



Cruise trouble. A practice-based approach to studying Arctic cruise tourism

Carina Ren^{a,*}, Laura James^b, Albina Pashkevich^c, Hindertje Hoarau-Heemstra^d

^a Centre for Innovation and Research in Culture and Living in the Arctic, Aalborg University, Denmark

^b Department of Culture and Learning, Aalborg University, Denmark

^c Centre for Tourism and Leisure Research (CeTLER), Dalarna University, Sweden

^d The faculty of Social Sciences at Nord University, Norway

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Arctic cruise tourism
Theories of practice
Arctic communities, staying with the trouble
Cruise communities

ABSTRACT

Cruise arrivals in the Arctic often take place in small coastal communities. Although there may be economic benefits for these communities, these are often counterbalanced by social and environmental stresses. In this article, we ask how we can tend to Arctic cruise tourism development using Haraway's concept of staying with the trouble. As a way to bridge often polarized views on cruise tourism as either an economic tool or a destructive force, we propose a practice-based research approach to engage with the complexities of cruise tourism. The aim is to foster response-ability for Arctic cruise communities to live (better) with cruise tourism. We argue that practice-based approaches help researchers 'stay with the trouble' as it is rooted in everyday experiences and the materiality of cruise destinations. Also, its flat ontology supports a 'tinkering' approach to cruise practices.

1. Introduction

Visits to ports of call are an important part of the Arctic cruise tourism experience. However, the potential economic benefits of cruise tourism in small coastal communities are counterbalanced by the social and environmental stresses associated with these visits (Weaver & Lawton, 2017). Managing cruise tourism in the Arctic is very complex, but political and public discourses often reduce cruise tourism to either a lever for economic development for local communities (see Naalakkersuisut, 2016:14) or a destructive force threatening them (e.g. Connolly, 2019). Here, the trajectories of cruise communities are either seen as locked in to salvatory and dystopian futures. In these scenarios the futures where cruise tourism is framed either as a way to (economically) save or (socio-culturally) destroy Arctic communities.

In this paper, we are interested in bridging the understanding of and response-ability towards Arctic cruise tourism as reductionist avenues towards either progress or despair. We introduce Donna Haraway's concept of staying with the trouble (2016) as the research position(ality) towards this aim. As argued by Haraway (2016), the idea of staying with the trouble is both livelier and more serious than accounts of salvatory or dystopian futures. It "requires learning to be truly present, not as a vanishing pivot between awful and endemic pasts and apocalyptic or salvific futures, but as mortal critters entwined in myriad unfinished configurations of places, times, matters, meaning" (p. 2). As a relational

endeavor, such an approach does not offer simplistic, generalized 'solutions' or sweeping critique, but proceeds through research efforts which Anne Marie Mol has also described as "ongoing, adaptive, tinkering and open ended" (Heuts & Mol, 2013, p. 130). In this lens, and as argued by Ren (2021, p. 135), referring specifically to tourism, "trouble is not an issue to be overcome, but rather a condition that we are in and in which we all become-with tourism".

While policy makers and media might seek to address and respond to the complexities, forces and impacts of Arctic cruise tourism, their often simple or reductionist conclusions have been less successful in rendering communities response-able in relation to cruise tourism, in the sense of enabling responses to expressed exigencies and concerns. Often, building 'resilience' is proposed as a way forward to harness cruise communities, which according to Reid (2019) implicitly demands adaptation to external imperatives (especially economic) and in responding to global changes. Referring to the Indigenous Sami, Reid argues how resilience should be seen as "an element within a narrative strategy for the scripting of the Arctic and the life-worlds of indigenous peoples inhabiting it, rather than an expression of the agency of indigenous peoples as such" (p. 13). While resilience might allude to adaptive powers, it also forces Arctic communities, "into accepting the necessity of a future laden by disastrous events" (ibid.).

As suggested by Haraway, the situated knowing, made possible by staying with the trouble, allows instead for response-ability. Such an

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: ren@hum.aau.dk (C. Ren), leja@hum.aau.dk (L. James), alp@du.se (A. Pashkevich), hin.h.heemstra@nord.no (H. Hoarau-Heemstra).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100901>

Received 26 October 2020; Received in revised form 1 October 2021; Accepted 15 October 2021

Available online 5 November 2021

2211-9736/© 2021 The Authors.

Published by Elsevier Ltd.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

approach expands the visions of cruise tourism as much more than an industry (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006; Ren & Chimirri, 2018; Ren, Jóhannesson, Kramvig, Pashkevich and Höckert, 2021) and invites in many more actors, such as non-humans, into a cruise tourism ontology. It enable us to see tourism not as a uni-dimensional ‘tool’ or ‘threat’, but as a “tense, messy, distributed and collaborative achievement and a process of making-with, becoming-with and thinking-with a much larger collective than the usual tourism stakeholders” (Ren & Jóhannesson, 2017, p. 27).

Drawing on recent collaborative formats in Arctic and cruise research (Hansen & Ren, 2020; Stewart, Dawson, & Johnston, 2015), we propose a practice-based approach to staying with cruise trouble by engaging with its development together with stakeholders and local communities. We argue that the flat ontology introduced in tourism through practice theory (James, Ren, & Halkier, 2019) supports a ‘tinkering’ and relational perspective on cruising and cruise communities by linking local to national as well as global concerns.

Haraway (1988, p. 590) argued that “the only way to find a larger vision is to be somewhere in particular” and this leads us to emphasize a more fine-grained and situated understanding of cruise tourism and its role in everyday life. The importance of tending to the local scale responses to the challenges brought by cruise tourism is critical. Cruise tourism development varies considerably among Arctic communities depending on the social, political and institutional settings, as well as the possibilities to adopt and respond to the changes that often have global origins (Heikkinen, Bjørst, & Pashkevich, 2020; Lépy et al., 2014; Smit & Wandel, 2006). In relation to cruise tourism, this is important, as we acknowledge that there are different ways of valuing it, as it connects to the practices of a wider group of different stakeholders.

