tourist and every place a destination… touristic experiences of engaging with the 'Other', negotiating between familiarity and unfamiliarity…[are] strongly embedded in everyday life and decoupled from travelling long physical distances. Therefore, as Govers et al. (2008: 1058) argue, the assumption that a 'usual environment' is bounded by a particular distance travelled is theoretically flawed, both due to local 'otherness' but also distant familiarity. Layered on to this, the distinctive behaviours of tourists – taking photos, buying souvenirs, not understanding local people (Yu et al., 2012) – are also increasingly apparent in local encounters across difference. In part, this arises from the growing role of social media in narrating or scripting the continually re-imagined construction of place and space as (local) tourists utilise smartphones to capture 'exotic' and 'unique' images (see Gössling, 2016; Richards, 2016; Schmallegger and Carson, 2008; Xiang and Gretzel, 2010). These images not only contribute to the dialogical (re)construction of place and space, which can be understood as a 21st century interpretation of Urry's (1990b) 'Tourist Gaze' but are also used to inscribe individuals' online profiles – or brands – as members of the creative class.

The notion of the 'creative class' is derived from Florida's (2003) treatise on the role of creative capital as a driver of urban regeneration and economic development which has inspired urban development policy across the globe (for extensive critiques of Florida's work see for instance

Peck, 2005; Pratt, 2008). Florida's (2003: 8) broadly defines the creative class as encompassing those who "engage in work whose function is to 'create meaningful new forms'", including both the super-creative core of knowledge producers and thought leaders (scientists, writers, actors, academics, etc) and creative professionals working in knowledge-based occupations, finance and legal and health sectors. For the purpose of this paper, we use the term the creative class in a more specific manner to refer to individuals who are utilising social media as a platform to share creative media and, by so doing, to develop their own on-line brand and reputation in a place-based or spatially-referenced manner (see Gandini, 2016).

In addition to the spatial factors discussed above, the temporal aspect common in many definitions of tourist/tourism requires reflection. As noted above, UNWTO (2010) defines a tourist as someone undertaking an overnight stay in the country or city visited, or as a same-day visitor or excursionist if not. However, this definitional work assumes that the traveler is visiting a *different* country or city. As a proximate or local tourist remains within their city of residence, this definitional requirement becomes unworkable. Others have defined excursionists as being motivated by "challenges, physical fitness, and recovering from everyday stress" (Oh and Schuett, 2010: 43), a set of activities which excludes the (re)discovery of hometown environments and the practices associated with the tourist gaze (Urry, 1990a). These efforts to define who is/not an excursionist fail to encompass the practices and motivations of resident or proximate tourists.

Thus, rethinking 'who counts' as a tourist inherently involves revisiting where tourism happens. Tourism-studies literature has tended to focus on inter- and intra-national tourism, with the mobilities turn influential in understanding the implications of globalisation and increased interconnectivity on tourism. Simultaneously, Saarinen (2017) addresses how local practices of bordering and separating spaces creates 'tourist enclaves' which allow tourists to consume in safety and from which locals can be excluded, unless performing either a service provision function or consuming the space in approved ways (in the South African context see Dirsuweit and Schattaeur, 2004; Hammett and Jayawadane, 2009). We also witness in South Africa how 'slum'/'poverty'/'township' tourism provides a further dynamic to the spatialisation of tourism, one which provides a problematic engagement with 'the other side' of the city – economically, socially and spatially (Hoogendoorn et al., 2019; Steinbrink, 2012; Tzanelli, 2018).

In this article, we invert the gaze and consider the inverse of this process, of tourists avoiding these enclaves and peripheries, and instead exploring 'local', core spaces. In so doing, we

recognise that for resident tourists, the visiting of the urban center remains bound up with a desire and curiosity to explore the unfamiliar and cross the "spatialized urban divides between the affluent and the poor, nonwhite and disenfranchised populations" (Tzanelli, 2018: 1). By focusing on resident tourism to inner-city Johannesburg, we consider the implications of modern urbanites' daily lives and mobilities for the rescaling and reterritorialising of touristic spaces. In so doing, we further nuance debates relating to the spatiality and temporality markers used in defining who is/not a tourist. Specifically, through focusing upon a city in the global south we critically advance the conceptual concept of the resident tourist – a concept that has, to date, been developed in relation to cities in the global north. In so doing, we identify how historical and contemporary divisions and social and spatial distance are implicated in the construction of the imagined geographies, and destination images, of the inner-city as an 'othered' space which is simultaneously ordinary and extraordinary.

