

Covid-Holidays and Sustainability

*Exploring Holiday Travel Experiences of
Norwegians During the Covid-19 Pandemic*

Georgina Winkler



Master's Thesis in

Development, Environment and Cultural Change

Centre for Development and Environment

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

May 2021

© Georgina Winkler

2021

Covid-Holidays and Sustainability: Exploring Holiday Travel Experiences of
Norwegians During the Covid-19 Pandemic

Georgina Winkler

<https://www.duo.uio.no/>

Print: Representeren, University of Oslo

Abstract

The tourism industry contributes significantly to climate change, mainly through greenhouse gas emissions from transportation. In order to reduce emissions, we need to travel shorter distances, less frequently and by flying less. By restricting global mobility, the covid-19 pandemic has induced all these changes and had an unprecedented impact on the tourism industry. This thesis discusses the implications of the covid-19 pandemic for making tourism more sustainable in the long term. It does so through exploring the holiday experiences of Norwegian travellers during the summer of the covid-19 pandemic in 2020.

Through in-depth interviews, the thesis investigates the aspects of travel motivations, transportation modes and the place of holiday travel in an alternative 'good life'. The holiday experiences of the interview participants during the pandemic are analysed from the perspective of environmental sustainability. Social practice theory and modernity theory make up the main theoretical background of the analysis.

The study finds that participants, to whom travelling abroad had been a yearly habit before the pandemic, tried out a summer holiday with only domestic travel and no flying, and they had positive experiences. The data suggests that the covid-19 crisis can provide an opportunity for making holiday travel more sustainable in all discussed areas. At the same time, the findings also indicate that participants are likely to return to their carbon-intensive holiday practices as soon as it becomes possible. To avoid this, interventions in all elements of holiday practices are necessary as well as a societal redefinition of 'the good life' and the role of holiday travel in it.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all those people who made this project possible.

Thank you to all of my informants for taking the time to participate in the interviews and for sharing your insights with me. I am also thankful to those who helped me get in touch with them.

Thank you to my supervisor, Karen Lykke Syse, for giving me so much helpful feedback and guidance. Most of all, thank you for your encouragement that kept me going when things got difficult.

I would also like to thank the Include research centre. I am deeply grateful for the scholarship and support that I have received in connection with this project.

Last but not least, thank you to all the researchers and fellow students who have given me feedback on my text. I truly appreciate your comments and support as well as getting the chance to read your inspiring texts.

Georgina Winkler

Oslo, May 2021

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background and rationale.....	1
1.2. Research questions, aims, objectives	2
1.3. Thesis structure.....	3
2. Methodology.....	5
2.1. Qualitative research.....	5
2.1.1. My role as a researcher.....	5
2.1.2. Resource or topic	7
2.1.3. Semi-structured interviews.....	8
2.2. Data collection process	8
2.2.1. Interview guide	8
2.2.2. Recruiting informants	9
2.2.3. The interviewing process	11
2.2.4. Ethical considerations	12
2.3. Data analysis	12
2.4. Limitations.....	13
3. Literature review.....	16
3.1. Tourism: definition and history.....	16
3.2. Sustainable tourism	17
3.2.1. Overview of the field.....	17
3.2.2. Climate change.....	19
3.2.3. Behavioural change.....	20
3.2.4. Slow travel.....	21
3.3. Covid-19 and tourism.....	23
3.4. Norwegian holidays	24
3.4.1. Cabins.....	24
3.4.2. Syden.....	25
4. Theoretical concepts.....	27
4.1. Theories of social practice	27
4.1.1. Defining practices	27
4.2. Theories of modernity	28
4.3. Theories of mobility	29
4.4. Theories of the good life	30
4.5. Connecting it all	32
5. Travel motivations and destinations.....	35

5.1. Longing for the extraordinary.....	36
5.1.1. Weather	36
5.1.2. Cultural elements, identity and anti-tourism	38
5.1.3. Getting away.....	42
5.2. Covid-holidays in Norway	47
5.2.1. Cabin trips.....	47
5.2.2. Discovering Norway	49
5.2.3. The good holiday	53
5.3. Visiting family and friends	57
5.4. Chapter conclusion	60
6. Transportation modes	63
6.1. The impact of covid-19 on choosing transportation mode	63
6.2. The car: more freedom, more opportunities	65
6.2.1. Access	65
6.2.2. Flexibility.....	68
6.2.3. Privacy.....	71
6.3. The plane: the motor of tourism	72
6.3.1. Access and time	73
6.3.2. Flying addiction?.....	76
6.4. The train, the bus and the holiday experience.....	77
6.4.1. The joys of travelling slowly.....	77
6.4.2. Controversies.....	79
6.5. Chapter conclusion	82
7. Futures.....	84
7.1. Post-covid holiday travelling.....	84
7.2. Social denial	85
7.3. Covid-19 and climate change: comparing the social response	87
7.4. The freedom of mobility and the tragedy of the commons	91
7.5. An alternative good life	96
7.6. Chapter conclusion	103
8. Conclusion.....	105
References	110
Appendix 1: Interview guide.....	119
Appendix 2: Consent form.....	121

1. Introduction

1.1. Background and rationale

The outbreak of the covid-19 virus in the first half of 2020 created massive changes in people's lives around the world. Activities many of us had taken for granted, like shopping, meeting up with friends or travelling on holiday, suddenly became restricted and subordinated to infection control. While the pandemic has led to its own crises on many levels, it also started in the midst of the ongoing climate crisis, and it soon became clear that the decrease in transportation combined with a cutback on economic activity led to reduced CO₂ emissions, the most important driver of human-induced climate change (McGrath, 2020).

Seeing the quick response governments gave to the pandemic, the rapid adapting of people to the unprecedented measures, and the following environmental implications, I could not help but wonder why the covid-19 crisis and the climate crisis are approached so very differently by both governments and individuals. Even more importantly, I started wondering about what the pandemic can teach us about our current failure to achieve environmental sustainability and what is needed to develop a better response. Can this pandemic be a wake-up call and a turning point where we finally move away from business-as-usual and start real action to mitigate climate change?

With this question in mind, in this thesis, I set out to explore the topic of tourism and, in particular, holiday travel. As it will be discussed in the following chapters, the tourism industry has strong connections to both the covid-19 pandemic and climate change. Tourism has contributed to the spreading of the virus through the worldwide mobility it generates, and it has also been severely affected by the pandemic through the travel restrictions introduced by governments around the world. Similarly, tourism contributes significantly to climate change through greenhouse gas emissions from transportation, and climate change has in turn a significant impact on tourism, potentially threatening its existence (Gössling & Hall, 2006). In other words, what ultimately connects these three phenomena is the central role of mobility. Both the covid-19 pandemic and climate change are partly results of extreme mobility, of which tourism is a part of, and a meaningful response to these challenges must involve reducing this mobility. Contemporary tourism is based on high mobility, but, as noted above, it is also making its own conditions worse by contributing to pandemics and

climate change. Thus, a transformation of the tourism industry is desirable both from the perspective of contemporary global challenges and for the future of the industry.

While this latter aspect is also important, the main interest of this thesis is to discuss possibilities to create more sustainable forms of tourism from a climate change perspective. The basis of the analysis will be interviews conducted with Norwegians, who, as a result of the pandemic, visited only domestic destinations during their summer holiday in 2020. I had several reasons for choosing Norway as my study site. My academic background is in Scandinavian Studies, I speak the language and have spent the past three years in Norway. I hope that my starting point as a foreigner with some experience and a great deal of interest in the country and its people can provide some valuable aspects for the research project.

Besides my interest, Norway can offer important insights when researching tourist experiences since few other European nations participate in tourism as eagerly as Norwegians: over 90% of the population in Norway aged 15 and over travelled on at least one holiday trip in 2019 (Eurostat, 2021). When one third of these were in addition abroad trips before the pandemic (Henriksen & Kvile, 2019), this suggests that the contrast between the summer holidays of 2020 and previous holidays has been quite large for many Norwegians. This is relevant from a climate change perspective because domestic holidays in many cases involve shorter travel distances and less flying than abroad holidays, which leads to less greenhouse gas emission, as discussed in detail in chapter 3. Therefore, the changes connected to the covid-19 measures are in some ways similar to the changes we need to mitigate climate change. How did individuals experience this shift? How did they create meaningful holiday experiences in this unusual setting? And, most importantly, what is needed to hold on to some of these changes and make low-carbon holidays the norm? These are some of the questions this thesis intends to explore.

1.2. Research questions, aims, objectives

On the basis of the above considerations, I have formulated the following research questions:

1. How did Norwegian travellers experience taking domestic holidays as a result of the covid-19 restrictions in the summer of 2020?

2. How did this experience shape their perceptions on holiday travel in connection with sustainability and ‘the good life’?

In other words, the aim of this thesis is to describe the impacts of the covid-19 pandemic on the way people living in Norway think about holiday travel and what this means for transitioning to more sustainable lifestyles. As objectives to answer the research questions and achieve this aim, I have conducted and analysed in-depth interviews with individuals living in Norway who undertook domestic holidays during the summer of 2020, but not international holidays.

In the first research question, I use the word ‘travellers’ to include all holiday travelling, also where participants might not characterise themselves as tourists. Even though the term ‘tourism’, as discussed in chapter 3, is often used in a very broad sense, and I also adopt this approach in the analysis, ‘being a tourist’ involves common associations that might not fit well with, for example, visiting family members or travelling to the cabin of a friend (see Backer, 2012). ‘Travellers’, in this sense, simply refers to those who travel away from their usual residence in the context of summer holidays.

When it comes to the second question, the terms ‘sustainability’ and ‘the good life’ will be conceptualised in the following chapters. In short, I am focusing on the climate change aspect of environmental sustainability, which means that reducing greenhouse gas emission is at the centre. By ‘the good life’, I refer to the socially constructed ideas of the kind of life it is desirable to pursue (McKenzie, 2016). Holiday travel is thus explored in relation to both of these aspects.

Even though I am exploring the experiences of individuals, the focus of this thesis is not on these individuals themselves, but on uncovering structural reasons behind individual experiences. It is important to note that it is not in any way my intention to criticise the choices and opinions of the interview participants. If I, at times, appear to be critical, it only serves the purpose of pointing out inherent contradictions and issues in the system of holiday travel.

1.3. Thesis structure

Following the introduction, I will present the chosen methods to answer my research questions. Afterwards, in chapter 3, I review the relevant academic discussion on tourism, sustainability and covid-19. Then, I introduce some theoretical concepts that I

draw on in the analysis, including social practices, modernity, mobilities and the good life. The analysis of the interviews are presented in chapters 5-7. Firstly, travel motivations are explored both generally and in the context of the pandemic. Afterwards, experiences and perceptions around different transportation modes are discussed. Finally, participants' reflections on future holiday travel are presented along with a discussion on the potential place of holiday travel in lives that are both 'good' and 'sustainable'. In chapter 8, I briefly summarise the findings of the thesis and draw conclusions.

2. Methodology

2.1. Qualitative research

As I am exploring individuals' unique experiences about the summer holidays in the time of the covid-19 pandemic, I decided that qualitative methods would suit the research best. Qualitative research goes deep and focuses on the unique understandings of individuals (Travers, 2013, p. 225), and this is exactly what I would like to achieve in connection with this research. While large-scale quantitative analyses are also very helpful when trying to understand the changing practices and preferences in society as a result of the pandemic, I am more interested in exploring individual experiences in this text. While this does not create generalisable data like quantitative methods usually do, it enables me to dig a little deeper and uncover meanings that would not be possible with quantitative methods.

Qualitative research has a variety of different methods (Travers, 2013, p. 225), but for my purposes, qualitative interviews seemed to be the most suitable. Unlike quantitative methods, the goal for qualitative interviewing is not to collect neutral, generalisable data (Byrne, 2018, p. 219), but to generate complex data in order to explore individuals' knowledge, views and experiences (Byrne, 2018, p. 220). I focus on exploring the complex and subjective depths of how leisure travelling relates to 'the good life' for individuals at a certain point of time and space, and qualitative interviewing can be a great research tool to achieve this as it can help me get access to people's values, feelings and opinions. The flexibility of this research method makes it possible to form the interviewing process along the way and adapt it to the person being interviewed (Byrne, 2018, p. 224). The informant gets a chance to explain their thoughts in their own words in as much detail as they wish, to give context to their answers and even to include additional topics that the researcher did not consider previously. If the researcher manages to use these opportunities wisely, he or she can get access to a type of data that would not have been possible with other methods.

Although the depth and complexity of the generated data make qualitative interviewing an attractive choice, a researcher who chooses this method must reflect over certain questions.

2.1.1. My role as a researcher

Firstly, one has to consider the question of reflexivity (Byrne, 2018, p. 224), which revolves around understanding the role of the researcher in the interviewing process.

The researcher does not only have an impact on which questions are asked and how they are asked, but also has a role in the generating of data, as it is based on an interaction between the interviewer and the informant. The similarities and differences between the two people can have a significant impact on the data collection. Prejudices, biases and assumptions can affect both the interviewer and the interviewee. From the researcher's side, they can have a conscious or unconscious impact on the content of the questions and follow-up questions and how the questions are formulated. From the informant's side, the researcher's real or assumed personal characteristics and background can affect how much and what kind of information they share about their experiences, what they choose to withhold and how they formulate their answers.

It is therefore desirable to reflect over how my personal characteristics and role as a master's student researcher might affect the interviews I conduct. In many research projects, aspects like age, gender, class, ethnicity or religion might be very important to consider (Byrne, 2018, p. 224). These and other similar features are likely to have some impact on every interviewer – informant interaction at least on an unconscious level. However, given the fact that my project does not involve sensitive topics directly connected to any of the above-mentioned aspects and the data generated is highly unlikely to put the informants in uncomfortable or dangerous situations, the differences or similarities between me and my informants will probably not have significant impacts on the interviewing process. Still, it is important to try to look at myself from my informants' point of view and understand how they might perceive me.

First of all, we are located in Norway and my informants are Norwegians of both genders and various age groups. Given the high level of gender equality and low level of hierarchical structure in the country, the fact that I am a young female researcher is unlikely to have any serious impact on the interactions between me and my informants. This assumption is not simply based on stereotypes, but my own experience living in Norway and interacting with Norwegians in various contexts.

The most obvious difference between me and my informants is our nationality. As I do not find it relevant or important for the topic, I do not state my nationality during the interview unless they ask or it becomes relevant during the conversation. I also conduct the interviews in Norwegian, which might increase the feeling of similarity between me and my informants. On the other hand, my accent makes it obvious that I am a

foreigner, and this might affect how comfortable they feel talking to me and what kind of information they share. However, it is not very likely that my informants will give this aspect much consideration because of several reasons. Firstly, my appearance does not reveal my nationality, secondly, I speak Norwegian on a high level, and thirdly, the Norwegian society includes people of many different nationalities, ethnicities and cultures. In addition, I am a student at the University of Oslo, which might also increase the feeling of similarity.

It is very possible that my own assumptions and biases have a bigger influence on the interviews than that of my informants'. As someone who has a background in Scandinavian Studies and has lived in Norway for a few of years, I am familiar with many aspects of the Norwegian way of life. On the other hand, it is not always easy to distinguish between knowledge rooted in reality and assumptions that are based on single experiences, stereotypes and false conclusions. Therefore, when I investigate what 'the good life' means in Norway, it is very important to be conscious of my biases and assumptions connected to the people I interview and the answers I get. My goal is to be open-minded and curious and as little judgmental as possible. While qualitative interviewing makes it possible for the interviewees to share their subjective opinions, I, as a researcher, aim to have an objective starting point and understand the individual realities of my informants.

However, I am aware of the fact that it is not possible to achieve full objectivity as a researcher. In addition, as the interview is an interaction between the researcher and the informant, my background and unique point of view might help the informants reflect on their experiences in a new way that might lead to a more original research. In order to make this happen, I, as a researcher, have to be as conscious as possible of my own beliefs, values, prejudices and assumptions and decide what to do with them in the interview process.

2.1.2. Resource or topic

According to Byrne (2018, p. 221-223), qualitative researchers have to answer the question of the epistemological status of their material. One can either take a realist position and focus on *what* the informants say or an idealist approach and focus on *how* they say it. The former approach views interviews as resources, while the latter views them as topics. When I consider my topic, neither the realist nor the idealist position seems to fit in a pure version, but rather a mixture of the two.

It can be relevant to give some attention to the “how” question in my analysis, meaning for example the kind of words the informants use and the subjects they struggle to talk about, but this will consist a smaller part of my analysis. My topic is namely unlikely to involve sensitive issues that my informants find hard to talk about, and it is also unlikely that they will use any advanced rhetorical strategies in their replies.

Because I am more interested in *what* the informants say and mostly view the interviews as resources, I am taking more of a realist approach. However, I am not necessarily looking at the interviews as resources that contain “real ‘facts’ about the social world” (Byrne, 2018, p. 222). In that sense, the idealist approach of considering my material to be “one possible version of the social world” (Byrne, 2018, p. 222) seems to be more fruitful. This is because my informants recall certain events and feelings from the past in addition to constituting present reflections, and they do this in an interview setting. There are many circumstances that influence what they choose to emphasise and what they might forget to mention in the moment of the interview. I prefer therefore to view the interview material as data that says something about the social world without it being facts.

2.1.3. Semi-structured interviews

Travers (2013, p. 229) makes a distinction between in-depth and structured interviews. While structured interviews are constituted of closed questions with the purpose of gathering large-scale data that is easy to compare, in-depth interviews are meant to be flexible and open-ended with only a collection of topics that guide the interview. As my project is small and aims to explore the informants subjective understandings, an in-depth interview suits my purposes better than a structured one. However, as the project also has a clearly defined time-frame and context of the experiences which the interviewees are asked about, giving some structure to the interview guide seems appropriate. Therefore, I have decided to conduct semi-structured interviews that include a set of open-ended questions that encourages the informant to talk freely about a certain subject, and that can be expanded and shaped during the interview.

2.2. Data collection process

2.2.1. Interview guide

The most important aim I considered while creating the interview guide for my project was that the questions should generate data that would help me answer my research

questions. I created a semi-structured interview guide with open-ending questions focusing on the following topics connected to the informants' summer holidays:

- Changes in practices as a result of the covid-19 pandemic
- The holiday experience
 - Mode of transportation
 - A holiday in Norway
 - People
- Reflections about future holidays
- Holiday sustainability

Although I made an effort to create an interview guide that would be applicable for the majority of my informants, I was aware of the fact that not every question would be equally relevant for everyone. The open-ended questions serve the purpose of giving room for the informants to explore the topic in-depth and talk about what they themselves believe to be relevant. At the end of the interview, they also get the chance to add any additional thoughts that come to their mind.

2.2.2. Recruiting informants

The aim of the research project is to explore different experiences and reflections connected to travelling to Norwegian holiday destinations in the time of covid-19 travel restrictions. Therefore, anyone who travelled inside of Norway during the summer of 2020 could be a potential participant.

Although the number of informants tend to be significantly lower in qualitative research than in quantitative, there are huge variations from project to project and there is no easy way to tell how many in-depth interviews are best to conduct (Travers, 2013, p. 232). For my project, I had to consider that the interviews needed to be conducted shortly after the summer to minimise memory loss. In addition, the available resources were limited since I had to conduct and analyse the interviews myself. In total, 13 interviews were conducted.

For finding informants, non-probability sampling was found satisfactory since there was no possibility or need to access a random sample. Even though the number of potential informants were very high, recruiting participants was challenging, not least because health considerations connected to the pandemic made recruiting in public spaces impractical. The informants were therefore found with a mixture of convenience

sampling and snowball sampling (Tranter, 2013, p. 110-111). Possible informants were contacted through friends and acquaintances, and those who participated in the interview were asked to give access to additional people who could be suitable informants.

Below follows a table over the interview participants with information about gender and age group:

Pseudonym	Gender	Age
Olivia	F	50-59
Ella	F	19-29
Oliver	M	19-29
Maia	F	19-29
Jakob	M	50-59
Emma	F	19-29
Emilie	F	19-29
Emil	M	19-29
Leah	F	40-49
Nora	F	19-29
Sofie	F	30-39
Ingrid	F	19-29
Noah	M	30-39

As mentioned above, the recruitment process was based on my own network (although I did not know any of the participants in advance except for one whom I had a loose acquaintance connection to). As a result of the fact that my network in Norway is mostly limited to student environments, over half of my informants also turned out to be young adult students, and all informants are under the age of 60. Therefore, the overrepresentation of young university students needs to be kept in mind when interpreting the findings. In addition, nearly all of my informants live in urban areas, and everyone either has higher education, or was, at the time of the interview, in the process of attaining it. While students generally reported having lower financial means than the rest of the informants, all informants had been on numerous abroad holidays before. Thus, the findings of this thesis generally depict the views of a specific segment

of Norwegian society: educated urban dweller young adults and adults. As I did not aim for representativeness within the Norwegian society or within a certain part of it, the composition of the informants is deemed satisfactory. Notwithstanding the limitations this composition entails, the main goal of recruiting informants who travelled in Norway during the summer of 2020 (and could therefore contribute with valuable insights to answer the research questions) was achieved. I also received additional information about the participants' place of living, occupation and household, which I decided not to include here because this information did not prove to have significant relevance for the data collected and it would have somewhat reduced the participants' anonymity.

2.2.3. The interviewing process

The interviews were conducted during September and October 2020. Each informant could decide themselves which time and platform would be suitable for them. Because of health risks due to the covid-19 crisis, a digital platform was offered to everyone in addition to meeting personally. Even though a personal meeting could have been possible with the majority of informants based on distances, most informants preferred a digital format.

The digital format is likely to have had a significant impact on the interviews. Although the video chat function made it possible to see each other and communicate more or less the same way as if we had met in person, the screen made it somewhat more difficult to create a positive atmosphere and establish a relationship between myself and the participant. My impression was that, compared with in-person interviews, the participants used less body language and answered the questions quicker and more concisely. It was harder to create a real conversation and make the informants give a detailed explanation of their thoughts and experiences. Silences, even short ones, often became uncomfortable, and it was hard to make the informants look at the interviewing session as a time for reflections rather than another online task one has to rush through. As a result, the digital interviews tended to be shorter than the in-person ones.

Each interview started with the participant giving informed consent and the researcher answering any questions about the project the participant might have. This was followed by the interview itself, which was guided by the questions in the interview guide. At the end, the interviewee was given a chance to add further comments and ask further questions about the research project.

All interviews were sound recorded with either the recorder of a mobile phone or the recorder of the digital platform. The length of the interviews varied between 30 minutes and 71 minutes, depending on the amount of information the participants wanted to share. After the interview sessions, all recordings were transcribed.

2.2.4. Ethical considerations

Keeping in mind the necessary ethical considerations was a priority throughout the research project. The project description along with the interview guide and the steps taken to ensure an ethical research were approved by the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD).

Prior to the interview, every participant received a document with a project description and information about how their personal data would be recorded, stored and used in the project. They were familiarised with their rights connected to participating the research project and asked to give informed consent. In the cases where the interview was conducted in person, the informed consent was given in a written form. In the cases where the interview was conducted digitally, the consent was given verbally and was recorded. The participants had permanent access to the information sheet and were informed that they could make contact with the researcher at any point in the future with inquiries about the use of their personal data in the research project.

In order to create anonymity, the participants got assigned a number, which served as a labelling of their audio files. The association between the number and their real names were stored in a separate document. Shortly after the data collection, each participant got assigned a pseudonym, which also appear in the above table over informants.

Whenever information connected to a participant is mentioned in the thesis, these are the names that are used.

2.3. Data analysis

In analysing the interviews, I utilised the method of thematic coding (Rivas, 2018; Willis, 2013), which helped me interpret my data. Rivas (2018, p. 431) suggests that coding has two main approaches, inductive and deductive. As I developed my themes through data analysis instead of working with pre-determined themes, my approach can be considered inductive. Following the method of inductive coding, I began with reading through the transcripts line by line identifying “in vivo codes” (Rivas, 2018, p. 435), that is, phrases taken straight from the data with the informants’ own words. This

is a way to ensure that one does not start interpreting the data too soon (Rivas, 2018, p. 436). Afterwards, I grouped the codes into relevant categories and developed themes from them. According to Willis, a theme is “a central idea that emerges from the data” (2013, p. 324). Moving from category to theme means interpreting the data rather than simply describing it (Willis, 2013, p. 327).

Throughout the analysis, I aimed to provide an interpretation of the findings by connecting different participants’ insights to theories, studies and each other. However, I did not base the structure of the analysis entirely on themes. Based on the existing literature (chapter 3), I identified ‘destinations’ and ‘transportation modes’ to be essential focus points for my discussion, and the analysis of chapter 5 and 6 is built around these topics. Although interpretation was central, descriptions were also important to include to explore and understand different aspects. For example, in chapter 5, I first described the informants’ use of cars during the covid-19 pandemic and then presented an interpretation through the aspects of ‘access’, ‘flexibility’ and ‘privacy’.

2.4. Limitations

Even though efforts were made in the research design and throughout the research process to reduce the shortcomings, the chosen methods and the data collection process both have some clear limitations.

As the project is based on qualitative interviewing, the drawbacks of this method are present in the project. The smallness of the sample and the flexibility of the interviews did not make it possible to obtain comparable and generalisable data that could be used to say something about trends in the population or make policy recommendations. The goal was, however, not to obtain such data, but to contribute to the academic discussion by exploring individuals’ experiences connected to a certain topic in depth.

As already explored in the ‘Recruiting informants’ section, an important limitation comes from the method used to recruit informants. Both convenience sampling and snowball sampling result in a highly unrepresentative sample. This effect is even further increased by the fact that the informants were recruited through my own network. As someone who has only lived in the country for a couple of years, my network is limited in both number and scope. This, in addition to the restraints imposed

by the pandemic, explains the somewhat uncommon composition of informants. The implications of this limitation have already been addressed.

As I have mentioned earlier, my personal characteristics and views and my role as a researcher have definitely affected the research design and the research process. The questions asked and the way they are formulated reflect my view on the topic and on the Norwegian society. While none of my informants are closely connected to me, they are all connected to my circle. The answers they gave to the interview questions might have been affected by, consciously or unconsciously, the way they perceived me as a person and my role as a researcher. This means that while I made efforts to make the research as objective as possible, my values and biases might be present in every part of the project.

The use of two languages in the research process must also be mentioned as a limitation. The Norwegian language was chosen as the language of the interviews. Using the English language could have also been an appropriate option since I am not a native speaker of Norwegian and many Norwegians speak excellent English. A big advantage of English would have been the fact that the interviews could have been conducted in the same language as the language of the thesis, thereby avoiding translation issues. However, since the whole research project is based on interviews, I found it especially important to get as much out of them as possible. From this perspective, the Norwegian language has a clear advantage: my skill levels of English and Norwegian do not differ significantly, but my informants get the chance to use their mother-tongue. Based on my experience in language learning and teaching, even when we speak a foreign language on advanced level, we will to some degree always be limited to say what we can the way we can, especially in oral conversations. It is usually our mother-tongue that can come closest to expressing the wide range of thoughts and feelings that constitute our inner world. The Norwegian language was chosen in order to make it easier and more comfortable for the informants to share their thoughts and hopefully generate more detailed and authentic data.

With that said, I am also aware of the serious limitations that this choice imposes on the project. The analysis, which is written in English, is based on Norwegian interviews, and the citations are translated to English. It is very important to be aware of the fact that there is no perfect translation that is able to convey the complete meaning of a text

in a foreign language. And since both of these languages are foreign languages to me, I was extra careful with the translations and consulted with native speakers when I was in doubt.

Although it was a priority to behold as much meaning as possible the way the informants conveyed it, some meaning is bound to be lost not only in the translation process, but also in the transcribing and analysing process as a consequence of the loss of body language and tone and the possible misinterpretations.

3. Literature review

3.1. Tourism: definition and history

According to the definition of the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO), tourism refers to “the activity of visitors”, where a visitor is “a traveller 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” (UNWTO, n.d.a). This definition also includes for example people travelling for education or to visit family members. The broadness of the term and the wide accessibility of tourism in today’s Western societies means that it can no longer be viewed as something exotic (Elliott & Urry 2010), but more as a commonplace part of contemporary lifestyles.

In this thesis, I am only investigating a small part of what the UNWTO considers tourism. Although a very important field, exploring business travel in connection with the covid-19 pandemic exceeds the scope of this thesis. As the context of the conducted interviews was the summer holiday of 2020, the main area of investigation is leisure travel, and, to some extent, visiting family and friends.

As Enzensberger notes, “[t]ravel is one of the most ancient and common aspects of human life; it can be traced back to mythical times” (1996, p. 122). However, for a long time, travel was a necessity, a means to an end with biological or economic motivations (Enzensberger, 1996). Although leisure travel already existed in Greek and Roman times (Butler, 2009, p. 347), tourism as large-scale travel for its own sake has its roots in romanticism’s longing for faraway places (Enzensberger, 1996) and the expansion of capitalism from the nineteenth century (Goodwin, 2010). This is also connected to “the democratisation of travel”, meaning that travel became available to a larger part of the population in Europe (Urry & Larsen, 2011, p. 2). While the appearance of the railway was crucial in this process, the real explosion of tourism came with widespread car ownership and the unprecedented growth of aviation in the second half of the twentieth century (Lickorish & Jenkins 1997; Urry & Larsen, 2011). Yearly international tourist arrivals grew from 0.5 billion to 1.4 billion between 1995 and 2018 (The World Bank, n.d.), and although the covid-19 crisis might influence the future of the industry negatively, the numbers are expected to reach 1.8 billion arrivals by 2030 (UNWTO, n.d.b). In addition to this comes domestic tourism, where the numbers are over eight times bigger (UNWTO, n.d.b). With such extreme numbers, the tourism industry

affects not only those who have jobs in this sector and those who travel, but also the entire society through its economic contribution.

3.2. Sustainable tourism

3.2.1. Overview of the field

Bibliometric studies are created to assess the advancement of research fields (Koseoglu et al., 2016), and therefore, they can provide information about which research topics are most prevalent in the field of our interest. Koseoglu et al.'s review of bibliometric studies in prominent tourism and hospitality journals presents the following sub-disciplines: “business and management”, “economy”, “health”, “sociology”, “alternative tourism”, and “other” (2016, pp. 187-188). Based on this collection of studies, it is clear that a majority of research interest is connected to “business and management” with the field of “marketing” containing an especially large number of topics that have been taken up in bibliometric studies. The field of sustainable tourism seems to receive significantly less attention and appears as a sub-category within “sociology” and under the category of “other”.

Although the links between tourism on the one hand and the environment and societies on the other had been researched earlier as well, the term ‘sustainable tourism’ has only been used since the 1990s (Buckley, 2012; Butler, 1999). According to Butler (1999), the emergence of the field can be connected to the famous ‘Our Common Future’ report by the UN World Commission on Environment and Development, which contained the following definition of sustainable development: “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (1978, p. 41). ‘Development’ is not explained in this definition, and it can be interpreted in a way that for anything to be sustainable, including tourism, it must not impede that future generations are able to meet their needs. As Buckley puts it, “[t]he fundamental concern of sustainability is that aggregate human impacts threaten the survival of humans and the ecosystem services on which they depend” (2012, p. 529).