In the article, we critically review Arctic cruise research and explore cruise tourism as a troubling, serious and very real phenomenon in the Arctic. We present an overview of Arctic cruise tourism through three tenets of *cruise trouble* identified in cruise tourism research. Based on these central research themes, we advocate for a research approach, which is dedicated to ‘staying with’ rather than solving or critiquing, the tensions and troubles of cruise communities. This entails a practice-based approach, which is then introduced in further detail. Practice-based research is rooted in the everyday experiences and the materiality of cruise destinations. Through a flat ontology, this allows for an extended view of the interconnectedness of local to global. As we illustrate using the case of a beach clean-up in Svalbard, tending to practices offers a view into how stakeholders engage and co-exist with cruise tourism, seeking not to *overcome*, but to live (better) with (or without) it. In our conclusion, we propose ways forward in Arctic cruise tourism research after Covid-19 and reflect on the management implications of this approach.

2. Co-existing with cruise: An overview of Arctic cruise tourism research and its central themes

Since the 1980s cruise tourism has experienced explosive growth. Cruise ship activities have expanded from the Mediterranean and Caribbean to the Baltic Seas, South America, South East Asia, China, Antarctica and the Arctic (Brida, Riaño, & Aguirre, 2011; Têtu, Dawson, & Lasserre, 2019). Few early publications can be found on cruise tourism in Polar regions, which generally warned that careful consideration should be given to the environmental implications of cruise tourism development (Wace, 1990). Furthermore, Marsh and Staple (1995) concluded that given the environmental fragility of the Arctic region and the vulnerability of small, remote, largely aboriginal communities to impact, great care must be exercised in using the area for cruise tourism.

In the Arctic, expansion of cruise tourism prompted the development of integrated management policies to address sustainability concerns for local inhabitants, the fragile Arctic environment, and safety of the polar cruise tourism industry. This has influenced the research agenda for Arctic cruise tourism research, as sustainability and resilience have also

become important themes in cruise tourism research since 2000. Early studies focused on the regulatory framework in order to identify gaps, opportunities and barriers for cruise tourism (Dawson, Johnston, & Stewart, 2014, 2017; Dawson, Stewart, Johnston, & Lemieux, 2016; Lasserre & Têtu, 2015; Pashkevich, Dawson, & Stewart, 2015; Pashkevich & Stjernström, 2014). In the following sections, we review Arctic cruise tourism research, structuring the discussion in relation to three central troubles, which are elaborated below. The first trouble centers around the impacts and stakeholder attitudes connected to cruise tourism. The second focuses on climate change, sustainability and resilience, while the third trouble connects to governance and management.

2.1. Impacts and stakeholder attitudes

The effects of large numbers of cruise tourism passengers to Arctic Canada, Svalbard and Greenland have received the most research attention (Stewart, Dawson, & Draper, 2011; Têtu et al., 2019). Much of this research has focused on the impacts of cruise tourism development and the views of cruise tourism stakeholders and/or local residents, typically with recommendations for more sustainable and inclusive management and regulation of the industry (e.g., Dawson et al., 2016). Arctic Canada is particularly well researched e.g. (Dawson et al., 2014; Dawson et al., 2017; Johnston, Johnston, Stewart, Dawson, & Lemelin, 2012; Stewart et al., 2013; Stewart and Draper, 2009). A smaller number of studies have focused on destinations in Iceland (Fridriksson, Wise, & Scott, 2020), Greenland (James, Olsen, & Karlsdóttir, 2020), Norway (Van Bets, Lamers, & van Tatenhove, 2017), Alaska (Adams, 2010) and North-west Russia (Lamers & Pashkevich, 2018; Olsen et al., 2020; Olsen, Carter, Dawson, & Coetzee, 2019; Pashkevich & Stjernström, 2014).

A general feature of the above research is that it takes a case study approach, typically based on one to three destinations, and framed in terms of the costs and benefits of cruise tourism from the perspective of the destination communities, and how these can be balanced. While there are differences in the ways that each individual community is affected by cruise tourism, there are a number of common impacts that reappear across the literature, often coupled to a sustainability framework based on economic, social and environmental costs and benefits. Typical benefits of cruise tourism in Arctic destinations are perceived to be economic growth, extra income and employment, the showcasing of local culture and heritage and the development of transportation and other infrastructure. Also mentioned are opportunities to meet people from other cultures, the potential creation of tourist ambassadors and the promotion of a positive image of the destination among those who visit (Adams, 2010; Maher, 2007, 2012; McCarthy, 2018; Olsen et al., 2020; Stewart et al., 2015). In relation to the costs of cruise tourism, a variety of environmental impacts are frequently mentioned, such as fuel spills, bilge water release, groundings and invasive species introduction, air and noise pollution, disturbance of wildlife and the disposal of waste (Fridriksson et al., 2020; Palma et al., 2019; Van Bets et al., 2017).

With regard to social and cultural impacts, local cultural practices, intrusions to privacy and livelihoods, overcrowding and competition for resources are frequently noted, with the worst effects in small destinations where many passengers come ashore at the same time (Brida & Zapata, 2010; James et al., 2020; Olsen et al., 2020). Concerns are also expressed about the extent to which alleged economic benefits of cruise tourism are realized by local cruise communities. Research indicates that cruise tourists spend less money than land-based tourists, partly because they have relatively little time ashore (Larsen & Wolff, 2016; Larsen, Wolff, Marnburg, & Øgaard, 2013) and that external cruise tourism operators keep a large percentage of the price of shore excursions (James et al., 2020).

Stewart et al. (2015) note a shift in the way that resident attitudes have been theorized, away from stage-based attitude models such as Doxey (1976) and Butler (1980). These models assume that residents'

attitudes are homogenous and evolve in a predictable way. While studies have found that cruise communities are heterogeneous, there does seem to be a link between development stages and the concern of residents about the negative impacts of cruise tourism (e.g. James et al., 2020; McCarthy, 2018; Stewart et al., 2011; Stewart et al., 2015).