An abridged history of the Johannesburg inner city

The inner city of Johannesburg was zoned as a 'white' group area during apartheid (1948–1994) (Davies, 1981) and established its economic importance as the core business, retail and financial center of the city and the country through most of the 20th century (Murray, 2011). By the 1960s, most service-based industries of Johannesburg were situated in the inner city. However, the development of edge cities like Sandton in the late 1960s triggered state-incentivised economic decentralisation (Crankshaw, 2008) which was followed in the 1980s by inner-city de-industrialisation (Rogerson and Rogerson, 1995). Decentralisation continued with the establishment of several new modern business nodes across the city (Rogerson, 1996).

Meanwhile, the desperate need for housing for the 'non-white' population in the inner city during the 1970s resulted in a series of demographic shifts and eventual white flight from the urban centre (Morris, 1994; Winkler, 2013). Economic stagnation and decline during the early 1980s lead to mass abandonment of the inner city by businesses which migrated towards the northern suburbs (Rogerson, 1996). Elevated crime levels, declining quality in municipal services, crumbling infrastructure and plummeting property prices meant the city authority lost most of its tax base (Murray, 2011). With the repeal of the Group Areas Act in 1991, the proportion of 'black' residents in the inner city rose rapidly: by 1993, over 85% of inner city residents were classified as 'black', with the inner city seen by many white suburbanites and other middle class South Africans as a working class 'black' residential space (Morris, 1996; Peberdy and Majodina, 2000).

INSERT FIGURE 1 AROUND HERE

Figure 1: The Johannesburg inner city (Source: Authors)

The City Improvement District (CID) urban renewal initiative was launched in 1992, initially as the voluntary Central Johannesburg Partnership and incorporating extensive privatised management of the inner city, including private security provision and maintenance of public spaces (Didier et al., 2012; Peyroux, 2012). The CID enjoyed limited success, resulting in the Johannesburg Development Agency (JDA) being established in 2001 to run urban renewal projects on behalf of the city council (Rogerson 2006). Success was again limited, with a small number of areas including the ABSA precinct, Ghandi Square, Newtown's cultural precinct and Constitutional Hill undergoing renewal by 2004 (Winkler, 2013). Meanwhile, most of the city still suffered under 'territorial stigma' as an inner city rife with urban decay and criminal activity (Frenzel, 2014), a challenge exacerbated by broader media representations of the city (and country) which undermined its destination image (Hammett, 2014).

In 2007, the Urban Development Zone (UDZ) property tax incentive and Urban Regeneration Charter were introduced to lure investment back into the inner city (Garner, 2011). The UDZ tax incentive has been relatively successful in attracting private investment. Since the mid-2000s, several private property developers have invested in the fringe areas of the inner city including Braamfontein and the post-industrial Maboneng precinct (Walsh, 2013). These areas emerged as popular nodes for creative consumption for the middle and upper classes (Gregory, 2016). Following the 2016 Municipal elections, the Democratic Alliance (DA) took over the governance of Johannesburg, in alliance with smaller political parties. In this time, the inner city of Johannesburg has undergone another round of decline, notably in relation to basic services such as refuse removal, public safety and infrastructural upkeep. Despite the current state of decline, the redevelopment districts have been holding on with varying levels of economic success and continue to draw fluctuating numbers of suburbanites over weekends, especially in Braamfontein and No. 1 Fox Street.

Many of these urban development initiatives have been informed by Municipal and National policy endeavours to promote creative industry entrepreneurship in order to support economic development and urban regeneration (Oyenkule, 2017; Snowball et al., 2017). Johannesburg has been at the forefront of many such efforts as the city has the "most well-developed creative economy in South Africa and [is] home to the highest concentration of creative enterprises in the country" (Oyenkule, 2017: 610). Initially, such industries were located across the city's northern suburbs although recent policy interventions which have sought to link creative

industry development with expanding the urban tourism sector, including efforts to bolster the film industry, craft industries and other sectors, have led to many creative industries relocating to the inner-city fringes (Gregory, 2016). These processes reflect broader urban policy experiences wherein cultural and creative industries are viewed as promoting job creation and social inclusivity, while enhancing place-marketing via the emergence of a marketing-friendly Bourgeois Bohemian downtown (Pratt, 2008; Snowball et al., 2017). In Johannesburg, these efforts have contributed to the redevelopment of the Newtown cultural district, and Braamfontein and Maboneng districts. However, as Gregory (2016: 168-9) notes, while these developments have developed "trendy" brands for these areas, "attracting visitors and investment back in to neglected and abandoned spaces of Johannesburg's inner-city" they have simultaneously exacerbated "socio-economic polarisation, gentrification and exclusion in an impoverished part of the city". While such processes have partially addressed the factors contributing to the inner-city being viewed as a 'no-go' area for many city residents (see Hoogendoorn and Gregory, 2016), the outcomes have been highly uneven and incomplete. These considerations frame the ways in which resident tourists have engaged with the varied urban geography of Johannesburg's inner-city, specifically those individuals seeking creative social-media opportunities arising from their gaze upon the urban spectacle.

