

**TOP HAT AND CANE SHOW: GENDERED EMOTIONAL LABOUR IN
KAYAK GUIDING**

CARLIN R. SHARPE
Bachelor of Arts, University of Lethbridge, 2009

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
of the University of Lethbridge
in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology
University of Lethbridge
LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA, CANADA

© Carlin R. Sharpe, 2012

Acknowledgments

This thesis would not have been achievable without the help and support of many people.

To my supervisor: thank-you for all of your support and encouragement throughout this process. Your time, energy and advice made this thesis possible. Thank-you for being there through cheerleading meetings and late-night emails and giving me the space to figure things out on my own. Through your mentorship I have learned how to be a researcher and an academic.

To my committee members, Dr. William Ramp and Dr. Catherine Kingfisher, your thoughtful comments have helped make this thesis better.

To my interviewees: this research would not have been possible without your time and enthusiasm.

To my husband David Sharpe who lived through this process with me. Thank-you for everything.

A thesis is great undertaking and one not done alone. Thank-you to those of you who have read and edited along the way. Annabree Fairweather, Marie Lefaive, Chloe Riley, David Sharpe, and Constance Sheriff.

To my fellow graduate students who helped me feel less crazy and alone: Gillian Ayers, Noreen Chatur, Natasha Fairweather, Mike Granzow, Christina Marcotte, Auburn Phillips, Constance Sheriff, Brittany Thompson, and Abe Tinny.

To Jenny Oseen who was always there to listen.

To my parents, friends, and family who supported me with food, love, and encouragement.

Finally, I would like to thank the Social Sciences and Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and the University of Lethbridge for financial and institutional support.

Abstract

This thesis interrogates the intersections of gender and emotional labour in an exploratory study of guided kayak tours. The kayak tour is a socially produced location where guides hold the double role of entertainer and protector of their clients. The social space of the tour not only constructs and markets to particular clients (which impact guide-clients interactions), but also constructs particular gender locations for guides. Semi-structured, open-ended interviews were conducted to produce rich qualitative data, and were supplemented by fieldwork and examination of promotional materials. Guides' stories offer detailed accounts of the emotional labour in which they engage as they produce a tour experience for clients. They also reveal the ways in which this labour is intertwined with their gender projects. As kayaking is unexamined within sociological literature, this thesis contributes to an understanding of the social world and furthers knowledge on the complexities of gender and emotional labour.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	iii
Abstract.....	v
Proem	1
Chapter One: Introduction	5
Setting the Scene: Colourful speed bumps.....	5
Understanding guides' performances.....	6
Overview	7
Chapter Two: Literature.....	9
Introduction.....	9
Perceptions of the Tour Space.....	9
Guides' Emotional Labour	12
Gender as a Performance.....	15
Gender, Risk Discourses, and Emotional Labour	17
Conclusion.....	21
Chapter Three: Methods.....	22
Introduction.....	22
Methods Overview	25
Sampling.....	25
Geographical and seasonal implications	26

Fieldwork	27
Access.....	29
In-depth Interviews	32
Analysis	34
Validity	35
Ethical Concerns	37
Chapter Four: “The top hat and cane show”: Guiding and Emotional Labour	38
The kayak tour.....	38
Eagles, sea stars and capsize: The narrative space of the tour, framing and anticipation	42
“Terrified of getting wet”	48
“It’s a persona thing. It’s an acting job in part. Like you are putting on a bit of a show”	56
“The family from hell”	62
“OK, bye-bye guys”	64
“Even if people kind of suck”	70
Chapter Five: “I think females make way better guides, just because of the maternal thing: Guiding and Gender	71
“I thought, ‘but she’s a girl’, and then I thought, ‘what the fuck am I doing?’”	72
“I was 19 years old, I weighed around 103 pounds, and I was 5 foot 4, so....that I think had its challenges”	78

“A male guide just wants to kayak, kayak, kayak, kayak”	83
Stories and the spaces in between	87
Chapter Six: “You’ve still got to put on that happy face”: Conclusion.....	89
Contributions	89
Limitations	93
Further directions	95
Coda	97
References	103
Appendix A	107
Interview Guide.....	107
Appendix B	109
Consent Form	109
Appendix C	111
Minor Consent Form	111

List of Figures

Figure 1	42
Figure 2	45

Proem

*I grew up on a light station. We moved onto the lights¹ when I was three years old, and off when I was eleven, but this part of my childhood is not something that comes up in casual conversation, unless I'm guiding. I have told more clients I grew up on the lights than I have ever told friends. I don't hide that I grew up on the lights, but people tend to fuss over it a bit, because they've "never met someone who's lived in a lighthouse". The response to my self-revelation often exoticizes me to other people, something that I avoid when making friends. But while guiding, I **am** the exotic for my clients, so I might as well go all the way and tell them that I grew up on a light station. In a way, it was a natural conversation track to pursue because clients would often ask me if I grew up on the island, thus giving me the opportunity to respond with 'Actually, I grew up on a light station'. This statement instantly made me exciting, and my stories of winter storms and humpback whales were golden with clients, especially those who didn't live on the coast. And even with the coastal clients, sometimes this tidbit worked where tales about sea stars didn't. It was an effective conversation starter, and positioned me favourably in relation to kayaking and the water. I didn't look the part of a rough and tumble outdoors person. I wore mascara, and cute short shorts and tees to work, not quick-dry MEC² everything like some guides, but I used my lights currency to tip the scales in my favour. I tapped into my biography to help compensate for my lack of other currency (such as a vast amount of experience on personal kayak trips, or camping trips). Through what I told clients about myself, I created a picture of a person who conformed to what I believed a guide should be. Guides enjoy being outside and with nature all the time, and spend all their free time camping, kayaking, or doing other outdoor activities. I don't. That's not why I kayak. I'm a people person. I like people. I like talking to them. I like showing them new stuff. I do it for the gratification of being in some sort of teaching role, and making people happy.*

Who I am and how I am situated (and how I situate myself) as a guide and researcher is important. I grew up on a light station, I am a woman, I am in my 20's, I have a level-one guide certification, I have four years of experience guiding, and I am a sociologist. What is of particular importance, though, is how these experiences and

¹ Short for light station.

² Mountain Equipment Coop

attributes influence and shape how I came to this research project, how I think about researching, and how I have researched this thesis. I am not an unbiased researcher who has objectively measured social life, but an individual who has interacted with research participants to mutually produce an understanding of an aspect of social life. As such, it is important to write myself and my contributions into the text, but the process of reflectively writing about one's experiences is messy and complex. Throughout the research process I have endeavoured to be as reflexive as possible in each moment, but the extent and depth of my reflexivity has changed over time and with each new stage of the research process. The process of learning to think and write reflexively occurred during and alongside the writing of this thesis. And while my own experiences are mostly absent in the body of this thesis, as readers, you should know the relationships, experiences, fears, and self-discovery that shaped this thesis and occurred during this its development, as they cannot (and should not) be divorced from the research I am presenting.

I was in the field from late May 2010 until mid-August. During that time I talked to guides and worked alongside them for the land portion of the tour, but I never actually got in a boat and went on a tour. I was offered the chance to join tours a few times but declined. I consciously declined without quite knowing why. Upon further reflection, I have a few ideas.

I am a relatively inexperienced guide. I guided for four years, and during that time I paddled the same route twice a day five days a week all summer. I did a few trips out of another location, but that ended after a bad capsizing which resulted in a shoulder injury for me (and fabulous story for my client, about being rescued from the depths by a "pretty young woman").

I was a cautious guide. I was the first one to cancel if the wind came up. I was not the guide who would push clients - quite the opposite. I ran very relaxed, calm tours focused on sea life and enjoying the water. I guide in the summer months, and stories of overnight trips and long expeditions don't sound exciting or fun to me. I fake it (it being

enthusiasm about adventurous aspects of kayaking) because I worry people will not take me seriously if I do not love MEC everything and want to go “roughing it” every chance I get.

In the field, I accounted for this reluctance by lamenting that I lived in Alberta for school, and didn't own my own boat and so was unable to kayak – “poor me”. Telling other guides that I really was not “into it” would have made my research harder, I think. I did worry that by doing this I was using counterfeit currency with my guide identity - and hoping no one noticed. I told people that I had only guided with one company and that I only really guided one route - they knew I was inexperienced, but that was ok, because I was still a guide. And I do still identify as a guide somewhat. I have kept my certification up, mostly because of my master's, but I'm still on the books as a certified guide.

I heard some guides tell me that really they would like to sleep in their own beds every night (i.e. not do overnight trips) but as a group, the line is still pulled that guides are tough outdoorsy people. Being a ‘retired’ guide was a comfortable persona: people can think of me as a guide who is stuck living in Alberta and unable to guide. In truth, I miss what I called guiding, but I have no intentions of guiding again. It was a great summer job and I really enjoyed it, but I don't plan on going back.