2.2. Climate change, sustainability and resilience

Sustainability and, in particular, the impacts of climate change, are prominent themes in the literature on Arctic cruise tourism. The climate of the Arctic is changing rapidly, with higher average temperatures, increased precipitation and more variable and extreme weather conditions (Palma et al., 2019). The thickness and extent of sea ice has decreased (Bystrowska, 2019; Zhang, Rothrock, & Steele, 2017) and this is one of the reasons why Arctic cruise tourism has experienced rapid growth, as previously inaccessible areas have become potential destinations (Lasserre & Tétu, 2015).

Unpredictable ice conditions also increase the risks for Arctic shipping. A frequently noted concern for local communities is their ability to react to incidents involving cruise ships and the lack of search and rescue capabilities in remote areas (Stewart et al., 2015). Climate change also affects the photogenic wildlife - one of the main motivations for tourists to visit the Arctic. In this context, the Arctic has become one of the most important destinations for so-called 'Last Chance Tourism' (Lemelin, Dawson, Stewart, Maher, & Lueck, 2010) where tourists are motivated by a desire to see landscapes or wildlife that are expected to disappear due to climate change. This phenomenon underlines the fact that Arctic cruise tourism is vulnerable to rapid environmental changes and natural hazards.

Much of the cruise tourism literature focused on communities is framed in terms of sustainability, typically understood in terms of the three 'pillars' of environmental, economic and social impacts, and studied at a local scale. A growing literature also takes its starting point in the concepts of resilience and vulnerability and is framed in terms of complex social and ecological systems (SES). This body of research explores the experiences of cruise tourism destinations and their capacity to adapt to both the development of the cruise tourism industry and rapid and unpredictable environmental change.

While the concept of sustainability emphasizes stability and preservation of social and ecological assets, the threat of global climate change, natural disasters and the current covid-19 pandemic point to a different approach based on the assumption that SES are inherently unstable and dynamic (Lew, 2014; McCool, Butler, Buckley, Weaver, & Wheeler, 2013). Resilience refers to the ability of a system to absorb disturbance and reorganize while undergoing change (Walker, Holling, Carpenter, & Kinzig, 2004). The resilience of tourism destinations is therefore closely linked to their ability to adapt to changing conditions, by reducing dependency on the vulnerable system, strengthening it or decreasing their sensitivity to the system (Kajan, 2014).

The unique character of expedition cruise tourism based on the reliance on contacts with local communities has created pressures on these societies to develop different types of preparedness to manage the fast development of this marine shipping sector (examples from Canadian Arctic were accessed by Stewart et al., 2011, 2015, Johnston, Dawson, De Souza, & Stewart, 2017 and Lasserre & Tétu, 2015). To account for this, a resilience framework has been applied to a variety of remote and nature-based tourism destinations (Biggs, 2011; Espiner & Becken, 2014) including some Arctic cruise tourism destinations. Adams (2010), for example, studied the resilience of the town of Haines, which experienced growth in cruise tourism activities, invested in infrastructure and employment to cater for the industry but suffered a severe downturn when the cruise tourism operator dropped the port from its itinerary.

A common theme is the dependency of Arctic communities on nature-based tourism - and their resultant vulnerability to climate change. Also in the case of cruise tourism destinations, fluctuations in

demand and the decisions of global cruise tourism operators are mentioned (Espiner, Orchison, & Higham, 2017; Sisneros-Kidd, Monz, Hausner, Schmidt, & Clark, 2019). This literature highlights the importance of studying cruise communities in the context of global networks and dynamic systems and suggests a need to move beyond single community case studies and managerial responses to local impacts.

2.3. Governance and management

The development of Arctic cruise tourism destinations can only be understood in the context of a complex web of relations that connect local communities, global cruise ship operators, tourists, nation states and non-governmental organizations. This is reflected in a third stream of Arctic cruise tourism research which focuses on the complex and overlapping governance structures and institutional arrangements that make cruise tourism in the Arctic very challenging (Pashkevich et al., 2015). Also, governance has important implications for the ways in which local communities are impacted and their agency in relation to the development and management of cruise tourism.

As Dawson et al. (2014) note, the governance of Arctic cruise tourism is characterized by complexity, insufficient capacity, and lack of dedicated authority to oversee the management and development of guidelines. The eight individual Arctic states (Canada, Russia, USA, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Iceland and Norway) have complete jurisdiction over territorial waters up to 22.2 km from shore, some rights over the continuous zone up to 44.4 km from the baselines. They also have certain rights regarding the management and conservation of natural resources in the Exclusive Economic Zone up to 370 km from the baseline. Beyond this, cruise ships are regulated by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, and a series of non-binding agreements such as the Polar Code developed by the International Maritime Organization and covering ship design, equipment, operations, training, search and rescue and environmental protection. An additional problem is the institutional complexity within individual nation states. In both Canada and Russia, for example, over thirty different state agencies or authorities are involved in the regulation of cruise tourism (Pashkevich et al., 2015).

Cajaiba-Santana, Faury, and Ramadan (2020) emphasize the relative importance of normative and especially mimetic institutional pressures due to the regulatory voids noted by many other authors (e.g., Dawson et al., 2014; Horejsova & Paris, 2013; Pashkevich et al., 2015; Pashkevich & Stjernström, 2014; Van Bets et al., 2017). In place of binding regulatory frameworks, the Arctic cruise tourism industry is characterized by what Van Bets et al. (2017) describe as collective self-governance. The Association of Arctic Expedition Cruise Operators (AECO) is particularly important in this context. Membership requires operators to follow laws and regulations as well as private policies on visitor, site-specific, operational, wildlife and biosecurity guidelines but only a small percentage of cruise ships operating in the Arctic are covered.

