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ABSTRACT

Scholarship on backpackers speculates some individuals may extend backpacking to a way of life. This article empirically explores this proposition using lifestyle consumption as its framing concept and conceptualises individuals who style their lives around the enduring practice of backpacking as ‘lifestyle travellers’. Ethnographic interviews with lifestyle travellers in India and Thailand offer an emic account of the practices, ideologies and social identity that characterise lifestyle travel as a distinctive subtype within backpacking. Departing from the drifter construct, which (re)constitutes this identity as socially deviant, the concept of lifestyle allows for a contemporary appraisal of these individuals’ patterns of meaningful consumption and wider insights into how ongoing mobility can lead to different ways of understanding identities and relating to place.

Keywords: lifestyle consumption; backpacker; mobility; drifter; identity

INTRODUCTION

Within the social world of backpacking, there exist a small proportion of tourists who travel as a lifestyle for years on end. Reminiscent of Cohen’s (1972) seminal ‘drifter tourists’, but subverting connotations of aimlessness implicit in this term, these extreme tourists, who I reconceptualise as ‘lifestyle travellers’, move beyond an episodic consumption of backpacking. Backpacking is instead extended to an ongoing lifestyle practice that on a micro level provides both a unique sense of self to its practitioners and on a macro level comprises a distinct and recognisable social identity. Lifestyle travel in a broader sense can take on
different forms, whether, for instance, through backpacking, ocean yacht cruising (Macbeth, 2000) or caravanning (White & White, 2004). What these forms of travel have in common that distinguishes them from many other lifestyle choices is sustained physical mobility. Whilst social scientists dispute just how ‘new’ mobilities are to our lives (Creswell, 2010; Sheller & Urry, 2006), less disputable is that globalisation, with mobility as a crucial characteristic, is leading to different ways of understanding identities and relating to place. As such, the current paper not only contributes the first empirical material to advance past speculative evidence that backpacking can extend to a way life (Noy & Cohen, 2005; Welk, 2004; Westerhausen, 2002), but it also contextualises this form of lifestyle travel within a wider discussion in the social sciences of how physical mobility can affect and challenge the ways in which we experience ourselves, others and places over time. Based on ethnographic interviews with lifestyle travellers in India and Thailand in 2007, I use theory on lifestyle consumption to frame a nuanced understanding of the practices, ideologies and social identity that characterise lifestyle travel as a distinctive subtype within backpacker tourism.

Although backpacking as a lifestyle has clear conceptual links to Cohen’s (1972) drifter, the social world surrounding ‘non-institutionalised tourist roles’ has changed significantly since the inception of the drifter model. Cohen (1972, p. 168) describes a drifter as venturing ‘furthest away from the beaten track and from the accustomed way of life of his home country…The drifter has no fixed itinerary or timetable and no well-defined goals of travel.’ Drifters are further understood as tourists who ‘roam internationally, living with the indigenous population and taking odd jobs to keep themselves going’ (Adler & Adler, 1999, p. 54). Like the ‘hippie counterculture’ of the 1960s-70s in general, the arguably derogatory drifter label connotes a social deviancy undertaken by ‘dropouts’ from affluent societies (O’Reilly, 2006). Although Vogt’s (1976) ‘wanderer’ and Riley’s (1988) ‘international long-term budget travellers’ represent similar attempts to cast a terminological net around this type of tourist, it is the drifter concept that inspires ‘one of the prevalent trends of contemporary tourism’ (Cohen, 1973, p. 90), backpacker tourism.

The succinct and less pejorative epithet ‘backpacker’ gained momentum from the late 1990s (O’Reilly, 2006) as a descriptor for predominantly young, budget tourists on extended holiday (Loker-Murphy & Pearce, 1995). More recently, Maoz and Bekerman (2010, p. 426) describe backpackers as ‘relatively young tourists who tend to gather in ghettos or enclaves: places where large numbers congregate to experience home comforts and the company of tourists of similar interests.’ This latter enclavic focus reflects an institutionalisation of the backpacking phenomenon, a mainstreaming decried by some authors (Cohen, 2003; O’Reilly, 2006) for its alignment with the stigma of mass tourism. The homogenisation of backpacking with the rubric of mass tourism, however, is derailed by scholarship that teases out heterogeneity from within the backpacker umbrella concept (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2005; Uriely, Yonay, & Simchai, 2002). Sørensen (2003) calls for continued research on specific subtypes within the backpacker market.

Westerhausen (2002, p. 146) notes ‘for a sizeable minority, being on the road becomes a preferred way of life to which they will return whenever the opportunity presents itself.’ Noy and Cohen (2005) further highlight that such ‘lifelong wanderers’ have rarely been the subject of empirical research. Whilst many backpackers are in a moratoric or transitional phase of life (Maoz & Bekerman, 2010), such as on a ‘gap year’ or ‘overseas experience’, which may be temporally viewed as an episode, Uriely et al. (2002) do observe evidence of ‘serial backpacking’, in which multiple backpacking trips may be pursued after an initial backpacking experience, sometimes reflecting changing motivations across a ‘backpacking biography’ or a single trip. Whereas Uriely (2005) leverages these observations to further a
late modern understanding of the phenomenon as pluralised, he does not pursue how these diverse and episodic experiences may be assembled into a mobile lifestyle that offers a unique sense of identity to its adherents and forms a recognisable social identity within a broader social matrix.