While sustainability is a complex issue with several environmental and non-environmental aspects (see Buckley, 2012), in this text, I am mostly focusing on the aspect of climate change. Driven by CO₂ and other greenhouse gas emissions, climate change is “one of the most important symptoms of ‘unsustainability’” (Cohen et al., 1998, p. 342). The tourism industry is contributing to these emissions primarily through transportation. According to research conducted by the UNWTO and the International

Transport Forum (2019), transport-related CO₂ emissions from tourism made up 1,597 million tonnes in 2016 and is estimated to reach 1,998 million tonnes in 2030. This is respectively a 5% and a 5,3% contribution to all human CO₂ emissions. While it is debated exactly how much carbon-dioxide we are allowed to emit in order to avoid the most severe consequences of climate change, in a report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2018) it is estimated that we need to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050 at latest for a 50 % chance of limiting warming to 1.5 °C. This means that there is a need for a rapid reduction of emissions in all industries, including the tourism sector. As we know that climate change already has an impact on basic needs such as water (Raju & Kumar, 2018) and food (Wheeler & von Braun, 2013), and this impact is expected to grow in the future, tourism cannot be called sustainable unless it reduces its carbon emissions significantly.

It must be noted that a large body of research on tourism and climate change focuses on the impact of climate change on tourism (e.g. Amelung & Moreno, 2012; Ayles et al., 2014; Lise & Tol, 2002; Yazdanpanah et al., 2016). Clearly, tourism and climate change are interlinked on many levels, and they are both affecting each other (Gössling & Hall, 2006). Therefore, tourism has to be made environmentally sustainable and adapt to climate change for its own survival. The main focus and starting point of this thesis, however, is on the impact of tourism on climate change through carbon emissions. The biggest concern here is reducing as much emissions as possible for the sake of mitigating climate change.

How is the tourism industry planning to achieve sustainability goals then? The UNWTO makes it clear in their report (World Tourism Organization & International Transport Forum, 2019) that the current and expected future tourism demand stands in contrast to the urgent need for decarbonisation. Their official website (<https://www.unwto.org/>, retrieved 10.01.2021) shows a great deal of belief in and commitment to making tourism sustainable: sustainable development is shown as the first item on their list of focus areas, and a recent quote by UN Secretary-General António Guterres appears on the front page stating that “Tourism can be a force for good in our world, playing a part in protecting our planet and its biodiversity, and celebrating what makes us human [...]”. However, it is hard to find any detailed measures the organisation suggests in order to achieve the ideal of sustainable tourism. It has been pointed out in the literature as well that the tourism industry lacks a plan

with concrete steps to reach the necessary emission reduction targets (Scott, 2011; Scott et al., 2010). As Scott notes, “[i]n the absence of a credible plan, there is no other way to interpret these tourism industry targets than as rhetoric” (2011, p. 28).

Connected to this is the area of ecotourism, which is often linked to sustainable tourism even though its sustainability is questionable. According to Buckley, ecotourism is distinct from sustainable tourism in the sense that the former is a small-scale subsector of the tourism industry, while the latter aims to reform the whole of the industry to make it sustainable (2009, p. 665). At the same time, ecotourism does have relevance for sustainable tourism. According to Weaver & Lawton, three conditions have to be present for tourism to qualify as ecotourism: nature-based attractions, a focus on learning and education of tourists, and following principles of “ecological, socio-cultural and economic sustainability” (2007, p. 1170). Focusing on the impact of ecotourism on the environment, Buckley’s (2009) review suggests that evaluating the net positive and negative effects of ecotourism is largely infeasible. While it has the important potential of supporting conservation efforts, it also contributes significantly to environmental degradation through, among other things, long-haul tourism travel, which is not systematically addressed in ecotourism (Buckley, 2009). As explained above, transportation in tourism is a highly significant contributor to climate change, and by neglecting this aspect, it is questionable how ecotourism aspires to follow the principle of ecological sustainability.

Which other areas does the field of sustainable tourism involve? To illustrate the complexity of the field, Lane (2018) lists twenty of the most timely and important areas of sustainable tourism. These areas are complex in themselves and also interlinked with each other, which suggests the need for a holistic approach to advance sustainability in tourism (Lane, 2018). Out of his twenty points, I am focusing on the following three, which will be discussed more in detail below: “climate change issues”, “behavioural change” and “slow tourism implementation” (Lane, 2018, p. 162). Agreeing with Lane, I maintain that these topics are interconnected with each other, with other aspects of the tourism industry, and with larger political and economic systems.

3.2.2. Climate change

Although other factors like accommodation can also be significant, tourism’s main contribution to greenhouse gas emissions, as pointed out above, is through transportation. The projected growth of these emissions in a business-as-usual scenario

is mainly attributed to two factors. Firstly, there are more and more people who engage in tourism, and, secondly, there is a growth in both the frequency of trips and the distance of destinations, which are increasingly reached by energy-intensive transportation, notably aviation (Peeters & Dubois, 2010, p. 452; Scott et al., 2010, p. 396).

As it has been pointed out by several authors (Lee et al., 2009; Peeters & Dubois, 2010; Scott et al., 2010), technological improvement in aviation, like fleet renewal and biofuels, is insufficient to achieve the necessary emission reductions. In order for tourism to move into a sustainable direction, the industry's dependence on aviation needs to be reduced by using alternative transportation modes and travelling to less far-away destinations (Peeters & Dubois, 2010; Scott et al., 2010). The urgent need for such a change acts as the starting point of this thesis, which intends to contribute to the knowledge on realising a sustainability transformation in tourism.

3.2.3. Behavioural change

In the light of the scientific evidence on the urgency of reducing emissions from transportation, it is astonishing to see the lack of response. Researchers often explain this phenomenon through identifying barriers to behaviour change. Many point to the 'attitude-behaviour' gap to explore the puzzle of environmentally concerned individuals taking part in environmentally damaging activities like holiday travelling (Bamdad, 2019; Becken, 2007; Juvan & Dolnicar, 2014; Prillwitz & Barr, 2011). These studies often find that engaging in such activities while having knowledge on their harmful impacts creates cognitive dissonance (Harmon-Jones, 2019), which is then attempted to be reduced through different strategies. Juvan & Dolnicar (2014) provide the most exhaustive list over how individuals justify flying on holiday. One key strategy they find is "denial", which can appear both as denial of own responsibility for the environmental consequences and a denial of the consequences themselves as well as a denial of being able to act differently. Juvan & Dolnicar (2014) also identify that individuals justify their actions through comparing them to other individuals or industries that they perceive to be having a bigger impact than themselves. In addition, they refer to benefits their travelling can bring about and present their holidays as a special occasion when they can allow themselves to not prioritise environmental concerns. This is in line with the study of Becken (2007), who found that holiday travel has a distinct value for individuals and the majority would not consider altering them

towards less flying and shorter distances. Similarly, Barr et al. (2010) found that pro-environmental behaviour in holiday travel was uncommon even among those who engaged in such behaviour in everyday life. Reaching similar conclusions, Hares et al. (2010) suggests that, in the case of holiday travelling, the gap is not necessarily between attitude and behaviour, but between awareness and behaviour. This is because the participants of their study showed a strong reluctance to take environmental aspects into consideration when planning their vacations.

Even more alarmingly, in the studies of Juvan & Dolnicar (2014) and Bamdad (2019), individuals working in environment-related professions and environmental activists showed unwillingness to adopt pro-environmental behaviour in the context of holidays. The fact that individuals who possess both the necessary knowledge and the desire to create more sustainability fail to make changes in their vacation-related behaviour illustrates the scope of the challenge we are facing in trying to influence behaviour. In fact, Barr et al. draw the conclusion that “many consumers are not yet ready to reduce the amount they fly to reduce their impact on climate change” (2010, p. 480). As consumers today still do not appear to be “ready”, and time is running out, it is reasonable to ask whether a large-scale transformation to sustainability requires an altogether stronger approach than simply encouraging pro-environmental behaviour.

Indeed, Shove (2010, 2014) argues that focusing on individual behaviour is a mistaken approach. She suggests focusing on ‘practices’ as units for change and intervening on the socio-material level instead of on the level of the individual. I draw on this approach in this thesis and will explore it in detail in chapter 4. At the same time, barriers to behaviour change, similar to the above-mentioned studies will also appear in the analysis. This is because, firstly, the thesis aims to explore the holiday experiences of participants, in which the above-mentioned cognitive dissonance plays a significant role. Secondly, these barriers can provide information about why change is not happening in the current context and what kind of structural shifts are necessary for a real transformation. In addition, the impact of the covid-19 pandemic on environmental attitudes and behaviour can further add to this discussion.

3.2.4. Slow travel

The concept of ‘slow travel’ responds to several challenges posed by climate change in the tourism industry. This is because an important element of it is choosing other transportation modes than planes as well as travelling less and less far away (Dickinson

et al., 2011; Dickinson et al., 2010). Although journeys by car are acceptable in some 'slow travel' conceptualisations (see Dickinson et al., 2010, p. 483), a climate perspective requires moving away from this transportation mode as well because of the significant carbon emissions it entails (Borken-Kleefeld et al., 2013). This leaves us with cycling and travelling by rail or bus as the most relevant 'slow travel' transportation modes (Dickinson et al., 2011).

While structural factors act as barriers to behaviour change towards 'slow travel' (Dickinson et al., 2010), there are individuals who embrace slow travel for a variety of reasons. Dickinson et al. (2011) show in their research that some individuals have very strong environmental values, which lead to conscious decisions of avoiding flying and driving, while others are simply fond of particular 'slow travel' transportation modes without necessarily having any environmental concerns. This illustrates how 'slow travel' is more than a response to climate change. It is one branch of 'slow living', which advocates for slower lifestyles generally, most famously in the area of food practices (Parkins, 2004), and, in our case, travelling. As Georgica notes, "[s]low travel is not so much a particular mode of transportation as it is a mind-set" (2015, p. 1597). Importantly, it does not only emphasise slowness on the way to the destination, but also *at* the destination (Lumsdon & McGrath, 2011). A slow-traveller spends time on exploring destinations on a deeper level, participates in activities that help develop a connection to the local culture while having an overall less stressful and rushed holiday (Georgica, 2015; Lumsdon & McGrath, 2011).

Even though reducing carbon emissions might not necessarily be the most important aspect in 'slow travel', it is this aspect that makes it relevant for this thesis, similarly to Dickinson et al.'s (2010) study. On the one hand, the fact that mitigating climate change can appear as a side-benefit instead of a core motivation in 'slow travel' might question its potential to make the tourism sector more sustainable. For example, in the case of one of Dickinson et al.'s (2011, p. 288) informants, 'slow travel' trips only acted as an addition instead of a substitution of long-distance travel. At the same time, we have seen in the previous section that focusing on carbon emissions without questioning the prevalent tourism narrative largely leads to inaction. Making tourism sustainable requires the rethinking of the kind of tourism we want to pursue as a society, and from this perspective, the holistic approach of 'slow travel' appears to be highly relevant.

The potential for slow travel to challenge mainstream tourism is as yet unclear. As we have seen in the previous section, there is a significant opposition to the necessary behaviour change, and abroad holidays are strongly connected to aviation (Hares et al., 2010). At the same time, Buckley (2011) finds that increased air travel prices would likely lead to a growth in the popularity of ‘slow travel’ as a significant amount of people claim to consider it a viable alternative. This thesis can contribute to the research area of ‘slow travel’ by exploring participants’ experiences of an aviation-free holiday due to the covid-19 pandemic. Insights from these experiences can help us better understand the possibilities of transitioning to a low-carbon tourism.

3.3. Covid-19 and tourism

The above-mentioned statistics from UNWTO clearly show that societies and the industry were not able to induce the necessary change in tourism during the past decade. However, the covid-19 pandemic in the spring of 2020 brought about an unprecedented change that transformed many areas of our lives, including mobility. As noted in the introduction, the strong measures that have been introduced to slow down the spreading of the virus led to significant emission reduction as well (McGrath, 2020).

As restricting international mobility has been one of the most powerful means to limit the spread of the virus worldwide, the tourism industry has been especially negatively affected (Gössling et al., 2020b). The pandemic highlighted how the aviation industry is not only problematic from a climate change point of view, but also as a key accelerator of worldwide pandemics (Gössling, 2020). In addition, as Gössling (2020) points out, the aviation industry is highly vulnerable to disruptions such as economic crises or the current pandemic, which is repeatedly addressed through state aid. Going back to business-as-usual is highly undesirable if we want “aviation to become more resilient financially and more sustainable climatically” (Gössling, 2020, p. 3). Such a transformation of the aviation industry has key importance for the emergence of a different tourism industry as well, since, as argued earlier, the two sectors are deeply embedded in each other.

Despite the fact that there is a clear need for a change, the future effect of the pandemic on these industries remains highly uncertain. It can easily be followed by a rebound, but there is also a possibility for a transformation in the tourism industry towards a more local tourism (Ioannides & Gyimóthy, 2020). Maybe previously popular destinations

will lose their attractiveness, and previously undervisited places will be favoured (Haywood, 2020). Perhaps the crisis will make us question underlying values in the tourism sector, and speed up the establishment of a new normal by putting previously radical thoughts into mainstream consciousness (Ateljevic, 2020). One thing is for certain: the challenges of tourism are still there, and we have to decide how we want to deal with them in the new post-covid normal (Brouder, 2020). Importantly, the covid-19 crisis offers the tourism industry a unique opportunity to finally start going in a different direction (Lew et al., 2020).

Given the fact that the covid-19 restrictions have largely, even if not fully, coincided with the type of change we need from a climate change perspective (namely fewer trips, shorter distances and transportation modes alternative to flying), research on tourism during the pandemic can offer valuable insights for sustainability as well. This is what this thesis sets out to contribute to.

3.4. Norwegian holidays

As the study site is in Norway, it is important to take up two aspects that are especially relevant in the context of Norwegian holiday travel: cabin trips and the concept of ‘Syden’. These will be discussed in the following sections.

3.4.1. Cabins

Cabins have a long-standing tradition in Norway, along with the other Nordic countries (Müller, 2007; Vittersø, 2007). It has been argued that cabins are traditionally connected to the Norwegian ideal of leading “a simple life outdoors” (Vittersø, 2007, p. 269). Because of historical reasons, ‘the real Norway’ was constituted through the country’s natural landscapes, which is apparent in the cabin’s prevalence in Norwegian literature (Rees, 2011). Research has also shown that, through connecting it to ideas around history, culture and family, Norwegian cabin owners often feel a strong attachment to the place their cabins are located in (Kaltenborn, 1997).

Partly as a result of this long tradition, spending leisure time in cabins is very popular in Norway. Today, there are over 440 000 cabins with several thousand new ones being built each year (Statistisk sentralbyrå, 2021). According to Berker et al. (2011, p. 9), almost half of all Norwegian households have access to a cabin. Cabins are often located by the sea, in the mountains or in the forest (Vittersø, 2007).

Even though cabins are traditionally connected to simplicity and being close to nature, it has been recognised that in the last few decades, Norwegians have increasingly desired bigger cabins with a higher comfort level (Johnsen, 2011; Støa et al., 2011; Vittersø, 2007). According to Støa et al. (2011), this paradox can be explained by the fact that people today have diverse ideas of what ‘simple’ means. Their findings show that people often attach simplicity with calmness and a lack of stress, which might be achieved by having high-tech household equipment in the cabin that saves time on housework, or by having a cabin that is easily accessible by car.

This high comfort has consequences for the sustainability aspect of cabins (Aall, 2011; Xue et al., 2020). As Xue et al. (2020) argue, a new, ‘modern’ type of cabin lifestyle can be identified in Norway, which has significantly bigger carbon emissions than the older, less energy-intensive type. This is because both the material and the energy consumption has increased through larger cabins with more furniture and energy-demanding appliances. In addition, constructing cabins and the relevant infrastructure alters the natural landscape, which cabin-owners desire to experience (Jørgensen, 2011).

In the context of this thesis, cabin trips in Norway can be part of a transition to more sustainable holiday travel as they can involve shorter distances than abroad trips. At the same time, as distances can be quite large in Norway too, a lot depends on the location, the transportation mode used to access the cabin, and, as pointed out above, the energy-use of the cabin itself.

3.4.2. Syden

The place of ‘Syden’ (“the South”) could perhaps be explained as sunny holiday destinations with high temperatures and a beach, or, as Døving formulates it, “tourist resorts for sun and fun” (2011, p. 18). As Døving further explains, these destinations have in common an infrastructure centred around tourism, and they are not clearly defined in a geographic sense (2011, p. 20). Still, we can say that ‘Syden’ trips are typically characterised by charter flights to the Mediterranean area (Jacobsen et al., 2015). For example, Spain was the destination for over 1 120 000 holiday trips from Norway in 2018 (Henriksen & Kvile, 2019), which shows the popularity of ‘Syden’-trips.

Jacobsen et al.'s (2015) study shows that primary motivations of Norwegian tourists for travelling to this area concern the warm climate, the beach and relaxing as well as eating out and being together with family and friends, although aspects like natural landscape or buildings were also important for a minority. Other, similar studies came with largely corresponding findings, highlighting the diversity of tourist motivations and the danger of treating tourists as a homogenous group (Jacobsen, 2002; Jacobsen & Dann, 2009). However, despite the diversity, it is relevant to talk about the phenomenon of 'Syden-trips' considering the existence and use of the term itself in the Norwegian language, the above-mentioned popularity of these destinations, and that it appears as a yearly habit or 'ritual' that is closely connected to the practice of 'holidaying' itself (Døving, 2011).

While other, related research areas like long-term visitors in 'Syden' could also be mentioned (Selstad et al., 2020), this thesis focuses on holiday-makers. It aims to add to the ongoing academic discussion by exploring tourist motivations in the light of a covid-19-induced immobility where potential tourists were forced to stay in their own country.

4. Theoretical concepts

4.1. Theories of social practice

As a theoretical background, I am going to use elements from social practice theory. In Bourdieu's (1977) theory of practice, one of the central terms for understanding practices is habitus. Bourdieu defines habitus as "systems of durable, transposable dispositions" (1977, p. 72), where the term 'disposition' incorporates, among others, concepts like "structure", "way of being" and "tendency" (1977, p. 214). Habitus, the system of these structures, produces practices that appear to be organised and goal-oriented, but do not have a conscious organiser (1977, p. 72). Central to Bourdieu is the role of history in the formation of habitus and, in turn, social practices. He argues that present practices are determined by past structures and have an inclination to recreate the structures which produced them. This way, habitus is both the creation and the creator of history: "In short, the habitus, the product of history, produces individual and collective practices, and hence history, in accordance with the schemes engendered by history" (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 82). As many of our current practices are environmentally unsustainable and reproduced over and over again, achieving a more sustainable society would require shifting dispositions, which in turn would have an impact on habitus and social practices (Sahakian & Wilhite, 2014). Formulated in another way, understanding how social change occurs requires exploring how practices "emerge, persist and disappear" (Shove, 2014, p. 418).

4.1.1. Defining practices

Bourdieu's theory acted as a fundament for the emergence of practice theories, and succeeding scholars formulated various definitions for 'practice'. Schatzki defines practices as "organized spatial-temporal manifolds of human activity" (2010, p. 129). Reckwitz calls a practice a "routinized type of behaviour" (2002, p. 249), which – by suggesting that a practice has to be a habit – might be unnecessarily restrictive (Shove et al., 2012, p. 5). According to a more inclusive approach, practices can be composed of both regular and irregular or infrequent components (Schatzki, 2002, p. 74).

A key part of defining practices is outlining their elements. According to Reckwitz, a practice "consists of several elements, interconnected to one other: forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, 'things' and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge" (2002, p. 249). Important here is that a practice is a unit that consists of all the

interlinked elements together. Similarly, Shove makes practice to her “unit of enquiry” (2010, p. 1279) and identifies “meanings, competences and materials” as the elements of practices (Shove, 2014, p. 419). A third approach by Sahakian & Wilhite locates the fundament of social practices in the “distributed agency” between the three main aspects of “the body”, “the material world” and “the social world” (2014, p. 28). According to them, the key to changing habits lies in shifting as many of these three pillars as possible.

The above approaches are touching similar areas and overlap with each other. In this thesis, the terms coined by Sahakian & Wilhite (2014) will be employed. Following their approach, holiday travel practices are, in part, viewed as habits. While they are not always and not completely routinised practices, the data is going to demonstrate that both certain destinations and transportation modes are chosen automatically, without much reflection. In addition, these elements prove to be difficult to change, which is an important characteristic of habits (Sahakian & Wilhite, 2014, p. 28). Thus, Sahakian & Wilhite’s approach provides a useful basis for the analysis.

4.2. Theories of modernity

In order to understand the context in which contemporary social practices exist, I am using the modernity theory of Giddens (1990, 1991). As defined by Giddens, modernity “refers to modes of social life or organisation which emerged in Europe from about the seventeenth century onwards and which subsequently became more or less worldwide in their influence” (1990, p. 1).

One of the main characteristics of modernity that separates it from earlier social orders is the profound and far-reaching transformations (Giddens, 1990). These are not only unprecedented in speed (Giddens, 1990, p. 6), but also invade both global and personal levels of existence (Giddens, 1990, p. 4). According to Giddens, globalisation – meaning that occurrences taking place spatially far away from each other are interconnected – is an essential part of modernity (1990, p. 63). One consequence of globalisation is that certain aspects of modernity concern nearly everyone on the planet, and these involve both the systems we live our everyday life in and global risks (Giddens, 1990, p. 84).

The concept of risk as a fundamental element of contemporary life is explored more in detail by Beck (1992). As he defines it, risks are “a systematic way of dealing with

hazards and insecurities induced and introduced by modernization itself” (Beck, 1992, p. 21). The essence behind the concept of a risk society is not that life was more dangerous in previous historical periods (Giddens, 1991, pp. 114-124), but that the present dangers are of a different scope: today’s ecological and technological risks stretch over time and space affecting potentially everyone and everything on the globe including those not yet born (Beck, 1992, p. 22).

Modernity is thus perceived to have a duality: on the one hand, the life-opportunities this era offers to people are much bigger than in earlier periods, but on the other hand, the risks are also immensely greater (Giddens, 1990, p. 7). Moreover, risks like a nuclear war or an ecological collapse can never be eliminated, but will stay with us forever (Giddens, 1990, p. 133).

As a result of this, one important element of the risk society is the central role of the future (Beck, 1992, pp. 33-34; Giddens, 1991, p. 117). As tomorrow’s potential dangers gain a significance over today’s actions, it is no longer the past that governs the present (Beck, 1992, p. 34). Instead, it is the future that is “continually drawn into the present” (Giddens, 1991, p. 3).

Both Giddens and Beck look at reflexivity as a key feature as the power of past traditions decreases. On the one hand, “reflexively applied knowledge” (Giddens, 1990, p. 39) becomes the fundament of social structures. On the other hand, Beck argues that modernity results in individualization, where the self also becomes reflexive (1992, p. 135). This means that individuals are left to create their own biographies themselves, and in this process, they are reliant on making themselves the focus of their decisions. In order to reflexively constitute their self-identity, individuals have to face a myriad of different lifestyle choices (Giddens, 1991, p. 5; Beck 1992, p. 88). At the same time, they are not free in the sense that they depend on social structures like work, education and consumption (Beck, 1992, p. 90).

4.3. Theories of mobility

According to Elliott & Urry (2010), mobility has become a key actor in reshaping both our social practices and our identities in the West. Referring to ideas similar to Beck’s (1992) dependence-oriented individualization, Elliott & Urry see mobility as an organising element in society: “The social structure of human agency and individual

life is substantially and increasingly constituted through systems of movement” (2010, p. 13).

What do we mean by mobility? As mobility is a diverse concept with many layers, it can be useful to look at the different mobilities that exist. Urry distinguishes between five different, albeit linked mobilities, including physical movement of people, physical movement of things, imaginative travel, virtual travel and communicative travel (2012, pp. 568-569). Another way of approaching mobilities is through the many social practices that require moving in complex ways. These include, but are not restricted to business travel, migration, military mobility and, what this thesis focuses on, tourist travel (Urry, 2012, p. 569). These mobilities have a profound impact on the lives of individuals, which become fundamentally interconnected with global networks (Urry, 2012, pp. 569-570). Contemporary mobilities thus bear one of the key characteristics of modernity, namely the interrelationship between global and personal (Giddens, 1991).

According to Lyons (2012), the core substance in societies has always been ‘access’, which he defines as “the ability for us as human beings to reach people, goods, services and opportunities” (2012, p. 159). While movement has always been connected to gaining access, mobility in modernity has an increased scope: we travel faster and further in order to access what we want or need (Lyons, 2012). This supports and is supported by the ever-developing transport system (Lyons, 2012).

When talking about the contemporary transport system, it is inescapable to emphasise the importance of aviation. Practically all areas of social life are connected to aeromobilities, which have enabled access to greater distances and contributed to creating and sustaining global networks (Urry, 2009). Similarly, cars have introduced new mobilities and fundamentally transformed social life (Urry, 2004). They provide flexibility, but at the same time, they also force flexibility upon people by becoming an imperative tool for participating in much of social life (Urry, 2004). In the context of holiday travelling, both aeromobility and automobility are critical aspects, which will be explored in the analysis.

4.4. Theories of the good life

‘The good life’, ‘happiness’ and ‘well-being’ are contested terms that often appear together in literature, sometimes without clear distinctions between them. Happiness and well-being are often used synonymously referring to “a generic for all worth”

(Veenhoven, 2013, p. 12). When approaching the concept of happiness, it is common to distinguish between hedonia and eudaimonia, terms that have their roots in ancient philosophy. Hedonia is often connected to pleasure, while eudaimonia (attributed mainly to Aristotle) emphasises virtue and excellence as the key to happiness (Huta, 2013, p. 2). In contemporary scholarship, Huta acknowledges that these concepts are sometimes interpreted as “ways of behaving” and other times as “forms of well-being” (2013, p. 10). Using the former interpretation, they can be perceived as paths to the good life and/or happiness (Niemi & Ryan, 2013).

Another approach to the term ‘happiness’ distinguishes between a more fleeting “episodic happiness” (Raibley, 2012, p. 1108) and a deeper happiness in the sense of a “personal attribute” (Raibley, 2012, p. 1110). This might explain why happiness sometimes appears to be almost a synonym of the good life and other times not. Raibley also argues that happiness and well-being are fundamentally distinct from each other. In his view, well-being is defined as “agential flourishing” (2012, p. 1106), which is attributed to “a person who successfully realizes their values and is stably disposed to do so” (2012, p. 1106). In this approach, happiness – because of its value in itself and its positive impact on realising other values – is one (but not the only) important element of acquiring well-being.

It is worth mentioning that the debate has also linguistic and cultural dimensions as different languages and cultures attribute different meanings and words to ideas of happiness (Wierzbicka, 2004). This might lead to even more inconsistencies in happiness theory and research.

The above examples attempted to shed light on some of the disagreements and confusions present in the literature. While acknowledging that ‘the good life’, ‘happiness’ and ‘well-being’ are closely connected and can have overlapping elements, this thesis does not treat them as synonyms. Without delving more into philosophical and psychological approaches of the above concepts, I am adopting the sociological approach of McKenzie (2016) for the purpose of the thesis. This can be a suitable addition to the sociological contexts of modernity and practice theory.

McKenzie defines ‘the good life’ as “a life that is fulfilling, enjoyable and experienced as authentic” (2016, p. 253). This is only a broad description as McKenzie does not aim to find the ultimate definition. He acknowledges the diversity of approaches to the

concept, and instead of arguing for one side, he claims that the numerous elements the different definitions focus on might all be necessary to realise a good life. In his view, it is ultimately both individuals and society who interdependently define what ‘the good life’ is.

In connection with the discussion about the good life, McKenzie finds it important to distinguish between ‘happiness’ on the one hand, and ‘contentment’ on the other. In his terminology, happiness is defined as “an emotion of pleasure and joy that contains physiological stimuli within the subject” (2016, p. 253), while contentment is “a social experience that consists of a satisfying relationship with society” (2016, p. 253).

According to this theory, happiness is associated with quick positive feelings in the individual that do not necessarily require a social context. Contentment, on the other hand, refers to lasting fulfillment coming from reflection that is tied to the social context and its norms, values and interactions. Importantly, it can also involve negative states of mind like pain and sacrifice.

McKenzie argues that although these two aspects are equally important in the quest for the good life, happiness is often favoured over contentment in Western modernity. The “individualisation of happiness” (2016, p. 262) results in an emphasis on self-help, quick fixes and finding happiness within, while contentment with its roots in the social gets less attention.

With the help of this theory, I aim to discover more of what ‘the good life’ means in modernity and pay special attention to the role of the social aspect.

4.5. Connecting it all

The uniting aspect of the above theories is that they all deal with ‘the social’ at their core. The practices in practice theory are inherently social. Individuals are important as “carriers” of practices (Reckwitz, 2002, p. 250), but the focus is on how practices come about, exist and change in society (Shove, 2014). The social context in which contemporary practices exist is captured in the theories of modernity (Giddens, 1990, 1991).

While practice theory highlights the importance of the past, modernity emphasises the role of the future in social life. As Bourdieu’s (1977) habitus is a product of history, practices are perceived to emerge from the past. Giddens, on the other hand, introduces

reflexivity as the fundament for recreating social life, claiming that “the routinization of daily life has no intrinsic connections with the past” (1990, p. 36). It is, in fact, the future that has a significant role in the formation of today through the ever-present threat of risks (Beck, 1992; Giddens, 1991).

Perhaps this paradox is just one of the many dualities of contemporary life. Modernity offers great opportunities, but there is no escape from its global risks with unimaginably tragic consequences (Giddens, 1990). The risks affect everyone, yet they are also distant from the individual (Giddens, 1991). And, as the analysis will explore, living today with social practices rooted in the past and a climate disaster threatening from the future makes individuals and societies face hugely difficult dilemmas. Modernity is not black or white, but “double-edged” (Giddens, 1990, p. 7). However, the place we are heading if we do not manage to reduce greenhouse gas emission and environmental destruction looks very dark. And what Giddens termed as “low-probability and high-consequence risks” (1990, p. 131) no longer applies for ecological collapse. It is a risk that is becoming more and more high-probability and high-consequence with every day that goes by.

In a time when, on top of all the other challenges, the covid-19 pandemic has completely transformed everyday life and social practices, societies are confronted with the question of what post-covid life should look like. Redefining what ‘the good life’ means and how we as a society want to pursue happiness is a crucial question in this moment.

However, ‘the good life’ cannot be redefined on its own. It is not a universal or an individual, but a social concept, and today’s good life is deeply anchored in modernity and its structures (McKenzie, 2016). One example of this, which this thesis explores, is the connection between mobility and ‘the good life’.

Mobility in itself is a key aspect of modernity, but it has also become an element of the contemporary idea of ‘the good life’: “A life ‘on the move’ is viewed as a fundamental indicator of achieving ‘the good life’. Indeed, we might say that multiple mobilities have become the drivers of symbolic power, bodily habituses and pleasureseeking lifestyles” (Elliott & Urry, 2010, p. 10). Living ‘the good life’ today is inseparable from being mobile, especially if we accept McKenzie’s argument on the importance of “a satisfying relationship with society” (2016, p. 253) for living a good life.

As mobility, in this sense, is explored as a social phenomenon, focusing on social practices rather than individual behaviour can be fruitful. As Elliott & Urry argue, “this assembling of mobile life is not the product of human agency. Mobile lives are rather the outcome of complex configurations of relationality, affect, desire, socialities, systems, states, regional organizations and global institutions” (2010, p. 13). When analysing mobilities, it is therefore my priority to explore them in the social context of modernity, taking into consideration the many complexities involved.