Methods

Data for this paper were collected as part of a larger project on urban tourism in Johannesburg. Data were gathered through two surveys making use of non-probability convenience sampling methods. The first dataset was constructed from an online survey using Surveyplanet in March 2016, posted on several social media platforms including *Instagram*, *Facebook* and *Twitter*. Data was gathered from 105 surveyed respondents, 83 of which can be considered as 'tourists in their own city', i.e. they are resident within the Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Area, and 22 who can be considered tourists in the traditional sense. In addition, 100 international and domestic tourists were interviewed during a five-week period in September and October 2016 after taking part in a walking tour in the Johannesburg inner city (Hoogendoorn and Gregory, 2016; Hoogendoorn and Giddy, 2017). The timing of this data collection was designed to avoid the peak domestic tourism periods, specifically the summer/Christmas holiday period, during which many Johannesburg residents leave the city for coastal areas. The timing also avoided peak international tourist arrival periods, as these travelers were not the focus of this project.

A selection of both open and closed ended questions were asked in both surveys, although for the purpose of this paper, responses to open ended questions were selected for analysis of notion the 'resident tourists'. To this end, an initial sift of responses identified and retained responses from resident tourists (i.e. those resident within the Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Area). Their responses to questions relating to their motivations for participating in Instameets or walking tours, their experiences of these events, as well as their (changing) perceptions of the Johannesburg inner city were identified and subject to thematic coding. An iterative approach to coding was used, incorporating both open and axial coding. An initial set of codes were developed based upon existing literature, and this code-set was then expanded to include key themes and terms emerging from the data. All responses were subject to two rounds of coding to ensure consistency in approach and application.

Developing the resident tourist

Responses from resident tourists on walking tours or Instameets reiterated how, despite the very limited spatial distance between their everyday life spheres and the inner city, social and psychological distance rendered these as fundamentally different spaces. As one walking tour participant explained, "I live here [in Johannesburg] but have never seen what happens on the street!" This quote, which provides the title to the paper, reiterates the core concerns explored in the following analysis – that social distance, more than spatial distance, is the key factor in creating the 'unusual' environment which is sought by resident and non-resident tourists, and that new forms and practices of tourism are emerging which entwine the tourist gaze with self-branding. Thus, what we seek to draw out from the short quote above – and expand upon below - is that there is a growing trend whereby groups of Johannesburg residents are engaging in forms of resident tourism in order to explore and encounter 'other' parts of the urban space. Thus, the urban 'street' takes on a new meaning as it is engaged with through actions commonly associated with touristic practices – taking photos of 'othered' peoples and places: only in this instance, those acting as tourists are themselves spatially 'local' but socially 'distant'. A key nuance here is the utilisation of these encounters by an emergent creative class to build their online personal 'brand' and become 'influencers' which draws, in part, from their position as (touristic) 'gazers' upon the urban 'other'. To elucidate this argument, we first examine the

motivations of resident tourists in Johannesburg to highlight their motivations for engaging in these practices.

The motivations of resident tourists

Resident tourists who participated in Instameets and walking tours regularly identified two primary motivations: to meet new people, and to discover 'new' places. The meeting of new people is explored further below, but it is worth signposting that the motivations described were not to meet – in a substantive sense - the 'othered' of the inner city, but to meet other 'creative' types and build networks and contacts amongst other participants with a view to building social capital and status. Indeed, the inner city remained positioned as an 'other' and (potentially) dangerous space that would be avoided in daily life and is thus situated outside the participants' 'usual' environment. Resident tourists commonly explained how joining organised touristic incursions allowed them to "explore parts of the city I might have otherwise avoided", "see the city in a different light", "to discover places I wouldn't go to on my own", and "explore the city in a safe environment". Their encounters with 'new people' within the inner city remained framed in the power – and other – dynamics of the tourist gaze, as discussed below.

Informing these motivations is a continued reputation of inner-city Johannesburg as a dangerous, no-go zone for (white, middle-class) suburbanites (Van der Merwe, 2013). At a local, or resident, scale we can understand this as being a form of destination image driven by media coverage and popular perception which locates not only the space of the inner city, but those who occupy this space, as 'other' and dangerous (Didier et al., 2013; also Hammett, 2014). This was clearly outlined by one respondent who argued that "people tend to think that it is a dangerous place, riddled with crime, but they fail to see the cultural diversity, new developments and ultimately the homely atmosphere that one can only find in a South African city. There's a whole lot more to Jo'burg than what meets the eye as one drives through the street and what is published by the media". Simultaneously, several other respondents spoke of touristic visits to the inner city as being for 'adventure', allowing them to visit places "I would not go [to by] myself for safety reasons".