Indeed, lifestyle travel is a phenomenon that illustrates a de-differentiation of everyday life and tourist experiences, a process that Uriely (2005) identifies as characteristic of tourism in late modernity. But rather than tourism permeating everyday places where individuals reside, through, for instance, simulated environments and virtual reality, lifestyle travellers make tourism an everyday practice through the ongoing physical mobility of backpacking. Although Pearce and Lee (2007) do refer to ‘travel career patterns’ to try to encapsulate how tourists may develop across time, lifestyle travel is distinctly not akin to career, which metaphorically implies a logic of production. As such, Uriely et al.’s (2002) reference to a backpacking biography presents an apt departure point in the backpacking literature for exploring how the episodic consumption of backpacking can be assembled into a meaningful and identifiable lifestyle.

**Lifestyle Consumption**

Although lifestyles can be used as a means of socially stratifying individuals, as one might do through social class, occupation, ethnicity or culture, it is important to locate lifestyles as products of the same post-industrial period they can be used to analyse (Binkley, 2004). Lifestyles are central to debates about consumer culture and are often ‘articulated in relation to shifts identified with post-Fordism and/or postmodernism’ (Bell & Hollows, 2006, p. 1). Historical shifts from mass to specialised production in the context of urbanisation saw western class distinctions begin to destabilise and a concurrent rise in niche consumption practices as a means of symbolically conveying personal style (ibid). With a decline in identities based on logics of production and tradition, Shields (1992) suggests selves are instead increasingly fashioned and differentiated through aesthetic consumption practices. Distinctive consumption becomes a life project wherein ‘the particularity of the assemblage of goods, clothes, practices, experiences, appearance and bodily dispositions’ are designed together into a lifestyle (Featherstone, 1987, p. 59). Lifestyle practices such as habits of dressing, what to eat, how to spend leisure time and even ‘favoured milieux’ become ‘decisions not only about how to act but who to be’ (Giddens, 1991, p. 81).

As increased consumer choice may afford a dizzying array of life options (Gergen, 1991), the stylising of a distinctive mode of living also promises the opportunity to anchor one’s self amidst the cacophony of liquid modernity (Bauman, 2000). Featherstone (1987) does question, however, whether lifestyles actually cut across structures such as class and culture, as the politics of consumption are still mired in economic asymmetries. Nonetheless, Giddens (1991) offers that the more post-traditional and fragmented the context, the more lifestyle choice becomes critical in the (re)constitution of self-identity. Chaney (1996) thus sees lifestyle as the consumption of sets of goods and services in response to a perceived loss of meaning in everyday life.

In this latter sense, the aesthetic sign-value of lifestyle consumption becomes politically mobilised and forms a basis for resisting dominant power structures, as seen in the countercultural protests of the 1960s (Binkley, 2004). The ideal of ‘alternative lifestyle’ was then extolled as a break from the past and the constraints of its collective structures. As lifestyle was imbued in this period with a ‘controlled hedonism’ (ibid) focused on styling life
around playful leisure consumption rather than work, it comes as no surprise that the cognate field of leisure has sustained interest in the concept of lifestyle (see Stebbins, 1997; Veal, 2001; Wheaton, 2004). Past attempts at tightly defining lifestyle, however, often divorce the concept from its politicised history and instead concentrate solely on patterns of tangible behaviour (Stebbins, 1997). For instance, Sobel (1981, p. 3) defines lifestyle as ‘any distinctive, and therefore recognisable, mode of living’. In contrast, Stebbins (1997, p. 350) observes that in addition to an emphasis on shared patterns of behaviour, lifestyles encompass sets of related ‘values, attitudes and orientations’ that become ‘the basis for a separate, common social identity’.

Past labels that have been impressed upon individuals who backpack as a lifestyle choice, such as ‘drifter’ and ‘wanderer’, usefully highlight how identities have changed in post-industrial societies. These former labels (re)construct this identity as socially deviant. For instance, the Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines a drifter as one who travels or moves about aimlessly while Roget’s Thesaurus equates drifter with wanderer and includes in its list of synonyms the words derelict, hobo and vagrant. These marginal markers are tied to industrial discourses of ‘normality’ and the ‘mainstream’, with identity largely measured against production. In this sense, to drift was to escape from a normal life-path (Cohen & Taylor, 1992). Creswell (2001) notes how mobility in general has often been viewed in the past as a threat to normality, as there has been a tendency by agents of the state to try to position people within particular boundaries. In contrast, a result of the ‘opening’ of identity provided (to some) through post-Fordism is that the stigma associated with non-traditional lifestyles and mobility is diminished (Adler & Adler, 1999). Even though enduring social categories such as nationality, class and occupation still mediate identity, pluralism and consumerism allow for a more open appraisal of transient styles of life fashioned around patterns of meaningful consumption.

Although the concept of lifestyle is gaining speed as a theoretical tool amongst social scientists, it has until now received little import as a perspective of social analysis within the field of tourism. The uptake of lifestyle as an analytical device in tourism has been largely limited to quantitative approaches that use psychographics to segment travel behaviour (see Lee & Sparks, 2007). Outside of tourism, Adler and Adler (1999) examine the migratory patterns of resort workers and the manifestations of their transient lifestyles. Of a similar chord, growing sociological discussion of ‘lifestyle migration’ focuses on individuals who migrate in search of a ‘better’ way of life (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009). These lines of research transverse the intersections of mobility, lifestyle, and social meanings. Distinguishing lifestyle migrants from tourists, Benson and O’Reilly (2009, p. 614) observe that ‘there has yet to be an adequate explanation of why people might want to turn their experiences from tourism into a way of life’.