In this process, I make use of various other theoretical concepts, like Dann’s (1981) theory on travel motivation or Soper’s (2015) theory on ‘alternative hedonism’, which will be explored in the relevant chapters. These concepts help me interpret particular themes that emerged in the analysis, while the above theories act as a background for the whole thesis.

5. Travel motivations and destinations

As discussed earlier, the covid-19 pandemic has largely made the world take a break from long-distance holiday travelling. For many Norwegians, who often spend their holidays abroad, this meant a significant shift in holiday destinations. It is therefore an excellent opportunity to explore what motivates interview participants to travel and how they choose holiday destinations, which is the topic of this chapter. Identifying what motivates people to choose certain destinations and what they do when these destinations are unavailable can help us develop a deeper understanding of the challenges and potential paths towards creating a low-carbon society.

Motivation can be a confusing term with both theoretical and methodological challenges to consider (Dann, 1981). Dann defines tourist motivation in the following way: “A meaningful state of mind which adequately disposes an actor or group of actors to travel, and which is subsequently interpretable by others as a valid explanation for such a decision.” (1981, p. 205).

Dann (1981, pp. 190-191) also lists several different approaches to researching tourist motivation, of which the push and pull factor approach is most suitable for the purpose of this analysis. In this approach, elements of tourist motivation are characterised as either connected to inner needs and desires of the tourist (push factors), or to attributes of the destination (pull factors), which act as a response to and a reinforcement of the push factors. This distinction is useful in the context of covid-19 as the pandemic affected push and pull factors differently. On the one hand, the travel measures have made the pull factors of abroad destinations irrelevant as citizens were not allowed to or discouraged from travelling to most countries. At the same time, the motivation to travel does not seem to have been reduced: in the third quarter of 2020, Norwegians participated in more holiday travel than in the same period the year before (Oyier, 2020). Domestic holidays exceeded the previous year’s domestic and abroad holidays combined. This might imply that the pandemic did not have a strong effect on push factors, that is, core motivations to travel. They seem to have paired up with pull factors of domestic destinations.

Firstly, if domestic destinations are able to satisfy tourist needs and desires, this information has important implications for making tourism more sustainable. Secondly, these new pair-ups might also suggest the primacy of push factors over pull factors. It

has been argued that viewing destinations as ‘the heart of tourism’ is misleading because it implies that destinations are the core of generating tourism trips (Leiper, 2000). Rather, as Leiper suggests, “[t]he hearts of tourism [...] are in tourists or, to be precise, in persons at home who are about to become tourists” (2000, p. 366).

Therefore, instead of analysing the attributes of destinations objectively, I look at these places through the eyes of the tourists to see what motivates them to travel to certain destinations. In this sense, pull factors are not only interconnected with push factors, but they would, in fact, not exist without them.

The chapter follows with identifying relevant push and pull factors on the basis of the interviews conducted. The analysis does not intend to provide an exhaustive review of tourist motivation. The focus of this particular analysis is to draw attention to how the context of the covid-19 pandemic combined with a sustainability perspective can add to the academic discussion.

5.1. Longing for the extraordinary

During the interviews, participants reflected over the role of holiday travelling generally and what they were missing during the pandemic when abroad travel was not possible. One major theme that emerges from the interviews is a longing for something that is different from what participants experience in everyday life. Enzensberger originates the desire to escape, which makes travelling an end goal in itself, from romanticism. “Tourism is [...] nothing other than the attempt to realize the dream that Romanticism projected onto the distant and far away” (1996, p. 125). Indeed, it was clear from the interviews that this longing was not fully satisfied by the domestic holidays during the pandemic. As we will see, many of the participants’ holiday travel motivations appear to be strongly linked to distant abroad destinations.

While there is no clear line, some reflections focus more on the pull factors of the destination, while others emphasise the importance of getting away from home. This might suggest that in some cases the destination that can fulfill the needs and desires of push factors is more flexible, while in other cases the suitable pull factors can be much more specific. First, we are going to look at these specific pull factors.

5.1.1. Weather

Not surprisingly, the weather was often mentioned as a major reason to travel to other countries. This is a somewhat banal, but nonetheless very important aspect. As

introduced in chapter 3.4.2., trips to ‘Syden’ destinations have a special importance for Norwegians and travelling to these destinations can be a routinised activity for many. When participants reflected on what they could not experience in Norway, and why sunny Southern destinations are attractive, they immediately thought about good weather:

I think it’s because of the weather, I mean, people want- people want to lie on a beach, swim, sunbathe, get tanned, maybe drink alcohol, cheap one- I think it’s simply the climate. It’s too cold in Norway, it’s a luxury to get out to the sun. (Sofie)

I guess, it’s perhaps the weather again. If you want to go to the beach and sunbathe a lot, it’s not always possible in Norway. (Emilie)

And then there’s that warmth too. Yes, I feel it’s- it’s perhaps not exactly what you find in Norway except for on the hottest summer days. (Emma)

These comments all highlight the desire for experiencing a warmer climate than what is found in Norway. However, a desire for good weather can be much more than just a longing for the extraordinary. For example, it is closely connected to the aspect of the body in social practices. Comfort and the senses have been researched in connection with social practices, and much research focuses on energy consumption in the home connected to comfort and temperature (e.g. Madsen & Gram-Hanssen, 2017; Hitchings, 2011). It has also been argued that the popularity of cars is connected to sensory experiences (Sheller, 2004; Kent, 2015). In the case of the weather, it is possible that feeling bodily comfort and pleasurable sensory experiences in connection with the sun and warm temperatures is a big part of why participants wish to travel to sunny places. For example, it has been stated that comfort connected to weather has an impact on the use of beaches by tourists (Ibarra, 2011) and that the weather affects individual tourism decisions (Craig & Feng, 2018; Muñoz et al., 2021).

Ingrid’s example illustrates how weather can be an especially strong motivation factor in the context of Norway, where many consider the climate to be less than ideal. She emphasises the body’s need for sunshine and warm temperatures both physically and mentally. Ingrid expresses strong environmental concerns and guilt in connection with her trips to warmer places, but the push factor of Norwegian climate (“it’s simply a fact that Norway is dark and sad during [winter] months”) and the pull factor of sunny, hot weather abroad appears to create a strong motivation to travel. She reflected over imagined long-term covid-19 travel-restrictions in the following way:

I would surely think it was a little sad, a little upsetting. At least during the darkest times. Because, I mean, it's dark when you leave the house in the morning, and it's dark when you come home from school, it's dark all the time and freezing cold, so I think it would be hard. Tough. Us humans need, like- we do need sun, and we need something to look forward to, and- there are quite a lot of- over half of the year is dark and cold. (Ingrid)

In this remark, Ingrid connects negative emotions to Norwegian winter climate, which stands in contrast to humans' "need" for sunshine and also for the hope of breaking away from the darkness. This justification forms a powerful motivation for travel, which, in the absence of covid-19 restrictions, is resistant to factors like environmental concerns.

5.1.2. Cultural elements, identity and anti-tourism

During the interviews, certain cultural elements appeared to be strong pull factors.

'Culture' is a much debated term without a universal definition (Jahoda, 2012). For the purpose of understanding how participants might have used the term, the simple definition of the Cambridge English Dictionary is sufficient. According to this definition, culture is "the way of life, especially the general customs and beliefs, of a particular group of people at a particular time" (Cambridge, n.d.). Although most participants refer to the importance of getting to know other cultures through travelling, they do not seem to mean the whole of the culture. There appear to be certain elements that they find more important within the culture.

One often mentioned cultural element is 'foreign languages'. Participants recognise speaking, reading, listening to, and experiencing another language as something attractive in a foreign country. This aspect is most apparent in the case of Olivia, for whom the language appears as a central pull factor of Italian destinations:

Other than that, I prefer to travel to Italy. I'm trying to learn the language, so it's about getting there and getting to practice it. Very nice language, it's like music, it's so close to my heart. (Olivia)

She comes back to the language aspect several times during the interview, mentioning going to language courses in Italy, the language as a key to talking to locals, and hearing Italian as one of the main things she would miss if she was not able to travel back. The way she talks about Italy suggests that her connection to Italian culture has become a part of her identity or at least she has a significant emotional connection to it, which contributes to her recurring visits. The language seems to have both instrumental value in the sense that it makes it possible for her to talk to locals ("if you go to small

villages where they don't speak English, and they don't even attempt to speak English, then speaking the language means being able to communicate with them at least to some extent") and final value through the beauty of the language as Olivia's above quote shows.

The importance of self-identity in tourism has been recognised in the literature (Desforges, 2000; Lew, 2018; Wearing & Neil, 2000). Desforges (2000) argues that focusing on self-identity is an important means of exploring travel motivations and destination choices. He views participating in tourism as making "investments [...] in forming particular identities" (2000, p. 930), where identity is a part of "personhood", meaning "what sort of person am I" (2000, p. 927). Lew (2018) argues that self-identity both influences tourism choices and is influenced by them. This is what has likely been the case with Olivia, whose push factor of self-identity might have become strongly attached to Italy. The continuing trips might have reinforced the connection of her identity to Italy, which might have induced new trips.

Other participants also appeared to connect travelling to self-identity. Sofie connects travelling directly to her personhood: "[...] I'm a person who loves travelling to other countries. I've always liked travelling, I've always been very adventurous [...]". It seems that travelling abroad is part of who Sofie perceives herself to be. Another example of tourism's role in self-identity could be Ella's case. She claims to have come from "a very international environment" with many friends all around the world. Like Olivia, she is interested in foreign countries and their cultural elements, but her focus is slightly different. She is 'the sort of person' who lives with locals on her holiday trips:

Yes because it's often in the homes of people that you really get to know the culture. Especially if you get, like, grandma's dinner or-. I think it's a lot of fun to meet grandparents who are a bit crazy and kind of get the whole package of family discussions, and really understand the dynamics and how people are. I personally get a bit bored of looking at nice exhibitions after a while. It's fun at first, and then it becomes like-. I travel much more to, kind of, get to know the human side of culture. Not necessarily to experience so much art or buildings. (Ella)

This approach is another example of the meeting of strong push and pull factors. The desire to experience how people in different cultures live is fulfilled by visiting and living together with locals. Ella's wish to "get drawn deep into a place one could never travel to as an ordinary tourist" is a well-researched stream of contemporary tourism. Enzensberger calls the practice of observing the 'true' life of locals "lifeseeing" – as opposed to sightseeing (1996, p. 132). A person who pursues such 'lifeseeing' and

views herself as different from typical tourists has been called an ‘anti-tourist’ (Jacobsen, 2000). Week (2012) finds that anti-tourists claim to be seeking ‘authentic’ and ‘real’ experiences contrary to tourists they perceive as leisure-seekers.

Paradoxically, being an anti-tourist has become a common travel aspiration. In a study of German tourists travelling in Norway, Prebensen et al. (2003) find that nearly 90% of respondents claimed they were not typical tourists. This is in line with the findings of this thesis: Ella was not the only informant who expressed that their holiday travelling practices differed from those of others. Sofie finds it important to “do some research and go to places different from where all the others are going”. Noah says that he often travelled to ‘Syden’ as a child with his family, but since he became an adult and “can decide for [him]self”, he tends to avoid such trips where “there are tons of Norwegians and you speak Norwegian with everyone”. Still, he might travel to places perceived as ‘Syden’, but he does not participate in this kind of charter tours. According to Døving, the anti-tourist in ‘Syden’ is someone who views herself as an individual, but is viewed by locals as simply a tourist (2011, p. 26). Other scholars have also highlighted the focus on being a unique individual in this type of travel, viewing anti-tourism, as opposed to mass tourism, as a highly individualised activity (Jacobsen, 2000; Prebensen et al., 2003; Week, 2012).

Why is this relevant for our topic? Firstly, the individualised nature of anti-tourism can say something about push factors of those who participate in it in the context of modernity. Ella’s desire of getting to know the real life of locals can be perceived as a search for authenticity in the travel experience (Week, 2012). Week (2012) suggests that the longing for authenticity is connected to Western colonialism and a nostalgia for that which has been destroyed or altered. Although exploring this approach exceeds the scope of this thesis, it is clear that understanding travel motivations on a deeper, collective level seems to necessitate looking at tourism in societal, cultural and historical contexts.

Secondly, it is possible to look at whether anti-tourist behaviour is connected to destination choice, and, thereby, carbon emissions. Many of my participants agreed with Noah on the topic of ‘Syden’-trips, claiming it was something “safe and predictable” (Nora) for those who would like to “lie on the beach with a thousand other tourists and eat at the same restaurant as their neighbours from Oslo” (Sofie). From the

participants' remarks, 'Syden'-trips appear as a somewhat lower-quality holiday, which they distance themselves from: "I'm not such a big fan of typical charter holidays, I'm perhaps more of a fan of experiencing things" (Nora). As 'experiencing things' and 'being active' often appeared as core desires and the very meaning of going on holiday, and 'Syden'-trips do not seem to satisfy this desire, we could assume that the popularity of them are low among those who embrace the anti-tourist attitude. However, holiday travelling practices are more complex than this.

Firstly, it has been argued that there is no significant difference between the travel motives and actions of those who view themselves as 'nontypical' tourists and those who view themselves as 'typical' tourists (Prebensen et al., 2003). Secondly, as there is no clear line between tourist and anti-tourist, it is very possible that individuals sometimes act as the former and other times as the latter or combine elements from the two attitudes. For example, Olivia mentions that she prefers to combine taking language courses and meeting locals with lying on the beach. The individualised, anti-tourist nature of her trips lies in designing it the way it suits her best and by hiking or cycling to the beach on her own. Nevertheless, the typical 'Syden'-holiday elements of 'sun and sea' and 'hotel and swimming pool' are important parts of her trips. It has also been argued that despite the emergence of new tourist types, "sun and sand" destinations are often able to maintain their popularity (Aguiló et al., 2005).

Thirdly, despite being somewhat "second-rate" or "tacky" (Noah used the Norwegian word "harry"), 'Syden'-trips hold an undeniable importance for Norwegians (Døving, 2011). The desire for sun and hot weather appears to be an especially powerful push factor, as explored in the previous section. In addition, it appears that 'Syden'-trips can be linked to long-held positive meanings that originate from childhood experiences as in the case of Ingrid:

[...] going on a Syden-holiday has always been, like, extra exciting and fun already from the time you're small because- I don't know, it's very much hyped. [...] So to me and my family, in a way, a Syden-trip has always meant something light and warm and good to look forward to. (Ingrid)

The perceived positive role of these trips appear to be very strong in Ingrid's life, who admits that it often outrules environmental considerations as well. She was also planning to take a highly anticipated 'Syden'-holiday before the covid-19 pandemic hit.

She would have gone on an active holiday with a small group of friends, which, again, implies that the individualization of holidaying and 'Syden' as a destination do not contradict each other.

These findings suggest that even though the anti-tourist attitude is common among participants, it does not mean a decline in travelling to sunny Southern places associated with charter tours. If some of these are substituted with other destinations, they are often cities in Europe or places even farther away like 'dream destinations' in Asia and the United States as mentioned by several participants. This way, anti-tourism is important to understand contemporary travel motivations, but its impact on carbon emissions might not differ significantly from charter tours. Week (2012) argues that even though travellers with an anti-tourist attitude might distance themselves from the negative impact of mass tourism, their own impact might not be any more beneficial to host communities or the environment. Connected to this, Sofie claims to have "more sympathy" for those who travel for "exceptional food experiences" than for those who travel to the same destination "to buy cheap clothes". However, it is questionable whether one or the other can be superior in a wider context than the perspective of the individual. From a societal and environmental point of view, anti-tourism might also just be tourism.

Here, it is important to mention that anti-tourism and mass tourism has been connected to class differences (Week, 2012). We might assume that in the egalitarian society of Norway together with modernity's reflexive individualism (Beck, 1992; Giddens, 1991), class does not play a very important role. However, research shows that class does matter even in contemporary Norway (Flemmen et al., 2018; Vassenden & Jonvik, 2019). The scope of this thesis does not make it possible to analyse class aspects. However, the fact that all interview respondents either have higher education or are in the process of obtaining it is important to note in the context of anti-tourism. Week (2012, p. 198) points to education as a factor that makes it more likely that individuals distance themselves from mass tourism. It is therefore possible that a group of participants with lower education levels would have painted a very different picture of their tourism motivations.

5.1.3. Getting away

As we have seen in the previous section, some destinations appear to offer strong pull factors that reply to and strengthen the inner push factors of participants. However,

many times, the most important pull factor appeared to be ‘newness’ without much concrete detail (perhaps except for the criterium of nice weather), and this might imply that push factors and home environments play the main role in these travel motivations. Participants talked about the importance of “a new place with new impulses” (Nora), “to travel to a new place, do something new” (Emilie), and “to be able to go to different countries and see new things and new cultures” (Ingrid). The remarkable thing here is that most destinations seem to be able to fulfill these desires – unless they are in Norway. Despite the fact that they enjoyed their domestic holidays in Norway during the pandemic, participants mostly agreed that these holidays cannot substitute abroad holidays – because they do not offer enough ‘newness’. Leah pointed out that even though she perceived this vacation to be ‘a good holiday’, the lack of novelty made that she was not completely content:

I mean, I felt maybe that we experienced a bit too little. By travelling abroad, we get totally different experiences [...]. There are activities and experiences [in Norway], but they are at the same places we usually are. It’s not something new, right? It’s just not. Maybe that’s the biggest difference, that there is nothing new. (Leah)

Thus, Leah’s desire for novelty does not find its pull factor in Norwegian destinations. As she connects going on holiday with experiencing something new, and domestic destinations are not perceived as new, international holidays are inevitably superior.

The case of Sweden and Denmark are interesting because of the physical proximity as well as the cultural and historical connections with Norway. Could these places be different enough for a good holiday? Emil considers these destinations as giving a better holiday feeling than Norway because they offer some variation in certain aspects:

Because it’s going to be other places [in Norway], but it’s still the same language, the same products in the shops and the same prices. So in that sense, I think it’s kind of more holiday feeling to travel to Denmark or Sweden although the changes are not so big. (Emil)

Emil’s comment gives examples of what kind of differences make him feel ‘away from home’. However, he also implies that if the differences had been bigger, the feeling of being on holiday would be even stronger. Similarly, Emma distinguishes between Denmark and Sweden on the one hand and other holiday destinations on the other. She mentions that she gets an “abroad feeling” when she travels to ‘Syden’, which is “a different feeling” from what she experiences in Norway. That is when she gets a question about the neighbouring countries.

Georgina: And do you get the same feeling when you are in Denmark or Sweden?

Emma: It's a bit different feeling because then we travel by boat and then you get more of a boat atmosphere, there is the deck, and you go out and such. But it's more about having fun with some water sports maybe, so it's a bit different, but- it does give some holiday feeling, this one too, I must admit. Just in a different way.

The activities and feelings she connects with Denmark and Sweden are clearly different from those she attaches to sunny Southern countries. Holidays in Scandinavia are enjoyable, but they cannot substitute visiting 'Syden', where "it's warm in the evening", "there is music and a lot of people" and "promenades" (Emma). This is also how Sofie thinks: "It's not enough to just travel to Sweden. It's not so exotic". But why is it so important that a holiday destination is new, different and exotic?

As it already appeared in Emil's remark, a common approach of reflecting over 'the good holiday' is through exploring 'the holiday feeling'. This holiday feeling has novelty at its core, but the newness of the place is not enough. Getting away from home is important because it also makes it possible to get away from everyday life. Perhaps the importance of travelling somewhere exotic lies in having as few reminders as possible to our lives at home?

You should completely get away from everyday life, and-. It's one thing that when you are in Oslo during the holiday, it's of course nice, but when you have gotten away from Oslo, it's then you somehow realise that you are on holiday. (Oliver)

[...] I think about holiday as getting away a bit. So it's- it's about getting away a bit, right, and not being at home all the time, and getting kind of a break from everyday life, so it's- I think about holiday as travelling a little. (Emma)

Oliver and Emma both highlight the importance of taking a break from their usual day-to-day lives. A 'real' holiday is about being at a different place both spatially and mentally from where one usually is. In addition, the spatial distance appears to be a prerequisite for the mental break. This is what Oliver points to when he talks about why his family did not consider Norway as a holiday destination prior to covid-19: "I think it's maybe a bit about us wanting to get out of Norway. That when you are in Norway, it won't be a holiday in the same way". Thus, it seems that the very definition of holiday is connected to travelling abroad for Oliver's family.

Noah also points out the difference between domestic and abroad holidays, but he attempts to shed light on it by distinguishing between "holiday feeling" and "tourist feeling":

Noah: It's, of course, clear that it's something different to be in Norway, and maybe you don't get exactly- you do get the same holiday feeling, but you don't get exactly the same tourist feeling if you understand what I mean.

Georgina: I think so, but it would be nice if you could explain it a bit more.

Noah: [laughs] I was hoping you wouldn't ask because I'm not sure if I can explain. [laughs] I don't know, it's a bit weird, when you are abroad, you might feel something like 'okay, I am visiting someone now'. Something like that. While when you are in Norway, you might think more like 'okay, I'm home'. So it's like- it's almost this kind of feeling.

Noah's point here is that it is possible to have a vacation without going abroad, but this kind of vacation is missing the 'getting away from home' aspect, which he refers to as 'tourist feeling'. In essence, he has the same approach as Oliver, Leah and the others: it is the experience of 'not being home' that a domestic holiday cannot offer. Even though one gets away from one's usual surroundings within the country, it still feels like home – avoiding which appears to be the aim of going on vacation for many participants.

In fact, getting away from home seems to be so important that after a summer in Norway, several participants started feeling 'restless'. This word refers to a state where one is unable to remain at rest, where one needs to move about. Oliver summarised the most negative side of his summer holiday the following way: "I became very restless, so I realised that I was thinking 'ah, I've been in Norway for so long, I can't bear it anymore'". In a similar way, Emma was happy with how her holiday turned out, but was still not entirely satisfied: "Yeah, but you still miss the feeling of travelling abroad even though you might think it's pretty fun to be here, so- there's this urge to just get away. You get a bit restless, right?"

Where does this restlessness come from, and why do participants experience such an urge to take a break from their everyday lives? In his book 'The Holiday Makers', Krippendorf (1987/2010) also explored this puzzle:

A restless activity has taken hold of the once so sedentary human society. Most people in the industrialized countries have been seized by a feverish desire to move. Every opportunity is used to get away from the workday routine as often as possible. Shorter trips during the week and on weekends, longer journeys during the holidays. The fondest wish for old age is a new place to which to retire. Anything to get away from home! Away from here, at any cost! (Krippendorf, 1987/2010, Introduction, para. 2)

What he theorised, and what the findings of this study also support, is that the roots of longing to escape are found in everyday life and, ultimately, society. The social and material structures we live in not only make us want to break away, but also offer tourism as the solution (Krippendorf, 1987/2010). The time for tourism is during the holiday, the very idea of which is about taking a break from work for a little while. In turn, work is what constitutes much of our everyday lives and the basis of a functioning society. Here is where Krippendorf (1987/2010) finds the core of the longing to get away: work life gives little satisfaction to the masses, and the only way to endure it is with the help of regular holidays. Does this argumentation still have relevance in contemporary Norway? Noah's reflection seems to suggest that it does:

You always look forward to going out and travelling, right? And then it's often- at least for me, I think it's something to look forward to if you have a very tough period at work or you- after all, I often work quite a lot, so then it's of course often the holiday I can look forward to. So if you take it away permanently, the joy of being able to travel abroad and that you know you are going to experience something new in two weeks-. If you don't have that to look forward to, I think it would be- it would be mentally tough for me at least. And I don't think holidays in Norway would be able to replace it. Unless you made the best plan ever, and that- that you can do. But it's also limited how many times you can do it. (Noah)

It is clear from Noah's comment that the holiday does not only have a value in the few weeks he actually spends on vacation, but also during the whole working year in the form of anticipation. Looking forward to the holiday is what keeps him going during the challenging times at work. He feels the urge to get away to a different place and experience something very different – without this, the balance is lost. Importantly, after having tried out a full summer holiday with only domestic destinations, he finds abroad holidays to be superior and, in fact, the only option that can offer a satisfying breakaway from work. Similarly to what we have seen in many previous comments, Norway is perceived to be unable to fulfill the desire to “experience something new”.

This finding has several implications. Firstly, waiting for individuals to change their behaviour in the social setting they exist in is unlikely to lead to significant results. As it is obvious from Noah's comment, abroad vacations represent a source of joy which is difficult to find elsewhere, and which also appears as a necessity for surviving work in a healthy mental state. Secondly, reducing holiday travelling in the long-term cannot

happen through simple restrictions like the ones we are experiencing during the covid-19 pandemic. This is because such restrictions do not address the core push factors, or, in other words, the underlying causes of why people want to escape in the first place. Any attempt of changing holiday practices has to be combined with changing work practices.

As we have seen, Noah and many other participants do not find Norwegian destinations to be able to give them all that they expect from a holiday. At the same time, they experienced their holidays in Norway during covid-19 overwhelmingly positively. Now is the time to look at what Norway can offer to Norwegian tourists and what this means for making holiday travelling more sustainable.

5.2. Covid-holidays in Norway

5.2.1. Cabin trips

Where did participants spend their summer holidays in 2020? None of them left the country, but there was a large variation in domestic destinations. Some visited well-known destinations like Jotunheimen and Prekestolen, while others went on a roadtrip along the Southern coast of Norway, or travelled up to the Northern part of the country. No matter the destination, they reported to be highly satisfied with their trips, even if they sometimes expressed a lack of excitement: “[...] it was quite nice, but not like I’m going to be thinking about it the whole winter, in a way. We didn’t experience anything huge, no.” (Leah).

The collected data does not make it possible to give a detailed analysis of the different destinations participants visited. Instead, I am going to focus on cabins, which the majority of participants used as an accommodation during their holiday trips, and general insights participants gained during their holiday in Norway.

As discussed in the literature review, cabins are widely popular holiday homes in Norway and very much connected to travelling in Norway. According to Ingrid, going to a cabin was the obvious choice for this year’s holiday: “Because there is not much else, if you can’t go abroad, then- then it’s going to be cabin trips.” How did participants experience and how do they perceive cabin trips? Oliver’s example is illustrative as previous to covid-19, his family did not consider Norway as a holiday destination. However, when they went on a cabin trip during the summer, they realised that it can, in fact, be very enjoyable to have a vacation in Norway:

And so- we talked about it when we were at the cabin that we were like ‘Oh my God, we must do this more often’ and ‘we want to go there again’. I personally have been on some cabin trips with friends, but my family and my siblings for example, they haven’t participated in anything like this before, and we all realised that it was lovely. This can’t be the last time. (Oliver)

Oliver and his family has clearly changed their opinions about cabin trips, and it seems likely that this experience will induce future trips in Norway. Several other participants were very familiar with cabin trips from before. Based on their reflections, cabin trips appear to be connected to some of the same push factors as abroad journeys. Importantly, their value often lies in getting away from everyday life.

I don’t know, I guess it’s a place where you can relax and, in a way, don’t have all those things you have to do when you are at home. (Emilie)

I really like going on cabin trips because it’s often about either- during the winter, you can go skiing or downhill skiing maybe. And then it’s possible to go hiking, which I think is a lot of fun, and also to be outside in nature or just break away from city life and maybe disconnect from social media and maybe read more or play board games with the family and- yeah. Cards, cooking, you can, in a way, take life at a slower pace a bit. (Nora)

I think the idea, in a way, is that you have a place that’s a bit further away from the busy everyday life. Just like my parents and grandparents, who own cabins, they can, in a way, go to kind of a bit more sheltered place for a weekend, for example, and just live a bit more primitively in a way. Not that it’s like they don’t have electricity and such, but it’s in a way very simple, and nature is a bit- it’s kind of right outside the cabin. And that they can, in a way, go a bit further away from work and nuisance and such things for a weekend or a longer weekend and such. I think I’m maybe very- what makes it more attractive to own a cabin is the cabin life. I know myself that when I’m at the cabin, I don’t really do those things I would be doing at home like sitting in front of the fireplace and read a book and go hiking and such. This is what you typically do at the cabin. (Maia)

These citations illustrate what kind of role cabins play in participants’ lives. The emphasis appears to be on living a ‘simpler’ life close to nature with less noise, less technology and less intensity. As Berker et al. (2011) note, cabins have special connections to both ‘home’ and ‘leisure’. Cabins are often owned by the family and thereby give associations to ‘home’. As the above comments show, it is also often connected to spending quality-time with family and making time for leisure activities the busy life in the city does not give room for.

Although slowing down, playing cards and reading in front of the fireplace are very different from finding exotic cultural experiences that the participants mentioned in connection with abroad trips, a core push factor appears to be getting away from everyday life in both cases. The above comments all convey a deep desire to escape from the constraints of everyday life and experience a less fast-paced and more relaxed mode of

existence. Despite the fact that cabin trips also offer a type of escape, we have seen in the previous section that most participants perceive the ‘real’ holiday to take place at an abroad destination. Maia’s above comment also suggests that cabins are primarily perceived as leisure places for weekends rather than main holiday locations. This issue will be further explored in the next section.

As noted earlier, making holiday travel more sustainable requires not simply shorter distances and different transportation modes, but also reducing the amount of trips. Therefore, the issue of ‘wanting to escape from everyday life’, which is an important factor in both abroad and domestic trips needs to be investigated. With regard to cabin trips, it is relevant to ask why participants struggle to slow down, play board games with their families and read books at home. Similarly to Noah’s reflections on work life in the previous chapter, everyday life must be given more attention to if we want to understand and transform holiday practices. In chapter 7, I will return to this challenge.

Another aspect that is worth mentioning in connection with sustainability is that cabins increasingly require similar comfort levels as main homes (Støa et al., 2011; Vittersø, 2007). In her above remark, Maia mentions that living simply does not equal living without electricity, and in another part of the interview, Emilie also mentions that her family owns a cabin without electricity, water and toilet, which they never use as a result of its lack of comfort. Therefore, the energy-intensity of cabins needs to be taken into consideration when measuring the sustainability of cabin trips.

5.2.2. Discovering Norway

Apart from gaining some extra appreciation for cabin trips, what kind of changes can we see in participants’ perceptions around Norway as a holiday destination? Although Jakob believes that certain people will not be interested in Norwegian destinations no matter what happens, he also sees a change in the perceptions of his acquaintances:

I know a lot of people who have discovered their own- many people who have had a holiday in Norway, who haven’t done it in many years. Who have discovered their own country and seen that it’s actually very nice at home too. (Jakob)

What Jakob mentions is one of the reasons why the pandemic can offer a window for change. People had to adapt their practices to the new situation, and maybe they have found out that it has some positive outcomes. Emma confirms Jakob’s statement as this is precisely what she has experienced.

Yes, I think it was very nice. There are so many nice places that I have never even thought about, that are along our travel route at least. And it's of course- it was only a small part of Norway. There's a lot to see. (Emma)

Emma's comment suggests that experiencing a holiday in Norway has made her look at Norwegian destinations in a more positive way than before. What can a holiday in Norway actually offer? In the previous chapter, we saw that there are aspects of an abroad holiday that a Norwegian destination cannot live up to in the eyes of the participants. But is there also something that one can only experience in Norway? Participants were unanimous: no other place can compare to Norwegian nature.