What is clear from these responses is that the Central Business District (CBD) remains, psychologically and socially, an 'othered' space – one which is dangerous to enter and which is avoided in terms of daily physical patterns of behaviour and interaction. Thus, the motivations "to explore my country", "seeing new places. Explore my city" and "exploring

new areas", as offered by resident tourists, underscores how the spatially proximate local can be socially, psychologically and experientially distant. Taking this further, we see how even when stereotypes and destination images are challenged, the inner city remains – at least partially – othered and distanciated. Thus, as one resident tourist outlined, their perception of the inner city had changed but encountering this 'othered' space nonetheless required a 'sense of adventure', "I've learned that crime is not such a common occurrence and that it should not hinder our sense of adventure". Reading across these responses, scales of tourism are clearly not simply nested in a hierarchical sense: the practices of resident tourists can be seen as reflecting the differing scales at – and through which – experiences of 'other' people and places occur in both social and spatial ways.

'Discovering' the local other

However, the subsequent framing of the encounters with the 'other' frequently had unsettling echoes with the privileging of the colonial gaze (Burns, 2004; Hammett, 2014; Law et al., 2007). This was identifiable in several responses which returned to tropes of 'discovery', "it [walking tour] made me more aware that town isn't as rough as it's made out to be. There is so much undiscovered beauty in our city", "discovering the beauty of the inner city", "it's helped me discover various parts of the city", and how a tour "opened my eyes to all the incredible nooks 'n' crannies that no one knows about". Implicit in these statements seems to be a belief that the 'beauty' and 'nooks 'n' crannies' can only be identified through/by an external gaze, thereby taking away the agency – and even presence – of those who live and work in the inner city. In part, this narrative of discovery can be linked to a broader practice of the culturalisation of poverty (Steinbrink, 2012) and diversification of heritage tourism practices (Light, 2000).

Further contributing to these practices is the discursive positioning of the urban space as an 'unknown' and 'alien' space which is there to be *explored*. Multiple resident tourists talked of these practices as allowing them to 'explore' the urban core: Instameets were described as being "a great way to get out and explore", while individuals spoke of wanting to "explore my city", "exploring areas of Jo'burg I wouldn't have necessarily ever been to before" or "To explore a part of Johannesburg that very few people realise is there". This discursive positioning of the inner city as somewhere to explore resonates powerfully with broader motivations and lexicons of tourism, not least the socio-cultural construction of space and place (Pritchard and Morgan, 2000). Of particular interest here though is the notion that "few people realise [a part of Johannesburg] is there" which – probably unintentionally – positions the urban core as being not only different and separate from the suburbs, but also as *terra nullius* and

simultaneously assumes that if a space is not frequented by a certain section of society it does not exist while erasing the presence and experience of those who reside and/or habituate this space. Drawing from the critical analysis of Pritchard and Morgan (2000), we can see how the privileged gaze of the resident tourists in Johannesburg frames the inner city in specific ways which reflect race, gender and power.

Not only does such rhetorical positioning denote the 'destination' of the inner city as somewhere unknown and (inherently) dangerous, but such practices resonate with historically narrations of colonial adventure and the discovery through exploration of previously unknown/impenetrable spaces (see also Hammett, 2014; Pritchard and Morgan, 2000; Tickell, 2001). In response to this 'impenetrability', these individuals entered the urban space as part of a larger collective whose motivations were, partially, urban exploration or urban adventurism. By entering the urban space as a group, this mitigated various concerns relating to safety and security, allowing resident tourists to "explore parts of Johannesburg I wouldn't do alone", and to "Get to see new places where I would never have gone if I was alone". Thus, while there were a few anecdotes of moments of overt hostility or crime, the dominant narrative was of resident tourists being able to "take photos in beautiful settings in Johannesburg which might otherwise have been unsafe had I not been part of a group of people" and "explore downtown Johannesburg (otherwise perceived to be dangerous and risky) in a big group and with some degree of control". Navigating the inner city in a large group does give the perception of safety and security, and can be seen as typical tourist behaviour to engage inner cities across the globe in a formal tour format or in groups.

