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Abstrakt:
The phenomenon of tourism presents a complicated construct. This fact can become clearer if we try to interconnect two distinctive topics – tourism and authenticity. The everyday meaning of authenticity is too reduced to be applied in a more sophisticated study. The philosophical approach presents authenticity as a more complex and complicated term, in the conception that has been followed within existentialism, phenomenology and fundamental ontology (especially by Martin Heidegger). This paper deals with the possibilities how to interconnect some very practical problems based on different forms of tourism with the ontological (and abstract) understanding of authenticity. The methodological instruments are argued in a form of categorization of motivation for traveling. Thus, the authentic and inauthentic modes of being can be examined via specific aspects of motivation. In conclusion, authenticity is presented as a concept which cannot deny its ontological sources, but it can be followed via specific examples put in the settings of tourism.

INTRODUCTION

Trying to interconnect two distinctive topics – tourism and authenticity – presents a more complicated task than it could be expected after we decide to use the word connection labeled as “authenticity of tourism”. The main reasons for appearing the problems with establishing an understandable construct consist at quite “slippery” nature of authenticity as the eidetic phenomenon. First, we can pay attention on the everyday perception of authenticity within tourism. In some previous publications we defined three different modes of traveling according to the rate of authenticity. They include presence of the physical perception, credibility of described events and stories and behavior based on free will and a natural approach (Hurych, 2017, 45). The last one emphasizes an active approach to human being (included in the imperative “try to be yourself”) and presents the first step on the way leading to understanding philosophical interpretations of authenticity.

The philosophical backgrounds of authenticity can be found in the works of Johann Gottlieb Fichte and his concept of Das Ich, or Søren Kirkegaard and his theory of the three stages on life’s way. A very strong focus on authenticity can be found in the works of some influential existentialists, like Jean Paul Sartre, or Emmanuel Levinas. For purposes of our study, Martin Heidegger’s conception of fundamental ontology (coming from phenomenology) can be used as a basic inspiration instrument. The authentic and inauthentic modes of being introduced by Heidegger in his book Being and Time present a very inspiring, robust and voluminous complex of ideas.

We wouldn’t like to repeat the ideas which have already been published about the authenticity of tourism in the context of sport tourism (Hurych, 2015). In spite of this intention, one important idea must be emphasized here again: Authenticity as a pure phenomenon is much more understandable in its negative delimitation. Heidegger described the inauthentic modes of being much more exactly than the authentic ones (Heidegger, 2008). This negative delimitation is sometimes considered as the weak point of Heidegger’s concept. On the other hand, for some practical reasons it can be useful because we are able to determine some very concrete aspects of traveling which are not authentic in practical settings. In other words, it is very difficult to measure or define what really presents the authentic behavior within tourism because we are not able to measure it or define some exact criteria. However, what we could try is to focus on some inauthentic elements of tourism which are quite common, and which present a kind of problem in the everyday approach to traveling.

Another issue which should be considered in this context is the problem with some behavioral characteristics of authenticity within tourism. Observing behavior of some travelers without studying the intrinsic (and thus not visible) aspects of their motivation can be very confusing because the authenticity of their acting can differ from each other even in the cases of very similar ways of behavior. The quantitative research presents a key instrument for majority of empirical studies because the methods of a questionnaire investigation bring a good deal of outputs for the statistical analyses and their exact interpretations. There are some possibilities how to examine the authentic modes in this way. One of them is presented by The Authenticity Test, which is a kind of the questionnaire containing 100 items (Park, 2007). However, there are some limits for using the methods like this. They can be successfully used if we examine authenticity in its everyday conception but for the approaches based on the phenomenology (e.g. the Heideggerian concept of authenticity) they are not very suitable. It is for two main reasons. Firstly, majority of the questionnaire items are primarily focused on behavior and neglect the purposes and consequences of it. Secondly, in the cases of feelings, expressions of opinion and evaluation of values the answers are very subjective which seriously decrease reliability of the outputs.