I'm thinking about nature. There is nature abroad too, but it's of course a different kind of nature. (Leah)

And then it's of course nature that's special in Norway, that there are completely unique fjords and mountains. Yes. I guess it's mostly that actually, I don't think the towns are so exciting actually. (Sofie)

The national romanticism that we have. Hardangervidda and Hvasser for example, where I have been. I mean, that it's so lush. That there is so much green and contrasts of blue. I don't know, there's just something about Norwegian nature that's somehow that I haven't seen or experienced other places. There are a lot of other countries with beautiful nature, but in completely different ways. There is a reason why for example that painting by Tidemand, 'Bryllupsferd i Hardanger' or something like that [correct form in English: Bridal Procession on the Hardangerfjord] because- I mean, the background of it. (Ingrid)

These answers did not come as a surprise. Norway has a reputation of having magnificent nature, which is often the main attraction for foreign tourists who visit the country, as Helgerud (2018) explores in his book. Here, he discusses his cruise journey to see the Northern lights, where he travels together with foreign tourists, who all came to see this natural phenomenon. My Norwegian language learning book also had a picture of the Northern lights on its cover and contained information about unique mountains, fjords, the midnight sun and even national romanticism that Ingrid mentions. Putting such an emphasis on teaching students and immigrants about these phenomena suggests that nature has a special importance for Norwegian culture, which I saw confirmed when I came to Norway and also through these interviews. Ingrid's remark shows how nature has a special role in Norwegian culture and identity and that the romantic idealisation of nature is still present.

As Rees (2011) argues, Norway's natural landscapes have culturally played an exceptionally important role in the constituting the Norwegian identity. In this sense, it would be inaccurate to say that the covid-19 crisis made people discover Norwegian

nature. However, it seems that Norway as a ‘main’ holiday destination had not been popular among participants in pre-covid times.

It opens your eyes to Norway. I have travelled a lot around Norway when I was younger, but then there were several years where I mainly went abroad. When- when I think about going on holiday, I think that ‘okay, then I’m going abroad’. But it’s of course obvious that it’s a nice country, so there’s a lot to see that you haven’t- either haven’t seen before or haven’t seen for a very long time. (Noah)

I think there were a lot of people who thought about the same thing at the same time, right? Everyone knew that they were stuck in Norway, and everyone surely had a kind of inner desire for ‘one day I would like to see Norway’ or more of Norway, so I think it’s pretty natural that ‘yes, well, now I got the chance to do it’. (Sofie)

If, as Sofie says, people are actually interested in travelling in Norway, why did they not do it more often before the pandemic? Why can this covid-situation be perceived as getting a “chance” to do it when the possibility of spending the summer in Norway has always been there? The answer might lie in what Noah refers to, and what we have also seen in the previous sections, namely that a holiday per definition means going abroad for several informants. ‘Getting the chance’ to go on vacation in Norway might just be an appropriate way to express that the forces pushing and pulling people abroad were extremely strong before the pandemic. Despite the magnificent nature and the interest many Norwegians have for their home country, some of these forces had to disappear in order for many people to actually make a ‘main’ holiday in Norway a reality. As we saw in the previous chapter, push and pull factors connected to abroad destinations are reinforcing each other in a way that domestic destinations can hardly compete with. Moreover, the social norm and collective habit of travelling abroad on holiday must have added to not considering domestic destinations. Several participants referred to this aspect as Norwegians having a “culture” of travelling abroad, which needs to be changed if we want to achieve more sustainable holidays, and which, in fact, has changed as a result of the covid-19 crisis. Oliver discusses it this way:

I think we have to get rid of this kind of culture that we go to Syden, that we should, like, go- yeah, that it shouldn’t be in the culture that it’s cool to go abroad or whatever, but that we can have a culture that we’ve had this summer that it’s very-. I mean, there’s so much we can do here in Norway, and we drop the long-distance holidays. And I think if we continue this now, it will be more popular to travel in our own country and it’s going to make a difference. (Oliver)

By highlighting the importance of what is “cool” to do, Oliver points to the social aspect of holiday practices that can be connected to the concept of ‘conspicuous consumption’. Originated from Veblen (1912), conspicuous consumption refers to

acquiring consumer goods to display or improve social status. In the context of tourism (which can also be perceived as a type of consumption), it has been argued that some destinations are more conspicuous than others and thus have more value for status-seeking (Phillips & Back, 2011; Correia et al., 2016). Today, displaying social status through sharing travel experiences increasingly happens through social media (Siegel & Wang, 2019), and, according to some participants, the posts of others can influence their holiday decisions. During the pandemic, it appears that Norwegian destinations became “cool” with the help of social media. Both Sofie and Maia found holiday tips on such platforms:

And then we had some time to look at Western Norway and- inspired for sure by all the others who advertised it on Instagram and Facebook and- it was a trend this year, right? (Sofie)

Yeah, and the thing is that when you see for example on Instagram and such where people have been, then of course you feel like going there too. So there are many places [in Norway] we didn't manage to visit this year where I maybe want to go to later, and I can also do it during an autumn or summer holiday. (Maia)

Sofie and Maia point to the importance of what others in one's social circle do. Some destinations become attractive as a result of relevant people who choose to go there in a conspicuous way. This aspect is explored by Siegel & Wang (2019), who find that the influence of peers, often through social media, is a major factor for younger generations' travel behaviour. The fact that people participants compare themselves to and get inspiration from also spent the summer holiday in Norway might have contributed to participants' high satisfaction level regarding their holiday experiences. This is what Oliver's reflection suggests:

[...] it's hard to think now 'oh, I could be abroad' because almost no one is there. It was a bit dangerous, right? Which means that- it was this year you would travel in Norway, so it was kind of- it was what everyone did, so there is no miss out in a way. (Oliver)

Even though Oliver is very fond of travelling abroad, he finds comfort in the fact that he did “what everyone did” and did not “miss out” on anything when he stayed in Norway during the pandemic. It is also recognised in the literature that the ‘fear of missing out’ on experiences family and friends engage in can be a powerful force behind consumption (Good & Hyman, 2020). If the travel motivations connected to social influence are so strong, it makes sense that transforming holiday travel to mitigate climate change also has to be a social act. Oliver would have likely taken long-distance trips had it not been for the pandemic. Instead, he travelled to domestic

destinations without flying, and he was satisfied with his holiday in the context of the reduced mobility experienced by the whole society. Without seeing that most others are in the same situation as himself, his reaction would have likely been different.

5.2.3. The good holiday

Now, let us look at some other reflections by the participants. Importantly, many of them reflected over how this different summer holiday had an impact on their travel motivations and what a ‘good holiday’ actually is. Emma made the following insights:

[...] I find that I actually like this kind of holiday that I had now a little more than going to places where it's very hot and you lie on the beach the whole day, because it's not really my thing. I have found out that I would perhaps like to go on a holiday in Norway once more and maybe make it a bit more about camping. And I have found out that it's not so important for me to always *go on* holiday during these holidays. [...] There were only ten days during the whole summer when we travelled, and the rest of the time we were home, so it was- and it was fine, really, so-. It was a bit boring sometimes, but other than that, it was fine. (Emma)

Emma points out two important shifts in how she thinks about holidays. Firstly, even though a holiday at a sunny beach seems attractive, it is not certain that it is also what makes the most positive experience. This break forced by the pandemic gives an opportunity to reevaluate why we travel the way we do and whether it is actually the best way. Secondly, Emma even questions whether she had attributed too much importance to travelling on holiday. Despite being “a bit boring”, maybe it would not be so terrible if we stayed home more often? This connects back to Krippendorff's (1987/2010) argument about how holiday practices are socially induced rather than biologically.

Others have also reflected on insights they gained during their special vacation. Several participants mentioned having spent more time with loved ones as a result of staying in Norway.

Georgina: So what was the most positive aspect of your holiday in Norway this year?

Nora: Perhaps that we can spend more time with the people we love. Like friends and boyfriend and family and- because when you travel out of the country, maybe you are only together with a few people. Maybe you don't see that many people. It's nice to meet people after all.

Nora's point about spending time with loved ones during holidays is especially relevant as for many people in the West, a contemporary lifestyle means that they no longer live together with the extended family. In Norway, 18% of the population lives alone (Andersen, 2020). In such a situation, the holidays can offer some extra time to spend

together with loved ones, which might be a more rewarding experience for many people than being at an exotic destination without their families. To Ingrid, this is what made her summer holiday a surprisingly positive experience:

Yes, maybe I have surprised myself a little bit about the fact that I thought- I mean, I myself would have surely- usually, if I had the opportunity, I would have surely chosen to spend money and time on the trip to Syden that I had planned. But now, I got so much more time with my family, with my mother and my little brother, so I was very positively surprised about how valuable it actually was. (Ingrid)

This insight is not only important from the perspective of social relationships, but also from the aspect of rethinking what ‘the good holiday’ should be like. Ingrid has found out that even though she missed a trip she was looking forward to, that trip would have meant missing out on the time she ended up spending with her family. The insights of Emma, Nora and Ingrid all point to how the covid-induced changes have made them look at habits and beliefs in a new light – and got surprised.

So what do participants say about ‘the good holiday’ and how does the summer holiday of 2020 compare to it? There are four aspects that emerged again and again when discussing ‘the good holiday’: experiences, relaxation, nature and loved ones.

The first one, ‘experiences’ is connected to the aspects discussed in the ‘Longing for the extraordinary’ section. As we have already seen, experiencing something new through being active and breaking away from everyday life often appear as push factors for abroad travel. However, the three other aspects were not mentioned so often in connection with abroad trips (apart from visiting loved ones who live abroad, which I will return to in the next section).

Relaxation, in the sense of resting and not being in activity, has appeared before in connection with lying on the beach in a sunny Southern country. This is the kind of relaxation that antitourists do not wish to engage in because they would rather “experience something” (Nora). Or, some prefer “a combination” of relaxing and being in activity like Olivia in chapter 5.1.2. However, the core motivation for travelling abroad never truly appeared to be relaxation. Cabin trips in Norway, on the other hand, have been associated with a relaxing atmosphere, lack of responsibilities and activities, and the “calmness of the soul” (Ingrid). According to Noah, to relax or unwind is the whole point of going on holiday, and the destination is less important:

The most important thing, really, is that I get a holiday feeling from it. That I relax and don’t stress and such. Or it’s okay to stress a little, right, if you need to catch a flight,

this type of stress is fine. But I really like to unwind when I'm on holiday. So if I manage to unwind, it's a good holiday no matter what I do, whether I'm in the cabin or I'm at Galdhøpiggen or whether I'm in Spain or in the Philippines or wherever. As long as I manage to unwind. (Noah)

Noah points out that flying can be a source of stress, even though he does not mind such stress. As discussed earlier in connection with Noah, it appears that his focus is on taking a break from work and the stress that is present there. Importantly, he emphasises that the destination does not play any role in whether his holiday is 'good'. We will come back to this statement in a bit.

Nature was sometimes, although not often, mentioned as an element of 'the good holiday'. It was most visible in Sofie's description, who connected nature to relaxation.

It should not be stressful, there should be space for reflections, to relax, nice experiences with nature, either active or passive, I mean, it has to be beautiful around me. If I lie on a beach, there shouldn't be too many people, with nice surroundings, I like it when there is, kind of, calm nature. Maybe these are the most important things. [And] that I get to read at least one book. (Sofie)

In this sense, nature acts as an esthetically pleasing background to relaxation. Even though nature appeared in connection with cabin trips as well, participants did not mention linking much deeper importance to it than what appears in Sofie's comment. Of course, the fact that they did not discuss it during these interviews does not exclude the possibility of nature having a profound impact on holiday experiences and motivations. However, it is noteworthy that nature appears as the most unique aspect of Norway, which participants appreciate (see also: chapter 6.2. in connection with the car), but it does not get a central role in the way they describe 'the good holiday'.

Finally, being together with loved ones was mentioned as a key factor of 'the good holiday'. In addition to experiences and nature, it is important for Nora "to spend time with the ones [she] loves". People are in the focal point of her holiday journeys: "It's always either travelling with someone or to someone that is a central part of the trip". In addition to Nora's and Ingrid's insights in the first part of the section, Emilie and Leah have also reflected on this aspect in connection with their holidays during the pandemic:

[...] usually when I travel on holiday, I want to experience something new and go to a new place. Of course, I didn't do it this summer, but it was still a very nice holiday, so I'm not sure. Maybe the important thing is being together with good friends. (Emilie)

I think a bit more that the most important thing is having fun together. I mean, us who are on holiday together. Maybe it's more important than exactly where we are. At least for a while. Then I want to go abroad again soon. But for a while, yes. (Leah)

Both Emilie and Leah note that, contrary to what they thought earlier, the destination has less importance for whether the holiday is 'good', and it is more important to spend time with friends and family. "At least for a while", as Leah says. This remark is noteworthy.

We have seen a number of comments on how destinations might not be so important after all. Norway offers beautiful nature, new places to discover, relaxation in cabins, as well as family and friends to spend precious time with. It was a "holiday of full value", as Emil says. Does this not mean that when participants make these insights, they will become less interested in abroad holidays? Not exactly. Staying in Norway might have been a positive experience this year, and it might have made participants more open for the leisure opportunities in the country, but as Leah's remark suggests, it does not mean that the desire to travel abroad has disappeared. Despite the fact that many of them expressed hope about the ability of the crisis to induce a shift towards more sustainable travel practices, participants made it clear that as soon as it becomes feasible, they will travel abroad.

Olivia will travel to Italy and "contribute to building up the tourism industry again". Oliver is excited about discovering more of Norway, but not by cutting back on abroad travel. When it becomes possible, he plans to take a break from Norway. He "needs to do it 100%". Similarly, Leah says she will return to her old holiday travelling habits and maybe "travel in Norway in addition".

So why do participants express such restlessness and a strong desire to get out of Norway if they also think this holiday in Norway was a good holiday? Even though a holiday in Norway can offer unique aspects that are not found abroad, we have seen through many examples that the same is true for abroad holidays. Importantly, one of the most important elements of 'the good holiday' according to participants is 'experiencing new things', which they repeatedly claim not to be able to find satisfactory in Norway. Noah, who claimed that the destination was not important for whether he has a good holiday or not, also states that "[...] the aspect of, like, a whole new culture and whole new things that you don't find in Norway, *that* you can't replace in Norway, in a way". All these findings suggest that reducing abroad travel in favour

of domestic travel is a challenge not because the opportunities for valuable holiday experiences are not present in Norway, but because these experiences are simply not what participants are looking for in the context of holiday travel.

In addition, the fact that abroad trips on holiday are a habit for many people is also likely to play a role. As Oliver notes, it can be challenging to act in a different way than what one is used to: “[...] you’ve done it every year [travel to Syden], and then suddenly you don’t. I mean, it feels wrong not to do it anymore”. In this sense, a significant part of holiday travel might not be motivated by pull factors from the destination or an inner desire to escape, but are simply repeated each year as a habit. Here, the covid-19 pandemic might be able to have a considerable impact on holiday travel practices, precisely because it has disturbed these habits. Whether this disruption will have long-term consequences remains to be seen.

5.3. Visiting family and friends

To get a fuller picture, one more aspect of travel motivation needs to be considered, namely visiting friends and relatives. In the tourism literature, this segment is often referred to as VFR. Despite its significance, VFR travel did not receive widespread attention for a long time (Backer, 2012). There is a considerable variation among VFR travellers’ motivations and contribution to the tourism industry, with some being more interested than others in visiting the region their hosts live in (Backer, 2012; Young et al., 2007). For example, Ella described that she often deliberately chooses to visit destinations where she has friends so that she can combine building social relations with discovering foreign countries. In this case, the core push factor might be connected to getting away and exploring different cultures, as discussed in the previous sections, while friends might act as pull factors through offering accommodation and social interaction.

However, in this section, I am only discussing a small segment of VFR, namely when seeing friends and relatives in person is the main push factor to travel to a destination. I consider this motivation to be qualitatively different from all other factors that have been discussed so far. In fact, many would agree that it is, at times, misleading to refer to this type of travel as tourism (Backer, 2012).

We could say that travelling to meet family and friends is, from a certain aspect, the opposite of the motivation of ‘longing for the extraordinary’ that has been discussed in

the previous sections as a key motivation for tourists. Rather than a desire to experience the extraordinary, this purpose is connected to something fundamental and, in a sense, very ordinary, namely to maintain social relations and perform social duties connected to the family (Elliott & Urry, 2010, p. 68).

Still, VFR is included in the UNWTO's tourism definition, and I would also argue that it should be taken into consideration in tourism research. Firstly, as argued above, the lines between VFR and other types of tourism are often unclear, and they can even strengthen each other (Dwyer et al., 2014). In addition, the transport infrastructure tourists utilise can be the same independent of the motivation, and thus, when it comes to carbon emissions, there might not be a big difference. Emissions from aviation are the same whether a passenger travels to visit her grandmother or to relax on a sunny beach. In addition, all types of tourism, at their core, are connected to the mobility and globalisation of the contemporary world (Elliott & Urry, 2010; Munoz et al., 2017). A real transformation of mobility has to take into consideration all segments of tourism.

When it comes to meeting family and friends as a main push factor, both domestic and international travel is relevant. For example, Olivia visits her family in Northern Norway twice a year, and she usually flies. It is clear that the large distances and the high popularity of aviation in Norway mean that some domestic trips emit just as much or more greenhouse gases than international trips. However, in the context of the covid-19 pandemic, it is more relevant to look at how not being able to visit loved ones abroad was experienced by the participants.

Ingrid explained how the most significant change for her during the summer holiday was not being able to visit her grandparents in Sweden. This is also what she mentions as the worst effect of a potential long-term covid-lockdown:

Yes, I think it would affect my mood negatively in relation to- mostly because I feel that it's not certain- as I mentioned earlier, I don't know how long I'm going to have grandma and grandpa in my life, so not being allowed to visit them, not even one year from now, would be very tough. It's in a way- being able to see these two people is actually the most important thing for me. (Ingrid)

It is clear that Ingrid has a very strong push factor to travel, and this motivation is not connected to any of the ones discussed in earlier chapters. It is neither about wanting to break away from everyday life and experiencing different cultures or about the destination's weather conditions. The only pull factor the destination appears to have in this case is her grandparents living there.

The covid-19 pandemic has put forward difficult dilemmas in Norway connected to travel to visit loved ones. The term ‘necessary travel’ emerged in government travel restrictions and recommendations, and has been criticised by both experts and people with family members abroad (Killingberg, 2021; Hjetland & Slåen, 2021). These debates concern mainly in what circumstances visiting family members abroad is justifiable in the middle of a pandemic. Is it ‘necessary’ for grandparents to meet newborn grandchildren? What about older ones? How sick a family member should be in order for a visit to be ‘necessary’?

Giving fair and just answers to these questions is a huge challenge, even more so than approaching the question of how much sun and sand tourism is necessary. This is because they touch one of the deepest aspects of human life: close human relationships and love.

What is more, similar questions are very relevant to address in connection with environmental sustainability as well. Several participants mentioned that they would find it unacceptable to reduce travelling to destinations where they have close family members:

For example, I wouldn’t be willing to cut out and travel less to Colombia because I believe it is personally important for me to meet my family [...]. (Ella)

[...] my big brother has now moved to the US, so when I visit him, there’s, of course, going to be a lot of emission, and we must take that into consideration as well, but I don’t think I will avoid travelling to the US for example. (Emil)

Ella and Emil are aware of the environmental consequences of flying to visit their relatives. Still, meeting them appears as something non-negotiable. As Elliott & Urry note, “[...] migration disperses family members and friends across vast areas, and thus the intimate networks of care, support and affection also stretch over large distances” (2010, p. 100). They also argue that the emergence of long-distance relationships (romantic or not) is closely connected to individualisation, referring to Giddens (1991) and Beck (1992). On the one hand, individuals have to make choices to create their self-biographies across a myriad of available lifestyles, which can be linked to different geographical places (Elliott & Urry, 2010, p. 91). On the other hand, life choices, including mobility choices, are also closely tied to relations and in that sense, go beyond the individual (Elliott & Urry, 2010, p. 98).

Thus, rather than simply individual choices, Ella's and Emil's family-visiting trips are embedded in other individual choices, social norms, and, above all, the system of mobility that makes it possible for families and friends to become geographically separated, and which also provides the means to maintain close relationships despite the distance. When exploring possibilities for a more sustainable tourism, VFR travel needs to be given special attention.

5.4. Chapter conclusion

In this chapter, I have explored participants' travel motivations both in regard to abroad holidays and the domestic holidays during covid-19. In order to identify travel motivations, I have used Dann's (1981) push and pull approach. One important finding, which supports Leiper's (2000) argument, is that although pull factors of certain destinations play an important role for participants (like a certain language or warm temperatures), the core of travel motivations appears to lie in the tourists themselves, that is, push factors. As we have seen, a connection between tourism and self-identity can act as a very strong push factor for abroad travel. Participants who perceived themselves as 'the sort of people' who discover foreign countries through travelling, attached a high value to having the 'freedom' to travel and reacted negatively to the idea of travel restrictions to mitigate climate change.

In addition, getting 'the holiday feeling' was strongly linked to getting away from the home environment and everyday life, which meant that, for many participants, holidays were essentially linked to abroad destinations. 'Getting away from home' and 'experiencing something new' appeared as such fundamental desires that participants often did not think its relevance required further explanation. When they did reflect over it, it appeared to be connected to the stressful and exhausting everyday life as well as boredom around engaging with the same places, language and products all the time. These aspects and their relevance for transitioning to more sustainable forms of tourism will be further explored in chapter 7.

A third important aspect that has been discussed is the role of visiting family members and friends in the context of tourism. As we have seen, this factor is important for several participants both in connection with domestic destinations and abroad destinations, and it raises moral dilemmas around reducing mobility both in the context of the covid-19 pandemic and climate change.

Ultimately, all of these aspects can be connected to the way mobility is embedded in modernity. As Giddens (1991) and Beck (1992) argue, individuals in modernity are building their own self-identities by engaging with lifestyle choices. As we have seen, travelling appears as an important element in the self-identities of several participants. This linkage appears to act as a barrier to reduce mobility. The same is true for the embeddedness of mobility in conducting social duties and acts of love for the many families whose members live far away from each other (Elliott & Urry, 2010).

Mobility is also inseparable from holidays from a social practice aspect (Sahakian & Wilhite, 2014). In this chapter, this connection has appeared as both individual beliefs and social norms that attach ‘the holiday feeling’ and ‘newness’ to travelling abroad. It seems likely that individual beliefs largely stem from social norms, considering the large number of Norwegians who travel abroad on holiday, the way participants repeatedly mentioned the importance of getting away from Norway as self-evident, as well as the impact of social media and the fear of missing out. The analysis in this chapter supports the bodily and social embeddedness of holiday travel practices. In the next chapter, the material aspect will also be explored. Sahakian & Wilhite (2014, p. 28) argue that the stronger the particular practice is linked to these different pillars, the harder it is to change it. The findings of this chapter suggest that holiday travel practices are indeed routinised to a significant degree and some trips are reproduced largely because they have been reproduced for a long time.

From a climate perspective, an important question is whether the experience with domestic holidays during the summer of 2020 will lead to a substitution of future international trips with domestic ones. Based on the interviews, if all else remains the same, the positive experiences with travelling in Norway do not seem to be enough to shift holiday practices towards choosing domestic destinations instead of abroad ones. As several participants noted, domestic trips might represent an addition to, rather than a substitute of, abroad trips. Cabin trips, while highly appreciated, are hardly any competition to abroad trips. This is in line with the findings of Adamiak et al. (2016), who investigated Finnish second home owners and found that even though trips to these second homes replaced some domestic travel, they did not reduce international trips. Instead of a reduction in long-distance travel as a result of having access to a domestic second home, Adamiak et al. found that these individuals actually took more long-haul trips than those without a second home, and second home trips are in fact “part of an

overall highly mobile leisure lifestyle” (2016, p. 146). Similarly, Xeu et al.’s (2020) study shows that long-distance abroad holidays are largely routinised, and cabin trips do not offer the kind of experience informants seek abroad.

Adding to this the aspect of visiting friends and family abroad, which similarly has very little potential to be substituted by domestic trips, it becomes clear that shifting holiday practices towards more sustainable destination choices is a highly complex task.

Destination choices must be viewed in the context of the totality of holiday practices and everyday practices, and any attempt at shifting destination choices must target several aspects of these practices. While the covid-19 pandemic does not seem to be able to induce the necessary long-term changes on its own, it has managed to disturb the habit of yearly abroad trips. It has also made participants aware of the fact that it is possible to have meaningful holiday experiences in Norway. This way, the pandemic has offered an opportunity for the emergence of alternative futures for tourism (Lew et al., 2020). Although, as this chapter demonstrates, it is a highly challenging and complex task, grabbing this opportunity instead of going back to business-as-usual is crucial for mitigating climate change.

6. Transportation modes

In this chapter, I am going to unfold how participants chose transportation modes for their summer holidays during the covid pandemic, and how this compares to past and future choices of transportation modes. We know that different transportation modes contribute very differently to carbon emissions. While overall climate impact is dependent on complex variables, travelling by plane is generally found to have the highest climate impact in passenger trips followed by cars, while trains and buses have a significantly lower impact (Borken-Kleefeld et al., 2013). In Norway, 90% of all transport emissions are attributed to aviation and cars, of which aviation represents 57% (Aamaas & Peters, 2017). Therefore, this chapter is going to explore the possibility of (1) reducing plane trips in favour of cars, rail or bus, and (2) reducing car trips in favour of rail or bus on the basis of participants' reflections.

6.1. The impact of covid-19 on choosing transportation mode

The covid-19 pandemic has caused an unprecedented change in mobility patterns, where aviation was the most severely affected (Nižetić, 2020). In Norway, there was a reduction of flight passengers by 61% in 2020 compared to the previous year (Lund, 2021). Among my interview participants, there was only one person who flew during their summer holiday. Nearly everyone reached their holiday destinations by car, which is not surprising considering that all participants stayed in Norway. The car has namely a long history of being a popular mode of transportation for holiday travelling in Norway, especially for domestic travel. In 1970, 68% of holiday travellers used the car, and at that time, 88% of holiday travellers spent their longest vacation in Norway (Dokka, 2015). While abroad holidays (and with that, flying) have become increasingly popular, domestic holiday travels are still largely conducted by car today, independently of the pandemic (Henriksen & Kvile, 2019).

The pandemic might have further strengthened this tradition as travelling in a private car removes the infection-risk that is present when travelling by public transportation.

Ingrid remembers her car trip this way:

So on the first trip, it was only me and another friend, and then she sat in the front and drove, and I sat in the back seat, only because we were a bit paranoid then. I mean, we were a bit like 'okay, we will at least try as much as we can not to be too close'.
(Ingrid)

Avoiding infection was obviously an important concern for her. Earlier, she also mentioned that public transportation would have felt "less safe" than taking the car. At

the same time, even though she was aware of the possibility of getting infected in the car as well, she chose to travel anyway. Other participants described their logic behind choosing the car in a similar way: it might have been perceived as safer than other transportation modes, but the main reason appears to be that driving was perceived as the most practical way of reaching a Norwegian destination, and participants had access to a car. I will explore this aspect more in-depth in the next section.

While the choice of destination and practicality were the main determining factors behind choosing the car, there were a few exceptions. Olivia had planned to take a flight to Northern Norway, but the new rule of having to wear a face mask made her change her plans.

And it was because, and only because we had to sit with a face mask. [...] one moment the flight company tells us it's totally safe to sit on the plane and there is HEPA filter and all that, in the next moment we would suddenly wear a face mask all the time. [...] And also it's- after all it's the distance that is the most important versus using face masks. (Olivia)

Olivia's comment demonstrates the confusion around different measures and modes of protection in connection with the new virus, which were very much present during the first months after the outbreak. Today, face masks have become a routinised part of many everyday practices, and their importance is hardly ever questioned. Olivia's example also shows how the covid-19 pandemic quickly shifted long-standing practices. For her, flying to Northern Norway to visit her family had been a habit, which she conducted twice a year. The fact that she had uncertainties around face mask use made her change this habit and opt for the car to reach her destination.

On the other hand, Nora had similar worries in connection with face masks, but this did not stop her from flying to Northern Norway. She was the only informant who flew during her summer holiday, and she also took a long trip by night train on her way back from Northern Norway, another thing that was uncommon among the interview participants. She explained that she is influenced by her environmentally conscious boyfriend, and therefore, she tries to reduce flying, which is how the idea of the night train came. Nora's example demonstrates that infection safety was often not the main concern when choosing transportation mode. She chose flying because of practical reasons like time and accessibility and the train because of environmental concerns.

Other participants, who mostly travelled by car, also mentioned reasons other than infection control. It was "the most natural way" of travelling to a certain destination

(Oliver), or it was the obvious choice because a friend “managed to borrow a car” (Maia). It seems that the biggest safety measurements they took from a covid-19 perspective was staying in Norway. Although there were some exceptions, like in the case of Olivia above, the pandemic seems to have had little direct impact on the transportation modes chosen. Indirectly, through a change of destinations, flying was often swapped out by driving. In the following, I am going to explore the different transportation modes, starting with the car. It is important to note that I do not focus on the distinction between gasoline cars and electric cars in this analysis. Depending on different variables, electric cars have a considerable potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (van Vliet et al., 2011), and they are also significant in Norway, where 9% of all passenger cars are electric (Andresen, 2020). However, as my participants generally reported travelling by fossil fuel cars (or not being able to recall the type of the car), and as the majority of cars in Norway are still powered by fossil fuels, I am not focusing on the electric car in this analysis.

6.2. The car: more freedom, more opportunities

As presented in the previous section, the covid-19 pandemic has in some ways reinforced the domination of the car: it often proved to be the most practical choice to reach diverse domestic destinations. At the same time, it has been widely recognised in literature that automobility is deeply embedded in contemporary mobile lifestyles and, indeed, the whole system of modernity (e.g. Goodwin, 2010; Kanger & Schot, 2016; Rajan, 2006; Urry, 2004). This is also supported by social practice theories, which move away from the focus on rational individual choice and acknowledge that all social practices – including travelling by car – are interconnected with a myriad of other practices, which themselves consist of a combination of interconnected social, material and bodily elements (Sahakian & Wilhite, 2014; Shove, 2010, 2014; Watson, 2012). Therefore, we have reasons to assume that there is a lot that lies behind the simple observation of the car being a practical choice.

6.2.1. Access

According to Lyons (2012), access has always been the core substance in societies. He defines access as “the ability for us as human beings to reach people, goods, services and opportunities” (2012, p. 159). In the context of holiday travelling, one can say that access to various holiday destinations – and with that, experiences and everything else Lyons mentions – is closely connected to access to transportation modes (Metz, 2013).

Participants often reported that the car was absolutely necessary for them to reach their destinations.

Like when I went to Risør and to Kvitseid, that cabin-part of the summer, I drove, you know- or, like, travelled with friends who drove, and then it would have been cumbersome to take the bus, actually, because then you, in a way, have to get off the bus and so you maybe have to get a taxi from the bus to the cabin or-. On trips like this, I guess, you must have a car. (Nora)

[...] when we were going to Jotunheimen, there were actually no alternatives to the car. It's almost impossible to use public transportation that way. Maybe it would have been possible if it had been planned, but then it's kind of not so flexible. (Sofie)

Neither Nora nor Sofie saw any feasible alternatives to the private car. They admit that alternatives might exist, but they appear to be so inconvenient that they are hardly even considered as alternatives. To Sofie, a lack of flexibility actually equalled near impossibility. I return to the flexibility aspect in the next section.