My own struggles to ‘fit in’ and to conform to ideas that I had (have) about both guiding and also researching³ highlight how I viewed categories such as ‘risk’, ‘adventure’, ‘guide’, or ‘researcher’ as rigid and constraining. For me, there was no space within the discourses of risk or the culture of guiding for someone who did not “*spend all their free time camping, kayaking or doing other outdoors-like activities*”; thus I reinvented myself through the use of my childhood light station experiences. I bought into the brochure pictures of paddling in the rough and rugged outdoors and built my identity as a guide from those. In the same way that brochures created kayaking as a particular type of activity, I created myself as a particular kind of person for my clients

³ I struggled with maintaining my role of researcher within the field. I held an ideal of what the role of “researcher” entailed and attempted to maintain artificial separation between myself as a guide and myself as a researcher. This is neither possible nor desirable, but instead reflects my own personal struggles with researching what I knew.

(and for my research participants) - one that conformed to ideas of what I thought a guide was.

My own thoughts and struggles around ideas of what 'counts' as a guide, and how I performed being a guide, were the jumping-off points for this research. My research built on, and originated from, my personal background as a kayak day guide. I worked for six years in the kayaking industry in a variety of jobs categories including, guide, land crew, and general manager. My experience as a sociologist and a guide fostered an interest in the social dimensions of kayak guiding, and has informed the direction of this research.

Chapter One: Introduction

Setting the Scene: Colourful speed bumps

Kayak shops in coastal British Columbia exude an atmosphere of small, friendly island businesses. The shops are understated buildings located at or over the water's edge. For the uninitiated, walking into a kayak shop can resemble walking into the back of someone's yard. It can be an unsettling experience for new clients arriving for their tour. They are often unsure what to do: some bravely walk in and look around; others stand back and let the land crew or guide come to them.

Guides generally watch as the clients approach, using these first few moments to get a feel for the type of tour they are going to have. Some will stand off to the side for a few minutes to watch the group before introducing themselves. During introductions both guide and clients take measure of each other.

The guide now assumes control of the tour. Clients are dressed in safety equipment, and valuables are securely stored in the shop. Clients are then fitted into their boats and given a paddle lesson on land before the boats are hauled down to the water's edge. Land crew and the guide help clients into their boats and push them off with instructions to stay close and to wait for their guide.

When all the clients are on the water, the guide calls them together for a last piece of safety information before they head out of the marina and begin the tour. "*See all those boats out there?*" says the guide gesturing to the power boats and sail boats entering and leaving the marina. "*We're just colourful speed bumps to them*". The term is purposefully chosen to both amuse and unsettle. "*So in order to ensure you don't get run over I need you all to listen to me and stay close enough that you can hear me when I*

give instructions” (Field notes, July, 2010). By now the guide has the clients’ attention and can begin to lead the group along the shoreline.

Understanding guides’ performances

The “colourful speed bumps” story is an example of how guides create the tour experience for and with clients. It also indicates how discourses referencing adventure, safety and, risk are present and (re)constructed through guides’ actions and words, and is an example of one ways in which guides do emotional labour within the social space of the tour. Finally, within the tour space guides’ actions and words are also gender performances (as will be explained in chapter five) that both draw on and (re)produce discourses of adventure, safety and, risk.

This thesis examines the intersections of risk participation, emotional labour, and gender in an exploratory study of guided kayak tours. Specifically, it explores how kayak guides create meaning for themselves and their clients as they engage in kayaking. Based on interviews and observational data, this thesis explores how guides navigate their interactions with clients, and how guides facilitate a tour experience through emotional labour. Personal stories, told by guides during interviews, provide the framework for understanding gender and emotional labour within kayaking. Specifically they illustrate how, within the parameters of specific risk and safety discourses, guides navigate their emotional labour performances and their participation in adventure activities, both personally and professionally. This contextualization allows the study to draw conclusions about how tours are packaged and ‘sold’ to clients, and how guides understand and construct their own experiences, as well as those of their clients. This research was undertaken to answer the following questions:

- How do guides make sense of the tour experience they perform for and with their clients?
- (How) do guides draw on and produce risk and safety discourses to shape the tour experience?
- In what ways do guides engage in emotional labour as part of their guiding activities?
- How can we understand guides' gender performances and what do these performances tell us?

Kayakers represent a largely unexplored group within sociology. This thesis focuses specifically on kayak guides and their experiences with clients and the tour. While guides and client are both actors within the tour experience, my focus is specifically on how guides experience, create and understand the tour. Beginning with personal experience and drawing on sociological literature concerning emotional labour, performance, gender, and risk this thesis aims to create a nuanced exploration of kayak guides' experiences. Finally, this thesis contributes to a growing understanding of kayaking and guided activities, and assists with understanding gender as a performance.

Overview

Chapter two provides a foundation for a sociological understanding of kayak guiding through an exploration of kayak tours as a socially constructed space. Kayaking is also marketed using much of the same language seen within established risk sports and therefore an exploration of risk participation is helpful in situating kayaking within a wider theoretical context. In particular, recent works that explore the gendered and

emotional aspects of risk participation help to further an understanding of the complex experience of kayak guides.

Chapter three outlines the methods, ethics, and analysis involved in this thesis research. The methods used to undertake this research reflect the school of thought that focuses on how knowledge is mutually produced. With this in mind, interviews, field notes, and kayaking companies' websites and brochures served as a tool to situate and understand guides' stories within the tour space.

Chapter four outlines the emotional labour in which guides engage as they negotiate relationships with clients, other guides, and management, and the parameters of job itself. In so doing, it conceptualizes guides' experiences as both relational and performative. Within the tour, how guides engage with their clients, and each other, reflects how we can understand their experience as guides in the specific context of guiding as a performance of individualized responsibility.

Chapter five interrogates guides' performances as always already gendered. Through guides' stories, the particular gendered subjectivities that are salient within the tour space are understood. The addition of guides' experiences as gendered builds on the emotional labour and performativity findings by highlighting how guides are fundamentally gendered actors; this requires that we understand their emotional labour as *gendered* emotional labour.

Finally, chapter six concludes by summarizing how guides' experiences are gendered emotional labour experiences, and how this contributes to our understanding of kayak guiding. Possible limitations of this thesis are also addressed, and suggestions and directions of further research are offered.

Chapter Two: Literature

Introduction

There is little sociological research related to kayaking and therefore the literature below draws on other well-researched fields that share similarities with kayaking. As will be discussed later, kayak tour guides engage in emotional labour, through narrative and humour, to create an adventure experience for their clients. This study frames the tour as a social space brought into existence through guides' performances, highlighting the salient discourses that both shape and are shaped by these performances..

Perceptions of the Tour Space

The focus of this thesis is on guides' emotional labour and gendered experiences, but first, an understanding of the social location in which these are performed is required. And while guides demonstrate that they have a great deal of control over what their individual tours look like, the tour space as a whole is created for the clients. Therefore we need to understand the tour space as the location where the tour experience is performed.

Performances are consumed through the senses and kayak tours are performed for and with tourists⁴, who represent a particular type of audience. Urry's notion of "visual consumption" explains how tourists engage with their surroundings (1992, 172). This occurs at different moments in a trip, including preparing for and traveling to the location, and visiting the new location. These acts impact how tourists view the experience they consume. Urry gives the example of an iconic photo of a couple

⁴ Interviewees unanimously confirmed that the majority of their clients were tourists. Interviewees defined "tourist" as someone either not from the island or not from other islands or immediate area.

embracing in Paris, which is viewed as “timeless romantic Paris” (1992). Paris, or the idea of Paris, therefore comes to symbolize romance, love, and passion, under the tourist gaze. Encapsulating a scene or experience by reducing it to a phrase, such as “timeless romantic Paris” or “island adventures”, impacts how people think about, and therefore experience, that location or event. Kayaking brochures draw on these encapsulating phrases and elicit feelings of “fun” by including adjectives such as exciting, relaxing, and adventurous, and placing them beside pictures of smiling paddlers, soaring eagles, and beautiful sunsets. Through this type of advertising, brochures frame the way the clients then visually and emotionally consume their experience of kayaking.