The resident tourist gaze

Another typical touristic behaviour was also apparent, namely the role of photography in exploring the 'new' space of the CBD and framing resident tourists' gaze in particular ways. Thus, we find responses as to the motivations for participating in Instameets as being to "take great photos of human life in motion", and that "I love exploring the city and connecting with people through photography". These practices return us to Urry's (1990b) observations on the role of the camera in tourism and discussions of the tourist gaze. In the case of Johannesburg's resident tourists, it is not the use of the camera *per se* which is insightful here, but how resident tourists implicitly invoke practices of othering which position the 'locals' as the 'othered' residents of the inner city, juxtaposed against the suburbanite resident tourist. The common positioning of inner-city residents as 'locals' – "the locals of whatever area we are exploring", "locals occupying the space" – is a dialogical positioning, locating the resident tourist as a non-

local and different to the local 'other'. While these responses may simply reflect the use of a common term, the deployment of the term 'local' carries discursive weight given the processes of distancing and othering outlined earlier, not least given the social, economic and racial histories of South Africa – and Johannesburg in particular. Thus, the middle-class suburbanite self-positions as 'non-local' to this inner-city environment. This positioning is further exemplified in responses that located inner-city residents as objects or subjects to be consumed. Those who "look interesting", the "vagrants, vendors, bystanders, whom ever is around" become the "people I want to photograph" and the "people who I want to be subjects in my pics". These individuals are given meaning as repositories of information, history and culture, "[there is] so much culture and history in the people who live there", who can be gazed upon (see also Pritchard and Morgan, 2000; Steinbrink, 2012).

Relations between the resident tourist and inner-city resident continue to be shot through with power relations and markers of difference: the participants (resident tourists) occupy a position of power and privilege, rendered visible through the practice of photography as manifestation of the tourist gaze. Thus, it is the social rather than spatial distance that is critical to resident tourists' practices and engagements; these replicate the 'traditional' tourist gaze, as well as power dynamics and relations. This sense is reinforced with resident tourists' narratives of gaining "window[s] into the lives of inner-city inhabitants and they give you a feel of the history and current state of the city". Thus, for resident tourists, an oft-repeated refrain was about how these engagements provided opportunities to learn about (local) people, places and histories – which, while spatially proximate, remained distant due to social, economic and political factors, "there is so much history to be experienced, culture to embrace and facts to learn"; "I never knew much about the inner city and now I do"; and "I notice more than just places and people. I see moments and history". Through this nexus of social and spatial proximity and distance, it is evident that the mundane becomes exotic, the everyday is rendered as a spectacle to be consumed, with the camera lens acting to simultaneously perpetuate/entrench and overcome the distance between the viewer and the viewed.

However, in positioning themselves in such ways, resident participants in these activities often did not view themselves as tourists *per se*. While many implicitly accepted that their practices may have replicated the behaviours, motivations and attitudes of tourists, others were clearly more uncomfortable with such practices. One respondent in particular explained how they tended not to take photographs of inner-city residents, outlining how "I don't want to act like a tourist with normal people going about their day. I find it rather condescending". While this

respondent demonstrated a concern that the practices of many on Instameets and similar platforms were enacting practices which exploited socio-economic inequalities, their voice was in the minority. Rather, the majority of resident tourists embraced the tourist gaze and associated practices, seeking to capture images of this urban 'other' in ways akin to traditional understandings of touristic practices: "will chat to shopkeepers, locals for some photographs"; "if I see an interesting person, I will interact with him/her and maybe ask to take a picture"; and "snap a passerby or ask them to pose for us and with us".

These practices clearly resonate with Urry's (1990a) emphasis on the importance of recognising the collective nature of consumption as a component of tourism, identifying the collective aspect to forms of consumption and in the work and social process involved in creating the object for consumption. Urry (1990a: 25) argues that "in relation to tourism it is crucial to recognise how the consumption of tourist services is social" as it usually involves some form of social grouping participating and consuming together as a social experience. Moreover, he continues to outline how the individual and collective tourist gaze is crucial and arises from people's movements through and stays within place(s). Such practices can be linked to Singh and Krakover's (2015a: 60) reflection on the simultaneous practices of cultural production and consumption amongst domestic tourists as leading "to global-local blending (glocalization) of tourist types wherein cultural producers (citizens) would be willing to assume a role of cultural consumers (tourists), concomitantly".

Layered on to these understandings, we see how within resident tourist practices, the creative class occupy a specific position. Instameets and urban walking tours thus provide opportunities for social media/creative community networking, while simultaneously providing participants with opportunities to both develop and showcase photographic and other creative skills. Specifically, several resident tourists made these connections clear in terms of both i) strengthening networks and connections from online creative and social media spaces ("Great way to put faces to the Instagram profile and to be inspired"), and ii) as a means of seeking to position themselves as 'influencers' on such platforms ("to show people how much I love Jozi"). Thus, while practices of consuming food and drink after tours of the inner city could be understood as replicating consumption practices typically associated with 'traditional' tourism, these perform a specific and differentiated function in this context: they are moments to socialise and network with other members of the creative class which form a sub-set of the resident tourist category. The emphasis in responses from participants can be understood as

being linked to efforts to promote individual skills, networks and reputations as online influencers.