Access appears to have a special meaning in a Norwegian context because of geographical reasons. As Ella explains:

Norway is a bit inaccessible, it's difficult to travel in Norway. [...] it's a bit expensive to travel to Northern Norway and large distances, and when you first arrive in Northern Norway, if you take a plane up, you have to rent a car. Because there are such large distances between the towns- between the places that there's very little public transport service. (Ella)

Ella points out that travelling in Norway can be challenging because of the large distances and lack of public transportation in certain areas. And this is where the car becomes especially important. "A holiday in Norway is very difficult to do without a car. I mean, you can travel to some places, but it's very limited where you can travel if you don't have a car" (Ella). Implied by these quotes is that it is the full collection of places accessible by car that acts as the basis of what is 'normal' to access. There exist places that are inaccessible by car as well, but no one complains over not being able to access those places. It seems that what is available by car provides the total of the available destinations, and with this starting point, all other transportation modes can only provide "limited" access.

In particular, accessing nature is an important aspect to take into consideration. 'Taking a trip to nature' has long been connected to automobility (Sheller, 2004), which might be especially important for the Norwegian car culture. Norway is often praised for the beauty and uniqueness of its nature, which has also been mentioned by the interview participants numerous times. They often find the main value of a holiday trip in

Norway in experiencing its one-of-a-kind landscapes. One example is Jotunheimen, a popular tourist destination, which, as Sofie mentions, is mainly accessed by car.

The car is appreciated not only because it gives access to the destination, but because it can also provide experiences during the journey, often connected to nature. Noah mentioned that when he travels by car, the journey itself becomes an important part of the trip as opposed to flying, where the only goal is getting to the destination. When asked what makes the car journey valuable, he mentions ‘nature along the way’:

Well, it’s often the experiences along the way. Often nature- places where one stops and such. It generally requires a bit more planning, of course, but when you stop at nice places or fun places, then it’s really cool. Yes, I would say this is the important thing.
(Noah)

While he claims that he usually flies on his holiday trips, Noah also finds the roadtrip-holiday attractive, mainly as a result of getting access to these extra experiences along the way.

As Urry (2004) argues, the system of the car is much more than a simple substitution of public transportation. He views automobility as a fundamentally different kind of mobility that broadly extends the available destinations, which also involves the available activities and experiences (2004, p. 28). Interview participants often emphasise the freedom the car provides. However, Urry also looks at the other side of the coin. Automobility has created a whole system, in which the car is an unavoidable element. In the context of holiday travelling, “[i]t separates homes and leisure sites often only available by motorized transport” (2004, p. 28). This way, the car does not only give freedom, but also restricts freedom as it means being dependent on the automobility system (Goodwin, 2010, p. 71). This dependence is also detectable in the above quotes: Nora feels she “must have a car”, Sofie means there are “no alternatives to the car”, and Ella argues that she has “very limited” options without a car. In other words, automobility provides the inescapable context for holidays in Norway.

Olivia’s car journey provides an interesting case. As mentioned in the previous section, she decided to change her usual practices and drive to Northern Norway during her summer holiday instead of flying as a result of the covid-19 measures. Her case is special because, as opposed to the previously mentioned informants, she would not have normally driven to this destination. She experienced the change positively, mainly because she was able to visit some family members on the way.

I mean, it of course takes more time to take the car versus the plane. But it gave me other opportunities, to put it that way. To visit my family who don't live near an airport- It's kind of cumbersome to travel there by plane, and then you have to be picked up, it's a lot of organising. (Olivia)

In this context, the plane appears to be just as inconvenient as the bus or the train for the other participants. In order to reach this particular destination, there are no acceptable alternatives to the car. Importantly, this example clearly shows how the car induces extra journeys that otherwise would not have been made (Urry, 2004, p. 28). Olivia would namely not have visited her family in Trøndelag had it not been for the covid-19 pandemic, which made her take the car:

So then I actually decided to drive. And that way I was able to visit some of my family on the way up north, because I have family in Trøndelag. I had not visited them in a long- I think we found out that it was ten years ago the last time I was there. Because that was the last time I drove north. (Olivia)

Olivia's example illustrates that there are more important and less important trips, which has a relevance for reducing carbon emissions. She was willing to drive up to Northern Norway to visit her family there when her preferred transportation mode became out of question. And when she did, she also found it desirable to visit other family members on the way. However, she would not choose the car over the plane *in order to* visit these family members. A study conducted by Gössling et al. (2019), which investigated leisure flight trips, found that almost half of the trips made were unimportant or indifferent, as perceived by the travellers themselves. Olivia's example shows that while important trips are more resistant to change even when elements of the practice is disturbed, less important trips can fluctuate considerably. Gössling et al. (2019) also suggest that interventions that aspire to reduce emissions should focus on the less important trips as these can be reduced more easily.

6.2.2. Flexibility

In addition to access, flexibility is another example of the perceived freedoms the car provides. In the previous section, a citation by Sofie emphasised that the car gives flexibility. This aspect is frequently mentioned by other participants as well. For Jakob and Ella, the car means an opportunity to change destination plans and duration instantly while Noah highlights the importance of managing one's time without external frames.

The significance of flexibility that provides the attractiveness of the car over other modes of transportation has been recognised by Urry: "The seamlessness of the car

journey makes other modes of travel inflexible and fragmented” (2004, p. 28).

Interview participants reflected over this flexibility in overwhelmingly positive ways, often referring to it as freedom. Maia and Jakob made the following insights:

I actually think it gave quite a lot of freedom in connection with when you can go, where you want to drive and stop, and you have, in a way, freedom to plan for yourself. (Maia)

Well, it's the freedom. And being able to change your mind and do- make some choices on the way that come 'oops, we're going in there or driving there or-'. It's the freedom. (Jakob)

Both informants emphasise the customizable characteristic of car trips. They enjoy being able to decide exactly where and when to travel while also leaving room for spontaneity. These elements can be connected to individualism, the ideal of modernity (Giddens, 1990). According to modernity theory, people live in an abundance of different choices and lifestyles, where they create their own narratives or “self-reflexive biographies” (Giddens, 1990, p. 135). Travelling by car can be seen as the transportation mode that offers the most opportunities for a self-created holiday trip where one can customise every space- and time-related aspect. When the idea of freedom, flexibility and individualism stand so strongly in social values and the car with its connected infrastructure is available to the masses, it is not surprising that driving is the “natural” way of travelling (Oliver).

At the same time, the same way as it both gives access to new places and defines what the ‘necessary’ level of access is, the car system both enhances flexibility and forces itself upon people as it “produces desires for flexibility that so far only the car is able to satisfy” (Urry, 2004, p. 29). As Goodwin (2010, pp. 71-72) notes, mobility should be distinguished from freedom. Looking at freedom as movement produces a system where movement is necessary for freedom, which in turn links cars and mobility to the concept of ‘the good life’ that one aspires to live. Modernity’s double-edged feature (Giddens, 1990) is therefore equally relevant in the context of its promoter, the system of automobility. Opportunities in access and flexibility are greater than ever before, but these opportunities are bringing with themselves risks of high consequence like climate change.

Interview participants generally rarely mentioned aspects of their car journeys that they perceived as negative. Still, there were some examples that shed light on the coercive and limiting side of the car system. Ella points to the issue of parking the car:

And then of course, for example, if you go to villages in Italy, you can't get there by train, there is no bus, and therefore you have to drive yourself, although I see that there are some challenges with bringing the car with you because then you will have to find parking. In a lot of big cities it's nearly impossible, especially if you have a big car. I have a lot of friends in Germany who live in cities, they only buy small cars because they can't find parking place for big cars, so everyone wants as short cars as possible. So it's a bit- there is a small challenge with taking the car too, and in addition, it has to function the whole way. (Ella)

Again, she finds it important to emphasise the absolute necessity of the car to reach certain destinations, but she also mentions two potential problems. Firstly, the car needs to be parked when not in use. With today's high car-density, it is not only a challenge for the individual car-user, but a significant issue in many urban spaces (e.g. Davis et al., 2010; Taylor & van Bommel-Misrachi, 2017). Another challenge Ella briefly mentions is that the car can actually break down, and a broken-down car cannot fulfill its function. As we depend on outer systems when using the car, our freedom is necessarily limited (Goodwin, 2010, p. 71).

Nora draws attention to another freedom-limiting element when recalling her summer roadtrip:

[...] actually, the roads were a bit bad on the way back because it was pretty hot and also there was a queue on E18, we drove in the afternoon, so we came, in a way, into the queue that goes from Drammen to Oslo, so it was a bit exhausting, but- So then maybe it would have been lovely to sit on the train that just goes without that queue. (Nora)

Interestingly, the traffic jam puts the mobile car and the mobility-seeking passengers into an immobile situation. In fact, having to sit in a traffic jam made Nora long for the rail, which was otherwise perceived as a less flexible transportation mode. This example illustrates, firstly, that the perceived flexibility of different modes of transportation is relative, and, secondly, that the car can only fill its function when the whole system of automobility is properly in place (Urry, 2004).

Following this last point, Leah points to the importance of the necessary infrastructure, in particular, electric chargers if one travels by an electric car:

There are several places I would like to travel to, but the bus doesn't go there. And we have an electric car that we can't drive there, and so I can't vacation there. So I think better bus services for example would be nice. (Leah)

This example connects back to the topic of access. It is noteworthy that Leah, instead of requesting a better infrastructure for electric cars, wishes there were better public transportation services. The car is put on the same shelf as the bus: none of them have

the ability to take Leah to the desired places. At the same time, the comment seems to imply that these places are part of the automobility system and would be accessible by a fossil fuel car. Nevertheless, the example highlights the importance of the material pillar in social practices (Sahakian & Wilhite, 2014), which determines where it is possible to travel.

6.2.3. Privacy

As previously discussed, the private car is both the creator and the creation of modernity's individualisation (Cohen, 2012; Dowling & Simpson, 2013; Rajan, 2006; Sheller, 2014;). When in the car, people travel "in their own private universes" (Paterson, 2007, as cited in Dowling & Simpson, 2013, p. 428) as they "collectively pursue private goals on public highways" (Rajan, 2006, p. 113). In the larger context of modernity, this means that even though individuals are responsible for creating their own narratives, they operate within the socio-material structures, on which they are dependent on (Beck, 1992).

A desire for independence, for not relying on anyone is expressed by Olivia ("I actually like being able to get there on my own, I mean, to a destination"). Instead of arriving at an airport and then being picked up by relatives, she prefers travelling all the way to the destination in her own private car. She appreciates being independent, although she acknowledges that independence also has a less positive side: "Also, it's a bit boring and hard to drive alone [...]".

But even if one drives together with others, it means a separation from other travellers. The car provides a private space that can be used for many different activities according to the passengers' individual preferences (Kent, 2015). In Kent's study, participants described that most activities they enjoy doing in the car (like having phone or in-person conversations with friends and family or listening to various audio materials) would be problematic to carry out on public transportation (2015, p. 737). My participants also found similar activities to be an important part of the car journey. Nora found it enjoyable to "drive while sitting and talking to friends", while Sofie pointed to the roadtrip-feeling as a core element of the car holiday's attractiveness:

When we drive together to the mountains, it's of course fun with this kind of roadtrip-feeling, right? That we are on our way somewhere together and make some plans in the car, listen to music, experience things along the way, stop along the way- kind of an adventure. (Sofie)

Sofie's description is filled with the excitement of participating in a journey in a private car. The car shows all its appealing features: one enjoys access to nature combined with a flexibility to manage one's time and route, all the while one is free to enjoy an optional type of music together with a few chosen others, but separated from everyone else. As this chapter discussed, these aspects – access, flexibility and privacy – fit well into modernity's individualisation and mobility system, and automobility's dominance has even been reinforced by the covid-19 pandemic. In the next section, we are going to look at aeromobility, which is a prerequisite for global tourism.

6.3. The plane: the motor of tourism

Aviation was a rapidly growing industry before the covid-19 pandemic. In a few decades, air travel had become a mundane, “effectively banal” practice (Cwerner, 2009, p. 6), available to a much larger part of the global population than before (Casey, 2010). Aeromobility, much in the same way as automobility, is unquestionably embedded in the global system of modernity (Urry, 2009; Adey et al., 2007). Together with its well-known contribution to climate change, the aviation industry fits well into Beck's (1992) risk society.

Although the emergence of low-cost airlines made flying more available to the masses, studies show that the majority of the world population does not participate in flying, and those who fly frequently mostly belong to higher income and social classes (Cwerner, 2009; Gössling & Humpe, 2020; Metz, 2013, pp. 265-266; Randles & Mandler, 2009). It has been shown that 50% of emissions from aviation is in fact caused by only 1% of the world population (Gössling & Humpe, 2020). This huge inequality is an issue in itself, but it also implies that the aviation industry has a huge potential to grow even further in the future (Metz, 2013, p. 266).

Norway is one of those countries where flying is deeply embedded in travelling practices of ordinary people. When it comes to holiday trips, Norway is on top of tourism participation among European countries with over 90% of the population aged 15 years or more conducting one or more holiday trips in 2019 (Eurostat, 2021). These involved 9,8 million trips by plane, which is the main transportation mode for international holidays (Henriksen, 2020).

6.3.1. Access and time

Although most interview participants did not fly during the summer holiday of 2020, flying was discussed during the interviews with a past- and future-oriented perspective as the covid-19 crisis might have helped participants reflect more consciously around a plane-free holiday. In accordance with the statistics, and similarly to cars in the previous section, flying often appears as inevitable in connection with certain destinations. Ella explained it the following way:

[...] I have lived in China or I have lived in Southern Norway, so there aren't too many options, there's only flying. (Ella)

We can drive to Germany, but, for example, if we want to go to Colombia, we have to- yeah, my husband is from Colombia, so- we can't swim so we fly. (Ella)

While she considers some abroad destinations like Germany to be feasible to reach by car, travelling to China and Colombia are dependent on flying. Stating that it is impossible to swim to Colombia acts as the ultimate justification of flying: swimming is presented as the only alternative, which makes any further questioning of flying pointless.

Other participants were largely on the same opinion: a holiday abroad usually equals flying:

[...] I, of course, travel abroad often because of, like, weektrips or long weekend or something like that, and then it's- then it's of course flying. Then I don't check anything else. (Olivia)

Travelling abroad, then it's of course going to be flying. (Sofie)

If it's an abroad trip, it's of course effectiveness- getting there fast. [...] I'm very rarely on roadtrips or interrail, so I usually fly. If I'm going a bit further. (Noah)

These quotes illustrate global tourism's fundamental connection to aviation. This seemingly unbreakable link is the biggest reason why sustainable tourism appears to be an unobtainable goal (Young et al., 2015). In turn, the high value ascribed to accessing these places and dismissing alternative transportation modes act as hindrances to voluntary reduction of flying (Hares et al, 2010).

This is an area that the covid-19 pandemic influenced significantly: less international trips meant a fall in air travel. However, in Norway, accessing certain domestic destinations is also closely connected to flying. In the interviews, the difficulty of travelling to Northern Norway often came up. The perceptions around travelling to this area of the country were fairly consistent: there is no reasonable alternative to flying.

And I don't usually fly so much because it's not so good for the environment, and it can be a bit expensive, and-. But, like, if you want to go to Northern Norway, it takes a lot of time and- so then maybe you just have to fly. (Nora)

Yeah, but I travel two times to Northern Norway by plane to visit my family. I cannot take the train or bus, and the bus is not so environmentally friendly either, but I can't, and time is an important point. (Olivia)

For example from Tromsø, there is no train I can choose, so- then I of course have to fly. So it would be nice if there was at least a possibility to take the train for example. (Emilie)

As the citations show, some expressed reasons behind choosing to fly to Northern Norway are time and the lack of alternative transportation modes. Common for these three statements is that they are all aware of the environmental issues with flying, but they claim they “have to” do it because of the above-mentioned reasons. Since the participants had been informed about my affiliation to a sustainability master's programme in advance, it is possible that they felt the need to justify their environmentally questionable choices in front of me. At the same time, considering that the environmental impact of flying is frequently discussed in the media and ‘flight shame’ is influencing social norms (Gössling et al., 2020a), it seems likely that environmental concerns actually cross the minds of participants when flying.

Their remarks also suggest that they have checked the possibilities for alternative transportation modes, but they found none. A quick search on Entur (<https://entur.no/>, retrieved 28.02.2021), a Norwegian trip planner website seems to partly confirm these statements. A trip from Oslo to Tromsø (assuming such a trip is easier to conduct than a journey between two smaller places) appears to be both time-consuming and expensive, as well as exhausting. By only specifying travelling without a plane and travelling the next day, Entur suggests two options: one involving two trains (one of them being a night train) and two buses, and another one including two trains and a boat. The former would take approximately 28 hours, the latter three days and six hours. Opting for the quicker option, which involves trains and buses, a one-way trip would cost an adult 3277 Norwegian kroner. Prices do get cheaper if one buys tickets more in advance and can be further reduced by opting out of the sleeper coach. Still, ordering a ticket two months ahead and sitting in a normal seat at night, the price does not go under 1000 kroner.

Taking the same trip by plane gives a very different picture. Ticket prices vary significantly: checking the cheapest ticket options at the end of February 2021 for the

following month gave results between 379 and 3039 Norwegian kroner. Several months ahead, the prices tended to stay under 650 kroner. No changes between transportation modes, and the trip takes under two hours.

This means that while Emilie cannot take the train directly from Tromsø, she does not *have to* fly, strictly speaking. The claim that Olivia cannot take the train and the bus is also questionable in theory. In practice, of course, there can be a number of good reasons why one cannot take such an expensive trip that lasts more than a day and involves three changes. Even if we take away all these reasons, choosing flying appears to be a much better deal from a time, money and comfort aspect.

Even when the superiority of flying is not so clear-cut and there are reasonable alternatives, the plane still often comes out as a winner:

If I'm going somewhere where there goes a plane, I prefer flying because it's generally the fastest, most comfortable- yeah. [...] Because it's more comfortable to travel by plane. You don't have to be pressed up onto others for a long time. On the train, you're in a big carriage, perhaps there's someone in front of you who doesn't smell good, and you have to sit there for 12 hours. (Olivia)

Because as I just said, time can perhaps- rule over other things. For example, if I can- it's a bit- I feel it's kind of bad to say it, but it's kind of that I would rather fly home because it takes less time than take the train for example. That it might not be so appropriate actually- like, for sustainable choices or a climate friendly choice in a way. (Maia)

Olivia emphasises the relative comfort of the plane compared to the train, although more comfortable in this case refers to being uncomfortable for a shorter amount of time. Maia also emphasises the priority of time, but her focus is on saving time rather than spending less time in an uncomfortable environment. She also expresses concern about the environmental impact of her flying, and she indicates a willingness to choose other transportation modes:

To a certain extent, when I think about it, it's easier to say it than to do it in practice. It is, yes. Because I kind of realise that if I have work or school for example, and then I want to go home, and I see that there is a plane two hours after I finish work, or I can wait until the next day to take the train for example, something that has happened, then it's tempting to go right after work maybe because then I get home faster. So it's easier to say it than to do it in practice [...]. (Maia)

Maia, for this particular journey, discusses the train as a potential alternative to flying. She is in a dilemma where she would like to do something good for the environment, but saving time by flying is so tempting that she is unsure of whether she is actually willing to give it up. This dilemma is discussed in the following section.

6.3.2. Flying addiction?

What many of the above comments on flying have in common is that they express some kind of guilt or concern for the environmental impact of aviation. Although this concern is usually overruled by the wish to access certain places in an acceptable time and comfort level (Higham et al., 2016), the feelings of unease do not disappear. This experience of a clash in one's identity has been recognised in literature as the flyers' dilemma (Cohen et al., 2011; Rosenthal, 2010; Young et al., 2014; Young et al., 2015). It has been suggested that 'binge flying' is a new type of behavioural addiction that bears similarities with, for example, tobacco addiction (Cohen et al. 2011). While this argumentation has its weaknesses (Young et al., 2014; Young et al., 2015), the emergence of such a comparison in itself says a lot about the aviation industry's place in today's society.

On the one hand, the metaphor of 'flying addiction' does fit well with some aspects of the respondents experiences. As the above comments show, they often express that they know they 'should not' fly so much, but they 'cannot help it'. After a summer without flying, some of them also express a feeling of 'restlessness' and an 'urge' to get out of the country: "I became very restless, so I realised that I became like 'ah, I've been in Norway for such a long time, I can't bear it anymore'" (Oliver); "there is a kind of urge to just get away... you get a bit restless, right?" (Emma). It is, of course, obvious from these remarks that this is not an addiction to flying per se, nor is it an addiction in a medical sense (Young et al., 2014).

By likening these "symptoms" with that of behavioural addictions (Cohen et al., 2011), we get a standpoint that, at first sight, appears provocative, but which is, in fact, very close to how the sustainability issue of aviation is treated today. As Young et al. point out, "global (environmental) risks *are now discursively reproduced as the internal anxieties of the individual consumer* who bears the economic and psychological cost of an unsustainable industry" (2015, p. 5, italics as in the original).

Thus, what one might experiences as the flyers' dilemma on an individual level is actually better characterised as a societal addiction to hypermobility or – if we want to move away from the illustrative but often misleading medical vocabulary – simply an essential feature of today's modernity: "aeromobility is now embedded in the global fabric" (Adey et al., 2007, p. 785). What is interesting is that not only are the concepts of the individual-focused flyers' dilemma and flying addiction inaccurate, they are also

fundamental for the sustaining of the unsustainable global tourism industry (Young et al., 2014). As the industry itself does not take responsibility for its impact on the environment (if it did, it would hardly be able to exist), it depends on individual flyers bearing the responsibility – and choosing to fly anyway (Young et al., 2014).

While the covid-19 pandemic has temporarily reduced flying, the participants' perceptions about the necessity of flying to get access to certain destinations (in an acceptable way) and aviation's embeddedness in the global mobility system suggest that a significant long-term reduction would require much more than the disruption of the pandemic.

6.4. The train, the bus and the holiday experience

6.4.1. The joys of travelling slowly

As we have seen in the previous section, flying has several clear advantages over other transportation modes, but we need to move away from it to reduce carbon emissions. How can low emitter transportation modes like rail and bus compete with aviation? As introduced in the literature review, the concept of 'slow travel' (Dickinson et al., 2010; Dickinson et al., 2011; Georgica, 2015) offers relevant ideas. Perhaps there are aspects of a good holiday that we miss if we travel by plane. Perhaps, by putting a bigger emphasis on the journey to the destination, we would discover that travelling slowly can lead to rich and valuable holiday experiences. This is what several insights from the participants suggest.

Nora and Sofie describe how they perceive the travel part of their holiday trips in the following way:

It's surely something you can remember. Or at least on the way to where you're going, maybe you look forward to meeting someone you're going to visit or to experiencing something fun. So it's definitely a small part of the, like, warm-up to the trip. (Nora)

I mean, travelling is in a way a time for reflection. It's kind of fun to think that I'm on my way to a vacation, or if I'm coming home from holiday, it's a kind of a break- it's a split between home and- or home in Oslo and where the destination is. (Sofie)

They both describe the process of travelling somewhere as a positive experience. Its importance lies in its transitional nature: it acts as a dividing line between home and away, which offers time to prepare for the coming experiences mentally.

Emil also appreciates the experience of the journey, and he describes how it is in some way richer when one travels by train or bus:

Yes, it's of course part of the experience, but not the most important part. But it's of course a reason why I prefer travelling by train to flying because then I can enjoy the view and get a good book and, like, relax, and it becomes part of the experience, while I think it's more stressful at the airport. (Emil)

For example, if one wants to go to Berlin, as I was actually planning to with our class, but it got cancelled- yeah, so I actually wanted to travel by bus through Sweden and, like, experience that part instead of taking the quickest route by plane. (Emil)

Emil points to several advantages of the train and the bus. On one hand, there is an opportunity to relax by looking outside the window or reading. He contrasts this peaceful experience with the stress of being at the airport. In addition, he emphasises the richness of the experience over time-efficiency. This is in line with 'slow living': "the dominance of speed" is questioned through choosing to spend time on activities with "meaning and value" (Parkins, 2004, p. 364).

Oliver and Sofie have had similar motivations for choosing to travel by train:

[...] but I also went to Bergen with two friends this year, and then we chose to take the train, but it was more for the experience of that route. (Oliver)

[...] I usually don't stress so much when I'm on holiday. It doesn't matter if a journey takes time. I think it's fine to sit and read or listen to podcast or-. I don't care if I, like, have to wait a little until I arrive. But to save- only save one or two hours, I'm not so interested in that. So if I were to travel to Bergen, I would rather take the train because it's nice to look at nature on the way [...]. (Sofie)

Both Oliver and Sofie bring up the example of travelling to Bergen from Oslo by train, which they find attractive because of the experience of the railway journey. Sofie also discusses the relevance of saving time, which appeared as a key motivation factor for flying in the previous section. According to Sofie's remark, trying to save time is connected to stress, and a more relaxed approach to time can also lead to a more relaxed holiday. Her insights stand at the core of slow travel: emphasising quality over quantity and appreciating travel time for its own sake (Lumsdon & McGrath, 2011).

These positive views on travelling by train or bus can also be connected to Soper's (2015) 'alternative hedonism', which questions ideas around human flourishing in the contemporary 'good life'. She argues that consumerism (in which the tourism and the aviation industry are deeply embedded in) in fact impedes human flourishing in much more ways than just through environmental degradation. She brings up the example of cycling instead of driving, which gives pleasures both through the physical senses and through the knowledge that we are not adding to the negative social and environmental impact of cars (2015, p. 51). Similarly, we can view travelling by train and bus as an

alternative hedonistic approach compared to flying. As illustrated by the participants' reflections, these transportation modes can be pleasurable to the senses through the beautiful visuals of the landscape as well as the ability to relax. Although participants did not mention positive feelings connected to the knowledge of contributing less to greenhouse gas emissions by choosing these transportation modes, this aspect might still be relevant. In addition, as I will explore in the next chapter, negative feelings connected to the environmental implications of flying often emerged. Therefore, reducing negative feelings by choosing other transportation modes can be a significant aspect. This way, slow travel might have the potential to be a part of an alternative hedonistic lifestyle, where joy is found in low-carbon activities.

Participants mentioned a number of other perspectives as well, which question the supremacy of aviation. Contrasted to the relaxing experience of the train and the bus journey, flying was often associated with less positive attributes. For example, Leah finds it scary and “tries to avoid flying”, while Emma gets “claustrophobia” up in the air. Noah is not afraid to fly, but he finds it “simply boring”. In addition, Ella and Sofie question the most attractive aspect of flying, namely saving time. Both of them point to the fact that getting to the airport and from the airport to the destination require additional transportation, while the train often goes directly to the city centre. Therefore, Ella points out that high-speed rail can actually be a faster mode of transportation than flying, bringing up Asian high-speed rail networks as an example. Connected to rail and high-speed rail, I will now look at some controversies that have to be taken into consideration in the context of slow travel.

6.4.2. Controversies

The aspect of high-speed rail mentioned by Ella deserves some more attention. Firstly, it is debated whether such a high-speed transportation mode can qualify as ‘slow travel’ (Lumsdon & McGrath, 2011), although it has been argued that high-speed rail supports ‘slow travel’ at the destination, where the time saved on transportation can be spent (Sun & Lin, 2018). More importantly for our topic, Sun & Lin (2018) find that, in the context of their study field of Taiwan, the emission reduction potential of the high-speed rail is not straightforward. On the one hand, they find that passengers do not travel larger distances as a result of high-speed rail, which means that carbon emissions can be reduced by shifting to high-speed rail from more carbon-intensive transportation modes. On the other hand, Sun & Lin (2018) also find that high-speed rail can induce

greater travel frequency, which can increase emissions. More research is needed to test the applicability of these findings in a Norwegian context.

It must be mentioned that at the time of writing, there is an ongoing debate about the building of railway in Northern Norway among politicians (Straumsnes et al., 2021; Eidsvold et al., 2021). This debate is especially relevant because, as we have seen in the previous chapter, several participants expressed that the lack of an extensive railway system made flying the only real option to this area. In addition, Nora tried out the night train on her trip to Northern Norway during the summer, and expressed disappointment with the infrastructure. She claimed that she would rather fly next time. These insights point to the fact that an extension and improvement of the rail system in Northern Norway is necessary.

The idea of such a project has been discussed among politicians for many years, and since a majority voted for it in the Norwegian parliament in April 2021 (Straumsnes et al., 2021), it might become a reality in the coming years. However, it has been pointed out in the media that the huge carbon emissions that inevitably accompany such a project mean that the railway will not lead to emission reduction in the next 40 years, which, from a climate perspective, might be too late (Eidsvold et al., 2021). Although exploring this aspect exceeds the scope of this thesis, this debate illustrates the complexity of creating a sustainable transportation system. Ultimately, it highlights the importance of not only travelling by low-carbon transportation modes and to shorter distances, but also reducing collective physical mobility rather than increasing it.

Another challenge with the sustainability aspect of ‘slow travel’ is that focusing on the pleasure element of it without the environmental benefits does not necessarily reduce long-haul air travel. This was common among the participants: the above positive comments applied only to certain trips, and most holiday destinations are intrinsically connected to flying as Sofie’s comment suggests: “So if I were to travel to Bergen, I would rather take the train because it’s so nice to look at nature on the way. Travelling abroad, then it’s of course going to be flying”. This is in line with the findings of Dickinson et al. (2010) and Dickinson et al. (2011), who pointed out that ‘slow travel’ is often combined with carbon-intensive travel.

It must also be mentioned that not everyone agrees with the journey having a significant role in the holiday:

No, I really like arriving [at the destination], and then I can do hunting or fishing or relax when I get there, so-. Yes, it's pleasant to travel too, but I just love it when I arrive. At the holiday destination or home. (Jakob)

Just like this year, the journey and driving around became a part of the holiday. So then we wanted to maybe drive to places where there was something nice to see and such, but otherwise, I think that time and price are more important than the journey itself, maybe. So I would maybe prefer to get to- in one hour from one place to another contra three hours, for example. If I'm being honest. (Maia)

Both Jakob and Maia admit that there are positive aspects to find in the travelling phase of the trips, but their focus is much more on arriving. Based on these statements, they do not find much value in travelling longer for the sake of the experience. From this perspective, we can assume that travelling by train or bus, even when it is feasible from a time perspective, is less appealing to these participants than to the ones mentioned earlier. In addition, the positive journey experiences they do refer to are connected to the car. Car journeys have some obvious similarities with train and bus journeys, notably the aspect of travelling through natural landscapes. However, as argued earlier, they are not ideal from a sustainability point of view.

It would also be inaccurate to claim that the experience of flying necessarily holds less value than ground transportation as some participants do mention enjoying the flying journey:

But personally, I also really like flying. Like, I like going to the airport, and I don't know- waiting, I mean, it gives me a kind of energy. That I know I'm going somewhere. [...] I don't know, it's a bit like- I think the whole experience with flying and such is generally kind of fun. I'm not sure if it's something specific, it's just that I know that I'm going on holiday now. It gives me good memories. (Oliver)

I've always liked travelling, going on a trip. I have even- I even like being at the airport. It's kind of an inspiration. (Sofie)

Sofie, based on her comments in this chapter, seems to appreciate different modes of transportation, including flying. Oliver struggles with formulating why he enjoys flying, but his appreciation appears to lie in strong positive feelings attached to travelling on vacation, which in turn is attached to flying, and the glue in all this is the memories of past experiences. The "energy" he gets at the airport might be related to what Sofie describes as "inspiration". Perhaps these feelings are connected to what Lew (2018) describes as the core of why we desire to travel: the creativity and different state of consciousness that comes from being away from home. In fact, it appears as though Oliver and Sofie are excited about travelling more than about flying in itself. If we swapped the words 'plane' and 'airport' with 'train' and 'train station', their statements

would still make perfect sense. Does this suggest that maybe some of the positive aspects we connect to flying could be replaced by a less environmentally damaging transportation mode? In another part of the interview, Oliver reveals that flying on abroad holidays with his family has always been an important part of his life. Perhaps these memories play a role in why flying is so hard to give up. As already discussed in the previous section, saying that people are addicted to flying is misleading (Young et al., 2014). It is more correct to say that flying is linked to positive experiences, emotions and memories.