The tourist gaze (Urry, 1992) is based on the construction of experiences primarily via visual senses. It “is the unusualness of the visual sensations that place these other activities within a different frame” (1992, p. 172). Mundane “activities, such as shopping, strolling, [and] sitting having a drink ... appear special when constructed against a striking [or new and exotic] visual backcloth” (ibid). The notion of visual consumption can be applied to how guides enact their performance within the frame of the tourist gaze, but we must extend the idea to encompass all the senses so as to capture the embodied experience of the kayak tour. The tour is experienced according to the rules and designs of that particular shop, but as Urry (1992) demonstrates, if the tour is marketed to the tourist gaze, then the whole experience is constructed to fit within ideas of consumption and exotic experience. Guides bring the kayaking experience into being in ways that mesh with the tourist gaze by drawing on familiar concepts of excitement, adventure, and nature. Furthermore, as I discuss in greater detail in chapter four, clients are created through how kayak companies market and construct client and guide

interactions. Kayak companies and guides create the experience for the tourist gaze, and in so doing act in accordance with what is acceptable within that framed experience.

Goffman adds to our understanding by emphasising the interactional aspects of encounters (in this instance, how guides interact with clients): “When an individual appears before others, his actions will influence the definition of the situation” (1959, p. 6). This is useful in understanding how actions and words, unintended and intended, define the situation and guides’ and clients’ identities and roles within it. In the same way that tour brochures can be understood as defining a situation through the use of particular pictures and actions, guides’ and clients’ actions and utterances (re)construct the tour experience. Goffman’s distinction between backstage (private) and frontstage (public) social arenas uses the language of performance once again to describe social interaction. Categories of front- and backstage are not fixed, and varying degrees of front- and backstage work may be revealed or hidden in social interactions. The social arena in which events or actions take place shapes how, for whom, and to what degree individuals engage in impression management in their efforts to define the situation (Goffman, 1959).

MacCannell (1973) takes up Goffman’s ideas of back- and front-stage arenas, and shows how the tourist industry creates “backstage” situations that are façades because they are truly front stage areas that tourists can view. Clues to backstage areas are consciously placed to give settings a degree of authenticity that is generally associated with backstage locations. Kayak brochures create a depiction of manufactured authenticity through the pictures of spectacular sunsets and stunning wildlife. These pictures tap into the idea of experiencing nature in the wild versus experiencing nature in

the zoo. Artificial backstage areas are also evident in the fact that most kayak shops exist as little more than small sheds full of gear (MacCannell, 1973). There is generally no staff space and all tour prep is done in the open with clients watching, which means the guides and staff are always ‘on stage’.

Guides’ Emotional Labour

Within the tour space guides take up aspects of the tour space creation (such as how they frame the viewing of wildlife) through how they engage with clients. In this way understanding the tour as a manufactured adventure offers insight into guides’ participation as performed within kayaking tours. Guided tours are unique experiences as they are sold to inexperienced clients. Within tours, guides facilitate (and construct) clients’ expectations through the management of the emotional tone of the experience within a controlled environment. The manufactured adventure experience provides a situational space in which to experience risk in a controlled fashion, although this type of experience also creates the possibility of compromising the authenticity of that experience: “adventure without risk is like Disneyland” (Holyfield, Jonas, and Zajicek, 2005, p. 173). Maintaining the (manufactured) authenticity of the tour experience for clients is the responsibility of the guides. Guided risk tours have sometimes been equated with theme parks; they are akin to the risk experience of a roller coaster which can result in guides feeling like over-worked entertainers in a job that is mundane, repetitive and emotional taxing (Holyfield, Jonas, and Zajicek, 2005).

Emotional work is the “[the] act of trying to change in degree or quality an emotion or feeling” (Hochschild, 1979, p. 561). As Lupton explains, “this definition suggests that at least some emotions do not ‘naturally’ occur as instinctive response, but

must be produced by the individual as a deliberate, reasoned social strategy” (Lupton, 1998, p. 19). Emotional work needs to be understood not as something one feels, but also as something one should feel and works to feel, or as something *others* should feel and that one works to produce *in* them. Emotional work is therefore “about constituting feeling, bringing it into being in response to awareness of social norms about what one *should* be feeling” (Lupton, 1998, p. 19, original emphasis).

Building on emotional work, the act of producing certain emotions, is the concept of emotional labour, producing particular emotions *as* part of one’s job (Hochschild, 1979). It entails workers being “paid to adjust their feelings to the needs of the customer and requirements of the work situation (for example, flight attendants, prostitutes, social workers, debt collectors and sales workers)” (Lupton, 1998, p. 21). The concept of emotional labour is particularly useful in understanding guides’ emotional involvement both within tours and during down time⁵. Within the tour situation, guides are responsible for shaping their clients’ experiences and emotions by mimicking these feelings themselves and through other techniques, such as the use of humour and stories.

As Lupton notes, women are “typically expected to engage in emotional labour more than men in paid employment and are overrepresented in the ‘caring’ or ‘service’ industries that involve dealing sensitively with clients or customers” (1998, p. 129). This highlights how emotions and emotion work are gendered, which means that particular emotions and emotional displays are often “read” as feminine or masculine. Guided tours are workplaces that require emotional labour, and how that emotional labour is performed

⁵ During down time, such as between tours or at staff pub nights, guides engage in careful re-telling of their tour experiences. Despite the lack of clients these performances are still ‘work’, as they serve to shore up the boundaries of what it means to be a guide.

by the guide reflects gendered practices, practices further complicated by discourses of adventure.

Emotional labour is not limited to the tour experience, but also includes framing and setting the emotional tone that happens during selling and advertising the tour (Sharpe, 2005). Risk participation, where knowledgeable guides lead and create a risk experience for less-knowledgeable clients, has been explained as “manufactured adventure,” in which guides make use of “organizational scripts and [the] social context” of the guided tour, and use emotional labour to turn risk into fun (Holyfield, 1999, p. 6). Some social settings, such as weddings and funerals, have strict ‘feeling rules’ (Hochschild, 1979) and the tour is no exception. Tracing how guided tours create an adventure experience ‘of a lifetime’ through scripted routines demonstrates how everything, the humour used, the stories told, and the timing of the tours, is constructed and interpreted as a narrative of adventure. In this setting, adventures become something that you can schedule, with no experience needed (Holyfield, 1999).

During the tour experience, guides “must *embody* the excitement they are selling, as customers look to them for feeling clues” (Holyfield, 1999, p. 10, original emphasis). Guides therefore can feel a loss of authenticity due to the emotional labour that they perform for clients (Holyfield, Jonas, and Zajicek, 2005). Guides’ embodied performances are undertaken for and with clients. Guides carefully “read” clients in order to create a fun and enjoyable tour experience through the use of humour, to ensure that the proper “spin” is placed on subjects such as the risks of falling out of the boat. These humorous “spins” are ways of framing these risks and distancing the “real” dangers (Holyfield, 1999). Guides, drawing on their knowledge and expertise, package “fake”

risks, while managing and keeping hidden the real dangers (Holyfield, 1999). Narratives such as those which detail the “proper etiquette” for falling out of the boat (by taking at least two friends with you) enable a humourous and “fun” spin to be placed on the risks of white water rafting (Holyfield, 1999). Holyfield makes a point of commenting that humour is the emotional labour tool used to create distance and reduce the fear surrounding the real dangers of the risk activity. Furthermore “a ‘good’ guide engages in the appropriate emotional labour” by disguising any evidence “that the job can be mundane” (Holyfield, 1999, p. 10). Guides therefore must “read” clients to ensure that they are managing clients’ emotions properly. Consequently, the use of humour in the face of risk, even perceived or created risk, is an effective way to keep clients’ attention on important information, but also to keep a fun and exciting mood intact, performing risk as something light, fun, and funny.

Guides exercise a great deal of influence over clients’ emotions, but “the goal is the generation of affect and facilitation of spontaneity, not the regulation or suppression of expression, at least not for the consumer” (Holyfield, 1999, p. 28). Through emotional labour, guides endeavour to create an adventure experience in which they lead through example and show their clients how risk participation can be fun.

Gender as a Performance

In a foundational work on gender as a social construction, West and Zimmerman explain that “doing gender involves a complex of socially guided perceptual, interactional, and micropolitical activities that cast particular pursuits as expressions of masculine and feminine ‘natures’” (1987, p. 126). Gender is not something that individuals possess, but something they achieve through actions, words and manners:

It is individuals who do gender, but it is a situated doing, carried out in the virtual or real presence of the others who are presumed to be oriented to its production. Rather than as a property of individuals, we conceive of gender as an emergent feature of social situations: both as an outcome of and a rationale for various social arrangements and as a means of legitimating one of the most fundamental divisions of society. (West and Zimmermann, 1987, p. 126)

Kayak guides' gendered performances are therefore undertaken with and for each other, and clients, within the frame of the tour. Therefore, gender is something we do, not once, but in an ongoing way every day throughout our activities. Not only is gender what we do; it is also what we do not do. As noted in the discussion of the tour as a social space, silences, or a lack of action can hold importance too. West and Zimmermann use the term "doing gender" when referring to gender performance, but this should not be conflated with action (1987). To do one's gender requires both action and a lack of action.