Van Bets et al. (2017) use the concept of a marine community (which encompasses the users and policy-makers) to analyze the governance of expedition cruise tourism in the Norwegian archipelago of Svalbard. In this community, state governance, represented by the Norwegian authorities, is supplemented with self-governance, initiated and facilitated by the association AECO (Arctic expedition cruise operators). AECO represents the interests of the cruise industry in a strong pan-Arctic organization that aims to minimize its environmental impact through collective action. While there were some positive features (partnerships, access to knowledge, conflict resolution and rule-compliance based on disclosure, traceability and trust) of this collaboration, authors also identified problems. These are caused by overlapping structures (alienation of expedition crew from user and policy community, informational overload due to co-existence of collective self-governance and state-governance) and threaten the possibilities for sustainable

development and management of cruise tourism. Ideally, collective self-governance does not replace or repeat, but rather complements the state in governing sustainable cruise tourism (Van Bets et al., 2017). One example of such synergies in governance is the AECO's clean-up Svalbard campaign, where the expedition cruise industry encourage and enable volunteers and citizen scientists to pick up, and document, litter on beaches in Svalbard (Bergmann, Lutz, Tekman, & Gutow, 2017) as a complement to the beach cleaning activities that are organized by the governor of Svalbard.

Overall, the complex and overlapping governance structures that regulate cruise tourism mean that local communities often feel disempowered and have little control over the development of Arctic cruise tourism. Cruise operators are global players and can change their itineraries to take advantage of regulatory differences in different regions of the Arctic. The need to include community stakeholders in governance and strategic planning is emphasized frequently, but how this is to be achieved is less clear.

3. Staying with the trouble through practice

3.1. Everyday cruise practices and beyond - materiality, bundling and flat ontology

As suggested in the above literature review, Arctic cruise tourism research has particularly engaged with what we might term as three 'troubles'. One of them concerns the impacts and attitudes towards cruise tourism, the second centers on the environment, climate change and community resilience. The third concerns troubles related to cruise tourism governance. As we saw, much of this research is either based on singular case studies that focus on community impacts (often framed in terms of economic benefits and environmental and social problems) or on policy research, which 'hovers above' the specific cruise tourism destinations. In this section, we propose a different way into knowing Arctic cruise tourism, namely a practice approach. We therefore outline how practice theories - with their insistence on paying attention to everyday sayings, doings and materiality, and their commitment to a flat ontology - can be used to stay with the trouble empirically and analytically.

Schatzki (2019, p. 28) defines practices as 'open-ended, spatial-temporal sets of organized doings and sayings'. While there are many varieties of practice theory, they share a focus on the routine and often unconscious 'doing' of social life, as well as the skilful performance of practices and the emotions and symbolic meanings attached to them (Schatzki, 2019). Reckwitz (2002, p. 249–250), for example, defines practice as "a routinised type of behaviour which 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". Shove, Pantzar and Watson (2012, p. 14) also adopt an element-based approach, defined practices in terms of the relations between materials, competences and meanings. Materials include "things, technologies, tangible physical entities and the stuff of which objects are made". Competences encompass "skill, know-how and technique", whilst meanings include "symbolic meanings, ideas and aspirations" (ibid). Practices, in this definition, are brought together through the performances of practitioners, thereby reproducing practices as entities that are composed of blocks of these elements. Individuals are carriers of practice, and may be recruited to, and leave, different practices.

In recent years, there has been growing interest in practice-based approaches to tourism generally and practice-based analyses of cruise tourism more specifically (Bargeman & Richards, 2020; James et al., 2019; Lamers & Pashkevich, 2018; Lamers, Van der Duim, & Spaargaren, 2017). Lamers et al. (2017), for example, use expedition cruising to illustrate the way in which our understanding of tourism behaviours can be enhanced by studying them as practices. Expedition cruising is

conceptualised as a 'distinct combination of materials (e.g. small ships, Zodiacs, remote environments), competences (e.g. navigation, guiding, interpretation) and meanings (e.g. environmental sustainability, adventure, safety)'. They add Schatzki's (2002; 2006) insights into general understandings, teleoaffective structures, and rules - the shared ideas about the meaning and acceptable aims and purposes of practices, normative judgements, beliefs and emotions associated with practices, and the explicit rules and principles that govern practices. These concepts help explain the coherence and more or less consistent reproduction of practices, but also conflict and controversy regarding how practices are - and should be - performed and regulated.

Conceptualizing Arctic cruise tourism in this way directs our attention to the performance of cruise-related practices in different destinations. This includes how they are reproduced through the enrolment of practitioners (e.g. tour guides and local craftspeople) who develop skills and competences specific to the practice (e.g. presenting their community to tourists, making souvenirs), and how they take on different meanings (e.g. cruise tourism as a problem or panacea). The dynamics of practice also open new perspectives on how tourism practitioners actively configure, perform and connect cruise tourism activities as shown by Lamers and Pashkevich (2018) in their analysis of the opportunities in the Russian Arctic region of Arkhangelsk. The use of practice-based analysis centered on the challenges of reproducing practices of cruise tourism and demonstrated that practitioners were active and knowledgeable actors skillfully adapting to the regulations posed on cruise tourism development. Drawing on the work of a range of practice theorists, including Theodore Schatzki (2002, 2019), Davide Nicolini (2017) and Elizabeth Shove and colleagues (Shove et al., 2012) we build on these contributions and suggest three specific ways of analyzing cruise troubles from a practice perspective.

First, we advocate a focus on the materiality of practice and the troubles that arise from the circulation of materials (such as waste) generated through cruise practices. This approach directs our attention to the material arrangements that make cruise tourism possible and to how different practices in cruise tourism destinations make use of the same material resources (for example, harbors, fish, infrastructure). As Nicolini (2017, p. 20) puts it: "the social world appears as a vast array or assemblage of performances made durable by being inscribed in skilled human bodies and minds, objects and texts and knotted together in such a way that the results of one performance become the resource for another". This underlines the importance of following the ways that materials connect and move between different practices, for example how waste from cruise ships is processed onshore or affects the marine environment and thus other practices such as fishing or hunting.

