QUARANTINE TOURISM: A NEW FORM OF TOURISM?

Turismo de Quarentena: uma nova forma de turismo?
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Abstract

The social isolation imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic that hit the world in 2020 has profoundly changed a long list of behaviors, and temporary travel with the purpose of social isolation in second homes became a prime feature in the relationship between tourism and COVID-19. Thus, this research aims to describe and discuss essentials that characterize this form of tourism, that emerges in the interstice between everyday life and the conventional tourism practices. The conclusion is the time-space boundaries between daily life (home town) and tourism (quarantine | isolation destination) blurred even more, demanding new perspectives on “mundane environments”, second home travel, and even tourism itself.
INTRODUCTION

The social isolation imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic has profoundly changed a long list of behaviors. An unprecedented number of people went to confinement in order to avoid getting contaminated and spreading the disease. Many activities were rapidly adapted, including work, study, leisure and all sorts of social interactions.

Temporary travel with the purpose of social isolation in second homes became a prime feature in the relationship between tourism and COVID-19. This type of travel, henceforth called quarantine tourism, was observed in several parts of the globe, from the United States (Nir & Tully, 2020) to Japan (Kozuki & Fukushima, 2020), Brazil included (Vargas, 2020). However, there is still little knowledge about its real motivations, the underlying feelings, the activities that are being carried out and whether there are differences with other well-known types of tourism. So this research note seeks to discuss: what are the characteristics of tourism that emerged along with COVID-19 social distance measures?

This research aims to describe and discuss essentials that characterize this form of tourism, that emerges in the interstice between everyday life and the conventional tourism practices. The mobility lenses and concepts (Freire-Medeiros et al., 2018; Kaufmann, 2010; Sheller & Urry, 2004, 2006) are a fruitful approach to put in a new perspective the dichotomy between ordinary and extraordinary domains, the familiar and the strange. This perspective acknowledges that touristic experiences “are no longer necessarily spatially and functionally separated from the mundane environments” (Russo & Domínguez, 2016, p. 16). The blurring of spatial, temporal, and behavioral boundaries brings about hybrid practices.
in the margins between tourism and other activities. In this sense, some authors argue towards the "end of tourism" in contrast to the usual Fordist forms of tourism and leisure so far (Urry, 1995).

During the COVID-19 pandemic, new tourist mobilities and especially its motivations evolved, urging to be identified, described, and discussed. Quarantine tourism in this work has been scrutinized from in-depth interviews with individuals living in large Brazilian cities, who traveled to second homes and were socially isolated for over a month (Table 1).

### Table 1. Summary characteristics of subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject (S)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Home town</th>
<th>Habitants*</th>
<th>Quarantine destination</th>
<th>Habitants*</th>
<th>Type of destination</th>
<th>Distance between cities</th>
<th>Travel companion</th>
<th>Familiar second homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Porto Alegre</td>
<td>1,492,530</td>
<td>Garopaba</td>
<td>23,579</td>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>397 km</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>São Paulo</td>
<td>12,396,372</td>
<td>Garopaba</td>
<td>23,579</td>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>744 km</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>São Paulo</td>
<td>12,396,372</td>
<td>Itapevi</td>
<td>240,961</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>41 km</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Anápolis</td>
<td>334,613</td>
<td>Abadiânia</td>
<td>20,461</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>37 km</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>São Paulo</td>
<td>12,396,372</td>
<td>São Roque</td>
<td>92,060</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>70 km</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Population estimate for 2021, with the last CENSUS being carried out in 2010 (IBGE 2021). Source: the authors (2021)

As for the age group and the municipalities of origin of the interviewees, there was no clear pattern of variation. This fact was also due to the researchers' choice for not establishing a cut for such sociodemographic variables. In terms of city of origin, however, it is noteworthy that these are larger than the destination cities. So it is possible to infer that the size of the cities of origin (in terms of population) partly justifies the respondents' desire to leave large cities and isolate themselves in smaller ones.

Three of the interviewees decided to isolate themselves in a beach house (S1, S2, S3), while two opted for a rural house (S4, S5). Regarding the distance between the cities of origin and destination, some were long (S1, S2), while others were close (S3, S4, S5). Despite these differences, all respondents had the company of their family and all the houses chosen for isolation were second family homes, not rented houses.

This research allowed us to grasp three basic dimensions of an emerging quarantine tourism: motivation, activities, and feelings. These standards will be detailed below.
MOTIVATION

The main motivation was the fear of infection, followed by the concern to avoid becoming a disease vector to others. If the environment of large cities became risky and frightening, the chosen tourist destinations offered reduced objective danger, a feeling of safety, and a perception of collaboration to reduce the spread of the virus, as well as the opportunity to care of mental health in touch with nature:

The possibility of being in an open space, where you can take a walk in the middle of the woods, without creating any risks for yourself or others. (...) That is it in the end; It is the nature aspect, both for security reasons, as well as for mental health and leisure. (S1)

We feel like a mental breath. There are plants, there is sunlight. You can walk around. All of that cheered up my family and diminished the anxiety and the stress mood (...) Here we felt protected and it is really secluded. We are in a woody area and at the same time, we feel more comfortable. You get landscape views (...) There are lots of animals and lots of birds. All that helps to rest the mind (S3)

We came because of the security issue, to be more isolated in the outdoors, here we are surrounded by nature, (...) Because we are more at peace here than in the city (S4)

ACTIVITIES

The less severe confinement rules in small towns allowed the practice of different outdoor activities, such as individual sports. However, the most relevant activities were carried out at home. Activities in the backyard included games, gardening, and other hobbies. Indoor leisure, such as reading, watching television, playing board games, listening to music, and cooking became more important. On the other hand, despite being a typical activity in second homes, socializing with friends and relatives simply vanished. Only family social interactions remained.