For our study, coming from the philosophical approach, it seems to be more meaningful to focus on the motivation of travelers and via establishing some criteria for categorization of the motivation factors to get and describe some instruments which can help us to orientate in the problem of authenticity in tourism. This approach cannot offer the objectives for decision whether some aspects of motivation are really authentic, but it enables us to name and define some dangers for the loss of authenticity in some concrete cases.
1 SOME SELECTED TYPOLOGIES USED FOR TOURISTIC MOTIVATION AND KINDS OF TOURISTS

Within this chapter we argue some selected overview of motivation factors in tourism, then we would like to present the typology coming from the phenomenological discourse and in the last part we introduce a point of the difference between the vulgar and philosophical concepts of authenticity.

1.1 Some Selected Motivation Factors in Tourism

Motivation factors in tourism were analyzed many times in different perspectives. The first studies devoted to this topic have been published since 1960s (Lazer, 1963) in the context of life-style and marketing. During the next decades there were introduced some more sophisticated models of lifestyle marketing segmentation (Michman, 1991). The experience of travelers started to become an important part of the empirical researches focused on the topic of touristic motivation (Pearc & Caltebiano, 1983).

For our purposes we selected two influential and, at the same time, quite understandable concepts that exactly sort and define the motivation factors. Horner & Swarbrooke (1996) define 6 major motivation factors: physical, emotional, cultural, personal, personal development and status ones. In general, physical factors can include relaxation, health, sport, sex and other aspects. The emotional factors can be presented by nostalgia, escape, aesthetics, fantasy etc. The cultural motives are connected with sightseeing, interest in some historical events, gastronomy and so on. The status factors deal with exceptionality or some fashion trends. The personal factors include meeting people, especially. The factors of personal development are related to language learning or some other educative aspects. However, any product provided within tourism can have its specific motivation for different individuals.

Kozak and Andreu (2006) edited a large collection dealing with the topic of marketing tourism including its motivation aspects. The empirical research devoted to influence of lifestyle aspects to tourist was realized by González Fernández, Blanco and Santos (2006). The factorial analysis of principal components and factorial analysis of multiple correspondences were used as a major methodological instrument. Within this research 5 segments of touristic motivation were established: home-loving, idealistic, autonomous, hedonistic and conservative (ibid., 154–157). This categorization is based on different criteria than the previous one (provided by Horner and Swarbrooke). However, both the models provide a meaningful basis for examining authenticity within tourism.

Before we present our model construct, we should devote some space to philosophical approaches to the typology of tourists. Searching for the authentic (and inauthentic) modes of being we should describe what authenticity in our interpretation means (more in detail).

1.2 Some Selected Examples of Touristic Typology Based on the Phenomenological Discourse

There are many theoretical studies and empirical investigations devoted to the aspects of motivation within tourism but just some of them are based on the philosophical backgrounds. One of the most influential ones is undoubtedly Cohen’s typology of modes of touristic experiences based on the phenomenological approach. Cohen describes five items: the recreational, diversional, experiential, experimental and existential modes (Cohen, 1979, 183). There is no direct connection between Cohen’s typology and motivation factors, at first sight. On the other hand, examining motivation within these different types of tourists can refer to the motivation of each type in relation to authenticity quite strongly. This idea is clearer if we interconnect Cohen’s typology with Jirásek’s categorization of differences between a tourist and a pilgrim.

Coming from Cohen’s model, Jirásek determines five major features distinguishing between the tourist and the pilgrim: the aim of the journey, attunement, mode of experience, relation to the question and focus (Jirásek, 2011, 226–227). There are some ideas contained and hidden in this distinction, which could help us to understand better the complex nature of the problem of authenticity within tourism. If we accept, at least for some time, the model typology of tourists and pilgrims (which is undoubtedly greatly simplified), we can notice some substantial differences. The tourist wants to see a place while the pilgrim wants to get experience. The tourist wants to record what he/she saw while the pilgrim tries to tune for the present moment and to understand the message of the journey. The tourist tries to answer the question “how nice is this place” while
the pilgrim is grounded in the question itself. The tourist notices many different details while the pilgrim concentrates on the whole.