Second, we propose a focus on the relations between practices and the troubles that arise through competition, interference, and co-dependence between practice bundles in cruise tourism communities. Shove, Pantzar and Watson (2012, p. 17) distinguish between "bundles of practice, loose-knit patterns based on co-location and co-existence, and complexes, representing stickier and more integrated arrangements including co-dependent forms of sequence and synchronization".

These two approaches help us analyze the ways in which practices are connected in space and over time. They prompt questions such as: What are the rhythms of cruise practices and how do these intersect with other local practices? Do cruise practices compete with other practices in Arctic communities, such as fishing and hunting, because they use the same resources or infrastructure? In 2020, the co-dependencies between practices in cruise destinations were exposed when the COVID-19 pandemic led to the abrupt cessation of cruise tourism. This situation has raised questions about what happens when a practice suddenly disappears. Have the material elements/skills been used in new practices? Have those involved become engaged in pre-existing practices instead? How will cruise practices be adapted in response to the current crisis?

Finally, we argue that the flat ontology (where all social phenomena exist at one scale - that of practices), integral to practice theories allows

us to follow the trouble across individual cruise communities and between practice bundles and complexes anchored in particular destinations. By tracing such connections, we are able to discern how practices relate to larger constellations or networks, potentially stretching across the globe. This insight is crucial to understanding that although Arctic cruise communities offer “situated knowledge” (Haraway, 1988), they should not be conceptualised as isolated, bounded destinations but as nodes in networks of overlapping and interconnected social, economic, regulatory practices that are performed in dynamic and unstable environments.

A specific technique for weaving together the local and global practices and relations of Arctic cruise tourism is ‘zooming in’ and ‘zooming out’ (Nicolini, 2012), which is a process of moving between from in depth studies of the everyday performance of practices to a wider perspective on how practices as entities intersect. Thus, a practice approach to staying with cruise trouble engenders an understanding rooted in cruise communities but without losing sight of the ways in which local experiences are connected into larger practice bundles, also related to non-cruise activities and to wider networks that stretch across the globe. In the following section, we illustrate how a practice-based approach can help us to stay with cruise troubles through the example of marine litter and beach clean-ups in the Svalbard archipelago. By zooming in on marine litter as a troubling material object, we can trace the connections between local communities and cruise tourism practices, and then zoom out to follow the relations between the bundles that intersect in the practice of beach cleaning.

3.2. A bundle of trouble- the case of an Arctic beach clean-up in the Svalbard archipelago

Pristine nature is one of the main motivations for cruise tourists to visit the Arctic but plastics heavily pollute polar waters and beaches. This anthropogenic litter is not only life threatening for Arctic wildlife, but is also unsightly and compromises the sense of connectedness with nature that humans (both locals and tourists) feel. In this sense, we can conceptualize marine litter as a material object generated by a myriad of local practices around the world that is then circulated by ocean currents and washes ashore; for example in the Svalbard archipelago. In response, new practices of beach cleaning have developed and for the last 20 years, every summer, about 20 tons of waste have been removed from beaches in Svalbard.

Different actors take the responsibility for removing marine debris. The Governor of Svalbard, for instance, organizes dedicated clean-up trips for locals twice a year and other stakeholders hold additional events, mainly in the area of Isfjord. Many cruise operators, for example, are also committed to combat marine plastic pollution. As part of this ambition, cruise operators involve passengers in regular beach cleanups, which have become an integral part of international cruise tourism practices (Bergmann et al., 2017). Expedition ships remove 3–4 tons per season, and mapping and removing marine litter has also been a scientific practice, connecting scientists and tourists in research projects. The practice of beach cleaning on Svalbard, which involves, connects and unites the local community, visiting cruise tourists as well as researchers, is unique. Different bundles of ‘beach clean-up practices’, their meanings, and relations between them, can be found and in the case discussed by Bergmann et al. (2017), which documents the cleaning practices of international cruise tourists connected to a research group based in Germany. These tourists gathered data by taking pictures, counting litter and discussing their findings with researchers.

Common to all beach cleaning practices, is the linking of plastic-pickers to wider constellations. The materiality of plastic waste connects Arctic wildlife, tourists, cruise operators, policy makers, local people and scientists through the practice of cleaning. However, the governance and level of organization of cleaning practices is also situated, and dependent on the stakeholders involved. This practice is reproduced in other areas in the world, but materials, competences and

meanings are combined and organized in different ways.

In activities such as the beach clean-up, the role of cruise tourism is ambivalent. While tourism is suspected to contribute to pollution in the Arctic (Tekman, Krumpfen, & Bergmann, 2017), beach cleanups which engage visiting tourists in picking up and documenting litter also counteracts some of the effects and enables the collection of data from remote areas (Bergmann et al., 2017) as well as educating people (Eastman, Núñez, Crettier, & Thiel, 2013). Instead of being overwhelmed with the troubles of a connected world that are too big to solve for a single community, concrete cruise tourism practice bundles such as the beach clean-up allow actors to collaboratively act on what they can change, to become response-able.

Staying close to the controversies of marine plastic pollution by studying the connections between practice bundles demonstrates, firstly, how cruise tourism is a *source* as well as a *response* to this concern; secondly, how practices bundle differently in different settings and thirdly, how the development of new practice bundles can help render communities response-able to major concerns. A practice approach focuses on the challenging, taxing and often modest ways in which people tinker with troubling practices, finding ways to adapt, improve, or fight situations they are in. Instead of focusing on the disaster of marine debris, or the salvation of cruise operators or policy makers to fix the plastic situation, we stay with the relations and motivations connected to practices.

In this example, we have zoomed in on marine plastic pollution as a material object that is troubling for cruise communities and tracing connections with more distant practice bundles. The same technique could be used to study many other potentially troubling aspects of cruise tourism practices, such as interactions between tourists and local communities, or the specific rules and regulations that govern tourism practices in different cruise tourism destinations.