All these insights point to the importance of structural changes in transportation and holiday travel. ‘Slow travel’ can be attractive and beneficial in many ways, but it is unlikely that it will be adopted on the necessary scale through voluntary action. In addition, a positive effect on the environment requires a “hard slow travel” approach (Dickinson et al., 2011): prioritising emission reduction by avoiding flying and driving whenever possible, and travelling less frequently. In contrast to this, participants who enjoy travelling by train and bus seem to fall into Dickinson et al.’s (2011) “soft slow travel” category as they utilise different transportation modes depending on what they find suitable for their journeys. Therefore, as Dickinson et al. (2011) argue, a transition to slow travel as a new normal would require significant policy regulations as well as developing the rail network.

6.5. Chapter conclusion

In this chapter, I have presented the findings connected to transportation modes, which provide the material conditions of holiday travel practices. I have discussed aspects of travelling by car, plane, train and bus both generally and in connection with covid-19. The findings show that both driving and flying are embedded in the perceptions of participants around holiday travelling. Cars provide access to most domestic destinations in a comfortable, flexible and private way, while planes give access to long-haul destinations, which are intrinsically connected to abroad holidays. The covid-19 pandemic impacted these two transportation modes differently: cars have been used extensively to reach domestic destinations, while the absence of abroad trips meant that most participants did not fly at all during the summer holiday. However, since the powerful link between holidays and abroad trips (as explored in chapter 5), and the strong connection between abroad trips and flying are still present, participants do not appear to have changed their perceptions around the necessity of flying significantly.

Reported experiences of car trips have been very positive, with an emphasis on aspects of freedom. Based on the summer holiday of the participants, the car might have some potential to substitute some aviation as in the case of Olivia, who is planning to travel by car more often on her trips to Northern Norway in the future. When it comes to trains and buses, the positive and negative associations to these transportation modes are largely independent of the experiences during the pandemic, except for Nora's negative experience with the night train to Northern Norway. Nevertheless, several participants show appreciation for train and bus journeys.

Making holiday travel more sustainable by shifting the dominance of planes and cars towards trains and buses is a challenging task. As the findings show, transportation mode choice is inseparable from destination choice. Some destinations are only feasible to reach by plane and others require a car. The positive attitudes toward train and bus journeys could be utilised by policy makers through providing cheaper tickets and better infrastructure. Importantly, this might be able to make these transportation modes a competition to car, and perhaps also to the plane on some trips. Several participants showed interest in interrail services in Europe, and by making such transportation easier to access and more appealing, the perceptions around how far away it is feasible to travel by train could also be widened. Putting an emphasis on the positive sides of 'slow travel' can also help transforming the way people travel. Seeing how participants automatically connected abroad holidays to flying, there is significant room for improvement in this area. At the same time, if long-distance trips remain such an embedded part of holiday trips in the post-covid world, flying is unlikely to be reduced.

7. Futures

7.1. Post-covid holiday travelling

As already mentioned in the previous chapters, it is uncertain what kind of effect the covid-19 pandemic is going to have on long-term mobility. We have seen that participants themselves are looking forward to travelling abroad as soon as it becomes safe. They undeniably express a grown appreciation for holidays in Norway, and many of them are planning to travel more in their home country – but without reducing abroad trips. When it comes to the collective future of Norwegians' holiday travelling practices, some believe that the pandemic might have a transforming potential:

It's- it's very difficult to tell because it's possible that people think that 'now I can finally travel more'. I have also thought that, when I get the possibility, I would like to travel around the Earth. Because I did that when I was 19. You kind of want to do what you're not allowed to. So either it's going to go up a lot, or it's possible that people realise that they don't need it. Like, holidays in big cities and such, that maybe it's not so necessary. (Sofie)

Yes, it's difficult to answer because it can really go two ways, I feel. I feel that people have either started to get their eyes opened to holidays in Norway and started appreciating it more, or everyone is like 'finally we can go abroad, we're going now'. I feel it can go two ways, really. (Ingrid)

It is obvious that even the most optimistic participants, like Sofie and Ingrid, have serious doubts about whether the pandemic will have any long-term impact on holiday travelling. They mention the strong desire people might have for travelling abroad, and Sofie also refers to her own ambitious travel plans. Still, they do not rule out the possibility of a different development where holidays in Norway become more popular.

However, most participants did not consider this possibility to be realistic. It is clear that going back to business-as-usual is the opposite of moving towards the transition to sustainability that is highly needed in all areas of our lives. Still, business-as-usual is exactly what most participants expect to happen.

[...] if you think long-term, two, three, four- three-four years forward in time, I actually think that people will travel more out instead of in Norway. I mean, it can be a combination, of course, that they do it every other year or-. But I don't believe there will be any big changes. Those are my thoughts on it. If I just think about myself and think that now I'm alone, right, so I want to travel out, of course. As soon as I get the opportunity to travel abroad where I want to, I will, of course, do it. (Olivia)

I think maybe that when it's allowed to travel, I think people will travel a lot because they so insanely want to travel that they just have to do it. But I also think that if the prices go up for example because there will be fewer plane tickets, it can have an impact. But at the same time, I think people will be quite desperate to travel and planes will surely be sold out [...]. (Nora)

While both Olivia and Nora note that some permanent changes might occur in travelling practices, they also believe that the desire to travel abroad is so strong that neither the positive experience of this summer holiday in Norway or potential higher prices will have a real impact. In fact, they believe that international leisure travel might even increase from pre-covid times.

We must, again, remember that these individuals are well-educated and have a high awareness of climate change and their contribution to it. Many of them have also reflected over sustainability issues as a result of the pandemic. What explains the lack of willingness to change practices in this situation? In the previous chapters, we have seen that travel motivations are often very strong, which explains much of the resistance to reducing abroad travel. However, this refusal to change has other important aspects to explore as well.

7.2. Social denial

As introduced in chapter 3, one well-researched area in literature is the attitude-behaviour gap, which focuses on the paradox of people not making their lifestyles more environmentally friendly even though most of them find it important to live sustainably (Bamdad, 2019; Juvan & Dolnicar, 2014; Prillwitz & Barr, 2011;). As Hares et al. (2010) find, it is also possible to trace an “awareness-attitude gap”, where, despite the awareness of the environmental problems, there is a lack of not only pro-environmental behaviour, but also attitude. The following comments by Jakob and Maia illustrate these gaps:

No, I don't think too much about [the environmental consequences of transport modes] maybe. I don't think it's so significant whether I do this or that, I don't think so. I do think about the environment, I work with organic farming, so I think a lot about the environment, but, at the same time, I'm also a bit relaxed in relation to it. (Jakob)

Yeah, to some degree, I would say that I'm interested in sustainability, but maybe not so much in practice if I, in a way, think about how I myself live for example. Because as I just said, time can maybe rule over other things. (Maia)

In Jakob's case, it is clear that through his job he is well-informed about environmental issues, but does not seem to believe in individual action. Based on this comment, he appears to have little environmental attitude in connection with transportation modes as he does not seem to be concerned about the environmental consequences of his travelling. In Maia's case, it is less clear whether the gap is between awareness and attitude or attitude and behaviour. It appears that she does find it important to adopt

sustainable lifestyles, but she is caught up in what Rauschmayer & Omann term “intra-individual tensions” (2015, p. 116). They argue that people adopt different strategies to satisfy their needs, which can lead to the arising of inner conflicts when environmentally friendly strategies make it harder or impossible to pursue certain needs the way we are used to it. In Maia’s case, as it becomes clear from other parts of the interview, her focus on time is connected to wanting to get home to her family as quickly as possible and, therefore, she prefers flying instead of taking the train. Thus, it might be linked to the need for affection (Rauschmayer & Omann, 2015, p. 113), which comes into conflict with her desire to travel in an environmentally friendly way. This latter desire may also be connected to needs, for example, as Rauschmayer & Omann argue, needs for “protection, affection and identity” (2015, p. 117). The intra-individual tension Maia expresses is noticeable, but does not appear to be too pressing, which suggests that sustainability might not have a very strong connection to her needs and she sees the option of saving time by flying as clearly the favourable option.

Some other participants experience a bigger tension, resulting in feelings of guilt. According to Kugler & Jones’s definition, guilt is “associated with the recognition that one has violated a personally relevant moral or social standard” (1992, p. 318). For example, Ingrid gets “bad conscience” when she has to “admit” that she wants to travel abroad. Similarly, Emilie has had “bad conscience for some time” because she thinks she should be travelling less. Also referring to the violation of moral standards, Noah calls himself a “hypocrite” because he does not act on his environmental values in the context of holiday travelling. While these formulations are useful to express the inner tensions individuals experience, being a hypocrite might not adequately describe what is actually going on. While there surely exist people who claim to possess strong environmental values without actually doing so, these participants appear to genuinely care about the environment even if other values might become even more important to them sometimes. Individual feelings of guilt are, most of all, symptoms of the inner contradictions of the society they are a part of.

Norgaard’s (2011) analysis of a Norwegian town sheds light on how societies can continue to exist mostly unchanged in the midst of these contradictions. Following Cohen’s (2001, as cited in Norgaard, 2011) terminology, Norgaard argues that it is through “implicatory denial” (2011, p. 10) that societies sustain these lifestyles. This does not mean that people deny the facts of climate change or the connection between

carbon emissions and their lifestyles. Implicatory denial is “the failure to integrate this knowledge into everyday life or to transform it into social action” (2011, p. 11). In this argument, the emphasis on society is fundamental. Individual failures to act on climate knowledge cannot be interpreted independently of the societal denial of which they are a part of. Societies profit from keeping up the denial, not only in the form of continued economic growth, but also by avoiding the psychological tensions they would otherwise have to face (Norgaard, 2011, p. 72).

At the same time, the fact that many individuals are aware of the tensions behind the often “invisible” denial (Norgaard, 2011, p. 60) and express unease, guilt and inner conflicts suggests that there are cracks in this façade. When participants talk about the tensions they have to cope with in connection with sustainability and everyday life, we get to see behind what Norgaard terms “the mask of suffering” (2011, p. 61).

Individuals might adopt a number of strategies to maintain the denial and deal with the discomfort of cognitive dissonance (see Juvan & Dolnicar, 2014), but this does not take away the underlying tensions, which many people, at least from time to time, are confronted with.

7.3. Covid-19 and climate change: comparing the social response

As Norgaard (2011) argues, and as I have argued many times in the previous chapters, a real transition to sustainability has to happen on a societal level. As we have seen, the covid-19 pandemic can be a catalyst for such a change through disturbing existing practices and making them, in some ways, more sustainable, which also offers a window for relevant policy change. However, the pandemic has also taught us important lessons on how social change itself happens, an aspect I have only explored in traces so far.

The comparison of the covid-19 crisis and the climate crisis is relevant for several reasons. Firstly, they both require immediate and global response: no one nation can solve these crises alone. Secondly, they both require unprecedented political effort with measures that have a drastic impact on both the economy and people’s everyday lives. In addition, both crises largely stem from humans’ exploitation of nature: in essence, they are both part of the environmental crisis, and, therefore, a real response would have to address this issue.

What makes this comparison even more relevant for our topic is the special role of mobility. Global mobility has had a crucial role in the spread of the virus as well as in climate change through carbon emissions. Therefore, both crises require a transformation of mobility.

On the other hand, there are also important differences between the covid-19 pandemic and climate change. The pandemic is a much less complex issue and has much more immediate consequences compared to climate change. Vaccines, as we are already starting to see at the time of writing, are potentially able to end it. While this solution does not address underlying issues, and thus, it does not reduce the likelihood of future pandemics, it is able to weaken the current one. If the vaccination programme proves to be successful, we might be able to return to business-as-usual – at least until the next pandemic hits. In the case of climate change, however, there is no turning back. It requires a permanent transformation and one that involves a change in even more areas of our lives than the pandemic.

These differences shed some light on why humanity appears to cope with the pandemic better than climate change. Still, it is very relevant to dig deeper into the comparison and look at how the covid-19 pandemic has been able to induce the kind of social response that climate change has failed to bring about.

Most evident from the interviews is the power of the pandemic to shift practices connected to holiday travelling in our case. The vast majority of the informants had a very different summer holiday than they had originally planned. Although the data available does not make it possible to draw conclusions about the climate impact of their trips, it can be assumed that avoiding flying resulted in a smaller carbon footprint than usual for most participants. Why was the pandemic, as opposed to climate change, strong enough to shift our habits?

To answer this question, I am adopting a practice theory approach (Sahakian & Wilhite, 2014). As introduced earlier, in Sahakian & Wilhite's (2014) approach, practices have three 'pillars' (body, material world, social world), and the key to effectively shift practices lies in shifting as many of these pillars as possible. While the climate crisis has resulted in little change in the pillars of holiday travelling, the covid-19 crisis has had a big impact on all three pillars, and this way, it has resulted in a significant change of the practices.

In connection with changes of the material world of holiday travelling, we can think about the existence of the virus itself, which started all changes. In addition, closed borders and cancelled flights made it impossible or much harder to access abroad destinations. These had an effect on the material aspect of travelling, but they do not involve technological innovations and essentially stem from the social world. We have managed to reduce carbon emissions from travelling not by creating more energy-efficient technology, but by deciding, as a society, to reduce mobility. Therefore, I would argue that it is the social world that has the biggest importance in pandemic-induced changes in holiday travelling practices, with the body also having some importance. I am going to look at these two pillars through the reflections of Noah, who had important insights regarding the difference between the two crises.

[...] it's kind of that the environment is a bit more difficult to understand. I mean, it's in a way- I mean, I am, of course, on a general level worried about the developments in climate and the environment, but at the same time, it's difficult for me to understand: okay, what happens if you stop travelling? I mean, is it going to help? If you travel only once a year, it's difficult to see the consequences of the different actions. Also, it's- compared to corona again, as an individual, you have- or at least, it feels like you have a much bigger impact. I mean, if I go to Spain, get infected, come home, infect 20-30 other friends in Norway, and then it spreads, then I'm suddenly a super-spreader, right? While with the environment, it's difficult to see: okay, if I recycle as an individual, or I as an individual cut out a flight trip or two flight trips, what does it matter in the bigger picture when you have, like, big organisations that spit out- and factories that spit out CO₂, right? They spit out much more than I manage to produce in a lifetime, right? So it's kind of- you feel very small in that context. And so it's also very easy to think that: okay, because I'm so small, it doesn't matter whether I take a trip or whether we travel with the family. (Noah)

Noah's comment contains several important take-aways. The signs of modernity's individualism (Giddens, 1990), in which contemporary practices are embedded, are apparent in the passage. In this context, both the individualisation of the individual and the individualisation of society are relevant. In social practices, individuals are important as carriers of practices, and they are also present in 'the body' through skills, knowledge and beliefs (Sahakian & Wilhite, 2014). Importantly, these aspects are interconnected with 'the social world'.

As Giddens notes, in modernity, the core basis of individual choices are the individuals themselves (1990, p. 87). As it is visible in the above quote, the focus is on what *I*, as an individual can do, who *I am* in this situation, and whether it is worth it *for me* to do it. This, however, does not mean that collective well-being is not important for the individual. As Noah's comment also shows, not infecting others is a priority, and he

happily acts for the common good, but *he has to feel that he can make a difference*.

This points to an important difference between the covid-19 crisis and the climate crisis: the latter is far away from the individual's control, and environmentally friendly behaviour will usually not have any visible results. As Noah points out, the opposite is true as well: the negative environmental effect of his trip to Spain is also invisible, as opposed to its potential effect on spreading the virus.

Looking at it through a practice theory approach, the pillar of 'the body' has been addressed by attaining knowledge and beliefs about how the virus spreads and what individuals can and should do to avoid getting infected and infecting others. Noah emphasises that he has clear ideas about what should be done to cope with the pandemic. In connection with climate change, however, he expresses uncertainty about what he can do, and, moreover, he refers to the scope industrial emissions suggesting a belief that it does not matter whether he acts in an environmentally friendly way or not. Thus, the practice-shifting potential of the pillar of 'the body' is much bigger in the case of covid-19 than in the case of climate change. In the former, Noah actually believes that his actions matter for the development of the pandemic, and he has shifted his holiday practices significantly by not travelling abroad. This did not happen in connection with climate change as his knowledge and beliefs tell him that his actions would not improve the situation.

Another comment by Noah can help us reflect over the role of 'the social world' as well:

It's very hard for me to cut out travelling if, firstly, everyone around me is doing it, then it's again very, I was about to say, depressing, or difficult for me to rationalise for myself that I'm sitting here and avoiding travelling when planes are going all the time. This is one thing, and then you also have to be able to see, in a way-. I mean, the difficult thing is that you don't see its effects, right? I mean, if I stop travelling today, we will still have huge environmental problems in ten years if we continue like this. So it has to be, kind of- a bit like when we talk about corona, we talk about a national 'dugnad' [voluntary work for the community], that everyone makes an effort for the country or for the world, right? The same thing needs to happen with the environment too, that we are willing to- everyone makes an effort. Because it's very difficult as an individual to be like 'okay, I'll start to recycle' or 'I stop flying' or 'cycle more', I mean-. (Noah)

What this reflection by Noah sheds light on is the huge importance of 'the social world' for practice change. He illustrates why it is futile to wait on individual behaviour change: in many ways, people follow what others do. Noah advocates for the same kind of 'dugnad' as the way slowing down the spreading of the pandemic has been viewed in

Norway: everyone contributes for the benefit of the community. Indeed, one of the most powerful practice shifting forces of the covid-19 response has been a societal decision of making the issue a priority and taking action. The same has not happened in the case of the climate crisis.

The Norwegian authorities and the media has had a crucial role in making infection control a into a social norm that shifts social practices. An example that clearly illustrates this could be the statement by prime minister Erna Solberg on a press conference in January 2021: “I would like to tell those Norwegians who, until now, thought it was okay to travel on abroad holidays that it is not okay anymore. It is unnecessary to travel on abroad holidays, even if you go to quarantine afterwards. I believe that we now all must do our share in solidarity” (Krantz et al., 2021, my translation). Solberg leaves no doubt about what is and what is not acceptable in the situation created by the pandemic. She clearly intends to shape social norms through this message. Despite the fact that the potential consequences of climate change are infinitely more devastating than this pandemic, the same declaration would be unimaginable from a prime minister in the context of reducing carbon emissions. Societies have been refusing to make climate change a priority for decades, while the covid-19 pandemic immediately became the first concern around the world. This aspect of the social is certainly an important part of why covid-19 has been able to shift practices in ways climate change has not even come close to.

7.4. The freedom of mobility and the tragedy of the commons

After identifying how the covid-19 pandemic’s potential to transform social practices has been much greater than that of climate change, the question of how societies could become better suited to address the challenge of the climate crisis – and sustainable mobilities in particular – must be addressed.

In his famous article about ‘the tragedy of the commons’, Hardin (1968) explores the issue of overpopulation. His starting point is that this challenge cannot be solved by technology and requires a completely different approach. As argued earlier, the same appears to be true for tourism. As Young et al. (2014) note, sustainable tourism is a contradiction inasmuch as tourism fundamentally relies on aviation, and aviation is highly unlikely to become significantly more sustainable in the near future.

What is, then, the different approach Hardin suggests? He proposes abandoning ‘the commons’ in more areas of our lives. By this, he means that, with the current population size, lacking restrictions on exploiting natural resources that belong to everyone has catastrophic consequences. He demonstrates his point with the example of the shepherd who shares a field (the commons) with other shepherds, and for whom it is always worth it to buy an extra animal because the gain is only his, while the loss created by exploiting the field more and more is shared with all other shepherds (1968, p. 1244). This argumentation builds on the economic approach that views individuals as rational beings always maximising their profit, an approach that practice theory strongly criticises (Shove, 2010). I am not intending to move the discussion to an individual or rational decision focus, and the previous chapters have also demonstrated that there is much more that lies behind travel decisions than rationality. At the same time, Hardin’s argument is significant because it captures an important aspect of society’s failure of dealing with climate change. Noah’s remarks in the previous section are strikingly similar to Hardin’s argumentation: telling people to stop exploiting the commons (stop flying, in Noah’s case) in a society that keeps doing so does not lead to change.

Hardin’s suggestion is a social one: we should restrict the freedom connected to the commons (1968, p. 1247). In the context of holiday travel, this could be understood as abandoning the idea of unlimited holiday trips. Travelling (and, importantly, flying) as often as we like and as far away as we like, combined with cheap plane tickets and a ‘culture of travelling’, while the responsibility for the following emissions belongs to ‘everyone and no one’ has, unsurprisingly, not led to the highly needed emission reductions. At the same time, Hardin’s suggestion of reducing freedom appears to be problematic on the basis of the conducted interviews.

As we have already seen in participants’ reflections on automobility, ‘freedom’ is positively associated with travelling. Importantly, freedom is connected to realising one’s own life projects and thus, individualism (Giddens, 1990; Beck, 1992). As Caruana & Crane argue, freedom in tourism is “fluid” (2011, p. 1510), meaning that it means different things in different tourism settings. They distinguish between freedom as a tourism motivation, freedom as a narrative created by the tourism industry and freedom as power relations between different tourism agents (Caruana & Crane, 2011). While the latter two represent important elements of the freedom and tourism

discussion, the focus is mostly on the first one in the current argument. Freedom as tourism motivation is characterised by Caruana & Crane (2011) as both a liberation from everyday life and a freedom to choose destination and other aspects of the trip. These elements appeared both in chapter 5 and chapter 6. In this chapter, they act as a background of sustaining existing travel practices.

The simplest, and highly individualistic, justification for not limiting the freedom of travelling is the way Ella formulated why she would find it unacceptable to cut out abroad trips: travelling to certain destinations is “personally important” to her. Similarly, Olivia justifies her numerous trips to Italy by stating the personal benefits these trips have brought her: “but it was then I learnt the most Italian”. Oliver would also react negatively to substitute flying with other transportation modes because of individual desires: “you only have a certain amount of time to travel, and if you spend a lot of that time on, in a way, getting there, then you don’t get the same experience and maybe not what you wanted with the trip”.

Seeing how much value participants associate with individual projects, it is not surprising that, when discussing potential travel restrictions in connection with climate change, they often brought up ‘freedom’ as an argument against such restrictions.

Because if I were to travel less, then that would, in a way, limit my freedom. My personal freedom to do the things I want. (Olivia)

I mean, it sounds so intrusive, and I believe people can have different lives and different needs independent of my own situation, but maybe some people have family abroad as well or just have a bigger interest in experiencing other cultures. (Sofie)

Well, it’s kind of that when someone will decide that we’re not allowed to travel, if it’s like that, that’s going to be a bit weird. I would rather do it in a different way. (Leah)

These remarks all emphasise the importance of giving individuals an opportunity to decide themselves how they want to organise their lives and travel as much as it is best for them. As Sofie in another part of the interview says, it is not the actual travelling she misses the most during the covid-19 pandemic, but “the possibility to travel, [...] the freedom to be able to do it”. A challenging aspect both in the case of the pandemic and of climate change is the fact that we need to reduce existing freedoms. As Font & Hindley argue, as a result of reducing freedom, “we react against the interference to our prior access and this manifests itself in an increased desire to want, or to possess, the item more than before” (2017, p. 28). In their study, this explains the increased interest

in disappearing tourist destinations, but it is also relevant for the context of reducing mobility generally as the comments of the participants illustrate.

Hardin (1968), on the other hand, finds the resistance to give up freedom irrelevant. This is because, as he argues, we already live with countless restrictions, which are fundamental elements of maintaining society. Most of the time, it is only new restrictions we are unwilling to accept. He formulates the argument the following way:

Every new enclosure of the commons involves the infringement of somebody's personal liberty. Infringements made in the distant past are accepted because no contemporary complains of a loss. It is the newly proposed infringements that we vigorously oppose; cries of "rights" and "freedom" fill the air. But what does "freedom" mean? When men mutually agreed to pass laws against robbing, mankind became more free, not less so. Individuals locked into the logic of the commons are free only to bring on universal ruin; once they see the necessity of mutual coercion, they become free to pursue other goals (1968, p. 1248).

Importantly, Hardin suggests in this passage that reducing freedom can be a positive change. While common associations with taking away freedom, as also reflected in the informants' remarks, are overwhelmingly negative (and not without historical reasons, we might add), Hardin's argument offers a different turn on freedom. He suggests that giving up some of it is not only necessary in order to avoid the 'tragedy of the commons', but might also lead to a bigger overall freedom.

In the context of climate change, it is obvious that the consequences of continuing with carbon-intensive lifestyles will sooner or later take away many freedoms we are not willing to give up at the moment. This might be why, despite the fact that many participants seemed very interested in protecting their freedom to travel, several others expressed a wish for some kind of travel restrictions. This is how they formulated their thoughts in connection with imaginary travel restrictions to mitigate climate change:

I would actually react positively because we actually have to think a bit about the environment too. We actually have to. We can't just continue the way we're doing now. Some restrictions will come as a result of- I mean, a total release of everything is actually not good for the climate. It would be very good to get some restrictions, some- I would be positive. (Jakob)

I would, of course, understand it. So it would not be- actually, I would maybe react positively to it if it was not like you could never travel. But if we had some restrictions so that you can't travel as much as before, yeah. Some limitations, I would be positive to it. (Emilie)

I totally think it would be good for us to have some restrictions at least because we actually had none in connection with travelling. I think there are a lot of people, especially in the West, who in a way- if they can [travel], they do it [...]. (Ingrid)

These comments demonstrate that some (perhaps a lot of) people would, in fact, be supportive of climate measures involving reducing mobility. In addition, some participants expressed that a bigger focus on climate change by the government and the media would make them take the issue more seriously.

[...] just as we got restrictions, let's say that you can't fly more than once a year because of the environment, if it's, like, a possible example, I'm sure I would be a little- very conscious of that 'oj, the environmental changes are that bad, oh no, I have to pull myself together'. I think I would go into a kind of crisis mode, maybe not full crisis, but a bit like preparedness. I think so. (Nora)

If people had said 'okay, the climate is now going- 'ad undas', we're not allowed to travel anymore', I would, of course, understand it. In the same way as we say that now there is a worldwide pandemic, and so we can't travel. So then it's okay. But, I mean, I see the seriousness of climate issues, so if there was a lot of focus on it in the media that we should not travel and try to stay in Norway, don't fly and such things, it would influence me and my decision about where I would travel. (Noah)

These remarks support the arguments in the previous section about how the response to the covid-19 crisis was able to shift practices significantly, and, as Nora and Noah point out, similar responses to the climate crisis would also have the potential to induce changes. What all these comments demonstrate is that there is an awareness of the necessity of policy change, and several informants are open for regulations. This is in line with the study of Markowitz & Bowerman (2012), who found that, contrary to common assumptions, a strong majority of their sample in the United States are in favour of reducing consumption. On the other hand, it has also been suggested that the public support for climate policies in Western countries is affected by a large number of factors and is generally not high (Drews & van den Bergh, 2016).

In our context, Kallbekken & Sælen's (2021) study on Norway provide important findings about the public support of climate policy. Comparing the support for policy measures to reduce leisure air travel in connection with covid-19 on the one hand and climate change on the other, Kallbekken & Sælen (2021) find that the reason why covid-19 measures receive more public support mainly lies in the fact that the threat of pandemic is perceived as more immediate and the connected measures are both temporary and impactful. In addition, they highlight the importance of the broad support of the measures coming from different political parties in Norway. Thus, Kallbekken & Sælen (2021) conclude that it could be very possible to gain similar public support for climate policy as well if such measures were perceived as having a significant impact on the environment, and if climate change itself was perceived as

more urgent and threatening. This is in line with the positive reactions several of my informants gave to potential climate measures. Notably, Noah's emphasis on being able to see that his efforts make a difference is supported by Kallbekken & Sælen (2021) as well.

These findings might give room for some optimism in connection with the possibility of policy change to address the climate crisis. At the same time, the permanent nature of any appropriate climate measure (as opposed to the relatively short-term covid-19 measures) proposes a significant challenge. As a returning back to business-as-usual is not possible in the context of climate change, we need something else to work for and look forward to. One way to do this is by connecting climate change mitigation to positive societal development and alternative ideas of what 'the good life' means (Bain & Bongiorno, 2020).

7.5. An alternative good life

Following Hardin's (1968) argument about the positive consequences of giving up some freedoms for realising other freedoms, I am now going to focus on rethinking 'the good life' in a world with less and different holiday travel.

There are several reasons to focus on the bright side of the sustainability transition on the one hand, and actively create human flourishing through this transition on the other. As we have seen, participants often view a reduction in long-distance travel as a sacrifice – and not without a reason. Notwithstanding the immense joy that travelling can offer, we must not forget that there is also a dark side to tourism in the form of not only environmental, but also social degradation (Oviedo-García, et al., 2019). As discussed earlier in the context of climate change, several participants experience feelings of guilt in connection with travelling. As Norgaard (2011) argues, privileged, carbon-intensive lifestyles often go hand-in-hand with inner conflicts and dark thoughts. Ending the socially organised denial and finally addressing the environmental crisis offers the possibility of living with good conscience.

This means creating lifestyles where morality and pleasure do not stand in opposition (Caruana et al., 2020), which not only free us from the ever-present feelings of guilt, but also make sustainable living more attractive because of egoistic reasons. For example, researching the motivations of people to buy fair-trade coffee, Hwang & Kim (2018) found that motivations connected to guilt and empathy alone do not tend to lead

to permanent fair-trade buyers, but in combination with the egoistic motivation of realising one's own potential, they lead to both happiness and loyal customers. Pleasure-seeking, as an egoistic motivation, is especially important for sustainable holidays as pleasure is at the core of tourism (Goossens, 2000). As Goossens (2000) argues, push and pull factors (which we explored in chapter 5) are interlinked through pleasure-seeking and emotions. Therefore, rethinking tourism cannot happen without hedonistic considerations.

One approach to a lifestyle where pleasure and sustainability are both present is conceptualised by Soper (2015). Her 'alternative hedonism' has been mentioned to interpret positive associations with 'slow travel' in chapter 6.4.1. As we have seen there, the low-carbon transportation modes of train and bus can be connected to pleasure. 'Alternative hedonism' attempts to conceptualise a new type of 'good life', where pleasure is derived from less carbon-intensive activities (Soper, 2015). The connection between consumerism and human flourishing must be fundamentally questioned, and a new and appealing alternative must be provided.

How do the covid-holidays of the interview participants relate to 'alternative hedonism'? Participants generally agreed that they found a lot of pleasure in their summer holidays during covid-19. They mentioned finding relaxation, coziness and the beauty of nature in connection with cabin trips. They also participated in activities they enjoyed such as sailing, cycling, hiking, fishing, reading, paddling, cave touring and more. Some of these activities they had never done before. Importantly, several participants reported spending valuable time with their family and friends, which they claimed to be even be more important than the holiday destination. Ingrid said that she got more time together with her loved ones than she would have without the pandemic, while Olivia visited some family members for the first time in a decade. All these experiences can be considered 'alternative hedonism' in the sense that they offer alternatives to participants' usual carbon-intensive holiday practices, which often involve long-haul flight trips and shopping. In fact, these experiences contain much more than just hedonistic aspects.