1.3 The Core of the Phenomenological and Vulgar Concepts of Authenticity

The phenomenological discourse used by Cohen and Jirásek presents a viewpoint for developing our model of categorization of motivation factors within tourism. This approach helps us overcome some limits of the vulgar concept of authenticity. Within the introduction of this paper we had already mentioned an everyday perception of authenticity and its reflection in tourism (presence of physical perception, credibility of reports and free will). In some previous works we introduced the term of “the vulgar concept of authenticity” (Hurych, 2017, 44), coming from the analysis provided by Martin Heidegger. Compare “the vulgar concept of time” in Being and Time (Heidegger, 2008). The construction of “vulgar concept of authenticity” is based on the perception of authenticity which is used in our everyday lives. That means: to be “original”, to be “yourself”, or even to be “different than the others”.

Authenticity in the philosophical, or more exactly in the phenomenological perspective presents a more complicated phenomenon. Heideggerian authenticity consists in the escape from the world of “The They”. Heidegger’s original ontological key term is Dasein which is mostly translated as “Being-there.” According to Heidegger, only “Being-there” – presented with “Being-in-the-world” (In-der-welt-sein) – can be authentic. In the past, we tried to describe the theoretical background of this problem more in detail in the topic of authenticity of sport tourism (Hurych, 2017a, 45–46). Now we would like to focus on motivation factors in tourism and on their authenticity. Very ontological characteristics of Dasein are very complicated and not easily understandable for many readers. However, our categorization and some realized implications are built on the negative delimitation of authenticity (in the form of the inauthentic modes), especially. Since, in our opinion, we can understand much more about what is not authentic than about what is actually authentic.

2 A RESEARCH GOAL AND METHODOLOGY

RISK OF FALLING INTO THE INAUTHENTIC MODES IN TOURISM

2.1 Categorization of the Motives Concerning Authenticity in Tourism

We argue a simple overview of three attributes dealing with authenticity of motivation factors. The next two tables are based on the categorizations provided by Horner & Swarbrooke and by González Fernández et al. The described attributes are: the inauthentic modes, risks, and possibilities how to support authenticity within the followed motives. The tables bring just a frame (in fact, keywords) for the ideas which will be more developed in the discussion part of the paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>The inauthentic modes</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Possible support of the authentic modes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>physical</td>
<td>body (dualistic perception)</td>
<td>superficial</td>
<td>holistic approach to person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional</td>
<td>illusive, virtual</td>
<td>escapes from reality</td>
<td>psychic health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural</td>
<td>indoctrinated roots of interest</td>
<td>snobbish</td>
<td>deep and meaningful education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal</td>
<td>egocistic, selfish,</td>
<td>profit-seeking</td>
<td>development of social relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal</td>
<td>building career at any cost,</td>
<td>performance-related</td>
<td>process-oriented motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>purpose-built</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>inauthentic in substance</td>
<td>fashionable, fleeting</td>
<td>to be aware of…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 2 Modes. Motivation factors according to González Fernández et al.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>The inauthentic modes</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Possible support of the authentic modes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>home-loving</td>
<td>indoctrinated, illusive, formal</td>
<td>strong nationalism</td>
<td>based on love for people and family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idealistic</td>
<td>illusive, virtual</td>
<td>escapes from reality</td>
<td>psychic health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomous</td>
<td>vulgar concept of authenticity</td>
<td>against anything?</td>
<td>intrinsic motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hedonistic</td>
<td>emphasizing pleasure</td>
<td>addiction</td>
<td>intrinsic motives (eudaimonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>formal, inherited</td>
<td>adopted without thinking</td>
<td>values of civilization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.2 Categorization of the Selected Typologies and Differences Concerning Authenticity of Tourism

Next, we use a very similar way how to introduce the typologies of tourist according to Cohen and differences between a tourist and a pilgrim according to Jirásek. The interconnecting links among all the tables will be provided in discussion and conclusion parts of the paper.