What becomes clear in many of the reflections on how walking tours or Instameets have changed residents' perceptions of the inner city, is that overcoming and challenging the psychological distancing that marks the CBD as a dangerous 'other' space leads to diminishing social distancing and the potential for changing spatial patterns of behaviour. Respondents acknowledged how touristic visits to, and experiences of, gazing upon the CBD as resident tourists have led to changed perceptions. There is also a recognition "that it is a City with an electric energy, with diverse, friendly people of various cultures that are able to intermingle and share a common vision". This sense, that visiting the 'othered' space of the CBD – one which was socially distant yet spatially proximate – had challenged and changed expectations and fears around safety and security was common, "yes, I've never [before] been into the Jozi city and seen some of its great sights. It's made me feel more comfortable going there"; "definitely! It is not as scary as people make it out to be, and it is filled with incredible people, history and stories to share"; and how "[it] breaks misconceptions about the city being dangerous. It's vibrant, busy, beautiful, full of history, home to many cultures and awesome, friendly people". Implicit in these narratives is a tale of overcoming social distance and challenge to the destination image and reputation of the inner city, with many of those expressing these views indicating a willingness to return to these areas – usually with similar groups, but some alone or with friends.

Conclusion

As interest and participation in proximate tourism increases, in part as an adaptive response to concerns with global warming, the traditional definitions of tourists/tourism come under increasing scrutiny. The purpose of this paper was to explore the notion of 'tourists in their own city' (Richards, 2016) and to extend this work by exploring how this phenomenon is manifest in a major city in the global south. More than this, we set out to further examine how resident tourism intersects with social and spatial distancing. In exploring these practices, we identified how discursive positioning of self and other simultaneously re-inscribe and challenge the imagined geographies of the inner city as an 'othered' space and a destination for resident tourists. Emerging from this research, we also identified how photography re-emerges as a

practice for resident tourists – in particular for the creative class who engage with the (socially) distant inner city as a stage for their creative media and social branding interests.

In developing this work, we acknowledge Richards (2016) argument that tourists and locals often compete for the same space in the global north, and take this further – to explore how this is occurring in atypical (i.e. non-tourist) destinations in the global south. The Johannesburg inner city has been off the tourist map for more than 25 years, yet produces a classic example of the dichotomy of the tourist gaze that exemplifies both the ordinary and the extraordinary (Urry, 1990b). Resident and non-resident tourists therefore may be looking for 'authentic' experience of a vibrant African city, learning about the history, or exploring places they have not seen before in ways which are simultaneously ordinary and extraordinary (Hoogendoorn and Giddy, 2017; Russo and Richards, 2016).

In a context such as Johannesburg, an urban space marked by historical and contemporary divides – from colonial- and apartheid-era racial segregation to continued socio-economic division and the legacies of the Group Areas Act – encounters with 'unfamiliarity' and the 'other' can be particularly prominent and proximate. The local context here sits in contrast to Singh and Krakover's (2015b: 223) argument for the need to rethink "domestic tourism since the resident tourist, in relation to ordinary citizens, is neither different nor the other". For the resident tourists discussed here, there are multiple markers of difference and othering which must be considered. For middle-class Johannesburg suburbanites, the 'other' is on the doorstep, across the highway or outside the door of the bakkie. This social and experiential distance means that while urban walking tours may be "marketed within specific types of cultural and sub-cultural experiences" (Giddy and Hoogendoorn, 2018: 1), the gaze of resident tourists is often not only upon cultural or architectural experiences, but upon the 'other' – the differently classed and racialised inner-city urbanite.

References:

Bergers, J. (2000). Urban landscapes: on public space in the post-industrial city. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 15, 145–164.

Burns, P. (2004). Six postcards from Arabia: A visual discourse of colonial travels in the Orient. *Tourist Studies* 4(3), 255–275.

Crankshaw, O. (2008). Race, space and the post-fordist spatial order of Johannesburg. *Urban Studies* 45(8), 1692–1711.

Davies, R.J. (1981). The spatial formation of the South African city. *GeoJournal* 2, 59–72.

Diaz-Soria, I. (2017). Being a tourist as a chosen experience in a proximity destination. *Tourism Geographies* 19(1), 96–117.

Didier, S., Peyroux, E. and Morange, M. (2012). The spreading of the City Improvement District model in Johannesburg and Cape Town: Urban regeneration and the neoliberal agenda in South Africa. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 36(5), 915–935.