As discussed in chapter 4.4, 'happiness' and 'the good life' are contested terms that can have numerous important elements (McKenzie, 2016). In his studies on the happiness of the Norwegian population, Hellevik does not use an overarching definition for

‘happiness’, but points out that questionnaires in happiness research often leave it up to the respondents themselves to interpret the term (2008, p. 12). Hellevik’s findings on the correlations between self-reported happiness and other factors can give us some ideas about the potential future of low-carbon holidays in ‘the good life’ in the Norwegian society.

Hellevik (2008) finds that a satisfaction in close relationships, living together with family, and health contribute the most to individual happiness. These had an even stronger positive impact than high income. The above-mentioned experiences of the participants suggest that their summer holidays had elements that could have contributed positively to happiness levels. Most notably, the emphasis on spending time with close family members and close friends as a result of staying in Norway can have an effect on the satisfaction with close relationships. In addition, several informants reported participating in outdoor activities, which is a mild happiness-increasing factor in itself (Hellevik, 2008, p. 100), and it can also contribute to health. For example, Sofie mentioned that this holiday had a positive impact on her physical fitness: “[...] I don’t think I’ve ever had such an active holiday before. That I have better fitness at the end of the holiday than at the beginning, I don’t think it has ever happened before”. Lower stress levels can also be beneficial for health. For example, Ingrid felt that she “got a little break from all the stress” as a result of the pandemic and “had a lot of time to relax”.

Of course, it must be mentioned that these findings are not excessive enough to draw any conclusions on the correlation between happiness levels and the summer holidays of the participants. Notably, factors that might have impacted happiness levels negatively were also present. Although it was not brought up during the interviews, the pandemic itself can obviously impose a psychological burden on people. The related mobility restrictions were also repeatedly connected to negative feelings, and they also had an impact on social relations for some participants who have family and friends abroad. Therefore, more research is needed to gain knowledge on the relationship between happiness and holiday travelling during the covid-19 pandemic.

In order for ‘alternative hedonism’ to become a long-term foundation of holiday practices, it is important to address all pillars of the practices (Sahakian & Wilhite, 2014). Firstly, knowledge on low-carbon holiday options could be more widely

conveyed. For example, several participants mentioned that travelling locally and to lesser-known tourist destinations in Norway could be more widely promoted. Secondly, the infrastructure could be transformed in a way that travelling by train or bus becomes cheaper and easier. This topic has been explored in chapter 5. Thirdly, as we have repeatedly seen during the chapters, it is highly necessary to transform social norms towards more sustainable holiday conceptualisations. Ultimately, this needs to involve a new social reevaluation of ‘the good life’.

Throughout the chapters, I have argued that modernity’s individualism (Beck, 1992; Giddens, 1990, 1991) has played a significant role in the production and reproduction of holiday practices. Therefore, McKenzie’s (2016) ‘good life’ theory, which suggests balancing out individual and collective happiness goals can be useful. As presented in chapter 4.4, McKenzie distinguishes between ‘happiness’ on the one hand, which focuses on pleasure and joy (it can be likened to hedonistic happiness), and ‘contentment’ on the other, which “consists of a satisfying relationship with society” (2016, p. 253). He argues that both are necessary for a good life, but our societies have been placing too much focus on the former and too little on the latter, which is partly a result of individualisation. ‘Contentment’ is both long-term and collective, and it is strongly connected to societal values and norms. Placing a bigger emphasis on this aspect can be vital for creating sustainable lifestyles in general and sustainable holiday travel practices in particular.

During the analysis, we have seen that there is a significant tension between what the informants thought was the environmentally friendly behaviour and their actual behaviour. This tension manifested in feelings of guilt, different kinds of denial, and other strategies to reduce the cognitive dissonance. In some ways, McKenzie’s ‘contentment’ can shed light on this tension. McKenzie (2016) claims that both ‘happiness’ and ‘contentment’ are important elements of ‘the good life’. Based on the interviews, it seems clear that, from the individualist aspect of ‘the good life’ (which McKenzie calls happiness), participants find it important to continue with carbon-intensive holiday practices despite the positive experiences they have had with less carbon-intensive trips. The collectivist aspect of ‘the good life’ (McKenzie’s contentment), however, is not so clear. Achieving ‘a satisfying relationship with society’ is not an easy task when, on the one hand, society itself encourages pursuing individual happiness (McKenzie, 2016), for example through flying to long-haul

holiday destinations, while on the other hand, being environmentally conscious has also become a societal expectation, as was suggested by the participants' eagerness to justify their decision to fly. In addition, participants are aware that the collective well-being of society requires a transition to less carbon-intensive lifestyles. Hardin also mentions this dilemma where the individual receives two opposing messages: if he decides to exploit the commons, he fails to act as a "responsible citizen", and if he does not exploit them, he becomes a "simpleton", who gives up drawing benefits from the commons, while everyone else continues to do so (1968, p. 1246). This contradiction is evident in Noah's case as explored in chapter 7.3. He would be willing to travel less on holidays, but not if everyone else continues to fly all the time. Similarly, Oliver's example in chapter 5.2.2 suggests that a big part of why he experienced staying in Norway during the covid-19 pandemic positively was the fact that the rest of society was staying too. He appears to have been able to achieve 'contentment' in this particular situation as his action of holidaying in Norway is in line with what he sees demonstrated as societal values in others' behaviour. Hardin's contradiction is not present here.

Therefore, as McKenzie argues, we need to address the "social shift toward individualisation" (2016, p. 260), where collective forms of happiness are pushed into the background and are characterised by the above contradictions. If, as McKenzie (2016) notes, 'the good life' is neither a universal or an individual phenomenon, but "a culturally specific idea that reflects the values and norms of a particular society" (2016, p. 260), we have the opportunity to create a new type of 'good life' on the premises of environmental sustainability. Restoring the place of long-term, collective happiness in 'the good life' seems essential in this process.

Eriksen reaches the same conclusion about the need for "a broad reassessment of the nature of the good life" (2015, p. 250). Like Soper (2015), he argues that a change is necessary not only because of environmental reasons, but also because the continuation of wealthy Western lifestyles does not lead to any more human flourishing. Eriksen (2015) points out, and this is especially relevant for Norway, that rich middle-classes hardly have anything to strive for or dream about because they have 'everything'. He takes one of his examples from holiday travel: dreams about exotic far-away holiday destinations are fulfilled quickly and easily (2015, p. 248).

What Eriksen suggests is “a collective project”, where sustainability and human flourishing are united and which could bring back a sense of hope for the future and of belonging to the community, very similarly to what McKenzie (2016) refers to with ‘contentment’:

Such a project would enable us to transcend ourselves, to do something both difficult and necessary, to reap other people’s recognition for it, to take part in an encompassing and encouraging community and to perform some morally defensible acts in the world. Such a project would reconnect politics and everyday life among the global middle classes with planetary needs (Eriksen, 2015, p. 255).

Such a project might bring us closer to finding the balance between individual and collective forms of happiness (McKenzie, 2016), and help create new social norms that bring pleasure in low-carbon ways (Soper, 2015), as well as end the cognitive dissonance and suffering behind the socially organised climate change denial (Norgaard, 2011).

Finally, Krippendorf’s (1987/2010) suggestions about creating “a better tourism” can offer ideas on what this collective project could look like in the context of tourism. Even though his text was originally published over three decades ago, his ideas are no less relevant today. Firstly, much in the same way as Hardin (1968), he argues that freedom should not be interpreted as a complete absence of regulations, but regulations should be in place for the sake of the environment and both present and future generations (Krippendorf, 1987/2010, chapter 12). Perhaps we need to adopt Jakob’s way of thinking, who is “able to adapt the freedom in the frames of restrictions”. If we want to reduce emissions, regulations on travel and especially aviation are absolutely necessary.

Secondly, Krippendorf (1987/2010) mentions what has also been the starting point of this thesis: we must travel less frequently and shorter distances. As we have seen in the interviews, it is possible to gain valuable and meaningful holiday experiences not too far away from home. Krippendorf’s suggestion of staying home more often and being more conscious of why we actually want to go away (1987/2010, chapter 15) is similar to Emma’s reflections, who, after her summer holiday during the pandemic, realised that staying home during the holidays might not always be such a bad thing. Similarly, Emil also mentioned becoming more conscious of his travel decisions:

In the future, I think I’m going to be more conscious of where I travel and why I travel there and whether there are any alternatives. (Emil)

And I have found out that it's not so important for me to always *go on* holiday during these holidays. [...] There were only ten days during the whole summer when we travelled, and the rest of the time we were home, so it was- and it was fine, really, so-. It was a bit boring sometimes, but other than that, it was fine. (Emma)

Perhaps, the boredom that Emma mentions can inspire us to find new ways of relaxing and having fun. The pandemic has at least shown that staying home from time to time might not be such a terrible thing. Nevertheless, as argued above, a wider societal change has a bigger potential of inducing change than focusing on individual decisions.

It must also be mentioned that Norwegians might have a better starting point for local holidays than many other nations. Despite the long and dark winters, Norway offers excellent opportunities for outdoor activities. As explored in earlier chapters, informants themselves praise the unique natural environment in the country, which provides great conditions for both relaxation and activity. In addition, many Norwegians enjoy relatively large and comfortable living areas in their homes in addition to having access to cabins, both of which might be suitable places for holiday relaxation.

Nevertheless, Krippendorf's (1987/2010, chapter 12) next point is very relevant for Norway as well: we need to create a better everyday life on several levels. As it has been argued earlier, holiday practices are interlinked with everyday practices, and a real transformation of holiday practices needs to include everyday practices as well. Perhaps, if some of our needs and desires we look for in exotic holiday destinations could be met in everyday life, it would be easier to travel less. Noah's and Ingrid's comments about how looking forward to the few weeks of vacation is what keeps them going during the work year illustrate that a rethinking work life might very well be a desirable aspect of creating more sustainable lifestyles. As Krippendorf argues, we need "self-realization and fulfilment in all spheres of life" (1987/2010, chapter 12, para. 2). Making work life more enjoyable, creative and fulfilling might help reduce the need to escape as explored in chapter 5.

For the same reason, the home environment could be improved so that inhabitants find more relaxation, meaning and excitement locally. Krippendorf suggests improving "homeliness":

A town, a neighbourhood, a street, a house or a flat are homely if they provide the opportunity for self-development, for contacts with other people, for expressing one's own personality, and creativity. Homeliness is above all the result of participation:

when the inhabitants can make their own contribution and change their own environment. It is people who create homeliness. (1987/2010, chapter 11, The restoration of homeliness, para. 1)

Thus, making local areas more homely can be part of Eriksen's (2015) collective project, where people could use their talents and build a community while contributing to a more sustainable world. Perhaps, Noah envisioned something similar when he called for a national 'dugnad' (voluntary work for the community) in connection with climate change.

7.6. Chapter conclusion

In this chapter, I have explored the possibility of achieving more sustainable holiday travel practices in the post-covid world. As we have seen, participants report that both themselves and people they know have found a new appreciation for travelling in Norway, which might suggest that domestic holidays will stay popular after the pandemic as well. At the same time, participants also show a great interest in travelling abroad as soon as it becomes feasible, and this is what they generally expect the rest of the society will do as well. Thus, the pandemic-induced experiences alone do not seem to be enough to shift holiday practices long-term.

That is why it is crucial to understand how and why change happened during the pandemic, and what is needed to achieve more sustainable holidays after the pandemic as well. Therefore, I looked at some of the most important similarities and differences between the covid-19 crisis and the climate crisis by analysing Noah's insights. In order for real action to happen in connection with climate change, it is necessary to shift 'socially organised denial' (Norgaard, 2011) to socially organised action. Similarly to the pandemic, the government needs to make climate change a priority, convey a clear message to people, and communities need to act collectively. It has been argued that, for substantial societal change towards sustainability, we need to redefine what 'the good life' means (Soper, 2015; Eriksen, 2015; Krippendorf, 1987/2010). In this 'good life', some travel freedom appears to be necessary to give up to avoid the 'tragedy of the commons' (Hardin, 1968). As the participants' reflections suggest, this freedom is not easily given up and any restrictions must happen in the frames of democracy. The fact that mitigating climate change requires a permanent transformation, from where there is no returning to business-as-usual makes the challenge even more difficult. However, as the study of Kallbekken & Sælen (2021) suggests, public support for leisure travel restrictions has been present during the covid-19 pandemic, and it is not

impossible to obtain in connection with climate change either. In addition, by placing a bigger emphasis on the societal contextuality of happiness (McKenzie, 2016), and making home environments and everyday life more joyous and fulfilling (Krippendorf, 1987/2010), a reduction of holiday travel might bring about meaningful, positive changes in society.

Of course, the above ideas do not give answer to how such a societal project would be feasible in practice. This analysis has attempted to shed light on the importance of targeting all pillars of holiday travel practices as well as the context these practices exist in. Both scholars and policy makers need to place more emphasis on how such a holistic tourism transformation could be achieved.

8. Conclusion

Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from holiday travel is essential to mitigate climate change (Scott et al., 2010). In this thesis, I have explored and analysed the summer holiday experiences of individuals in Norway during the covid-19 pandemic from a climate perspective. As both the climate crisis and the covid-19 crisis requires a reduction of global mobility, I intended to explore how the pandemic impacted the perceptions of the interview participants around holiday travel, and around the future possibility of more sustainable holiday practices. In particular, I looked at the perspectives of travelling shorter distances, less frequently and by more sustainable transportation modes, all of which are both relevant to reduce the spread of the virus and to reduce the severity of climate change.

During three analysis chapters, I have explored travel motivations for both abroad destinations and domestic destinations in Norway, perceptions around different transportation modes, and a potential sustainability shift in holiday travel. To formulate a conclusion, I am going to revisit the research questions presented in chapter 1.

1. How did Norwegian travellers experience taking domestic holidays as a result of the covid-19 restrictions in the summer of 2020?
2. How did this experience shape their perceptions on holiday travel in connection with sustainability and ‘the good life’?

Exploring the first question, we have seen that participants reflected on their holidays during the pandemic in various ways. To some of them, travelling in Norway during the summer holiday was a completely new experience, while others had done it many times before. Some participants reported unexpectedly enjoyable trips, while others were less thrilled by the experience. Still, while the level of satisfaction was not equally high, all participants reported an overall positive experience. Some found value in getting more time to relax or more time to spend with loved ones, while others fulfilled a long-term wish of discovering more of Norway. On the other hand, negative feelings also appeared in connection to not being able to travel abroad. Several participants mentioned feeling restless and having a strong desire to travel to foreign countries again. They agreed that their next summer holiday, if the state of the pandemic makes it possible, will be abroad.

Answering the second question required a deeper analysis. Several informants reported that their perceptions around the most important elements of a holiday has changed as a result of their experience during the pandemic. They mentioned giving more importance to spending time with close friends and family during the holiday as well as finding out that visiting ‘sun and sand’ destinations are not essential for a good holiday. In fact, their domestic holidays often fulfilled the requirements of what they themselves termed to be a ‘good holiday’.

Even though several participants appear to view Norway as a possible holiday destination to a larger degree than before, this positive experience seem to have had limited impact on the strong connection participants express between summer holidays and abroad destinations. Firstly, holiday travel practices can be strong habits where certain destinations are chosen largely because they have been chosen many times in the past. In addition, participants repeatedly mentioned that holidays in Norway are incapable of substituting abroad holidays because they do not contain enough ‘newness’. Domestic holidays in Norway are valuable, but travelling abroad, if this opportunity is present, is preferable because it provides new experiences that are very different from everyday life and home, as well as good weather conditions. As these aspects appeared to be some of the strongest travel motivations, participants were often negative to the idea of reducing abroad holidays voluntarily for sustainability reasons. In addition, visiting family and friends abroad acts as a very strong travel motivation for some participants, which makes voluntary travel reductions even less likely. Thus, while participants often expressed a desire to travel more in Norway after the pandemic as well, they want this to come in addition to – and not as a substitute of – abroad trips.

When it comes to transportation modes – a very important aspect from a climate perspective – participants mainly travelled by car to their domestic destinations. They found several positive sides of this mode of transportation, most notably the freedom to access a wide variety of destinations and to do so in a flexible and customisable manner. It is likely that they would choose to drive to domestic destinations in the future as well. Flying was not a significant transportation mode for the participants during the summer of 2020 as they did not travel abroad. A shift from flying to travelling by car can have some positive impact on greenhouse gas emission (Borken-Kleefeld et al., 2013). However, the pandemic does not seem to have had an impact on perceptions around flying and its attachment to abroad destinations, which means that

flying is likely to increase again as soon as the informants start travelling abroad. As both flying and driving should be reduced significantly to make holiday travel more sustainable (Borken-Kleefeld et al., 2013), the pandemic does not appear to be able to induce more sustainable transportation mode choices in the long run. A real change could occur by shifting to rail and bus, to which the participants showed some openness. Several of them mentioned choosing train and bus trips specifically because they enjoy the experience of the journey, which suggests that 'slow travel' (Dickinson et al., 2010; 2011) has relevance in tourism. At the same time, these were minor factors in the totality of holiday travel. Participants generally agreed that choosing these transportation modes more often would require an improvement of the infrastructure and cheaper tickets. In addition, many long-distance destinations are only accessible by flying, which again emphasises the importance of shifting towards short-distance destinations.

The findings suggest that such a change is extremely challenging to achieve because energy-intensive long-distance trips are deeply embedded in holiday travel practices. The importance of abroad trips does not simply lie in having a good holiday. They also have a unique importance to each individual, which has been built up through many years with abroad trips induced and reinforced by society. Therefore, as it has been argued throughout the thesis, a sustainability transformation requires a social approach.

Drawing on social practice theory (Sahakian & Wilhite, 2014), I have argued that the social response to the pandemic has been effective in changing holiday travel practices because it has addressed all pillars of practices, namely both knowledge and beliefs, and the sociomaterial world. Importantly, the social norm of holidaying during the summer involved staying in Norway instead of travelling abroad. As it has been explored through participant reflections, it was easy to understand the importance of staying in the country, and by doing so, one could make an important contribution to society by helping to reduce the spread of the virus. The same is not true for voluntary travel reductions for the climate, which neither have visible effect for the individual or the necessary societal support. Therefore, I have argued that climate change requires a similar response from governments to the covid-19 pandemic: it has to be recognised as an urgent threat, people need to get a clear message on what is to be done, and a societal effort needs to be made. As urgent emission reduction is necessary to mitigate climate change, regulations of travel appear to be essential.

However, it has also been recognised that the climate crisis is a much more complex and permanent challenge than the covid-19 pandemic. In order for long-term change to become possible, a deep societal transformation appears to be necessary. This would involve moving away from the dominance of individualism (Beck, 1992; Giddens, 1990, 1991), which maintains a society of individuals, who have the task of putting themselves in the centre and creating their own self-biographies through available lifestyle choices, while having to take responsibility for the environmental damage of large industries. Instead of denial, guilt and blaming the individual, there is a need for balancing out individual forms of happiness with collective ones (McKenzie, 2016), and reformulating ‘the good life’ on a societal level to include both pleasure and sustainability (Soper, 2015).

Thus, a holistic approach to making holiday travel sustainable is necessary. The linkages of the different bodily, social and material elements of holiday practices need to be taken into consideration as well as the interconnection of holiday practices with everyday practices. Thus, as Krippendorf (1987/2010) argues, a transformation of holiday travel needs to include a transformation of many segments of everyday life. Reducing frequent journeys to exotic travel destinations might happen through a combination of aviation regulations, better train and bus facilities, increased local leisure opportunities, a promotion of short-distance destinations, and generally through creating a more meaningful life at home and more fulfilling work conditions.

It is important to mention some limitations of this study. One significant limitation, as mentioned in the ‘Methods’ section, involves the qualitative approach and, in particular, the sampling process. Participants were overwhelmingly urban dwellers with higher education, and many of them were young adults. The collected data does not make it possible to draw conclusions regarding the Norwegian population or any small part of it. However, the lack of generalisability is not specific to this particular project, but rather a common attribute of most qualitative research (Agius, 2013). And, as most qualitative studies, this project did not aim to achieve statistical generalisation, but to analyse a phenomenon in detail and “deepen our understanding” of it (Agius, 2013, p. 204). In this case, this phenomenon was the summer holidays of individuals in Norway during the covid-19 pandemic and their connection to sustainability. In order to acquire even deeper knowledge and make the results more applicable for policy change, more research is needed in connection with the triangle of covid-19, tourism and

sustainability, both in Norway and in other countries. For example, the aspects explored in this thesis can be further investigated involving different population groups and methodologies.

In addition, I have interpreted the data through the perspectives of the chosen theories and literature. There are undoubtedly many other valuable perspectives that could have enriched the analysis and other aspects of the collected data that I could have focused on. Despite making an effort to answer the research questions through an objective and thorough analysis, this thesis has only been able to explore a small part of the relevant topics, angles and debates.

As a closing remark, we must remember that the covid-19 pandemic has taught us important lessons about how societal change happens. Perhaps, the most valuable lesson is that quick and profound societal change is possible. We see that governments around the world have been able to take radical measures to stop the spread of the pandemic, while people have shown willingness and ability to adapt to these measures. The experiences of the participants of this research have shown that different kind of holidays are not unthinkable, and travelling to short-distance destinations or even staying at home can be a basis of a valuable holiday experience. This can give us hope that a similarly strong response to climate change is also possible. However, the findings of this thesis clearly show that such a change will not happen automatically. Instead of going back to business-as-usual, it is crucial that we grab the opportunity the covid-19 crisis offers, learn from the past, and take strong steps towards the urgently needed societal change to sustainability. Just like the participants of this study, we might find some unexpected joys on the way.

References

- Aall, C. (2011). Hyttebruk og miljø: en arena for nøysomhet eller overforbruk? In H. J. Gansmo, T. Berker, & F. A. Jørgensen (Eds.), *Norske hytter i endring. Om bærekraft og behag* (pp. 107-124.). Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Aamaas, B., & Peters, G. P. (2017). The climate impact of Norwegians' travel behavior. *Travel, Behaviour & Society*, 6, 10-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2016.04.001>
- Adamiak, C., Hall, C. M., Hiltunen, M. J., & Pitkänen, K. (2016). Substitute or addition to hypermobile lifestyles? Second home mobility and Finnish CO2 emissions. *Tourism Geographies*, 18(2), 129-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2016.1145250>
- Adey, P., Budd, L., & Hubbard, P. (2007). Flying lessons: exploring the social and cultural geographies of global air travel. *Progress in Human Geography*, 31(6), 773-791. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132507083508>
- Agius, S. J. (2013). Qualitative research: its value and applicability. *The Psychiatrist*, 37(6), 204-206. <https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.113.042770>
- Aguiló, E., Alegre, J. n., & Sard, M. (2005). The persistence of the sun and sand tourism model. *Tourism Management (1982)*, 26(2), 219-231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.11.004>
- Amelung, B., & Moreno, A. (2012). Costing the impact of climate change on tourism in Europe: results of the PESETA project: The impacts of climate change in Europe. *Climatic Change*, 112(1), 83-100. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0341-0>
- Andersen, E. (2020). *Flere bor alene*. Retrieved 19.05.2021 from <https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/flere-bor-alene>
- Andresen, B. (2020). *Nesten 1 av 10 personbiler er en elbil*. Retrieved 24.05.2021 from <https://www.ssb.no/transport-og-reiseliv/artikler-og-publikasjoner/nesten-1-av-10-personbiler-er-en-elbil>
- Ateljevic, I. (2020). Transforming the (tourism) world for good and (re)generating the potential 'new normal'. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 467-475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1759134>
- Aylen, J., Albertson, K., & Cavan, G. (2014). The impact of weather and climate on tourist demand: the case of Chester Zoo. *Climatic Change*, 127(2), 183-197. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-014-1261-6>
- Backer, E. (2012). VFR travel: It is underestimated. *Tourism Management*, 33(1), 74-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.01.027>
- Bain, P. G., & Bongiorno, R. (2020). It's not too late to do the right thing: Moral motivations for climate change action. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews. Climate Change*, 11(1), n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.615>
- Bamdad, T. (2019). Pro-environmental attitude-behavior; A spillover or a gap? In U. Stankov, S.N. Boemi, S. Attia, S. Kostopoulou, & N. Mohareb (Eds.), *Cultural Sustainable Tourism: A Selection of Research Papers from IEREK Conference on Cultural Sustainable Tourism (CST), Greece 2017* (pp. 169-183). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-10804-5_17
- Barr, S., Shaw, G., Coles, T., & Prillwitz, J. (2010). 'A holiday is a holiday': practicing sustainability, home and away. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(3), 474-481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2009.08.007>
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Sage.
- Becken, S. (2007). Tourists' perception of international air travel's impact on the global climate and potential climate change policies. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(4), 351-368. <https://doi.org/10.2167/jost710.0>
- Berker, T., Gansmo, H. J., & Jørgensen, F. A. (2011). Hyttedømmen mellom hjem, fritid og natur. In H. J. Gansmo, T. Berker, & F. A. Jørgensen (Eds.), *Norske hytter i endring. Om bærekraft og behag* (pp. 9-22). Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Borken-Kleefeld, J., Fuglestad, J., & Berntsen, T. (2013). Mode, load, and specific climate impact from passenger trips. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 47(14), 7608-7614. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es4003718>

- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brouder, P. (2020). Reset redux: possible evolutionary pathways towards the transformation of tourism in a COVID-19 world. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 484-490. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1760928>
- Bryne, B. (2018). Qualitative interviewing. In C. Seale (Ed.), *Researching Society and Culture* (pp. 217-236.). SAGE.
- Buckley, R. (2009). Evaluating the net effects of ecotourism on the environment: a framework, first assessment and future research. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(6), 643-672. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580902999188>
- Buckley, R. (2011). Tourism under climate change: Will slow travel supersede short breaks? *Ambio*, 40(3), 328-331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-010-0100-x>
- Buckley, R. (2012). Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 528-546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.02.003>
- Butler, R. (2009). Tourism in the future: Cycles, waves or wheels? *Futures: the Journal of Policy, Planning and Futures Studies*, 41(6), 346-352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2008.11.002>
- Butler, R. W. (1999). Sustainable tourism: A state-of-the-art review. *Tourism Geographies*, 1(1), 7-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616689908721291>
- Cambridge. (n.d.). *Culture*. Retrieved 19.05.2021 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/culture>
- Casey, M. E. (2010). Low cost air travel: Welcome aboard? *Tourist Studies*, 10(2), 175-191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797611403061>
- Caruana, R., & Crane, A. (2011). Getting away from it all. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1495-1515. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.02.001>
- Caruana, R., Glozer, S., & Eckhardt, G. M. (2020). 'Alternative hedonism': Exploring the role of pleasure in moral markets. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 166(1), 143-158. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04123-w>
- Cohen, M. J. (2012). The future of automobile society: a socio-technical transitions perspective. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 24(4), 377-390. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2012.663962>
- Cohen, S., Demeritt, D., Robinson, J., & Rothman, D. (1998). Climate change and sustainable development: towards dialogue. *Global Environmental Change*, 8(4), 341-371. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-3780\(98\)00017-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-3780(98)00017-X)
- Cohen, S. A., Higham, J. E. S., & Cavaliere, C. T. (2011). Binge flying. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), 1070-1089. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.01.013>
- Correia, A., Kozak, M., & Reis, H. (2016). Conspicuous consumption of the elite: Social and self-congruity in tourism choices. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(6), 738-750. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287514563337>
- Craig, C. A., & Feng, S. (2018). A temporal and spatial analysis of climate change, weather events, and tourism businesses. *Tourism Management (1982)*, 67, 351-361. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.02.013>
- Cwerner, S. (2009). Introducing aeromobilities. In S. Cwerner, S. Kesselring, & J. Urry (Eds.), *Aeromobilities*. Routledge.
- Dann, G. M. S. (1981). Tourist motivation an appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(2), 187-219. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(81\)90082-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(81)90082-7)
- Davis, A. Y., Pijanowski, B. C., Robinson, K., & Engel, B. (2010). The environmental and economic costs of sprawling parking lots in the United States. *Land use policy*, 27(2), 255-261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2009.03.002>
- Desforges, L. (2000). Traveling the world: Identity and travel biography. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(4), 926-945. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00125-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00125-5)
- Dickinson, J. E., Lumsdon, L. M., & Robbins, D. (2011). Slow travel: issues for tourism and climate change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(3), 281-300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2010.524704>

- Dickinson, J. E., Robbins, D., & Lumsdon, L. (2010). Holiday travel discourses and climate change. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(3), 482-489.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2010.01.006>
- Dokka, Å. G. (2015). *Slik ferierte vi på 70-tallet*. Retrieved 04.03.2021 from
<https://www.ssb.no/transport-og-reiseliv/artikler-og-publikasjoner/slik-ferierte-vi-pa-70-tallet>
- Døving, R. (2011). Stedet Syden. *Norsk Antropologisk Tidsskrift*, 22(1), 18–34.
- Dowling, Robyn, & Simpson, Catherine. (2013). 'Shift - the way you move': reconstituting automobility. *Continuum*, 27(3), 421–433.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2013.772111>
- Drews, S., & van den Bergh, J. C. J. M. (2016). What explains public support for climate policies? A review of empirical and experimental studies. *Climate Policy*, 16(7), 855-876. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2015.1058240>
- Dwyer, L., Seetaram, N., Forsyth, P., & King, B. (2014). Is the migration-tourism relationship only about VFR? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 46, 130-143.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.03.009>
- Eidsvold, J., Eilertsen, M., Sveen, E. H., & Lysvold, S. S. (2021). – *Nord-Norgebanen kan ikke selges inn som et miljøprosjekt*. Retrieved 11.05.2021 from
<https://www.nrk.no/nordland/anders-bjartnes-mener-nord-norgebanen-ikke-kan-selges-inn-som-et-miljoprojekt-1.15464190>
- Elliott, A., & Urry, J. (2010). *Mobile Lives*. Routledge.
- Enzensberger, H. M. (1996). A Theory of Tourism. *New German Critique*, 68(68), 117-135.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3108667>
- Eriksen, T. H. (2015). Afterword: beyond the paradox of the big, bad wolf. In K. L. Syse & M. L. Mueller (Eds.), *Sustainable Consumption and the Good Life* (pp. 244-256.). Routledge.
- Eurostat. (2021). *Share of population participating in tourism, 2019*. Retrieved 16.05.2021 from [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=File:Share_of_population_participating_in_tourism,_2019_\(%25_of_population_aged_15_years_or_more\).png](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=File:Share_of_population_participating_in_tourism,_2019_(%25_of_population_aged_15_years_or_more).png)
- Flemmen, M., Hjellbrekke, J., & Jarness, V. (2018). Class, Culture and Culinary Tastes: Cultural Distinctions and Social Class Divisions in Contemporary Norway. *Sociology*, 52(1), 128–149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038516673528>
- Font, X., & Hindley, A. (2017). Understanding tourists' reactance to the threat of a loss of freedom to travel due to climate change: a new alternative approach to encouraging nuanced behavioural change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(1), 26-42.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1165235>
- Georgica, G. (2015). The Tourist's Perception about Slow Travel – A Romanian Perspective. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, 1596-1601. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00557-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00557-2)
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in The Late Modern Age*. Polity Press.
- Good, M. C., & Hyman, M. R. (2020). 'Fear of missing out': antecedents and influence on purchase likelihood. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 28(3), 330-341.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2020.1766359>
- Goodwin, K. J. (2010). Reconstructing automobility: The making and breaking of modern transportation. *Global Environmental Politics*, 10(4), 60-78.
https://doi.org/10.1162/GLEP_a_00031
- Goossens, C. (2000). Tourism information and pleasure motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 301-321. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00067-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00067-5)
- Gössling, S., & Hall, C. M. (2006). *Tourism and Global Environmental Change: Ecological, Social, Economic and Political Interrelationships*. Routledge.