Consequently, I suggest that the term lifestyle traveller affords a rich conceptual tool with which to interrogate the proposition of backpacker tourism as a way of life, providing a means of both identifying this lifestyle group from within a broader social mix and understanding how backpacker consumption practices can be assembled into a meaningful personal identity. With regards to my semantic use of ‘traveller’ instead of ‘tourist’, debate over a distinction in these words amongst backpackers has received considerable attention elsewhere (see Dann, 1999; O’Reilly, 2005). It is reported that backpacker tourists mostly either reject the tourist and backpacker labels altogether in exchange for self-identification as ‘travellers’ (Davidson, 2005; Welk, 2004) or, less often, identify themselves as travellers whilst fundamentally still recognising this subject position as a category of tourist types (O’Reilly, 2005). By contextualising backpacking as a lifestyle within a wider range of forms of lifestyle travel, it
can be seen in a broader light wherein distinctions between tourism, migration and mobilities over the life course may blur. Nonetheless, Maoz and Bekerman (2010) stress the importance of listening to how tourists describes themselves when (de)constructing social categories. It is with this focus on emic perspectives and unpacking the discourses in which these subject positions are embedded that this paper turns to empirical exploration of the practices, ideologies and social identity of lifestyle travellers.

EXPLORING LIFESTYLE TRAVELLERS

Study Methods

The empirical material for this paper derives from 25 ethnographic interviews with lifestyle travellers in northern India and southern Thailand from July through September 2007. Stebbins (1997, p. 358) suggests that the unstructured ethnographic interview ‘remains the most effective way to explore the values, attitudes and orientations used to explain and justify’ lifestyles. My own six years of experience backpacking through Europe, Asia, Oceania and South America (1999 to 2003, 2005) helped in gaining access to the social world of these lifestyle travellers. My past travel periods typically ranged from six to nine months, as after this length of time I ordinarily exhausted my savings and turned to casual employment in the United States to save up funds for my next extended backpacking trip. Whilst I once adhered to a romanticised vision of a life of backpacking, the research process saw an eventual ‘secularisation’ of my disposition towards lifestyle travel, despite my continuing interest in de-marginalising this lifestyle choice. My travel experiences and research journey thus not only affect how I continue to interpret lifestyle travel, but also manifest in the present text as a more critical and less romanticised reading of this phenomenon than I have held in the past.

As field sites, India and Thailand have reputations as attractive destinations for long-term tourism (Cohen, 1982; Elsrud, 2001) with established backpacker enclaves that provide contact points with lifestyle travellers. Enclaves in both countries supply infrastructure for low-budget tourism and the consumption of hedonistic and/or spiritual experiences. Although Cohen (2003) presupposes difficulty in accessing ‘contemporary drifters’, as they may theoretically seek remote localities, the present research found lifestyle travellers interspersed amongst other backpackers in enclavic settings. Specifically, participants were accessed in the popular destinations of Rishikesh, Manali, McLeod Ganj and Leh in northern India and on the islands of Koh Phangan and Koh Tao in southern Thailand. Lifestyle travellers, like backpackers in general, however, are found in regions throughout the world, often following migration routes described as the ‘international seeker circuit’ (Adler & Adler, 1999, p. 36). The inclusion criteria here for lifestyle travellers is a fluid combination wherein each participant self-defined travel as her/his lifestyle and had been on multiple backpacking trips of approximately six months or more. The latter criterion functioned as a temporal starting point, as the majority had taken several trips lasting roughly six months to a year. Participants typically totalled four years of travel experience, with three of them having travelled the longest at 17 years (Table 1). Variations within the participants’ travel experiences are discussed in the next section.

In both India and Thailand, I entered the field again as a ‘traveller’ and for the first time as a researcher. Drawing on my travel experiences, I blended back into backpacker culture by dressing in somewhat worn casual attire, a practical style common among backpackers in South Asia (Hottola, 2008), socialising with them and moving through daily practices in the
same networks of accommodation and eating facilities (see also Davidson, 2005; Sørensen, 2003). Lugosi (2006) notes that communicating one’s research identity to prospective participants is typically abrupt or incremental, lying between overt and covert. Through many conversations with other backpackers over meals or a drink, I was able to avoid approaching strangers abruptly and occasionally established I was speaking to a lifestyle traveller or was subsequently introduced to one. My research was often disclosed early in the unfolding of relationships as initial casual conversation typically turns to how long each person intends to remain in the destination country. Only two potential participants openly reacted negatively to the research disclosure, which led to my withdrawal from the encounter. In most cases, participants seemed pleased to have an opportunity to discuss their travels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Interview location</th>
<th>Years of lifestyle travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>Rishikesh</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendon</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Rishikesh</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>Rishikesh</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>High school drop-out</td>
<td>Rishikesh</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Israeli/French</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Manali</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Manali</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Canadian/Indian</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>McLeod Ganj</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>McLeod Ganj</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehud</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Israeli</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Leh</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Israeli</td>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>Leh</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Koh Phangan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>High school drop-out</td>
<td>Koh Phangan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>Koh Phangan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Koh Phangan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>Koh Phangan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>Koh Phangan</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>Koh Phangan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Swiss</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>Koh Phangan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Koh Phangan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Koh Phangan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Koh Phangan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alec</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>Koh Tao</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>Koh Tao</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felipe</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Koh Tao</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Koh Tao</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Digitally recorded interviews were typically held in cafes, restaurants or guesthouses, often several days after first meeting and continuing to socialise with the participant. In line with Stebbins’ (1997) description of lifestyle as a guide for exploratory ethnographic interviews, I sought to understand patterns within the social practices of the participants, and the ways they explain and justify these behaviours. Interviews averaged in length from 45 min to two hours and were loosely based around the life narratives of the participants, focusing on aspects of their lives before and during their backpacking, as well as their future aspirations.
Participants often went to great lengths to explain why they travel as a lifestyle choice. The narratives of participants in India and Thailand were remarkably consistent.