West and Zimmerman further expand on gendered performances by commenting that "to 'do' gender is not to live up to normative conceptions of femininity or masculinity; it is to engage in behaviour *at the risk of gender assessment*" (1987, p. 136, original emphasis). Doing gender speaks to others about our gender and about theirs in ways that take particular situations and particular others into account. When a male client does not ask questions about what happens if he capsizes, he is performing his gender (in this culture) by displaying a lack of concern or fear. When a female guide rescues the male client, she is performing her gender in ways that are incongruent to her sex category (West and Zimmermann, 1987). This means that "the oppressive character of gender rests not just on difference but the inferences from and the consequences of those differences as performed. The inferences and attendant consequences are linked to and supported by historical and structural circumstances" (West and Zimmerman, 2009, p.

117). This is not to say that after one non-conforming gender performance a person, or the boundaries of the category to which that person ‘belongs’ will be challenged, but that these types of performances invoke framing and containing as aspects of performance work. Therefore, what counts as an appropriate gender performance varies between different social situations.

West and Zimmermann highlight the uncertainty of gender performances when they state that “because accountability is a feature of social relationships, the accomplishment of gender is at once interactional and institutional – with its idiom drawn from the institutional arena where such relationships are enacted” (2009, p. 114). This means that within the same social setting, differences between participants (for example, clients’ and guides’ age and background influence how they perform their gender as they engage in risk participation) could lead them to do gender in different ways; this highlights the fluidity of gender performances. As mentioned above, the guide’s role creates a special social space in which particular actions become more acceptable than they normally would be when performed by someone who does not ‘fit’ an expected gender or sex category (e.g., women who rescue men twice their size; men who engage in intense emotional labour). Within the tour, guides engage in gender performances that make sense within the tour, and which may not make sense in other settings.

Gender, Risk Discourses, and Emotional Labour

Guides’ available gender performances both impact and are constituted by emotional labour. Therefore, to understand emotional labour we must understand it as *gendered* emotional labour. However, gender is performed in relation to a social location and the discourses that govern that location. While guiding is arguably governed by many

different discourses, risk discourses are salient – and (re)produced – within guiding, particularly because guides’ gender performances are shaped and constrained by risk discourses, and negotiating this is itself a source of emotional labour.

Palmer (2002) illustrates the intersections of gender and emotional labour by explaining how media accounts ‘policed’ female risk takers in the case of Alison Hargreaves, a climber and mother of two. Hargreaves’ climbing career and accomplishments were severely sanctioned as being self-centered and an example of bad mothering (Palmer, 2002). When Hargreaves died during a climb, she was accused by the media of having “effectively abandoned her children by taking such extraordinary risks” (Palmer, 2002, p. 334). Palmer highlights how male climbers’ deaths or triumphs are not constructed this way, even if their wives are pregnant (Palmer, 2002). The invocation of motherhood discourses to sanction Hargreaves’ actions depicts how interwoven gender is with risk participation. The media tale of Hargreaves’ death constructs her as a mother and wife first, and a climber second, and simultaneously constructs motherhood in particular ways. Conversely, media coverage of male climbers’ deaths describes these men as dying “doing what they loved” (Palmer, 2002, p. 334). The disjuncture between media representations of male and female climbers reflects gendered ‘risk-taking’ and its association with masculinity. The media’s treatment of Hargreaves demonstrates how particular gender performances require emotional labour, as during her lifetime Hargreaves, like other sport participants, was required to attempt to affect feeling rules surrounding their gender and participation in particular activities.

Emotional labour therefore becomes an expression of how gender is performed in particular ways. As West and Zimmermann note, the “best” gender performance is one

that is not worthy of note, for if a gender performance is called out then it in some way falls outside of the norm (1987). Within the social location of the four particular gender performances are more 'normal' than in other social locations (particularly for women) but moving between different social locations with different groups of people requires emotional labour to manage the transition.

Olstead discusses "a discourse of responsibility" in her investigation of the embodied emotions that female risk participants feel and examines "how responsibility discourse shapes what discursive expressions are culturally intelligible, and what expressions are available to [risk] participants in their various gender projects" (2011, p. 5). The concluding implication is that "the construction of their edgework discourse is both a personal story, and a collective product, based on the meanings derived through social interaction with others" (2011, p. 5). Therefore, gender is constrained by discourses of risk, creating a fundamental relationship between how gender and emotions are framed and constrained through gender politics.

Olstead argues that risk discourses subject female participants to guilt and social pressure from friends and family to stop "hurting them" (family members) by taking these unnecessary risks (2011, p. 91). These types of claims are derived from the belief that by risking themselves these women are rejecting an essential aspect of femininity and threatening the gender organization of relationality as women's work (see Laurendeau and Adams, 2010). Both family and organizations use protection discourses as reasons to hinder or deny women's participation in risk-taking (Laurendeau and Adams, 2010). Gender discourses construct women as caregivers, nurturing, maternal, and emotional. Therefore, by placing themselves in situations of 'risk' women are rejecting or going

against the essential roles of their gender (West and Zimmermann, 1987). Female risk participants are policed within their risk participation and without, and also engage in self-policing (Olstead, 2011). Therefore, performances of gender, particularly women's performances, done in reference to risk discourses, necessitate emotional labour.

Gendered emotional labour is well articulated through Lois' (2003) notion of emotional edgework. Lois (2003, 2005) outlines four stages (preparing for edgework, performing edgework, completing edgework, and redefining edgework) of emotional edgework, describing the gendered ways that men and women navigate these stages. While this concept applies to individuals engaging in risk participation the concept is valuable as emotional edgework serves to explain how emotions and gender operate within discourses of risk. Preparation for edgework is the building-up of confidence in regards to physical, technical and emotional abilities (Lois, 2005). In this way, risk participants mentally and emotionally prepare for their participation. Performing edgework is the act of participating in the risk-taking, and dealing in the moment with the emotions accompanying that participation (Lois, 2005; Laurendeau 2011). Completing edgework involves a release of controlled emotions. Lois explains how after "successful mission outcomes, like reuniting victims with their families ... rescuers released the pent-up stress that had been tightly managed throughout the mission by shouting, high-fiving each other, [and] making jokes" (Lois, 2005, p. 137). Finally the redefining stage of emotional edgework is characterized by the continuing efforts of "members to regain control of their feelings and cognitively process them, retrospectively redefining and shaping their experiences" (Lois, 2005, p. 143). This last stage is of particular importance as it highlights edgeworkers' continued attention to their performance of risk, and how

they negotiate not only how they think and feel during engagement with risk, but also what others think and feel about their risk performance (Olstead, 2011).

Conclusion

The above serves to situate this research within relevant bodies of literature. Understanding how the tour space is produced locates guides' experiences within a particular social situation and the constraints placed on action within that space. Guides' experiences are further intelligible through examining how emotional labour and gender performances inform and are (re)produced through their experiences. Exploring risk discourses demonstrates how these discourses challenge the intelligible gender performances available to guides, which results in their emotional negotiation of gender. As West and Zimmermann state, doing gender is beyond the individual: "the 'doing' of gender is undertaken by women and men whose competence as members of society is hostage to its production" (West and Zimmermann, 1987, p. 126). Therefore, guides' performances of gender constitute emotional labour as they negotiate the tour experience for and with clients.

Chapter Three: Methods

Introduction

In order to conduct research and produce sociological knowledge, I must first consider what counts as knowledge and why. Questions, notes, pictures, and recorded conversations are tools used in knowledge production and the particular kind of understanding sought through these research methods influences how these research tools are used. Below, the particular understanding of knowledge and the production of knowledge that were used within this research are explored.

Knowledge is not something that is discovered, but something that we produce. Knowledge therefore is nonfoundational; it is mutually constituted and created through a joint project not measurable by an unbiased observer (Rabinow, 1977; Guba and Lincoln, 2005). Therefore, researcher and participants are both “culturally mediated and historically situated [selves] ... in a continuously changing world of meaning” fundamentally entrenched within systems of meaning that affect their interactions with one another (Rabinow, 1977, p. 6). Upon entering the field, researchers become entangled in the meaning systems of the field, which are interpreted and mediated through the meaning systems they bring with them (Rabinow, 1977; Lofland and Lofland 1995). In the same way, participants’ meaning systems are affected by the researcher, as researcher and participants create new understandings together.