Now I go out for some walking, hiking around here, discovering new beaches on foot, riding my bike (...) And also in general, not only outdoors. We watch TV a lot, several TV series. We cook every single day. It is rare to order restaurant food, although that’s an option since they are delivering, but it’s very unusual. (...) I like to cook and, during the quarantine, that became therapy and a source of pleasure (S1)

However, second homes were no longer spaces for leisure only. Individuals started to work in a home-office scheme and to study online, relocating their schedules to this new environment. Professional and educational requirements became more important than
leisure, as they gained the typical use of a primary home. At the same time, the domestic routine started to consume more time and space. The opportunities for leisure activities provided by the surroundings were not fully exploited given limitations imposed by work and study.

What really changed is that now everything is online. I have been doing everything I used to do before. Here was more of a place where we used to come to have fun. So we used to come only to rest. We used to put a hammock outside, make a barbecue, put some music. That was the house environment back then, and we used to come in a group, in a gang (...) So there was this playful aspect of the house. Now I had to transform the house also into an office, also into a classroom. I brought a lot of things here. It was almost like a mini-move, of tools, of cookware... (S3)

The residential and temporary spaces not only became messy, but eventually came to an inversion. Eventual returns to the original home have occurred in order to get documents and other objects, to attend to obligations, or to solve other pending issues. However, visiting the primary home started to require special behaviors, which used to be a feature of a second home.

I confess that when I go to São Paulo (...) there is a kind of a war operation. I have to put the kids in the car, they cannot touch anything, the baby goes up to the apartment by the stairs. (S5)

I go out once a week to do all the shopping and to have a look at this other house in São Paulo, to get everything in order and try not to leave it too abandoned. I clean the things there and bring them back here already cleaned up (S3)

FEELINGS

These tourism practices were associated with an unusual combination of feelings. On the positive side, interviewees mentioned tranquility, comfort, confidence, gratitude, protection, emotional control, peace, reception, mental rest, well-being, relief and life quality. However, these trips were also associated with a series of negative emotions. Fear had a central role in tourists' feelings, motivations, and behaviors. Other mentioned feelings were psychological suffering, yearning, despair, sadness, solitude, tension, anguish, concern, nervousness, stress, and oppression.

The fear, despite being at peace, I say that there is a conflicting peace here. At the same time that I am at peace, we cannot stop feeling afraid. Things [the COVID-19] are getting closer (S4)
One of the mentioned feelings was the guilt of undertaking pleasurable activities amidst a sad scenario caused by the pandemic. This feeling resulted from the perception of the social privilege represented by the opportunity of isolation in a pleasant environment.

Sometimes I feel guilty because I know that there are lots of people going through problems. But it has been good to be here at the beach for so long. (S1)

Here is a place where I can worry less. It is a privilege. I feel grateful for having this, because there are lots of people who are confined, with children, wife, and that can cause problems. (S2)

In a way, these negative feelings did not allow these travelers to perceive that activity as a form of tourism. Most of them avoided employing the word “tourism” to describe their travel and stays. Neither were the words vacation and leisure used as descriptors. Protection and necessity were the most common words to describe these trips, even if leisure and the intention of returning to the primary home have been always present in the interviewees’ minds:

But I go back to the point, it is not a vacation. You are tense, anguished. I think that everyone has better and worse days, but within what is possible now, that is the better condition I could have. (S5)

That brings peace. There is no worry hammering your head: COVID, COVID. That is very good. As for me, I always liked the sea a lot, and living close to it is excellent. So it is very good. (S2)

From a general analysis of the three dimensions presented, it is clear that feelings are the basis for motivation. The negative feeling of fear affected the decision to travel. Particularly relevant are the fear of infection and the concern not to become a vector of illnesses for other people. The positive feeling of tranquility is the outcome of the mental health motivation. The activities are related to these feelings. Tension, concern, and protection promotes individual activities, internal leisure, social interactions with family only, and home-office work. Activities are also linked to motivations, because activities in the backyard and gardening are a consequence of the motivation to be close to nature.

CONCLUSION

The COVID-19 pandemic was a unique moment in the history of mankind. Among its innumerable consequences to tourism, the specific type of travel that was called quarantine tourism constituted a differentiated practice in many aspects: escaping from the danger
of large cities and the search for more secure and pleasant places motivated certain mobilities and long stays in second homes. These spaces, originally dedicated to weekends and vacation leisure, but mainly related to the escape from everyday life, were reframed for long stays and the relocation of work and study activities (Nouza, Ólafsdóttir, & Sæþórsdóttir, 2018).

Without neglecting their meaning as places for temporary stays, second homes gained new uses and meanings, opening room for alternative understandings of travel and tourism practices and concepts. The time-space boundaries between daily life (home town) and tourism (quarantine | isolation destination) blurred even more, pointing to new perspectives on “mundane environments”, second home travel, and even tourism itself. As new forms of mobility were enhanced by the pandemic, the (possible) tourism practices resulted from spatial, economic, symbolic, and identity intersections between the domains of tourism and daily life, bringing empirical evidence to what has been called the end of tourism. In fact, the combination of all these markers have been little observed or not observed at all up to this moment.

Future research should focus on new and challenging hybrid tourism spaces and practices that were strengthened by the pandemic, since these could be perpetuated in contemporary tourism at a flexible scale - with or without a pandemic context. One could mention the need to decompress tourism, making post-pandemic travelling more nature-and rural-oriented, in opposition to what has been seen until very recently.
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