The 25 participants represented a range of 13 nationalities (Table 1), with English, Australians, Israelis and Canadians being the most common. All but four of the participants travelled alone, 11 were female and education levels were from high school dropout to masters degree holder. Participant age ranged from 23 to 50, with an average age of 30. Following transcription and repeated readings of the empirical material, formal interpretation was carried out using an inductive thematic analysis approach (Patton, 2002). This approach involved reducing the empirical material into categories guided by the participants’ narratives without losing sight of the research aims (Miles & Huberman, 1994; K. O’Reilly, 2005). Attention was given during initial coding to monitoring both the potential influence of my prior knowledge of the social world of backpacking and conceptual proclivities. It is from these initial categories and subsequent interpretations that the following empirical insights into lifestyle travel were developed.

Initial and Enduring Involvement

Engagement in lifestyle travel was enabled by the participants’ common backgrounds of relative economic privilege and their first-world citizenships that allowed for admission into foreign nation-states. Their largely affluent backgrounds, predominant whiteness and able fit bodies admitted further access to geographically disparate casual employment opportunities, which helped to finance extended periods of backpacking. These structural identifiers that facilitate mobility are also observed by Germann Molz (2006; 2008) in her research on ‘round-the-world travellers’. In addition to trips to Asia, many of this study’s participants had backpacked through Africa, Latin America and Oceania, while a few had ventured to the Middle East. Time in the ‘rich north’ (primarily Europe, North America and Australia) was typically spent in casual employment aimed at financing extended periods in the ‘poor south’, reflecting an asymmetry of mobile economic power (Gogia, 2006). Periods of backpacking uninterrupted by return visits ‘home’ to work and/or see family and friends ranged from three months to two and a half years. Participants regularly resumed backpacking.

Supporting the work of Maoz (2007), participants often identified life crises, such as failed relationships, career disruption, the divorce of parents or drug dependency as catalysts for both their initial and continuing travels. These mobilities are embedded within a discourse of tourism as escape (Cohen & Taylor, 1992), not only instigated by crises, but in some cases through a broader feeling of alienation at home in which their prior lives are presented negatively. This latter tourism push factor is a well-trodden path in discussions of anomie in late modernity (Dann, 1977). A significant departure point, however, in the lifestyle travellers’ narratives of their lives pre-travel, is the many participants who located their initial travel motivation primarily in childhood tourism experiences. Ryan (2010), drawing on Havitz and Dimanche (1990), identifies enduring involvement as a way through which holidays may become extensions of life rather than means of escape. For Tamara (34, Canadian/Indian), diaspora tourism had been an annual childhood activity with her family, until she turned 17, at which point the form of her tourism practice changed to independent backpacking:

Travelling was so much introduced to me as a baby that it became much more of an option as a way of life. There’s no year in my life that hasn’t involved travel,
that doesn’t involve a few countries. Movement and constant change is very much a part of me and my lifestyle, and I don’t even know in a sense different.

In several cases, extended travel was socially condoned by the participants’ parents for its perceived educational value, a discourse linking back to the 18th century European Grand Tour (Loker-Murphy & Pearce, 1995). These participants often further mobilised an emotive explanation in justifying enduring involvement with travel. This materialised in privileging a vocabulary of neo-nomadism (see D’Andrea, 2007), in which some participants deeply felt their peregrinations reflected their nature, as well as how they were nurtured: ‘I truly feel in my soul I’m nomadic. This is why I can’t pinpoint it [why he travels], because it’s just in my blood, the same reason why birds fly south for winter’ (Thomas, English, 29). Participants frequently invoked a discourse of lifestyle in describing and justifying their mobilities. Resisting identification as a social deviant, Max (English, 40), who had been travelling for the last 17 years whilst working intermittently in hospitality in the UK and New Zealand, observed:

Some would look at me as a bum; I would feel a little bit sorry for them if they look at me like that. What’s really developed is my real lifestyle, rather than what I have to do to support it.

Indeed, the participants did not view their backpacking as casual drifting, but as movements imbued with purpose and meaning. This emic primacy given to the notion of lifestyle in their accounts adds empirical leverage to lifestyle travel as a distinct social identity.

Several of the participants described being swept into a life tailored around travel. This was in contrast to their original intentions, like many backpackers, of treating their backpacking period as a moratorium from their life-paths at home (Maoz & Bekerman, 2010). As Jackie (English, 26), a former nurse in the army, noted of her expectations of her first trip: ‘I was hoping it would broaden my mind a bit, but nothing more than that. I certainly wasn’t expecting to make it a lifestyle. I intended to go home, but I don’t think that will happen now.’ Alec (Scottish, 34), who supported himself teaching yoga and managing a small budget beach resort, narrated how travel eventually became integrated into his self-concept:

It’s exactly half my life I’ve been constantly travelling. I’ve got a base here in Thailand but I’m always back and forth, 17 years on the road. Maybe travelled about 43 countries. I think once you get used to this lifestyle, it becomes part of who you are.