4. Conclusion

In this article, we argue that a practice-based approach helps researchers to engage with the complexities of cruise tourism – cruise trouble - and to overcome overly simplified accounts of progress and despair (Haraway, 2016) of cruise tourism. We advocate the generation of ‘flat’ accounts of everyday practice bundles, starting in Arctic cruise communities. We have specifically suggested zooming in on the materiality of practice, and the troubles that arise in the relations between practice bundles in cruise communities, and following the trouble by zooming out and tracing the connections through networks of practice that stretch far beyond individual cruise communities. The case of beach cleaning practices in Svalbard was used to exemplify how this approach can be applied to trace everyday practices within and across cruise communities through which cruise troubles unfold, and suggests avenues through which these may coexist and tinker with cruise tourism.

Practice based approaches can be challenging to implement. Zooming in and out whilst staying close to specific communities and practices is not always easy. Arctic cruise tourism destinations are often located far from global transportation hubs, and are therefore often difficult, time-consuming and expensive to access for cruise tourism researchers. There is a risk that this may impede an in-depth understanding of the complexities and controversies of local cruise practices because researchers often cannot spend extended periods observing and participating in the practices of the communities they study. At the time of writing, the Covid-19 pandemic has added to these difficulties and makes ‘zooming in from a distance’, via digital and desktop research, the only option for most researchers at the present time. A possible way to meet such challenges, and to foster other types of insight, is to ‘zoom out’ and establish an open dialog and communication that cuts across several case studies through physical visit or electronic channels of communication (video conferences, webinars, etc.).

A practice-based approach to staying with the trouble also has important implications for the management of cruise tourism. As Lamers

et al. (2017) have noted, practice theories provide an alternative to psychological and rational-actor perspectives on policy design. In relation to managing cruise tourists, for example, a practice-based approach would analyze the ways in which materials, competences and meanings were combined in situated practices and identify ways in which these could be modified by policies to achieve more sustainable results. Rather than focusing on individual behaviours or generalized policies, a practice-based approach to tourism management would draw on the techniques of zooming in and zooming out to analyze and support tinkering with situated cruise tourism 'troubles' without losing sight of the ways in which bundles of practices connect local communities into global networks.

The example of beach clean-ups on Svalbard shows how local environmental policies can become part of many bundles of practice, connecting local communities, tourists and scientists across the world. A practice-based approach also directs policymakers' attention to competition, interference and co-dependence between bundles of practices rather than isolated groups or sites that need to be 'managed'. In the case of self-governance, such as that which characterises expedition cruise tourism in the Arctic, it is critical that those involved understand how different practices are connected in time and space, and where conflicts and negative impacts are likely to arise. In general, a practice approach to management emphasizes the importance of flexibility and openness to the constant adaptations of practices as they are reproduced over time and within the myriad of connections between bundles.

Finally, we suggest that policymakers should focus on strengthening the interconnectedness of stakeholders in the Arctic, and support cruise communities to build solidarity and forge response-ability with other Arctic communities which, in spite of distance between them, share similar concerns and experience similar controversies. For better and for worse, on a larger or smaller scale, Arctic cruise tourism is here to stay. How it develops *in* and hopefully *for* Arctic communities needs and deserves more careful thought, work and deliberation.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the The Research Council of Norway, NORRUS for supporting the project *Sustainable Arctic cruise tourism communities: From practice to governance* (grant number 301540).