Tab. 3 Modes. Typology of tourists according to Cohen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>The inauthentic modes</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Possible support of the authentic modes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recreational</td>
<td>too relaxing, no deeper sense, pulled by others</td>
<td>passive relax (in mind)</td>
<td>refreshing, searching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversional</td>
<td>illusive, virtual</td>
<td>escapes from reality</td>
<td>none (???)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential</td>
<td>recording (“photo-tourism”, “postponed experience”)</td>
<td>illusive (“made”) experience</td>
<td>to be “here and now”, to feel genius loci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimental</td>
<td>to prefer answer to question</td>
<td>performance-related</td>
<td>questioning (“the journey”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existential</td>
<td>just on “the road”, without direction</td>
<td>to try anything, no limits?</td>
<td>spiritual approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. 4 Modes.** Differences between a tourist and a pilgrim according to Jirásek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>The inauthentic modes</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Possible support of the authentic modes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aim of the journey</td>
<td>just to see the place</td>
<td>not to experience but to refer about</td>
<td>to experience a stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attunement</td>
<td>to record the story</td>
<td>capacity exhausted by recording</td>
<td>to follow the message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mode of experience</td>
<td>searching for pleasure (hedonistic)</td>
<td>just fun</td>
<td>searching for escapes from everydayness (sacral, ecstasy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relation to question</td>
<td>just to answer the question &quot;how is the place like?&quot;</td>
<td>descriptive</td>
<td>searching for the sense in questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus</td>
<td>many different details</td>
<td>shattered experience, no composition</td>
<td>focus on the wholeness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own construction based on Jirásek (2011).

**DISCUSSION**

As it was written, all the characteristics contained in the tables are provided in a very short and simple way (because of our intention to provide a good orientation in the tables). Majority of them should be explained more in detail. This can be realized here within discussion.

Tab. 1 presents 6 motivation factors. We argue that the physical motivation for tourism can be realized in the authentic modes of being just if we don’t keep the dualistic concept of a person (a sharp border between body and mind). If we are too focused on the body and on the physical attributes of the body, then we easily fall into the inauthentic modes of being in a form of mimesis (a kind of imitation) or falling into The They. The emotional factors are important for our authenticity because they keep us in the mode of human (opposite to cyborgs). Emotions can also lead to the inauthentic modes of being in a form of escapes into the worlds of fantasy, memories or to the virtual worlds.

The cultural motives are also very important for keeping the civilization message. The danger consists here in the falling into mimesis and indoctrinated patterns of behavior which present a typical example how we can lose authenticity. There is a direct relation to the status motives where mimesis presents the highest level of danger. Here we can see an important role of education which should lead learners not just to factographic knowledge but more to deeper looking for sense of our acting.

The personal factor presents such specific (and sometimes intimate) reasons for traveling, that it is not easy to evaluate the modes in common. On one hand, they can be strongly socially determined towards some authentic forms of being (like altruism, empathy, sympathy, love etc.), on the other hand personal interests can be related to egoistic behavior, so those motive for travelling could lead to searching a kind of self-profit (Heidegger warns from this danger).

The last motivation factor includes personal development. There are some dangers for authenticity hidden in it. One of the most typical examples is if somebody wants to learn languages (mostly English), in order he/she could earn more money. There is a strong relation to status motivation here again. It should be said that we do not express the idea that this interconnection (status-personal-personal development) presents wrong (or even evil) motivation. That is the question of ethics which is not opened at this place. We just argue that these interpretations of motivation are inauthentic.

Concerning the factors according to Gonzáles Fernández et al. we will pay attention on the risks which represent the most more visible parts of the inauthentic modes. There are 5 motivation factors included here. The home-loving factor can contain a lot of authenticity, the risk consists in too strong preferences of family, close friends, or home country expressed in a form of nationalism, paternalism and (in extreme cases) in xenophobia.
The idealistic factor is connected with “commitment to a better world and to fight against injustice” (González Fernández et al., 2006, 157). The risks consist in the confrontation of the illusion and reality which could conclude in rapid turn towards the pragmatic approach to traveling.