This perspective illustrates the actor-level intersection between self-concept and lifestyle (Cohen, 2011), wherein patterns of consumption may ‘give material form to a particular narrative of self-identity’ (Giddens, 1991, p. 81).

**Ideology and Identity**

Whilst it is well-established that backpackers returning home often mobilise narratives of self-transformation on the road (Noy, 2004), lifestyle travellers are subject to years of exposure to varied cultural praxes and backpacker subculture, which may manifest in extreme pressure on their socio-cultural identities. One possible outcome of sustained, diverse cultural interaction is a cosmopolitan disposition (in contrast to parochialism), in which it is suggested that tourism may lead to a subjective open-orientation or outlook towards other ways of life (Enoch & Grossman, 2010; Germann Molz, 2006; 2008; Hannerz, 1990). Indeed, Ryan
(Australian, 48) after 14 years of lifestyle travel attested: ‘I’ve experienced a continued acceptance of all lifestyles and all types of people. A greater knowledge about the world as a small glass, like a universal condition rather than a national condition.’ A further cosmopolitan claim was staked by Adam (Israeli, 25):

> I wanted to see other ways of living, to see if my way of living is the right way, to meet people from all over the world, to see what the outside world is about and to expand my way of thinking.

Whilst these perspectives do convey a cosmopolitan sensibility, the notion of cross-cultural mobility engendering cosmopolitanism has been subject to intense scrutiny. Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward (2004) remind us that behind the abstract ideal of cosmopolitanism often lurks the privileges of wealth and citizenship of the mobile elite, whilst John Urry warns in an interview with Blok (2005, p. 81) that to position one as cosmopolitan is to try to produce ‘superior cultural capital over and against others’. Andreas (Swedish, 25), for example, used his consumption of ‘exotic’ foods as a way to try to distinguish himself from his friends in Sweden: ‘I go home and I have a completely different taste because I’ve tasted foods from across the world that they might never have heard of.’

The participants more often embody performances of what has been referred to as ‘mundane cosmopolitanisms’ (Skrbis et al., 2004). Their day-to-day ‘actually existing cosmopolitanisms’ (Germann Molz, 2006) manifested mainly in the consumption of regional cuisine and, for the many not choosing basic casual clothing, the wearing of romanticised versions of ‘ethnic’ dress. Within Hottola’s (2008) study of diversity in backpacker dress styles, this latter attire largely reflects the ‘countercultural’ category, in which loose-fitting new age style clothing that eclectically idealises ‘Oriental culture’ is common. Navigating infrastructure catering to tourism, the participants were often to be found eating, drinking and socialising with other enclavic tourists. Local interactions, whether through food, water/coastal sport, yoga, or meditation, were predominantly instrumental and commercialised. Although many sought to ‘go native’, their participation was often imaginary. Despite limited non-commercialised contact with the Other, many participants found that years of backpacking led them to a more pointed sense of identity confusion, or a feeling of being lost in a ‘sea’ of cultural differences (see Cohen, 2010).

Return trips home for the participants were also commonly marked by distress and intense ‘reverse culture confusion’ (Hottola, 2004, p. 460), which in more pronounced cases manifested in a brief depressive state: ‘Every time I go back to the United States, it’s hard, I get real depressed, lay in bed for about a week, every single time (Josh, American, 23). Rather than returning home and, as is described of many backpackers, narrating their travels as a badge of achievement that might facilitate access to a professional workforce (Desforges, 2000; Sørensen, 2003) and eventually successfully reorientating themselves to their home societies (Noy & Cohen, 2005; Pocock & McIntosh, 2010), participants spoke of persisting profound feelings of alienation and a sense of stagnation in return visits to their countries of origin. Fiona (New Zealander, 23), contrary to her intentions to resettle upon returning home, soon departed on another major trip after encountering apathy from others towards her tourism experiences and a feeling of despondency:
Getting back to New Zealand, people hadn’t changed. All these amazing experiences to share and people there just didn’t want to know. Friends said – how’s South America? What do you say to that? You can’t just say, it was great, thanks. And then they switch off and they’re back on to what happened last Saturday night. There was just so much routine.

A feeling that ‘time stood still’ at home, as friends’ behaviours seemingly remained concretised, was shared by Max (English, 40):

If there’s such a thing as culture shock going away to a different culture, there’s certainly a culture shock coming back to your own. When you get back your friends are still doing the same things. It’s like you just travelled in space and come back and it’s just the next day.