Researchers and research participants also need to be understood as collections of selves, or subject positions that intermingle (Rabinow, 1977; Lofland and Lofland 1995; Kleinman, 1991). I, as a person, am a researcher, female, in my twenties, a certified level-one kayak guide, and a graduate student. These situated selves or subject positions

are not mutually exclusive or completely integrated, and both researcher and participants bring multiple subject positions to all interactions (Guba and Lincoln, 2005). Within this research I employ different selves in forming relationships, but so do research participants. As I hold the self of former guide, I need to be constantly mindful of how that self influences my understandings, questions, and readings of research situations.

It is fundamental to acknowledge that as researchers “are historically situated through the questions we ask and the manner in which we seek to understand and experience the world ... what we receive from our informants are interpretations, equally mediated by history and culture” (Rabinow, 1977, p.119). Furthermore, Guba and Lincoln highlight how in recent years “social scientists concerned with the expansion of what counts as social data rely increasingly on the experiential, and embodied, the emotive qualities of human experience” to inform their studies (2005, p. 205). Research often results in making the strange familiar and the familiar strange for both participants and researcher (Lofland and Lofland, 1995). As researchers, we are required to critically examine what we bring to the research experience and how we are shaping not only the knowledge that we are producing, but also what we count as research knowledge. Understanding research to be mutually constituted means that researchers must endeavour to think reflexively and examine how they relate and respond to the research process and participants, and how the information that is produced is collaborative (Guba and Lincoln, 2005). This is particularly important to this thesis as I am “researching what I know”, meaning that I possess pre-existing experience and knowledge as a guide. While all researchers (and participants) bring pre-existing knowledge to the field, mine directly affects how I understand the topic, ask questions, and relate to participants in the field.

The research focus is a direct result of my own experiences as a guide and questions I had about those experiences.

Language choice both respects and reflects the mutually constituted production of knowledge of the research process. This thesis will not refer to collecting data, but rather to generating meaning and understanding through stories from research participants. Furthermore the term fieldwork has been chosen over that of participant observation, as the later term cleans up a fundamentally messy process of constantly negotiating relationships while in the field (Blackman, 2007). This research, for example, involved moving to the community in which I was doing fieldwork. This allowed me to participate in after-hours activities, to be “on call” during the days I volunteered at the kayak shop, and to run into participants in the grocery store. Lastly, fieldwork is a term that reflects the relationships I have to kayaking companies in the area. Fieldwork is used not to simplify matters through a broad term, but instead captures the messy, awkward, uncomfortable, and exciting nature of research.

The deliberate use of the term “research participants” rather than “subjects” also further demonstrates the idea of mutually constituted knowledge (Dingwall, 1997). This terminology better capture the realities of interviewing friends and past co-workers. This word choice is not to clarify relationships, but to attempt to highlight the overlapping motives and relationships present in the research. I was not just a participant observer, but a co-worker, a local, a researcher, a friend, etc. These word choices also denote to the reader that knowledge creation is a mutual production within the research process.

Methods Overview

This project includes in-depth interviews and fieldwork. Industry literature, such as brochures and website, were used in a supplementary fashion to contextualize interviews and fieldwork notes. Multiple methods were employed in an attempt to capture the full experience of participants and to assist in clarifying validity and authenticity of meaning (Dingwall, 1997). Multiple methods were not used to create triangulation, but instead to achieve a “crystallization” of understanding and meaning (Richardson, 1997 in Lincoln, Lynham, and Guba 2011). Two fieldwork trips were taken during the summers of 2009 and 2010. The first trip was instructive; as I explored fieldwork sites and conducted a few preliminary interviews, I realised that due to the seasonal nature of kayaking I would require a shorter and more intense research approach that would be sensitive to that. The second trip occurred earlier in the kayaking season, and this trip was built around the realities of the season with the help of the contacts made during the previous summer. I drew on contacts within the industry and my guiding identity to gain access to study locations. While in the field, I engaged in informal interviews to foster rapport with participants and to situate guides’ interviews within the tour space.

Sampling

This thesis is not trying to capture a representative sample of the guiding companies in the geographical area, but to instead sample the discursive characteristics of guides’ sense-making. During initial fieldwork, guides were consulted about a range of subject positions, opinions and experiences. This knowledge, along with my own experience as a guide, informed the characteristics identified as relevant to this study: age, years of guiding experience, certification level, and gender. This form of inquiry is

called purposive sampling, which subscribes to “the idea that who a person is and where that person is located within a group is important” (Palys, 2008, p. 679).

Guides’ subject positions are understood not as formulaic expressions, but as intersections of experiences and characteristic that influence their worldviews. Because guides constitute a small numerical group, population demographics change from year to year, which means that the characteristics, such as age, gender, skill level, and experience can result in a shop being populated in a particular year with young female guides of medium experience and low skill and the next year it could male guides with a 50-50 split in age, experience, and skill level. But because this thesis is interested in a selection of how guides discursively make sense of their experiences and not a selection of the population, this does not significantly affect the research.

Geographical and seasonal implications

This project has geographical and seasonal implications that require special considerations associated with the limitations of the field, as well as issues of anonymity, which is discussed below. Kayaking is popular on the west coast of Canada, and the varied coastline offers a range of paddling experiences. The tamest of these are in the sheltered waters between Vancouver Island and the mainland. It is in these locations that kayaking is marketed principally to clients with little to no experience. Family days “where kids under 3 are free”, for example, are not seen in paddling groups on the west coast of Vancouver Island where mis-navigation could have kayakers heading into dangerous open ocean. In particular, it is in these sheltered areas that clients are offered low “risk”, high “adventure” guided tours (Palmer, 2003; Kane and Zink, 2004).

The geographical region is consciously limited to an area in which kayaking tours are marketed to inexperienced clients. Tours within this area offer experiences that are unique in nature due to the limited knowledge of the clients and short interaction time between kayaking staff and clients. Most kayaking companies are open on a seasonal basis as their tour business is done between May and September, with August being the busiest month. Companies never turn away a tour in the winter months, but due to the weather these are significantly less frequent. Some shops stay open all year through other revenues from store merchandise or tropical touring options.

The weather restrictions of the tour industry put constraints on the research window. Initial contact was made with a few kayak companies and participants in August 2009 and it was found that that this month was problematic for fieldwork, due to “crazy⁶” August tourists. For that reason, I returned to the field in late May of 2010 and stayed until early August. Entering the field at a low-volume time and exiting before the height of the season was an attempt to minimize the stress on research participants. Respecting that kayaking represents people’s livelihoods and minimizing interference with this was important to the formation of good research relationships with participants.

Fieldwork

Fieldwork refers to the practice of entering a social setting and participating in, observing, and systematically taking notes about the interactions between individuals in that social setting (Shaffir and Stebbins, 1991). Fieldwork allows the researcher to experience the social activity he or she is studying and to develop rapport with

⁶ August tourists are referred to as ‘crazy’ by guides, and thought to be the tourists who wait until the last moment to plan their holiday and then become irate when hotels are booked and tours are full. August is also the busiest month, making “unreasonable” clients particularly notable and difficult to deal with (Field notes, August, 2009).

participants through sharing the experience(s). In the current research, fieldwork was primarily used as a way to generate ideas to explore during in-depth interviews, and to situate these interviews within the day-to-day actions of kayaking shops. During fieldwork, I worked alongside many of the interviewees. We shared the day-to-day life of the kayak shop, including hauling in boats at low tide, joking together, and chatting during quiet down-time. Building relationships with participants, while it assisted with eventually receiving high quality stories, can also complicate the roles of researcher and participant, a point addressed below.

Fieldwork rarely, if ever, goes smoothly, and there can be intense social awkwardness felt by the researcher, and sometimes participants, upon entering the field for the first time (Van Maanen, 1991; Lofland and Lofland, 1995). Consequently, the “stages” of fieldwork (“getting in”, “learning the ropes”, “maintaining relations” and “leaving and keeping in touch” see Shaffir and Stebbins, 1991), are negotiated differently depending on the research situation, the participants, and the researcher. In my case, fieldwork experiences were mediated and influenced by my past experience working as a guide, and by previously established relationships. I drew on my past experience as a guide to gain access to fieldwork sites such as kayaking companies and guide retreats. I did not seek employment as a guide at any of these companies as I decided that guiding and researching would be too demanding. I was uncomfortable guiding and researching at the same time; I wanted to capture guides’ experiences and was unsure if it would be possible to focus on researching and critically exploring guides’ opinions while actively guiding.

Following from above, participatory fieldwork stints were limited to on-land activities. I drew on my two summers as shop manager and four summers of guiding as currency, which made me a useful assistant to guides. I was a full participant on land, helping the shop managers or land crew clean and haul boats, adjust foot-pedals, and conduct on-land rescue and paddle demos. These small tasks sped up tour entry and exit times, and helped out both guides and shop managers. Participating in these tasks also allowed me to interact with guides and observe guides interacting with clients in the beginning and end of the tour, points marked by others as important for meaning creation of the experience (Holyfield, 1999; Holyfield and Jonas, 2003).