Didier, S., Morange, M. and Peyroux, E. (2013). The adaptive nature of neoliberalism at the local scale: fifteen years of City Improvement Districts in Cape Town and Johannesburg. *Antipode* 45(1), 121–139.

Dirsuweit, T. and Schattauer, F. (2004). Fortresses of desire: Melrose Arch and the emergence of urban tourist spectacles. *GeoJournal* 60, 239–247.

Encalada, L., Boavida-Portugal, I., Ferreira, C.C., and Rocha, J. (2017) Identifying tourist places of interest based on digital imprints: towards a sustainable smart city, *Sustainability* 9, 1-19

Florida, R. (2003). Cities and the creative class, *City and Community*, 2(1), 3-19

Frenzel, F. (2014). Slum tourism and urban regeneration: touring inner Johannesburg, *Urban Forum* 25, 431–447.

Gandini A. (2016) Introduction: Beyond the 'Creative Class' Vision, in Gandini, A. (ed) *The Reputation Economy*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 1-12

Garner, G. (2011). *Johannesburg Ten Ahead: A Decade of Inner City Regeneration.* Johannesburg: Double G Media.

Giddy, J. and Hoogendoorn, G. (2018). Ethical concerns around inner city walking tours. *Urban Geography,* 39(9), 1293-1299.

Gössling, S. (2016). Tourism, information technologies and sustainability: an exploratory review. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 25(7), 1024–1041.

Govers, R., van Hecke, E. and Cabus, P. (2008). "Delianeting tourism: defining the usual environment" *Annals of Tourism Research* 35(4), 1053–1073.

Gregory, J.J. (2016). Creative industries and urban regeneration - The Maboneng precinct, Johannesburg. *Local Economy*, 31(1-2), 158–71.

Hammett, D. (2014). Tourism images and British media representations of South Africa. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(2), 221–236.

Hammett, D. and Jayawardane, N. (2009). Performing the primitive in the postcolony: Nyoni's Kraal in Cape Town. *Urban Forum* (20) 215–233.

Hoogendoorn, G. and Giddy, J.K. (2017). "Does this look like a slum?" Walking tours in the Johannesburg inner city. *Urban Forum*, 28(3), 315–328.

Hoogendoorn, G. and Gregory, J.J. (2016). Instagrammers, urban renewal and the Johannesburg inner city. *Urban Forum*, 27(4), 399-414.

Hoogendoorn, G., Letsatsi, N., Malleka, T. and Booyens, I. (2019). Tourist and residents' perspectives on 'slum tourism': the case of Vilakazi precinct, Soweto. *Geojournal*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-019-10016-2.

Hook, D. and Vrdoljak, M. (2002). Gated communities, heterotopia and a 'right' of privilege: 'heterotopology' of the South African security-park. *Geoforum*, 33(2), 195–219.

Jeuring, J., and Diaz-Soria, I. (2017). Introduction: proximity and intraregional aspects of tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 19(1), 4–8.

Jeuring, J., and Haartsen, T. (2017). The challenge of proximity: the (un)attractiveness of near-home tourism destinations. *Tourism Geographies*, 19(1), 118–141.

Jeuring, J. (2018). Pluralising touristic production and consumption roles of residents? An SME perspective on proximity tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 43(2), 147–160.

Johninke, R. (2018). Take a walk on the wild side: punk music walking tours in New York City. *Tourism Studies*, 1-17 DOI: 10.1177/1468797618771694.

Law, L., Bunnell, T. and Ong, C.-E. (2007). The Beach, the gaze and film tourism, *Tourist Studies*, 7(2), 141–164.

Lemanski, C. (2004). A new apartheid? The spatial implications of fear of crime in Cape Town, South Africa. *Environment and Urbanization,* 16(2), 101–112.

Light, D (2000). Gazing on communism: heritage tourism and post-communist identifies in Germany, Hungary and Romania, *Tourism Geographies*, 2(2), 151–176.

McCabe, S. (2005). Who is a tourist? *Tourism Studies* 5(1), 85–106.

Morris, A. (1994). The desegregation of Hillbrow, Johannesburg, 1978–82. *Urban Studies*, 31(6), 821–834.

Morris, A. (1996). *Bleakness and light: Inner-city transition in Hillbrow Johannesburg*. Witwatersrand University Press: Johannesburg.

Murray, M.J. (2011). *City of Extremes: The Spatial Politics of Johannesburg*. Wits University Press: Johannesburg.

Murray, M.J. (2013). The quandary of post-public space: new urbanism, Melrose Arch, and the rebuilding of Johannesburg after apartheid. *Journal of Urban Design*, 18(1), 119–144.