For Brendon (Irish, 26), returning home to Dublin was marked by a perceived conflict between his ‘new values’ and those he saw as representative of his country of origin: ‘I couldn’t settle at all into the normal routine of life. I was hypercritical about everything back home. I saw things differently.’ Sussman (2000) identifies this type of reverse culture ‘shock’ amongst international sojourners as resulting from a cultural clash in which a repatriate has incorporated values and behaviours of a host culture into her/his identity. In the case of lifestyle travellers, however, adopted sets of values and behaviours arguably derive more from appropriating elements of backpacker subculture, influenced by time spent in backpacker enclaves or ‘traveller bubbles’ (Wilson & Richards, 2008), rather than through engagement with indigenous communities. Drawing on a hybridisation of orientalism, romanticism and 1960s counterculture, lifestyle travellers (re)produce ideals of freedom, spontaneity and challenge that are embedded in a shared ideology of backpacking in order to justify their lifestyle choice:

I think travel affords me a whole lot of really good lifestyle things that are a little harder to find when you stay in the same place. So, for example, really simple words like freedom, spontaneity, aloneness, miracles, and newness (Ryan, Australian, 48).

A traveller identity, like all social identities, is based on a belief of what one is not in relation to the Other (Hall, 1996). Thus, whilst life on the road is positively valued by the participants, life at home is portrayed in opposition as constraining, regressive, boring, routinised, materialistic and production-oriented:

I couldn’t live the same lifestyle back home. I didn’t have the same free spirit there. There’s too many rules, regulations, taxes, laws, everything’s confined. It’s too constrictive for me now with the way I feel, the way I think, the way I want to live. I think if you travel long enough, there comes a point in time where you’re probably going to struggle to reintegrate into western society (Alec, Scottish, 34).

Although this discourse traces clearly back to a MacCannellian (1976) search for authenticity, what is remarkable is that the value systems of these lifestyle travellers, for whom a sense of alienation or personal crisis sent some off travelling in the first place, went on to become so entangled with the myths and ideologies of backpacker subculture that re-integration and adaptation back into their home societies was made difficult and untenable. Complications of re-entry and adjustment to one’s origin culture following extended international sojourn is explored elsewhere (see Brown, 2009; Pocock & McIntosh, 2010), but in the divergent case of lifestyle travellers, re-entry is only a brief transition before the next backpacking trip.
Work to Travel

Whereas Sussman (2000) locates an eventual reduction in cultural distress amongst repatriates after being home for 12-15 months, returning lifestyle travellers typically worked, saved money and departed on their next trip within one year of return. Not one of the lifestyle travellers had sufficient savings to sustain travel indefinitely without working. When finances ran low, intermittent periods of production were explicitly aimed at continuing travel, with the will to work almost entirely driven by their backpacking consumption needs:

I see working as more just supporting my lifestyle. If I didn’t have to work, I would be travelling all the time. I’ve only once worked for more than a year in one job for the last sixteen odd years (Max, English, 40).

Rather than work being a central activity of social identification, it is reconfigured here to an instrumental level that enables an identity expressed through lifestyle consumption. The decision to work casually to finance lifestyle travel was justified by Thomas (English, 29) as a generational shift away from an industrial logic of production: ‘In our parents’ day a career was something to treasure, you wouldn’t throw it all away. It’s not like that anymore. We can afford to be more frivolous with things like that now.’

Lifestyle travellers exemplify Bianchi’s (2000) observations that within post-industrial mobility patterns, the intersections between migration, tourism, leisure and work are more flexible, fluid and ambiguous. Ways of funding backpacking varied amongst the participants, but can be viewed mainly as intense short periods of work in one’s country of citizenship, travelling expressly to a country for its work opportunities and/or opportunities for casual employment while travelling overseas. These latter two methods largely reflect Uriely’s (2001) description of a ‘non-institutionalised working tourist’, wherein work while travelling is aimed at financing a prolonged trip. Whilst this practice is typically depicted as unskilled work, Felipe (Cuban, 29) subverted this assignment through the use of technology, by sustainably financing his travel through IT work attended to whilst backpacking. Technology thus allowed Felipe to dislocate work from place through virtual commuting.

Charlotte (Canadian, 26), who funded her trips through intensive stints of bartending in Canada, exemplified how intermittent work in her own country allowed her to maintain her lifestyle:

As soon as I get back I’m like, okay, got to work, and immediately have a next place in mind. Always working towards the next trip. I would say travel is the main motivating factor for me to even have a steady job.

In cases where participants rotated between work in their country of origin and backpacking, these spheres of life did not reach a balance in terms of time or importance. Periods of work only lasted as long as it took to be able to ‘set off again’. Although it is likely that some individuals may strike an annual balance of ‘seasons’ in which work at home and travel take on a cyclical harmony, for these lifestyle travellers the former was merely a fragmented and calculated means towards fulfilling the high self-investment placed in the latter. In this sense, work at home is ‘an unpleasant necessity’, engaged in only when ‘pressed by dire need’ (Cohen, 1973, p. 92).

In an example of targeting another country expressly for its work opportunities, Adam (Israeli, 25) recounted visiting the UK as a working tourist: ‘I worked like a dog for a couple of months in London and saved a big amount of money, with which I then went travelling in
India and Pakistan.’ Participants commonly took advantage of fluency in English and first-world citizenship to qualify for working holiday visas in countries such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the UK. The political privileges of crossing international borders to earn strong currencies that later give the ability to ‘live on the cheap’ for extended periods in the global south (Gogia, 2006, p. 365) were frequently exercised without concern for the practice’s potential neo-colonial implications. These movements to countries for their work opportunities were not, however, only limited to the rich north: ‘I’m already planning my next trip, which is to teach English in Mexico, learn Spanish, and then travel through Central America down to South America’ (Laura, Canadian, 28). In contrast, and in seeking to weave casual employment into the fabric of his daily backpacking life, Eric (French, 35) expressed a deep desire to find work with his hands that could generate income wherever he went:

I don’t back want to go back to France except for holidays, to meet my family. I want to find something to do with my hands, work I can do everywhere I go. Something like massage or working with stone.