References

- Adams, A. W. (2010). Planning for cruise ship resilience: An approach to managing cruise ship impacts in Haines, Alaska. *Coastal Management*, 38(6), 654–664.
- Bargeman, B., & Richards, G. (2020). A new approach to understanding tourism practices. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 84, 102988.
- Bergmann, M., Lutz, B., Tekman, M. B., & Gutow, L. (2017). Citizen scientists reveal: Marine litter pollutes Arctic beaches and affects wildlife. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 125(1–2), 535–540.
- Biggs, D. (2011). Understanding resilience in a vulnerable industry: The case of reef tourism in Australia. *Ecology and Society*, 16(1).
- Brida, J. G., Riaño, E., & Aguirre, S. Z. (2011). Residents' attitudes and perceptions towards cruise tourism development: A case study of Cartagena de Indias (Colombia). *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11(3), 181–196.
- Brida, J. G., & Zapata, S. (2010). Cruise tourism: Economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts. *International Journal of Leisure and Tourism Marketing*, 1(3), 205–226.
- Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for Management of Resources. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien*, 24(1), 5–12.
- Bystrowska, M. (2019). The impact of sea ice on cruise tourism on Svalbard. *ARCTIC*, 72(2), 151–165.
- Cajaiba-Santana, G., Fauray, O., & Ramadan, M. (2020). The emerging cruise shipping industry in the arctic: Institutional pressures and institutional voids. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 80(January 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.102796>
- Connolly, K. (2019). Polar cruise boom harming the Arctic, explorer warns Accessed April 19, 2021 <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/aug/13/polar-cruise-increase-harming-the-arctic-explorer-arned-fuchs-warns>.
- Dawson, J., Johnston, M., & Stewart, E. (2017). The unintended consequences of regulatory complexity: The case of cruise tourism in Arctic Canada. *Marine Policy*, 76, 71–78.
- Dawson, J., Johnston, M., & Stewart, E. J. (2014). Governance of Arctic expedition cruise ships in a time of rapid environmental and economic change. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 89, 88–99.
- Dawson, J., Stewart, E. J., Johnston, M. E., & Lemieux, C. J. (2016). Identifying and evaluating adaptation strategies for cruise tourism in Arctic Canada. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(10), 1425–1441.
- Doxey, G. V. (1976). When Enough's Enough: The natives are restless in old Niagara. *Heritage Canada*, 2(2), 26–27.
- Eastman, L. B., Núñez, P., Crettier, B., & Thiel, M. (2013). Identification of self-reported user behavior, education level, and preferences to reduce littering on beaches—a survey from the SE Pacific. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 78, 18–24.
- Espinero, S., & Becken, S. (2014). Tourist towns on the edge: Conceptualising vulnerability and resilience in a protected area tourism system. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(4), 646–665.
- Espinero, S., Orchison, C., & Higham, J. (2017). Resilience and sustainability: A complementary relationship? Towards a practical conceptual model for the sustainability–resilience nexus in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(10), 1385–14008.
- Fridriksson, J., Wise, N., & Scott, P. (2020). Iceland's burgeoning cruise industry: An economic opportunity or a local threat. *Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit*, 35(2), 143–154.
- Hansen, A. M., & Ren, C. (Eds.). (2020). *Collaborative methods in Arctic research. Experiences from Greenland*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575–599.
- Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.
- Heikkinen, H. I., Björst, L. R., & Pashkevich, A. (2020). Challenging tourism landscapes of Southwest Greenland: Identifying social and cultural Capital for Sustainable Tourism Development. *Arctic Anthropology*, 57(2), 212–228.
- Heuts, F., & Mol, A. (2013). What is a good tomato? A case of valuing in practice. *Valuation Studies*, 1(2), 125–146.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an "industry": The forgotten power of tourism as a social force. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1192–1208.
- Horejsova, T., & Paris, C. M. (2013). Tourism and the challenge of Arctic governance. *International Journal of Tourism Policy*, 1, 5(1–2), 113–127.
- James, L., Olsen, L. S., & Karlsdóttir, A. (2020). Sustainability and cruise tourism in the arctic: Stakeholder perspectives from Ísafjörður, Iceland and Qaqortoq, Greenland. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(9), 1425–1441.
- James, L., Ren, C., & Halkier, H. (2019). *Theories of practice in tourism*. London: Routledge.
- Johnston, A., Johnston, M., Stewart, E., Dawson, J., & Lemelin, H. (2012). Perspectives of decision makers and regulators on climate change and adaptation in expedition cruise ship tourism in Nunavut. *The Northern Review*, 35(Spring), 69–95.
- Johnston, M., Dawson, J., De Souza, E., & Stewart, E. (2017). Management challenges for the fastest growing marine shipping sector in Arctic Canada: Pleasure crafts. *Polar Record*, 53(1), 67–78. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0032247416000565>
- Kajan, E. (2014). Community perceptions to place attachment and tourism development in Finnish Lapland. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(3), 490–511.
- Lamers, M., & Pashkevich, A. (2018). Short-circuiting cruise tourism practices along the Russian Barents Sea coast? The case of Arkhangelsk. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(4), 440–454.
- Lamers, M., Van der Duim, R., & Spaargaren, G. (2017). The relevance of practice theories for tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 62, 54–63.
- Larsen, S., & Wolff, K. (2016). Exploring assumptions about cruise tourists' visits to ports. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 17, 44–49.
- Larsen, S., Wolff, K., Marnburg, E., & Ogaard, T. (2013). Belly full, purse closed: Cruise line passengers' expenditures. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 6, 142–148.
- Lasserre, F., & Tétu, P. L. (2015). The cruise tourism industry in the Canadian Arctic: Analysis of activities and perceptions of cruise ship operators. *The Polar Record*, 51(1), 24.
- Lemelin, H., Dawson, J., Stewart, E. J., Maher, P., & Lueck, M. (2010). Last-chance tourism: The boom, doom, and gloom of visiting vanishing destinations. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(5), 477–493.
- Lépy, É., Heikkinen, H. I., Karjalainen, T. P., Tervo-Kankare, K., Kaupilla, P., Suopajarvi, T., ... Rautio, A. (2014). Multidisciplinary and participatory approach for assessing local vulnerability of tourism industry to climate change. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 14(1), 41–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2014.886373>
- Lew, A. (2014). Introduction to special issue – Cultural geographies of tourism: Image, identity and place. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(2), 171–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2014.917382>
- Maher, P. T. (2007). Arctic tourism: A complex system of visitors, communities, and environments. *Polar Geography*, 30(1–2), 1–5.
- Maher, P. T. (2012). Expedition cruise visits to protected areas in the Canadian Arctic: Issues of sustainability and change for an emerging market. *Turizam: međunarodni znanstveno-stručni časopis*, 60(1), 55–70.
- Marsh, J., & Staple, S. (1995). Cruise tourism in the Canadian Arctic and its implications. In C. M. Hall, & M. E. Johnston (Eds.), *Polar tourism: Tourism in the Arctic and Antarctic regions* (pp. 63–72). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, UK.
- McCarthy, J. (2018). Maximising cruise tourism outcomes in small-medium cruise ports: Lessons from Atlantic Canada. *Urban Research & Practice*, 11(4), 289–313.
- McCool, S., Butler, R., Buckley, R., Weaver, D., & Wheeler, B. (2013). In concept of sustainability utopian: Ideally perfect but impracticable. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 38(2), 213–242.