Access

Access is an important part of fieldwork and should be understood not as a onetime event, but as an ongoing process of negotiation (Burgess, 1991, p. 52). The researcher moves through levels of access in a nonlinear fashion as he or she navigates the social complexities of research (Lofland and Lofland, 1995). Qualitative research, in particular, is constrained by the conditions under which a researcher has access to the location and participants. I began this project with an access advantage due to my guiding experience, my technical knowledge as a former guide, and knowledge of the general operation of kayak shops, along with a few contacts within the area of study. However, these advantages did not make me immune to the trials of gaining different levels of access to the field.

Past experience influenced the research location. I elected to remove the shop I had worked at from consideration as a possible fieldwork site. While I still contacted former co-workers, I kept a distance from the operation itself due to the issues related to

doing fieldwork at a location where my roles as researcher and/or former workmate might be unclear. Instead, the focus was on kayak shops within the same geographical area that offered similar services to the same type of clients.

Access to most research locations requires multiple sites of contact (Van Maanen, 1991, p. 55-57). Though I was known to the owners of the shop where I did fieldwork (through other contacts), I was still subject to access issues. The shop owner granted (top-down) research access, but then I had to establish relationships from the ground-up, by forming direct relationships and trust with guides. These points of access were negotiated while I assisted with the on-land portion of tours. I volunteered at the shop three to four days a week and used my guide knowledge as currency to assist tours. This showed guides that I was knowledgeable enough to be helpful, and enabled me to gain trust among the guides and land crew as a quasi-insider.

I became aware of my acceptance by the guides when I was included in the splitting up of gratuities for a tour that I helped with. The land crew were given a small share of the gratuities from a tour if they had done a good job. The guide insisted I keep the money commenting “that it was first rule of guides that you tip⁷ out to everyone”⁸. By including me in gratuities, the guides were accepting as legitimate me, my help, and my presence there (Lofland and Lofland, 1995; Schostak, 2006). Sharing gratuities is not done because guides feel they have to, but as a way to reward the land crew. In receiving the gratuity I did not hold any claim over the guides. The obligation was more the other way around as they marked me as worthy of sharing their ‘extras’, which obligated me to continue to perform a “colleague” role adequately. However, my role as researcher may

⁷ The term “tip” is also used to denote when someone capsizes. To ensure clarity I am using gratuities.

⁸ I accepted a total of \$20 in gratuities over the course of my fieldwork.

have become less prominent or forgotten as guides accepted me as a regular member of the land staff (Thorne, 2004). The roles and relationships are necessarily messy within fieldwork and the boundaries between formal researcher and participants are constantly being reshaped, vanishing and appearing depending on the individuals involved, the topics of conversation, or the situation. Accepting gratuities is a clear example of the messiness of these boundaries of fieldwork, but it also highlights that as a researcher I am as much following the rules as trying to make them around what counts as ethical, acceptable, fair, and normal (Ellis, 2004).

Possessing insider status, which made me a valuable helper to the guides, did put me at a disadvantage for accessing basic information that guides assumed I knew. I needed to negotiate interviews carefully to ensure that neither my own nor interviewees' assumptions about understanding of kayaking, or guiding interfered with interviewees' responses. While I did share some of my own experiences as a guide, I would only do so if asked and was careful to do so after guides told me about their own experiences. This mutual sharing helped to access guides' experiences and opinions, as together the guides and I would compare our experiences, allowing the opportunity to ask for clarification on points as we went. My limited experience allowed me to share my experiences in a non-threatening way, as most of the guides interviewed had more experience than me. My own experience, or lack thereof, allowed the guides interviewed to teach me about their experiences, and sometimes hearing of my experiences assured them that the implications of what they were saying was being understood (Schostak, 2006). Having no guiding knowledge would have presented different types of difficulties (Lofland and Lofland, 2005).

In-depth Interviews

Don't be misled. The interview is not a simple tool with which to mine information. It is a place where views may clash, deceive, seduce, enchant. It is the inter-view. It is as much about seeing the world – mine, yours, ours, theirs, – as about hearing accounts, opinions, arguments, reasons, declarations: words with views into different worlds. (Schostak, 2006, p. 1)

The interview “pervades and produces our contemporary cultural experiences and knowledges” (Rapley, 2004, p. 16), but interviews are not simply the process of asking questions: they allow participants to share meaning through stories and emotions. With this in mind, both formal in-depth interviews and casual interviews were conducted during fieldwork. The in-depth interviews were semi-structured in nature, giving participants the freedom to share their experiences in ways that made sense to them. Interviews were conducted by a set of topics, and questions around those topics, but I took cues from the interviewees, allowing the interviews to unfold as they told their stories.

I encouraged guides to tell stories about their experiences as a way to avoid the question-answer stiffness seen in some interviews. Despite the best efforts to create a comfortable and natural experience, interviews still need to be understood as artificial social situations, a conversation of power, and a situation where meaning is created (Rapley, 2004). For example, some of the questions asked of guides were about subjects they had not considered, such as ‘Do men and women approach kayaking in different ways?’. Their response is part of the process of them making meaning of a question that may or may not ‘resonate’ for them. As such, stories were encouraged in an attempt to allow interviewees opinions to form naturally through the retelling of experience. As Dingwall (1997) states:

What the world *is* is the way we call it into existence through talk. But this is not just for any talk. It is talk that shapes a world that others will recognize and for which they will hold us responsible. (p. 57)

An interview is a production of people's worldviews and personal experiences, a production that contains hints as to how they understand particular social phenomena. Interviews are seen as stories producing social contexts in which power and positioning play a role (Esterberg, 2002).

Interviews have particular power relations involved in them, and I was particularly concerned that my status as a researcher would inhibit my ability to relate to guides and elicit their opinions and experiences. I played down my role as a researcher in an effort to encourage my participants to be comfortable talking to me. Overall, I suspect that I was more uncomfortable in the interviews than were the participants. Most participants were flattered to be asked questions about their experiences and excited about the idea of being researched (Lofland and Lofland, 1995).

Eighteen participants were formally interviewed over the course of three months. A total of sixteen interviews were conducted, two of them with sets of husband-wife participants at their request. Interviewees consisted of both past contacts (six) and new contacts (ten) made during fieldwork. Of this selection of guides interviewed, nine were male and nine female. Their ages ranged from sixteen to seventy years, and their guiding experience from a few tours to thirty plus years. There were three current owner/operators, three past owner/operators, two current managers, one past manager, and two land crew (who also did or had done some guiding). Five of the eighteen individuals were no longer guiding because of retirement, other occupations, or relocation.

Interviews ranged from twenty minutes to two hours, with most being approximately one and a half hours. During the first few interviews, feedback was asked of interviewees to ensure the questions were intelligible. Interview questions were then revised to reflect relevant language and systems of understanding held by participants. I was also in contact with my supervisor for his feedback throughout this process. The finalized interview guide (see Appendix A) was used for all remaining formal interviews. Casual interviews about experiences were conducted on an ongoing basis (both before and after interviews) with guides at the fieldwork site. Due to scheduling conflicts, I conducted one interview by phone shortly after I had left the field. All of the formal interviews were recorded, transcribed in full for content, and coded.

Analysis

Analysis is an ongoing and systematic process that also reflects the messiness of producing meaning with participants (Schostak, 2006). Analysis begins long before the find of something “new” or “exciting”, but instead starts with the research questions and continues throughout fieldwork, interviewees and writing. With this in mind, I made reflections and comments throughout the project on subjects of understanding, personal experiences, and experience around fieldwork and interviews (Schostak, 2006).

The analysis of interviews does not involve examining them for a true meaning, but the explorations of the lived experiences of participants. The analysis aims to explore how the stories that guides told assist and further an understanding of the issues they talk spoke of (Rapley, 2004). The purpose of analysis is to situate and frame guides’ stories within relevant sociological literature. As with fieldwork, analysis is often a messy and complicated task. The initial analysis involved the exploration of interviews and

fieldwork notes for themes, connections and revelations (Van Maanen, 1991). I then immersed myself as I transcribed interviews and further coded them for themes.

Transcribing and coding did not occur in a neat and linear fashion, but was driven by the ideas that emerged during transcription (Van Maanen, 1991). After accomplishing the first few transcriptions, I alternated between coding and transcribing as new ideas and connections were formed. The main source of understanding came from the interviews, but field notes were used to help situate guides' opinions and experiences within action. The connections between the themes that emerged from these texts and participants' responses were explored so as to situate guides' thoughts within the social context of guiding. Through repeated reading of interviews, I identified themes and issues present within guides' stories. The fluidity of analysis reflects and respects the lived experiences of participants and how knowledge is produced through research.