As Fiona (New Zealander, 23) emphasised, however, no matter where and how work was undertaken, her focus remained on continued mobility: ‘I hope to keep travelling forever. I don’t know about money, but I’m going to have to find a way’.

Future Aspirations

Like Fiona, many participants expressed an intention to keep travelling for the rest of their lives. One commonly cited barrier to continuing a life of backpacking, though, was the difficulty in maintaining serious relationships. Adler and Adler (1999) take similar note in their study of transient resort workers. Steph (Australian, 23) made light of this issue: ‘If I raise a family, I’ll take them and do the same thing like my parents did and show them the world as well.’ Yet none of the participants were married, had children or pets, or needed to go home in the foreseeable future to support immediate or extended family members. The only participant who had taken on familial responsibilities, Simon (Swiss, 50), had separated from his wife four years prior and resumed his life of travel, which had been on hold during twenty years of marriage.

Whereas some participants highly valued being alone during their trips, others expressed regret at not having a partner with whom to share and to witness their experiences. Hoping to find a life partner through the course of his travels, Barry (English, 32) lamented: ‘I’m travelling solo and it’s hard sometimes. I want to share my adventures with somebody.’ Jackie (English, 26) went so far as to openly question when her roving might end:

That’s the question I’ve been asking myself. When will it stop? Because there are certain things you can’t do if you’re a traveller. It’s difficult to have a serious relationship, and at some point, I’d like to have a family.

In contrast to serious relationships, participants frequently cited the ease with which ‘situational’ or ‘expendable friendships’ (Adler & Adler, 1999) are formed whilst backpacking. Further to seeking enduring relationships, the participants often sought ways of moving beyond a rotation of working in order to save money for backpacking trips. Brendon (Irish, 26) shared his aspiration of integrating his travels with an occupation:
The aim seems to be to kind of integrate it [travel] into your life, find a way to make it viable; instead of this stop/start thing, this huge separation between your country of origin, or wherever you’re working, and where you travel to, to try and get a synthesis between them.

Participants seeking a livelihood on the road (e.g. dive instructor, yoga instructor, masseur, tour guide), mirror D’Andrea’s study of (2007, p. 220) migrant expatriates, who hoped to develop an occupation that allowed for a lifestyle related to ‘experiences of liberation, pleasure and expressivity’. They also challenge Uriely’s (2001) distinction within ‘working tourist’ types between those who engage in work whilst travelling for instrumental versus recreational reasons, arguably subsuming this divide. Bridging a travel-occupation gap often also manifested in a desire to bring the company of fellow backpackers to themselves without actually having to physically travel, whether it be through opening a hostel, budget resort or small adventure tourism firm. Participants based their aspiration of continued involvement with tourists largely on experiences of belonging and community encountered whilst backpacking. Fleeing moments of Turnerian ‘communitas’ (1982) also inspired the participants’ most commonly cited ambition, which was to find a new place to call ‘home’.

Resembling Cohen’s (1979) ‘existential mode’ of touristic experience, yet more mobile and ephemeral than Benson and O’Reilly’s (2009) idyll-seeking lifestyle migrants, several participants ultimately aspired to find an ideal place to settle. This unspecified idyllic place was imagined as aesthetically pleasing, providing a strong spirit of community and representing valuebelief systems congruent to their own. Their contemporary Shrangri-La-esque utopian visions were set in contrast to the perceived ‘toxicity’ of their generating societies, establishing these lifestyle travellers as representative of the most alienated of all tourist types (Maoz & Bekerman, 2010). One manifestation in which tourists inhabit such a revised notion of home is Auroville in southern India, where Sharpley and Sundaram (2005) describe the communal lives of a number of ‘permanent tourists’ who have settled in an expatriate community based on utopian ideals.

The most determined of this study’s utopia-seekers, however, narrated firm self-concepts and sought an external environment to match their culturally hybridised conceptions of self. Jackie (English, 26) related that a place would need to be extraordinary for her to consider ‘emptying out her backpack once and for all.’ Thomas (English, 29), who since being interviewed has settled on a remote Cambodian beach bungalow resort he purchased, depicted his own un-tethering from the UK:

I’ve opted out of the society I grew up in. I’ve got nothing to go back to anywhere in the world. I’ve got one bag of stuff in my friend’s house in Melbourne and my rucksack in my hut. The purpose of this trip is to find somewhere to live like this permanently.

Thomas’s mooring was an exception amongst the participants and begs the question of how long his exit from lifestyle travel will last. Indeed, the hypermobility of lifestyle travel became so internally entrenched in this study’s participants that staying in a fixed and singly bounded notion of home was a rarely attained ideal. Germann Molz (2008) explores the idea of ‘home-on-the-move’, in which the closest travellers come to finding a sense of home is through dwelling in movement, by being at home on the road. Despite the tensions of longing for a single place to settle down, the present research indicates that lifestyle travellers inevitably move again and it is in this way that travel becomes a way of life.
CONCLUSION

Several authors have theorised that for a small number of backpacker tourists, involvement in backpacking may extend to a way of life (Noy & Cohen, 2005; Welk, 2004; Westerhausen, 2002). In casting the concept of lifestyle as a net of social analysis, I have empirically supported these speculations through exploring the practices, shared meanings and social identity of lifestyle travellers who style their lives around the enduring practice of backpacking. Applying past labels, such as drifter or wanderer to this way of living inaccurately implies a social deviancy based on understandings of identity as regressively tied to production. In contrast, I have demonstrated that the term lifestyle traveller allows for a more open appraisal of these individuals’ patterns of meaningful consumption. Additionally, the primacy given to issues of lifestyle in the participants’ emic accounts is a further call for the construction of lifestyle traveller as a distinct social identity.