- Naalakkersuisut. (2016). *Turismeudvikling I Grønland. Hvad skal der til?* Government of Greenland.
- Nicolini, D. (2012). *Practice theory, work, and organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nicolini, D. (2017). In M. Jonas, B. Littig, & A. Wroblewski (Eds.), *Practice Theory as a Package of Theory, Method and Vocabulary: Affordances and Limitations* (pp. 19–34). Springer.
- Olsen, J., Carter, N. A., Dawson, J., & Coetzee, W. (2019). Community perspectives on the environmental impacts of Arctic shipping: Case studies from Russia, Norway and Canada. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 5(1), 1609189.
- Olsen, J., Nenasheva, M., Wigger, K. A., Pashkevich, A., Bickford, S. H., & Maksimova, T. (2020). Marine tourism development in the Arkhangelsk region, Russian Arctic: Stakeholders perspectives. In *In Arctic marine sustainability* (pp. 365–389). Cham: Springer.
- Palma, D., Varnajot, A., Dalen, K., Basaran, I. K., Brunette, C., Bystrowska, M., & Ronge, T. A. (2019). Cruising the marginal ice zone: Climate change and Arctic tourism. *Polar Geography*, 42(4), 215–235.
- Pashkevich, A., Dawson, J., & Stewart, E. J. (2015). Governance of expedition cruise ship tourism in the Arctic: A comparison of the Canadian and Russian Arctic. *Tourism in Marine Environments*, 10(3–4), 225–240.
- Pashkevich, A., & Stjernström, O. (2014). Making Russian Arctic accessible for tourists: Analysis of the institutional barriers. *Polar Geography*, 37(2), 137–156.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002). Towards a theory of social practices: A development in Culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5, 243–263.
- Reid, J. (2019). Narrating indigeneity in the Arctic: Scripts of disaster resilience versus the poetics of autonomy. In *Arctic triumph* (pp. 9–21). Cham: Springer.
- Ren, C. (2021). (staying with) the trouble with tourism and travel theory? *Tourist Studies*, 21(1), 133–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797621989216>
- Ren, C., & Chimiri, D. (2018). Arctic tourism - more than an industry?. In *The Arctic Institute* Accessed April 19 2021 <https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/arctic-tourism-industry/>.
- Ren, C., Jóhannesson, G. T., Kramvig, B., Pashkevich, A., & Höckert, E. (2021). 20 years of research on Arctic and indigenous cultures in Nordic tourism: A review and future research agenda. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 21(1), 111–121.
- Ren, C. B., & Jóhannesson, G. T. (2017). Collaborative becoming: Exploring tourism knowledge collectives. In C. Ren, G. T. Jóhannesson, & R. Van der Duim (Eds.), *Co-creating tourism research: Towards collaborative ways of knowing*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Schatzki, T. R. (2002). *The site of the social*. USA: Pennsylvania State Univ Press.
- Schatzki, T. R. (2019). *Social change in a material world: How activity and material processes dynamize practices*. Routledge.
- Shove, E., Pantzar, M., & Watson, M. (2012). *The dynamics of social practice*. London: SAGE.
- Sisneros-Kidd, A. M., Monz, C., Hausner, V., Schmidt, J., & Clark, D. (2019). Nature-based tourism, resource dependence, and resilience of Arctic communities: Framing complex issues in a changing environment. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(8), 1259–1276.
- Smit, B., & Wandel, J. (2006). Adaptation, adaptive capacity and vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change*, 16, 282–292.
- Stewart, E., Dawson, J., & Johnston, M. (2015). Risks and opportunities associated with change in the cruise tourism sector: Community perspectives from Arctic Canada. *The Polar Journal*, 5(2), 403–427.
- Stewart, E. J., Dawson, J., & Draper, D. (2011). Cruise tourism and residents in Arctic Canada: Development of a resident attitude typology. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 18(1), 95–106.
- Stewart, E. J., Dawson, J., Howell, S. E. L., Johnston, M. E., Pearce, T., & Lemelin, H. (2013). Local-level responses to sea ice change and cruise tourism in Arctic Canada's Northwest Passage. *Polar Geography*, 36(1–2), 142–162.
- Stewart, E. J., & Draper, D. (2009). Reporting back research findings: A case study of collaborative tourism research in the Canadian north. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 8(2), 128–143.
- Tekman, M. B., Krumpfen, T., & Bergmann, M. (2017). Marine litter on deep Arctic seafloor continues to increase and spreads to the north at the HAUSGARTEN observatory. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, 120, 88–99.
- Têtu, P. L., Dawson, J., & Lasserre, F. (2019). The evolution and relative competitiveness of global Arctic cruise tourism destinations. In *Arctic Shipping: Climate Change, Commercial Traffic and Port Development* (p. 94).
- Van Bets, L. K., Lamers, M. A., & van Tatenhove, J. P. (2017). Collective self-governance in a marine community: Expedition cruise tourism at Svalbard. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(11), 1583–1599.
- Wace, N. (1990). Antarctica: A new tourist destination. *Applied Geography*, 10(4), 327–341.
- Walker, B., Holling, C. S., Carpenter, S. R., & Kinzig, A. (2004). Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social-ecological systems. *Ecology and Society*, 9(2), 5.

Weaver, D. B., & Lawton, L. J. (2017). The cruise shorescape as contested tourism space. Evidence from the warm-water pleasure periphery. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 24, 117–125.

Zhang, J., Rothrock, D. A., & Steele, M. (2017). Projections of an ice-diminished Arctic Ocean – retrospection and future projection. Retrieved from <http://psc.apl.washington.edu/zhang/IDAO/intro.html>.



Carina Ren is Associate Professor at the Centre for Innovation and Research in Culture and Living in the Arctic, Aalborg University, Denmark and Head of AAU Arctic, her university's Arctic platform. Ren researches connections between tourism and other fields of the social through cultural innovation and knowledge collaboration. Her recent research focus is on Arctic tourism development and innovation and she has co-edited numerous volumes within the areas of tourism and Arctic research.



Laura James is Associate Professor of Tourism Development and Regional Change at Aalborg University, Denmark. She has published in the fields of regional studies, human geography and tourism. Her research interests include innovation, destination development, regional policy and tourism policy. She is currently working on projects related to sustainability and communities in cruise tourism destinations in the Arctic region, and the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on Northern Europe destinations.



Albina Pashkevich is Associate Professor in Tourism Studies at the Centre for Tourism and Leisure Research (CeTLER), Dalarna University, Sweden. Her research interests include a wide range of topics primarily connected to Arctic tourism development - cruise development in the Russian Arctic, representations of indigenous culture, tourism management, power relations and institutional structures impact on tourism development.



Hindertje Hoarau-Heemstra is Associate Professor at Nord University Business School. She works with sustainable destination development, innovation, knowledge management and learning in tourism, and she has an interest in cruise tourism and animal-based tourism. Hindertje is currently leading the international research project Sustainable Arctic Cruise Communities: from practice to governance, financed by the Research Council of Norway.