Validity

Interviews are rarely used in isolation as they require participants to engage in the “imaginative ability ... [to] objectify one's own culture” (Rabinow, 1977, p. 95).

Objectifying an experience and our understandings of situations is not a skill that we all possess. For this reason personal stories were requested of interviewees. Stories hold clues as to how participants understand their world and are often easier for participants to talk about. Fieldwork demonstrates how guides spoke about their experiences and belief was not always how they acted. The manner in which people act does not always reflect how they talk, but both hold partial truths (Schostak, 2006). Regardless of how guides act, how they understood their experiences as guides is best assessed by how they speak about those experiences. The stories guides told outline the discourses around guiding

and kayaking; the manner and tone of these stories, and the comments guides made around these discourses highlighted how they understood them. These discourses can be understood as ideal types that are reflected in diverse ways through action. This means that through the multiple methods of interviewing and fieldwork, disjunctures between the action and discourse were identified. These disjunctures are not to be understood as ‘compromising’ validity, but as capturing the fluidity between understanding and action (Schostak, 2006). Fieldwork helped to situate guides’ opinions and experiences within the larger social context of a kayak company and accessed the fluidity of meaning, understanding, and opinions that guides displayed. Tour texts were also examined as a way of framing and adding meaning to participants’ understandings. Five kayak companies’ websites, complete with pictures and brochures from various kayak companies were collected. These texts represent the public images of kayaking as marketed to the clients and act as stock information for guides when describing tours to potential clients. These texts were not analysed in a formal fashion, but used to frame and understand how the tour is presented. Multiple methods allowed the disjunctures present within guiding to be captured which highlight how guides understand and deal with these disjunctures and what meanings they might hold.

Guides’ input was requested through formal and informal means (Schostak, 2006). In the course of initial interviews, I invited feedback to ensure the relevance of the questions, and informal checks of interpretation were conducted on an ongoing basis (Holyfield, 1999). Accessing guides’ opinions through these multiple methods strengthened an understanding of guides’ opinions and experiences. Past experience as a guide also aided with respect to validity. A familiarity with guiding allowed me to

interpret issues and create ideas, themes, and questions pertaining to them. This knowledge became one tool among many in the process of verifying the authenticity of interviews and fieldwork notes.

Ethical Concerns

The small population and geographical space of my research project presents complications for anonymity. The conspicuous nature of the activity, descriptions of events, experiences, or opinions, along with my past involvement as an active guide in the area⁹, may give clues as to the identities of particular participants. As such, it was made clear to participants that despite all precautions, anonymity cannot be guaranteed. All interviewees were given pseudonyms and in some cases multiple pseudonyms were used when an interviewee appeared in an excerpt from an interview with another guide, in order to disguise relationships between participants. Because of the small community of guides in the area studied, minor details about participants were changed to further protect their identity (Ellis, 2004). Pseudonyms were used in field notes and transcriptions. All forms of information, as well as a master list of the participants' names, were kept at my home and accessible only to me. All tapes of recorded interviews are to be destroyed within five years of their collection. The consent forms are included in Appendix B and C.

⁹ I have not been actively kayaking or guiding for the past four years.

Chapter Four: “The top hat and cane show”: Guiding and Emotional Labour

The kayak tour

To help situate guides’ stories, it is important to describe the general operation of a typical kayak shop and day tour beyond the brief narrative provided in the introductory chapter. This is aimed at highlighting aspects of a tour that aid in understanding the tour as a particular type of experience. The description of a kayak tour is a compilation of my experiences, observations made during fieldwork, interviewees’ reports of their own tours, and tour stories they had heard.

The kayak shops within the research area are small, local businesses predominantly operating on a seasonal basis. Most shops close during the winter, but will provide tours on request year round. During the summer season a kayak shop will have five to twenty-five employees including guides, land crew, and shop managers. Owners generally hold multiple roles of owner, manager, guide, kayak repairer, and general do-it-all person (Field notes, July, 2010). How busy shops are depends on how they organize themselves, how they operate¹⁰, their tour capacity (how many tours they can offer per day), and fleet size (the number of kayaks they have). The physical structure of most kayak shops is rustic and many are no more than small sheds that house gear, with staff members sitting out front waiting for clients to book a tour. Kayak companies in the

¹⁰ How shops organize (by offering short tours, with beginner boats) also constructs clients as well as marketing to them. This means that the way tours are framed simultaneously creates and markets to a particular type of client: the inexperienced tourist.

research area rely on walk-up¹¹ clientele for the majority of their tour bookings. This means that kayak shops are often adorned with sandwich boards outlining the day's tours, brochures with glossy pictures of people kayaking, and old kayaks displayed as props (Field notes, July, 2010). Kayak shops use these types of visual aids to entice clients to book tours.

Clients are predominantly tourists, or family and friends of locals, with a very small number of locals actually going on tours¹². Guides identify most day tour clients as either novices who have been in kayaks few times, or beginners who have never or rarely been in kayaks. (Field notes, July, 2010). Guides use the term client¹³ to refer to people who lack sufficient kayaking knowledge to kayak on their own, and therefore require the presence of a guide for their own safety and enjoyment. Clients are tourists and not repeat clients, producing an ever-changing stream of enthusiastic clients who are thrilled by seals, sea stars, and just being on the water. A guide therefore tends not to develop lasting relationships with clients, but instead assumes the role of "*that nice guide who took us out kayaking*" (Field notes, July, 2010).

Tours are commercial events in which clients purchase kayaking experiences. This includes lunch options, kayaking-related merchandise, and free photos with your guide (Field notes, July, 2010). Day tours¹⁴ are two to six hours in duration, and children are welcome. Upon booking a tour, clients are instructed to wear weather-appropriate clothes, bring drinking water, wear shoes that can get wet, and arrive fifteen to twenty

¹¹ Walk-up is a term guides and shop managers use to refer to clients who book as a result of stopping at the shop and talking with staff. This can include people who stop at the shop specifically to book a tour or those who happen to stop out of curiosity and end up booking a tour.

¹² Guides commented that locals tend to take lessons and then rent as it is more economical.

¹³ For clarity, the term "client" within this research refers to anyone who purchases a guided kayak tour.

¹⁴ While some of the guides I spoke with had experience with multi-day tours, I am mainly focussing on day tours, which are 2-6 hours in length. From here on I will refer to day tours as tours.

minutes in advance of the tour start time to ensure that there is enough time to pay for the tour, sign the waiver form, and get organized. Clients are encouraged to leave behind anything that could be damaged by salt water, including wallets, car keys, and cameras. Some shops offer dry bags for cameras, and others offer to take pictures of clients in their kayaks as they paddle away and then store the camera in the shop (Field notes, July, 2010).

The tour starts when clients meet their guide and are outfitted with safety gear. Guides show clients how to enter their kayak properly, and adjust clients' foot pedals. The largest portion of the land instruction is the paddle demonstration during which guides teach basic paddling strokes. Paddling techniques are taught using the "four Ls" method. Beginners are instructed that to paddle properly they must to have a *long* and *low* paddle stroke, and must keep their hands *loose* and use a *lever* action to push and pull the paddle (Field notes, July, 2010). Guides use the four Ls to help clients remember the four points to successful paddling and for ease of instruction.

The gearing-up of clients, boat-fitting, and paddle demonstration take about twenty minutes for a four- to six-person tour (Field notes, July, 2010). The land section of the tour is information-heavy and can be chaotic, especially with groups of six or more people, or groups with young children, as guides try to organise the group and get onto the water in a timely fashion. The water portion of the tour is constructed as the main event. Clients are helped into their boats and pushed off with instructions to stay close to shore while the rest of the tour is launched. When everyone is on the water there is a brief safety talk about staying within voice range, and the paddling begins. Each guide paddles the tour his/her own way but most guides "lead" the group from the middle as this allows

them to keep an eye on everyone and keep the group close together. In the case of a double-guide trip one guide will paddle lead with the front-most clients and one guide sweeps (with clients at the rear), keeping the group within the boundaries of the two guides (Field notes, July, 2010).

Once on the water, guides will follow a general route that includes stops at points of interest due to historical significance or presence of wildlife. The tour is a private space where guides and clients interact in isolation from spectators or other groups and together create a tour that works for them. Some clients want to paddle fast, others slow, some love history or wildlife, and others are there for the physical exertion (Field notes, July, 2010). A guide's job is to read what clients want within first few minutes of the tour and then tailor the experience to match. Will (male, guide, 60s, fifteen years guiding experience) explains that during the short paddle to get out of the bay or marina he closely watches clients' paddling techniques, offers steering and paddling tips, and gains a feel for what type of tour he has: "*I'm really focused on those people and [so] that initial contact is really critical*".