Oh, J.Y., and Schuett, M.A. (2010). Exploring expenditure-based segmentation for rural tourism: Overnight stay visitors versus excursionists to fee-fishing sites, *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* 27(1), 31-50.

Oyekunle, A.O. (2017). The contribution of creative industries to sustainable urban development in South Africa, *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development*, 9:5, 607-616

Peberdy, S. and Majodina, Z. (2000). 'Just a roof over my head?' Housing and the Somali refugee community in Johannesburg. *Urban Forum*, 11(2), 273–288.

Peck, J. (2005). Struggling with the creative class, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(4), 740-770

Peyroux, E. (2012). Legitimating business improvement districts in Johannesburg: A discursive perspective on urban regeneration and policy transfer. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 19(2), 181–194.

Pratt, A.C. (2008). Creative cities: the cultural industries and the creative class, *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 90(2), 107–117

Pritchard, A. and Morgan, N.J. (2000). Constructing tourism landscapes- gender, sexuality and space, *Tourism Geographies*, 2(2), 115–139.

Richards, G. (2016). Tourists in their own city - considering the growth of a phenomenon. *Tourism Today*, 16, 8–16.

Rogerson, C.M. (2006). Creative industries and urban tourism: South African perspectives. *Urban Forum*, 17(2), 149–166.

Rogerson, C.M. and Hoogendoorn, G. (2014). VFR travel and second home tourism: the missing link? The case of South Africa. *Tourism Review International*, 18(3), 167–178.

Rogerson, C.M. and Rogerson, J.M. (1995). The decline of manufacturing in inner-city Johannesburg 1980-1994. *Urban Forum*, 6(1), 17–42.

Rogerson, C.M. and Rogerson, J.M. (2017). City tourism in South Africa: diversity and change. *Tourism Review International*, 21, 193–211.

Rogerson, J.M. (1996). The geography of property in inner city Johannesburg. *GeoJournal*, 39, 73–79.

Russo, A.P. and Richards, G. (2016). *Reinventing the local in tourism planning: producing, consuming and negotiating place*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Saarinen, J. (2017). Enclavic tourism spaces: territorialization and bordering in tourism destination development and planning *Tourism Geographies* 19(3), 425–437.

Schmallegger, D. and Carson, D. (2008). Blogs in tourism: Changing approaches to information exchange. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 14(2), 99–110.

Shaw, G., Agarwal, S. and Bull, P. (2000). Tourism consumption and tourist behaviour: A British perspective, *Tourism Geographies*, 2(3), 264–289.

Singh, S. and Krakover, S. (2015a). Tourist experience at home – Israeli domestic tourism. *Tourism Management* 46, 59–61.

Singh, S. and Krakover, S. (2015b). Homeland entitlement: perspectives of Israeli domestic tourists. *Journal of Travel Research* 54(2), 222–233.

Snowball, J., Collins, A., Tarentaal, D. (2017). Transformation and job creation in the cultural and creative industries in South Africa, *Cultural Trends*, 26(4), 295-309

Steinbrink, M (2012). 'We did the slum!' Urban poverty tourism in historical perspective. *Tourism Geographies* 14(2), 213–234.

Tickell, A. (2001). Footprints on The Beach: Traces of colonial adventure in narratives of independent tourism, *Postcolonial Studies: Culture, Politics, Economy*, 4 (1), 39–54.

Tzanelli, R. (2018). Slum tourism: A review of the state-of-the-art scholarship. *Tourism, Culture and Communication.*

UNWTO (2010). *International Recommendations for Tourism Statistics 2008* New York: UN.

Urry, J. (1990a). The ‘consumption’ of tourism. *Sociology*, 24(1), 23–35

Urry, J. (1990b). *The tourist gaze*. London: Sage.

Van der Merwe, C.D. (2013). The limits of urban heritage tourism in South Africa: the case of Constitutional Hill, Johannesburg. Urban Forum, 24, 573–588.

Visser, G., Erasmus, I. and Miller, M. (2017). Airbnb: the emergence of a new accommodation type in Cape Town, South Africa. *Tourism Review International*, 21(2), 151–168.

Walsh, S. (2013). We won’t move: The suburbs take back the center in urban Johannesburg. *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action* 17 (3), 400–408.

Winkler, T. (2013). Why won’t downtown Johannesburg ‘regenerate’? Reassessing Hillbrow as a case example. *Urban Forum*, 24, 309–324.

Xiang, Z. and Gretzel, U. (2010). Role of social media in online travel information search. *Tourism Management*, 31(2), 179–188.

Yu, X., Kim, N., Chen, C. and Schwartz, Z. (2012). Are you a tourist? Tourism definition from the tourist perspective. *Tourism Analysis* 17, 445–457.