- Gössling, S., & Humpe, A. (2020). The global scale, distribution and growth of aviation: Implications for climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, 65, 102194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102194>
- Gössling, S., Hanna, P., Higham, J., Cohen, S., & Hopkins, D. (2019). Can we fly less? Evaluating the ‘necessity’ of air travel. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 81, 101722. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2019.101722>
- Gössling, S., Humpe, A., & Bausch, T. (2020a). Does ‘flight shame’ affect social norms? Changing perspectives on the desirability of air travel in Germany. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 266, 122015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122015>
- Gössling, S., Scott, D., & Hall, C. M. (2020b). Pandemics, tourism and global change: a rapid assessment of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1758708>
- Gössling, S. (2020). Risks, resilience, and pathways to sustainable aviation: A COVID-19 perspective. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 89, 101933–101933. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2020.101933>
- Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162(3859), 1243-1248. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.162.3859.1243>
- Hares, A., Dickinson, J., & Wilkes, K. (2010). Climate change and the air travel decisions of UK tourists. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(3), 466-473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2009.06.018>
- Harmon-Jones, E. (2019). *Cognitive Dissonance: Reexamining a Pivotal Theory in Psychology* (2nd ed.). American Psychological Association.
- Haywood, K. M. (2020). A post COVID-19 future - tourism re-imagined and re-enabled. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 599-609. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1762120>
- Helgerud, M. (2018). *Si meg hvor du reiser og jeg skal si deg hvem du er*. Aschehoug.
- Hellevik, O. (2008). *Jakten på den norske lykken: Norsk monitor 1985-2007*. Universitetsforlaget.
- Henriksen, G. (2020). *Vi ferierte mer utenlands*. Retrieved 16.05.2021 from <https://www.ssb.no/transport-og-reiseliv/artikler-og-publikasjoner/vi-ferierte-mer-utenlands>
- Henriksen, G., & Kvile, J. (2019). *Spania på ferietoppen i Norge og Europa*. Retrieved 04.03.2021 from <https://www.ssb.no/transport-og-reiseliv/artikler-og-publikasjoner/spania-pa-ferietoppen-i-norge-og-europa>
- Higham, J., Cohen, S. A., Cavaliere, C. T., Reis, A., & Finkler, W. (2016). Climate change, tourist air travel and radical emissions reduction. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 111, 336-347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.10.100>
- Hitchings, R. (2011). Researching air-conditioning addiction and ways of puncturing practice: Professional office workers and the decision to go outside. *Environment and Planning A*, 43(12), 2838-2856. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a43574>
- Hjetland, G. B., & Slåen, Å. (2021). *Kommuneoverlege: – Besøk frå barnebarn er ei nødvendig reise*. Retrieved 16.04.2021 from <https://www.nrk.no/vestland/for-andre-aret-pa-rad-far-dei-ikkje-sja-barnebarna-1.15433684>
- Huta, V. (2013). Eudaimonia. In I. Boniwell, S. A. David, & A. C. Ayers (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Happiness*. Oxford University Press.
- Hwang, K., & Kim, H. (2018). Are ethical consumers happy? Effects of ethical consumers' motivations based on empathy versus self-orientation on their happiness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(2), 579-598. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3236-1>
- Ibarra, E. M. (2011). The use of webcam images to determine tourist–climate aptitude: favourable weather types for sun and beach tourism on the Alicante coast (Spain). *International Journal of Biometeorology*, 55(3), 373-385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-010-0347-8>
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2018). *Global Warming of 1.5 °C : an IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening*

- the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty.* IPCC.
- Ioannides, D., & Gyimóthy, S. (2020). The COVID-19 crisis as an opportunity for escaping the unsustainable global tourism path. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 624-632. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1763445>
- Jacobsen, J. K. S. (2000). Anti-tourist attitudes: Mediterranean charter tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 284-300. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00069-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00069-9)
- Jacobsen, J. K. S. (2002). Southern comfort: A study of holiday style patterns of Northerners in coastal Mallorca. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 2(1), 49-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/150222502760347536>
- Jacobsen, J. K. S., & Dann, G. M. S. (2009). Summer holidaymaking in Greece and Spain: Exploring visitor motive patterns. *Anatolia: an International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 20(1), 5-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2009.10518891>
- Jacobsen, J. K. S., Skogheim, R., & Dann, G. M. S. (2015). Sun, sea, sociability, and sightseeing: Mediterranean summer holidaymaking revisited. *Anatolia: an International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 26(2), 186-199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2014.931288>
- Jahoda, G. (2012). Critical reflections on some recent definitions of “culture”. *Culture & Psychology*, 18(3), 289-303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X12446229>
- Johnsen, T. K. (2011). Med barn på hytta - energikrevende rekreasjon. In H. J. Gansmo, T. Berker, & F. A. Jørgensen (Eds.), *Norske hytter i endring. Om bærekraft og behag* (pp. 75-90.). Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Jørgensen, F. A. (2011). Den første hyttekrisa. Samfunnsplanlegging, naturbilder og allmenningens tragedie. In H. J. Gansmo, T. Berker, & F. A. Jørgensen (Eds.), *Norske hytter i endring. Om bærekraft og behag* (pp. 37-52.). Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Juvan, E., & Dolnicar, S. (2014). The attitude-behaviour gap in sustainable tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 48, 76-95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.05.012>
- Kallbekken, S., & Sælen, H. (2021). Public support for air travel restrictions to address COVID-19 or climate change. *Transportation Research. Part D, Transport and Environment*, 93, 102767. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2021.102767>
- Kaltenborn, B. P. (1997). Nature of place attachment: A study among recreation homeowners in Southern Norway. *Leisure Sciences*, 19(3), 175-189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490409709512248>
- Kanger, L., & Schot, J. (2016). User-made immobilities: a transitions perspective. *Mobilities*, 11(4), 598-613. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2016.1211827>
- Kent, J. L. (2015). Still feeling the car - The role of comfort in sustaining private car use. *Mobilities*, 10(5), 726-747. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2014.944400>
- Killingberg, K. (2021). *Fortviler over definisjonen på «nødvendig» reise for å treffe familie i utlandet*. Retrieved 16.04.2021 from <https://www.nrk.no/vestland/de-med-familie-i-utlandet-fortviler-over-regjeringens-definisjon-av-nodvendige-reiser.-1.15434979>
- Koseoglu, M. A., Rahimi, R., Okumus, F., & Liu, J. (2016). Bibliometric studies in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 61, 180-198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2016.10.006>
- Krantz, A., Carlsen, H., Kristensen, M., Aasen, K. R., & Iraki, R. (2021). *I praksis blir grensen stengt for alle som ikke bor i Norge*. Retrieved 10.03.2021 from <https://www.nrk.no/norge/regjeringen-strammer-inn-innreisereglene-ytterligere-1.15348213>
- Krippendorf, J. (2010). *The Holiday Makers: Understanding the Impact of Leisure and Travel*. Butterworth-Heinemann. (Original work published 1987).
- Kugler, K., & Jones, W. H. (1992). On conceptualizing and assessing guilt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(2), 318-327. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.62.2.318>
- Lane, B. (2018). Will sustainable tourism research be sustainable in the future? An opinion piece. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 25, 161-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2017.12.001>

- Lee, D. S., Fahey, D. W., Forster, P. M., Newton, P. J., Wit, R. C. N., Lim, L. L., Owen, B., & Sausen, R. (2009). Aviation and global climate change in the 21st century. *Atmospheric Environment*, 43(22), 3520-3537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2009.04.024>
- Leiper, N. (2000). Are destinations 'the heart of tourism'? The advantages of an alternative description. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 3(4), 364-368. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500008667878>
- Lew, A. A. (2018). Why travel? - Travel, tourism, and global consciousness. *Tourism Geographies*, 20(4), 742-749. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2018.1490343>
- Lew, A. A., Cheer, J. M., Haywood, M., Brouder, P., & Salazar, N. B. (2020). Visions of travel and tourism after the global COVID-19 transformation of 2020. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 455-466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1770326>
- Lickorish, L. J., & Jenkins, C. L. (1997). *An Introduction to Tourism* (1st ed.). Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Lise, W., & Tol, R. S. J. (2002). Impact of climate on tourist demand. *Climatic Change*, 55(4), 429-449. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020728021446>
- Lumsdon, L. M., & McGrath, P. (2011). Developing a conceptual framework for slow travel: a grounded theory approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(3), 265-279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2010.519438>
- Lund, V. (2021). *71 prosent færre flypassasjerer i 4. kvartal*. Retrieved 01.04.2021 from <https://www.ssb.no/transport-og-reiseliv/artikler-og-publikasjoner/71-prosent-faerre-flypassasjerer-i-4.kvartal>
- Lyons, G. (2012). Technology fix versus behaviour change. In M. Grieco & J. Urry (Eds.), *Mobilities: New Perspectives on Transport and Society*. Routledge.
- Madsen, L. V., & Gram-Hanssen, K. (2017). Understanding comfort and senses in social practice theory: Insights from a Danish field study. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 29, 86-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2017.05.013>
- Markowitz, E. M., & Bowerman, T. (2012). How much is enough? Examining the public's beliefs about consumption. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 12(1), 167-189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2011.01230.x>
- McGrath, M. (2020). Coronavirus: Air pollution and CO2 fall rapidly as virus spreads. Retrieved 10.01.2021, from <https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-51944780>
- McKenzie, J. (2016). Happiness vs contentment? A case for a sociology of the good life. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 46(3), 252-267. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsb.12098>
- Metz, D. (2013). Peak car and beyond: The fourth era of travel. *Transport Reviews*, 33(3), 255-270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2013.800615>
- Müller, D. K. (2007). Second homes in the Nordic countries: Between common heritage and exclusive commodity. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(3), 193-201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250701300272>
- Muñoz, C., Alvarez, A., & Banos, J. F. (2021). Modelling the effect of weather on tourism: does it vary across seasons? *Tourism Geographies*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1868019>
- Munoz, J. R., Griffin, T., & Humbracht, M. (2017). Towards a new definition for “visiting friends and relatives”. *The International Journal of Tourism Research*, 19(5), 477-485. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2110>
- Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2013). What makes for a life well lived? Autonomy and its relation to full functioning and organismic wellness. In I. Boniwell, S. A. David, & A. C. Ayers (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Happiness*. Oxford University Press.
- Nižetić, S. (2020). Impact of coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic on air transport mobility, energy, and environment: A case study. *International Journal of Energy Research*, 44(13), 10953-10961. <https://doi.org/10.1002/er.5706>
- Norgaard, K. M. (2011). *Living in Denial: Climate Change, Emotions, and Everyday Life*. MIT press.

- Oviedo-García, M. Á., González-Rodríguez, M. R., & Vega-Vázquez, M. (2019). Does sun-and-sea all-inclusive tourism contribute to poverty alleviation and/or income inequality reduction? The case of the Dominican Republic. *Journal of Travel Research*, 58(6), 995-1013. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287518789272>
- Oyier, B. (2020). *Innenlandsreiser økte kraftig i 3. kvartal*. Retrieved 04.03.2021 from <https://www.ssb.no/transport-og-reiseliv/artikler-og-publikasjoner/innenlandsreiser-okte-kraftig-i-3.kvartal>
- Parkins, W. (2004). Out of time: Fast subjects and slow living. *Time & Society*, 13(2-3), 363-382. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X04045662>
- Peeters, P., & Dubois, G. (2010). Tourism travel under climate change mitigation constraints. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(3), 447-457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2009.09.003>
- Phillips, W. J., & Back, K.-J. (2011). Conspicuous consumption applied to tourism destination. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 28(6), 583-597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2011.603630>
- Prebensen, N. K., Larsen, S., & Abelsen, B. (2003). I'm not a typical tourist: German tourists' self-perception, activities, and motivations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(4), 416-420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287503041004011>
- Prillwitz, J., & Barr, S. (2011). Moving towards sustainability? Mobility styles, attitudes and individual travel behaviour. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 19(6), 1590-1600. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2011.06.011>
- Raibley, J. R., (2012). Happiness is not well-being. *Journal of Happiness studies*, 13(6), 1105-1129. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-011-9309-z>
- Rajan, S. C. (2006). Automobility and the liberal disposition. *The Sociological Review*, 54(s1), 113-129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2006.00640.x>
- Raju, K.S., & Kumar, D.N. (2018). Introduction. In *Impact of Climate Change on Water Resources: With Modeling Techniques and Case Studies* (pp. 1-25). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6110-3_1
- Randles, S., & Mander, S. (2009). Aviation, consumption and the climate change debate: 'Are you going to tell me off for flying?'. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 21(1), 93-113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537320802557350>
- Rauschmayer, F., & Omann, I. (2015). Well-being in sustainability transitions: making use of needs. In K. L. Syse & M. L. Mueller (Eds.), *Sustainable Consumption and the Good Life* (pp. 111-125.). Routledge.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2), 243-263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310222225432>
- Rees, E. (2011). "Det egentlige Norge" - hytter i norsk litteratur, ca. 1814-2005. In H. J. Gansmo, T. Berker, & F. A. Jørgensen (Eds.), *Norske hytter i endring. Om bærekraft og behag* (pp. 23-36). Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Rivas, C. (2018). Finding themes in qualitative data. In C. Seale (Ed.), *Researching Society and Culture* (pp. 429-454.). SAGE.
- Rosenthal, E. (2010). *Can we kick our addiction to flying?* Retrieved 10.01.2021 from <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2010/may/24/kick-addiction-flying>
- Sahakian, M., & Wilhite, H. (2014). Making practice theory practicable: Towards more sustainable forms of consumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 14(1), 25-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540513505607>
- Schatzki, T. (2010). Materiality and social life. *Nature and Culture*, 5(2), 123-149. <https://doi.org/10.3167/nc.2010.050202>
- Schatzki, T. R. (2002). *The Site of the Social: A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Scott, D. (2011). Why sustainable tourism must address climate change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(1), 17-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2010.539694>

- Scott, D., Peeters, P., & Gössling, S. (2010). Can tourism deliver its "aspirational" greenhouse gas emission reduction targets? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(3), 393-408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669581003653542>
- Selstad, L., Nogués-Pedregal, A. M., & Jacobsen, J. K. S. (2020). Practices in-between: Norwegian long-term visitors in Mediterranean Spain. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 18(3), 223-236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2018.1540631>
- Sheller, M. (2004). Automotive emotions: Feeling the car. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 21(4-5), 221-242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276404046068>
- Shove, E. (2010). Beyond the ABC: Climate change policy and theories of social change. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(6), 1273-1285. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a42282>
- Shove, E. (2014). Putting practice into policy: reconfiguring questions of consumption and climate change. *Contemporary Social Science*, 9(4), 415-429. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2012.692484>
- Shove, E., Pantzar, M., & Watson, M. (2012). *The Dynamics of Social Practice: Everyday Life and how it Changes*. SAGE Publications.
- Siegel, L. A., & Wang, D. (2019). Keeping up with the Joneses: emergence of travel as a form of social comparison among millennials. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 36(2), 159-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2018.1499579>
- Soper, K. (2015). Towards a sustainable flourishing: democracy, hedonism and the politics of prosperity. In K. L. Syse & M. L. Mueller (Eds.), *Sustainable Consumption and the Good Life* (pp. 43-54.). Routledge.
- Statistisk sentralbyrå. (2021). *Fakta om hytter og fritidsboliger*. Retrieved 16.05.2021 from <https://www.ssb.no/bygg-bolig-og-eiendom/faktaside/hytter-og-ferieboliger>
- Støa, E., Manum, B., & Aune, M. (2011). Drømmen om det enkle liv - et grunnlag for mer bærekraftig hyttekultur? In H. J. Gansmo, T. Berker, & F. A. Jørgensen (Eds.), *Norske hytter i endring. Om bærekraft og behag* (pp. 53-74.). Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Straumsness, M., Sølhusvik, L., Turnage, V., Eilertsen, M., & Skei, L. (2021). *Ap sikrer flertall for Nord-Norgebanen*. Retrieved 11.05.2021 from https://www.nrk.no/tromsogfinnmark/nord-norgebanen-behandles-i-stortinget-tirsdag_-ap-sikrer-flertall-for-jernbane-i-nord-1.15463058
- Sun, Y.-Y., & Lin, Z.-W. (2018). Move fast, travel slow: the influence of high-speed rail on tourism in Taiwan. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(3), 433-450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1359279>
- Taylor, E. J., & van Bommel-Misrachi, R. (2017). The elephant in the scheme: Planning for and around car parking in Melbourne, 1929–2016. *Land use policy*, 60, 287-297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.10.044>
- The World Bank. (n.d.) *International Tourism, Number of Arrivals*. Retrieved 10.01.2021 from <https://data-worldbank-org.ezproxy.uio.no/indicator/ST.INT.ARVL?end=2018&start=1995>
- Tranter, B. (2013). Sampling. In M. Walter (Ed.), *Social Research Methods* (3rd ed., pp. 227-253.). Oxford University Press.
- Travers, M. (2013). Qualitative interviewing methods. In M. Walter (Ed.), *Social Research Methods* (3rd ed., pp. 225-253.). Oxford University Press.
- UNWTO. (n.d.a). *Glossary of Tourism Terms*. Retrieved 10.01.2021 from <https://www.unwto.org/glossary-tourism-terms>
- UNWTO. (n.d.b). *Climate Action*. Retrieved 10.01.2021 from <https://www.unwto.org/sustainable-development/climate-change>
- Urry, J. (2004). The 'System' of Automobility. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 21(4-5), 25-39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276404046059>
- Urry, J. (2009). Aeromobilities and the global. In S. Cwerner, S. Kesselring, & J. Urry (Eds.), *Aeromobilities*. Routledge.
- Urry, J. (2012). Do mobile lives have a future? *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 103(5), 566-576. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2012.00749.x>
- Urry, J., & Larsen, J. (2011). *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. London: SAGE Publications.

- van Vliet, O, Brouwer, A.S, Kuramochi, T, van den Broek, M.A, & Faaij, A.P.C. (2011). Energy use, cost and CO2 emissions of electric cars. *Journal of Power Sources*, 196(4), 2298–2310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpowsour.2010.09.119>
- Vassenden, A., & Jonvik, M. (2019). Cultural Capital as a Hidden Asset: Culture, Egalitarianism and Inter-Class Social Encounters in Stavanger, Norway. *Cultural Sociology*, 13(1), 37–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975518782244>
- Veblen, T. (1912). *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*. Macmillan.
- Veenhoven, R. (2013). Notions of the good life. In I. Boniwell, S. A. David, & A. C. Ayers (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Happiness*. Oxford University Press.
- Vittersø, G. (2007). Norwegian Cabin Life in Transition. *Scandinavian journal of hospitality and tourism*, 7(3), 266-280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250701300223>
- Watson, M. (2012). How theories of practice can inform transition to a decarbonised transport system. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 24, 488-496. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2012.04.002>
- Wearing, S., & Neil, J. (2000). Refiguring self and identity through volunteer tourism. *Loisir et Société*, 23(2), 389-419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07053436.2000.10707537>
- Weaver, D.B, & Lawton, L.J. (2007). Twenty years on: The state of contemporary ecotourism research. *Tourism Management*, 28(5), 1168–1179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.03.004>
- Week, L. (2012). I am not a tourist: Aims and implications of “traveling”. *Tourist Studies*, 12(2), 186-203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797612454627>
- Wheeler, T., & von Braun, J. (2013). Climate change impacts on global food security. *Science*, 341(6145), 508–513. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1239402>
- Wierzbicka, A. (2004). 'Happiness' in cross-linguistic & cross-cultural perspective. *Daedalus*, 133(2), 34-43. <https://doi.org/10.1162/001152604323049370>
- Willis, K. (2013). In M. Walter (Ed.), *Social Research Methods* (3rd ed., pp. 315-336.). Oxford University Press.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our Common Future*. Oxford University Press.
- World Tourism Organization, & International Transport Forum. (2019). *Emissions of the Tourism Sector – Modelling Results*. UNWTO.
- Xue, J., Næss, P., Stefansdottir, H., Steffansen, R., & Richardson, T. (2020). The hidden side of Norwegian cabin fairytale: climate implications of multi-dwelling lifestyle. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 20(5), 459-484. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2020.1787862>
- Yazdanpanah, H., Barghi, H., & Esmaili, A. (2016). Effect of climate change impact on tourism: A study on climate comfort of Zayandehroud River route from 2014 to 2039. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 17, 82-89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2015.12.002>
- Young, C. A., Corsun, D. L., & Baloglu, S. (2007). A taxonomy of hosts visiting friends and relatives. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(2), 497-516. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2006.12.003>
- Young, M., Higham, J. E. S., & Reis, A. C. (2014). ‘Up in the air’: A conceptual critique of flying addiction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, 51-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.08.003>
- Young, M., Markham, F., Reis, A. C., & Higham, J. E. S. (2015). Flights of fantasy: A reformulation of the flyers’ dilemma. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 54, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.05.015>

Appendix 1: Interview guide

Korona og fritidsreiser intervjuguide

Del 1 - Endringer i praksis i forbindelse med feriereiser

- Hvordan var denne sommeren sammenliknet med en vanlig sommer for deg? Hva var de største endringene sammenliknet med før-korona sommerferien?
- Hva hadde du egentlig planlagt for sommerferien?
- Kan du fortelle meg om reisen du faktisk gjorde? (oppfølging: reisemål, transportmidler, overnatting)

Del 2 - Reiseopplevelse

1. Transportmidler

- Hvilke aspekter tar du i betraktning når du velger transportmiddel for fritidsreise og hvordan har dette forandret seg som følge av koronapandemien? (for eksempel tid, pris, komfort, trygghet, miljøkonsekvens)
 - Hvilke transportmidler brukte du i år og hva pleier du vanligvis å bruke?
 - Hvordan opplevde du å bruke dette transportmiddelet sammenliknet med det du vanligvis bruker?
- Hvilken rolle har transportmiddelet og selve reisingen i ferieopplevelsen for deg? Gi gjerne eksempler fra årets ferie eller tidligere ferier.
- Tror du at opplevelsen av sommerens reise vil påvirke hvilket transportmiddel du skal velge i framtiden? På hvilken måte?

2. Norgesferie

- Hvordan valgte du ut reisemålet? Er dette et sted du hadde vært før eller var det nytt?
- Hva slags forestillinger eller forventninger hadde du i forbindelse med å dra på norgesferie før reisen? Hvor lik eller annerledes var opplevelsen i forhold til det du hadde forestilt deg? Var det noe som overrasket deg?
- Hva slags aktiviteter gjorde du under ferien, og i hvilken grad var dette annerledes enn det du vanligvis gjør?
- Hva var det mest positive aspektet ved din norgesferie i år? Og det mest negative?
- Hva synes du generelt om feriemulighetene i Norge?
 - Hva tror du kunne gjøre norgesferie mer attraktivt for nordmenn?
- Er det noe du føler du kan oppleve i Norge som du ikke kan oppleve på utenlandsreiser? Og omvendt: Er det noe du føler mangler fra norgesferier som du bare kan oppleve på utenlandsreiser?
- I Norge er det populært med både sydentur og hyttetur. Hvilken rolle har disse ferietypene i ditt liv?
 - Hva tror du er årsaken til at disse ferietypene er så attraktive for nordmenn?

3. Mennesker

- Har det vært noen endringer i hvem du reiste sammen med på ferie i år? Hvordan tror du de du reiste sammen med opplevde ferien?

- Var det noen du hadde tenkt å besøke i sommerferien, men ikke fikk mulighet på grunn av koronakrisen? Var det noen du besøkte, men som du ikke hadde besøkt hvis det ikke hadde vært pandemi? Hvordan opplevde du dette?
- Hvilken rolle har mennesker generelt når du planlegger feriereiser? For eksempel å ha som mål å besøke venner eller familie eller å møte nye mennesker.

Del 3 - Framtiden

1. Refleksjoner basert på sommerferien

- Hva er de viktigste elementene av en god ferie for deg?
 - Hvilke elementer har denne sommerferien klart å oppfylle, og hvilke elementer manglet den?
 - Har det vært noen endringer i hvordan du tenker rundt den gode ferie nå sammenliknet med før-korona?
- Forutsatt at man får mulighet til å reise som vanlig i neste sommer, hvordan tenker du den sommerferien blir?
 - Hvordan tror du at koronakrisen vil påvirke feriereiser fremover på kort sikt og på lang sikt? For deg og for andre?
- Hvordan hadde du opplevd hvis du ikke hadde fått mulighet til å reise på ferie til utlandet i de kommende årene? Eller aldri igjen?
 - Hva tror du du ville savnet mest, og hva slags opplevelser ville du erstattet det med?
 - Hva slags konsekvenser hadde det fått for dagliglivet ditt hvis du ikke hadde fått mulighet til å reise på ferie utenom et begrenset område?

2. Miljø

- Nå har vi opplevd reiserestriksjoner på grunn av pandemi. Hvordan ville du reagert på reiserestriksjoner på grunn av klima?
- Koronapandemien har hatt positive konsekvenser for miljø i form av mindre klimagassutslipp fra reising. Hvor bærekraftig tror du din sommerferie var sammenliknet med før-korona sommerferier? På hvilken måte? (Du kan også trekke inn andre aspekter enn reising.)
- Hva betyr bærekraftig feriereising for deg?
 - Har denne erfaringen med koronapandemien påvirket hvordan du tenker rundt dette? På hvilken måte?
 - Hva tenker du skal til for at feriereising skal bli mer bærekraftig?
 - Hvordan tror du at koronakrisen kunne benyttes for å gjøre feriereising mer bærekraftig? På enkeltindividets nivå og på samfunnsnivå?
- Hvilke endringer i feriereiser ville du vært villig til å gjøre for miljøet?
 - I transportmiddel?
 - I destinasjon?
 - I hyppighet?
- Hva er Norges ansvar i å gjøre feriereiser mer bærekraftige?

Er det noe du har lyst til å tilføye?

Appendix 2: Consent form

Vil du delta i forskningsprosjektet «Korona og fritidsreiser»?

Dette er et spørsmål til deg om å delta i et forskningsprosjekt hvor formålet er å forstå hvordan koronapandemien har påvirket fritidsreiser i sommer. I dette skrivet gir vi deg informasjon om målene for prosjektet og hva deltakelse vil innebære for deg.

Formål

Formålet med dette prosjektet er å forstå hvordan reiserestriksjoner grunnet koronapandemien har endret hvordan nordmenn ferierer. Vi ønsker å undersøke hvordan de som dro på norgesferie i år istedenfor å reise til utlandet opplevde ferien. Videre vil vi undersøke hvordan denne opplevelsen har påvirket oppfatninger rundt norgesferier og muligheter for å gjøre fritidsreiser mer bærekraftige i Norge. Vi vil altså analysere koronapandemiens effekt på fritidsreiser fra et velvære- og et bærekraftsperspektiv.

Dette prosjektet gjennomføres i forbindelse med en masteroppgave på Universitetet i Oslo.

Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?

Karen Lykke Syse, forsker og veileder ved Senter for utvikling og miljø (Universitetet i Oslo) er ansvarlig for prosjektet. Prosjektet gjennomføres av Georgina Winkler, masterstudent ved Senter for utvikling og miljø.

Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta?

Vi ønsker å rekruttere rundt 10 personer som har lyst til å delta i studiet. Felles for dem er at de har vært på norgesferie i sommer. Ellers ønsker vi variasjon blant de som deltar for å forstå hvordan nordmenn med ulik bakgrunn har opplevd norgesferien under koronapandemien.

Hva innebærer det for deg å delta?

Å delta i prosjektet betyr at du blir intervjuet av studenten på et sted som passer for deg eller gjennom digital plattform. Intervjuet vil ta maks 1 time. I intervjuet vil dere snakke om din opplevelse av årets ferie, inkludert transport og aktiviteter, og dine tanker rundt fremtidige reiser og bærekraft. Intervjueren tar lydopptak og notater fra intervjuet.

Det er frivillig å delta

Det er frivillig å delta i prosjektet. Hvis du velger å delta, kan du når som helst trekke samtykket tilbake uten å oppgi noen grunn. Alle dine personopplysninger vil da bli

slettet. Det vil ikke ha noen negative konsekvenser for deg hvis du ikke vil delta eller senere velger å trekke deg.

Ditt personvern – hvordan vi oppbevarer og bruker dine opplysninger

Vi vil bare bruke opplysningene om deg til formålene vi har fortalt om i dette skrivet. Vi behandler opplysningene konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

- Det er kun studenten og veilederen som vil ha tilgang til opplysningene før intervjudataene anonymiseres.
- Navnet og kontaktopplysningene dine vil vi erstatte med en kode som lagres på egen navneliste adskilt fra øvrige data.
- Intervjudataene vil brukes i studentens masteroppgave og eventuelt foredrag knyttet til denne, men alle personopplysninger blir anonymisert. Det betyr likevel at det er en mulighet for at du gjenkjenner egne uttalelser fra intervjuet.

Hva skjer med opplysningene dine når vi avslutter forskningsprosjektet?

Opplysningene anonymiseres når prosjektet avsluttes og oppgaven er godkjent, noe som etter planen er mai 2021. Personopplysninger og lydopptak vil da slettes og kun det anonymiserte datamaterialet beholdes.

Dine rettigheter

Så lenge du kan identifiseres i datamaterialet, har du rett til:

- innsyn i hvilke personopplysninger som er registrert om deg, og å få utlevert en kopi av opplysningene,
- å få rettet personopplysninger om deg,
- å få slettet personopplysninger om deg, og
- å sende klage til Datatilsynet om behandlingen av dine personopplysninger.

Hva gir oss rett til å behandle personopplysninger om deg?

Vi behandler opplysninger om deg basert på ditt samtykke.

På oppdrag fra Senter for utvikling og miljø har NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS vurdert at behandlingen av personopplysninger i dette prosjektet er i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

Hvor kan jeg finne ut mer?

Hvis du har spørsmål til studien, eller ønsker å benytte deg av dine rettigheter, ta kontakt med:

- Senter for utvikling og miljø ved veileder Karen Lykke Syse
(k.l.syse@sum.uio.no)
- Senter for utvikling og miljø ved masterstudent Georgina Winkler
(georgiw@student.hf.uio.no)
- Personvernombud ved Universitetet i Oslo: Roger Markgraf-Bye
(personvernombud@uio.no)

Hvis du har spørsmål knyttet til NSD sin vurdering av prosjektet, kan du ta kontakt med:

- NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS på epost (personverntjenester@nsd.no) eller på telefon: 55 58 21 17.

Med vennlig hilsen

Karen Lykke Syse
(Veileder, Senter for utvikling og miljø)

Georgina Winkler
(Masterstudent, Senter for utvikling og miljø)

Samtykkeerklæring

Jeg har mottatt og forstått informasjon om prosjektet Korona og fritidsreiser, og har fått anledning til å stille spørsmål. Jeg samtykker til:

- å delta i intervju med lydopptak

Jeg samtykker til at mine opplysninger behandles frem til prosjektet er avsluttet

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)