The autonomous factor itself can lead to authentic modes of being. There is a risk that we can replace the authenticity in the phenomenological point of view with the authenticity in its vulgar meaning (which was presented in the previous chapters). There are many advertisements which use this (or similar) concept. For example, the imperative like this: “Be authentic! Buy our shoes! Only in them you can be yourself…”.

The hedonistic factor is quite interesting because it keeps us out of the material interests. On the other hand, searching just for pleasure and fun can remind the story about the choice of Hercules who was standing between two nymphs – Virtue and Pleasure. The easy path of Pleasure is the path to the inauthentic modes of being (so, that is why Hercules selected Virtue).

The conservative factor is very important because it presents continuity of civilization development. There is a strong risk in this case that the motivation instead of intrinsic can become indoctrinated coming from mimesis and inertia forces. We can see a lot of tourist roaming around, visiting galleries and museums because the others (parents, friends, schoolmates etc.) do the same.

Now we can examine (in short) Cohen’s types of tourist from our point of view. The recreational mode of a tourist contains refreshing and recovering of a person which can present a positive healthy effect. In the case of too much relaxing activities we can meet the same problem as in the case of hedonistic approach. Losing a deeper sense of our acting mostly lead to boredom and emptiness. The same problem can be found in the case of the diversionary mode. However, it is much stronger, because in this mode be just want to “kill the time” and there is no recovering activity as in the previous case.

The experiential mode can include the risk of the inflation of experiences. There are some controversial moments here. In the past we described the negative aspects of “photo-tourism” and “the postponed effect of experience” (Hurych, 2017b, 121). In short, these terms describe the situation when we are focused just on recording our stay (taking photos everywhere and anywhere) and the real experience comes not at the moment of our stay somewhere but during watching photos. This presents a case of very inauthentic behavior.

The experimental mode can be presented e. g. by a scientific expedition. Here we can say that if there is not a good balance between the goal-oriented and process-oriented motivation, we can be concentrated on the goals to much, and authenticity of the processes vanishes. The risks of the existential modes are rooted in falling into the present moment without goals (to be “on the road” like Jack Kerouac, “carpe diem” or some modes in Zen Buddhism). These modes are strongly connected with the phenomenon of “flow” (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). There is not possible to describe here this phenomenon in detail, but we can say that “flow” is one of the modes which can be considered as very authentic. However, feeling present moments can be related to gathering a lot of concrete details and the whole can stay hidden (we missa “pilot’s perspective”).

The explanation of Jirásek’s modes of a tourist and a pilgrim (defining differences between them) can lead us to conclusion that, in general and in this model construct, the modes of a pilgrim are more authentic while the modes of a tourist are more inauthentic. It is also a kind of the “educational message” provided by Jirásek. The basis of the differences is clearly described in Tab. 4. We would like to emphasize here that this message does not say that tourists are inauthentic while pilgrims are authentic. That would be a wrong interpretation (and extremely simplified). The aim of this categorization is to stress that traveling can be more authentic if we take more from the model mode of pilgrim than from the model mode of a tourist.
CONCLUSIONS

The methodological instruments were argued here in a form of categorization of motivation for traveling and categorization of types of tourist to get engaged in tourism. Thus, the authentic and inauthentic modes of being could be examined via the specific aspects of motivation, or via the specific typologies of tourists.

We used 4 influential and often cited models and tried to apply them in the topic of authenticity. Within discussion we tried to stress some risks for the authentic perception of traveling within the examined examples of categorization. Authenticity is presented as a concept which cannot deny its ontological sources. We distinguished between the vulgar concept of authenticity and between its philosophical concept. That is the reason why our two examples used as typological models were built on Cohen’s and Jirásek’s concepts coming from the phenomenological approach.

This interconnection of motivation factors and philosophically-determined typologies enables us to determine some risks for the authentic perception to traveling. Undoubtedly, those examples present just a part of this complex and difficult problem. However, we argue that this approach to authenticity of tourism has got a strong potentiality for some future studies.
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