Lifestyle travel is a nuanced phenomenon within backpacker tourism that sets its practitioners apart from other backpackers. Whilst heterogeneity within backpacking has been stressed in the literature (Uriely et al., 2002), few backpackers move from an episodic engagement with backpacking to investing in it as an ongoing mobile lifestyle. Many backpackers are depicted in the literature as relatively young, budget tourists on a moratorium as part of a transitional phase in life (Maoz & Bekerman, 2010). Lifestyle travellers, in contrast, can be distilled from this broader conceptualisation of backpackers in distinct ways that relate to enduring involvement, cultural re-assimilation, work motivation and problematising home.

First, the participants, whose enduring involvement with backpacking ranged from three to 17 years, did not view their travel as moratoric or transitional. They instead perceived their travels as a way of life and employed a discourse of lifestyle in describing and justifying how and why their ongoing practice of travel is central to their lives and identities. Participants narrated being swept into a life of backpacking following their initial extended trip, establishing an inversion in which tourism became their normality, rather than its traditional role as a restorative or recreational break. While some participants identified escape from life crises and broader societal alienation as travel push factors, others traced their enduring involvement with tourism to childhood holiday experiences. The latter demonstrate the propensity for tourism practice to become socially embedded in individual’s lives from an early life stage, albeit the dominant tourism form may change.

Second, contrary to Sussman’s (2000) work on the reverse culture shock of repatriates and suggestions that backpackers successfully reorientate themselves to their origin society upon return (Noy & Cohen, 2005), the lifestyle travellers did not adjust to feelings of conflicting social norms and cultural confusion (Hottola, 2004) experienced when returning home. The perceived anomie and reverse cultural confusion that often prevents these lifestyle travellers from re-assimilating into their generating societies, however, is not mainly due to cultural assimilation of the varied values and behaviours of the indigenous communities they visit. It is instead more attributable to having blended over time the practices and ideologies of backpacker subculture into their own self-identities and value systems.

Third, although participants commonly narrated their travel experiences as engendering cosmopolitanism, unlike descriptions of many backpackers, they did not leverage this perceived capital to gain access to a professional workforce in their home society (Desforges, 2000; Sørensen, 2003). Instead, the lifestyle travellers ventured back time and time again into the social world of backpacking, often financed through brief but intense intermittent periods of work at home or creative ways of earning money whilst abroad. Participants frequently
sought ways, however, to move beyond a travel-occupation gap (wherein the only motivation to work was to fund travel) and aspired to successfully weave together their backpacking and working selves.

Finally, whereas some participants endeavoured to engage in backpacking for the rest of their lives, other lifestyle travellers saw their tourism practice in tension with future aspirations. In place of the primarily ephemeral friendships characteristic of lifestyle travel, these participants expressed desires for relationships of more substance, which would allow for an ongoing sharing of experiences. The most commonly voiced ambition in the study, however, was to find a new place to call home. Packaged with utopian ideals, the reconfigured homes these alienated tourists sought were described as not only aesthetically pleasing, but in alignment with the participant’s revised self-conceptions. But this ‘homing desire’ (Germann Molz, 2008) remained a tension in the participants’ narratives, as paradoxically, the closest the lifestyle travellers came to feeling at home was being-on-the-road. Thus, in contrast to reports of other backpackers, whose stories often culminate in lasting self-transformation narrated upon returning home (Noy, 2004), this study suggests that lifestyle travellers seek a lasting change of home outright.

The present exploratory research has operationalised the concept of lifestyle in the context of tourism as a lens for mapping out how patterns of consumptive practices are embedded with shared meanings that can constitute a distinct social identity. The paper’s contribution is not only in offering the term lifestyle traveller and being the first empirical study that has explored the meanings and experiences of individuals who backpack as a way of life, but also in providing a window into how corporeal mobility as a lifestyle can play out over time. As such, it extends observations that tourism is increasingly de-differentiated from daily life (Uriely, 2005), but instead of illustrating ways in which tourism can permeate places in which individuals reside, the present text exemplifies tourism as the everyday through the tracking of individuals in perpetual motion. The paper thus contributes to a wider discourse in the social sciences wherein physical mobility is recognised as becoming more and more a part of the fabric of everyday life (Sheller & Urry, 2006).

As Creswell (2010) notes, rather than just smooth movement, mobility is accompanied by friction, turbulence and power asymmetries. In the course of fashioning a lifestyle through consuming tourism mobilities, lifestyle travellers negotiate tensions in which identities can both fuse and become confused and being on-the-move can affect both the ability and inability to relate and connect to place. Further, these movements are only produced through structural and political inequities that grant mobility to some, while denying it to others. Although the contours of lifestyle travel may present an extreme form of physical mobility, this exemplar provides further reach into how individuals may negotiate increasingly mobile lifestyles, and the challenges this may present to individuals over time as mobility becomes more commonplace.
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