Upon returning, clients hand over their gear, are reunited with their shoes and wallets, and head off, hopefully after leaving a gratuity for their guide (signs at some shops encourage this practice – Field notes, July, 2010). After the clients leave, guides either clean up their own gear¹⁵ if that was their last tour of the day, or take their break before the next tour. Between tours there is often about thirty minutes of down time. Guides rarely leave the shop for their break. In practical terms, this means that down time for guides is rarely client-free. Guides may end up booking tours or giving out information on their down time if the shop is busy (Field notes, July, 2010). During down

¹⁵ At most shops guides are responsible for cleaning and setting-up their own gear and boat.

time the kayaks are cleaned, and gear is sprayed down and hung to dry by land crew. If the day is particularly busy, guides will help clean clients' boats, but generally this is not part of their job.

Eagles, sea stars and capsizes: The narrative space of the tour, framing and anticipation

The tour and kayak shop environments create the stage within which guides construct their guiding 'selves'. In order to understand how guides view and experience the tour and their role within it, it is necessary to explore the tour as a narrative event in of itself (Urry, 1992).

Figure 1

Ochre Sea Stars Promotional Picture



Note: Retrieved February 2nd 2011 from www.kayakmayneisland.com¹⁶.

Tours sell through glossy brochure¹⁷ pictures of bald eagles, beautiful sunsets, and bright purple sea stars. Brochure pictures (see Figure 1) convey impressions that the tour

¹⁶ This company has since changed owners and name. The link provided is for the old website which has been taken down.

¹⁷ Brochures include both paper pamphlets and websites.

will bring one close to nature, and enable one to experience wildlife¹⁸ first-hand. The brochures are also part of kayak companies' efforts to create adventure experiences. Kayak shops list all the wildlife that *could* be seen on a tour in their brochures. For example, one shop claims that during their tours you will “*experience some of the highest concentrations of wildlife in the area including Harbour Seals, Sea Lions (seasonal), Bald Eagles, Otters, Starfish and more*”, while another company claims that, “*wildlife sightings are common on our tours - look out for eagles and their nests, river otters, harbour seals, sea lions, great blue herons, mink, porpoise, and a whole host of underwater life*”. As Holyfield and Jonas explain, in order to ensure a successful experience for clients within commercial adventures “emotions must be managed, perceptions must be shaped, and experiences must match expectations” (2005, p. 174). This is particularly true for kayak tours. The tour experience is highly dependent on weather conditions, tide (high-tide tours often see little-to-no marine life), water conditions (in the hotter summer months the water becomes murky, affecting the ability to view submerged marine life), and marine mammals' habits¹⁹. But listing seeing bald eagles as a “maybe” does not necessarily sell tours. This leaves guides to reframe the tour experience as exciting and unique (never the same twice) to ensure that the tour experience is enjoyable in its many forms. This type of framing is particularly useful around the unpredictable wildlife viewing that kayaking tours offer.

Companies cannot promise a connection with nature and all of the wildlife sightings that tour brochures depict, but guides and kayaking companies use the

¹⁸ For ease of writing the term wildlife refers to all marine and land creatures.

¹⁹ Most of the kayak shop locations have harbour seal haul-out rocks on or close to tour routes. Seal haul-out rocks are small outcrops of rocks where seals spend most of the day sunning themselves for the purposes of thermal regulation, social activity, and rest. Whether the seals will be there is dependent on weather, tide and the time of day.

possibility of visual sightings to invoke a sense of adventure. Guides often talk about the wildlife that might be seen in the introduction of a tour as a way to increase anticipation and frame the experience as an adventure. Emma (female, guide/owner, 40s, ten years guiding experience) would often frame the possibility of seeing harbour seals by asking her clients, “*So does everyone know what to do to bring the seals?*” [*Clients shake their heads.*] “*Seals love to be sung to and I have had great luck with ‘row, row, row your boat’, so get your singing voices ready*” (Field notes, July, 2010). Emma marks seals as something that might be seen, indicating that it is a possibility, not a guarantee; in this case Emma jokingly attributes seeing seals to her clients’ singing abilities. In the absence of any actual wildlife, guides will point out eagles’ nests and seal haul-out rocks as markers of wild animals. The effectiveness of these animal locations often hinges on the guides’ presentation of them, and guides take every opportunity to frame wildlife.

Richard (male, guide, 30s, ten years guiding experience) paused during the land demo of a tour to point out an eagle overhead: “*Bald eagles are local to the area and we see them fairly often as they have a nest just out beyond that bay. They had one egg hatch this year so keep your eyes open for the young eagle; he will look mostly brown and have white mottling on him*” (Field notes, July, 2011). In the moment captured in the field note excerpt above, Richard creates an atmosphere of both interest and education, something witnessed repeatedly during field observations. Guides will also gather clients around and show them sea life, such as sand dollars, starfish or crabs, on the walk down to the boats (Field notes, July, 2011). The framing of the viewing of eagles and crabs as unique and exciting reflects and constructs common ideas of viewing nature and wildlife (Urry, 1992). Tours do sometimes encounter wildlife that is new and exciting even for guides,

especially during a very low summer tide, but generally guides have seen the wildlife they encounter many times. The viewing of wildlife for guides provides moments of authenticity, such as when a pod of orca whale passes by (a rare sight), but the point is that regardless of whether the guides genuinely feel excitement at seeing eagles and crabs, it is their job to deliver the viewing of wildlife as an exciting experience. This is especially true as a wildlife sighting is often the highlight of a given kayak tour.

Figure 2
Promotional Kayaking Photo and Tour Description



At Eagle Island Kayaking, we provide more than just a guided tour...

Our tours include:

- ✓ Our “top of the line” equipment
- ✓ Friendly, experienced local guides trained and certified by the Sea Kayak Guides Alliance of BC
- ✓ Small groups – maximum 1:5 guide to participant ration
- ✓ Safe routes to the most scenic areas and best wildlife viewing
- ✓ Interesting local history and nature interpretation provided by our knowledgeable guides
- ✓ Inter-tidal, bird and mammal ID charts

- ✓ Waterproof camera case (Also available is a limited selection of dry bags, boots and gloves)
- ✓ Assistance with kayak adjustments and launching
- ✓ Neoprene booties
- ✓ And instruction too! For the beginners or those needing a little refresher we provide a short lesson on the beach including entry/exit, launching/landing, paddling techniques, rudder operation, foot peddle adjustments and review basic paddling stroke technique on the water.

We schedule tours daily in the summer season and by request the remainder of the year.

Note: Picture was retrieved February 2nd 2011 from <http://www.kayakpenderisland.com>. Tour description retrieved February 2nd 2011 from www.kayakmayneisland.com²⁰.

Brochures depict the wildlife aspect of kayaking tours alongside assurances of safety, stability of the boats, and ease of paddling as well as pictures of people paddling in calm waters. The above brochure excerpt (Figure 2) demonstrates the typical organization of pictures and information. Below pictures of majestic eagles and calm sunset paddles, brochures boast that tours are: *“specialized in introducing beginners of all ages to sea kayaking with a relaxed, easy-paced approach with all the safety equipment required”*; *“safe, fun and informative and no previous kayaking experience is required”*; and *“suitable for any experience level - including the ‘never-been-in-a-kayak-before’ level - and are fun for the whole family. Our boats are stable, comfortable, and a smooth ride”*. The focus on safety in these statements demonstrates how tours are marketed. Kayak companies have strict rules about client-to-guide ratios (5:1 is industry

²⁰ This company has since changed owners and name. The link provided is for the old website which has been taken down.

standard), and follow the Canadian Coast Guard boating regulations (Field notes, July, 2011). Furthermore, guides are trained in kayaking safety techniques and first aid, and often carry marine radios and navigation charts during tours. However, while safety is important and taken seriously, kayak tours are adventures.

Tours are aimed at a clientele excited by the prospects of seeing wildlife and experiencing an adventure, and reassured by the promises of safety and ease that kayaking can offer. But absolute safety is not always seen as fun: “[guides] do a lot of interpreting, but it’s not a guide’s responsibility to eliminate risk. If they eliminate the risk, that’s the end of the adventure experience - no one will do it without risk” (Tom, male guide/manager, 30s, ten years guiding experience). Clients do want to be safe, but as Tom explains, they do not want to be so safe that it is no fun. This means that it is up to guides to create a safe and fun experience for their ever-changing clients. Tom’s comment indicates how he understands what tour brochures are selling (and constructing) and his own reasons for kayaking: risk taking. While brochures do draw on the “high thrill, low risk” model, the high thrill has little to do with risk and more to do with the clients engaging in an adventure through the seeing of wildlife, and learning to kayak (Palmer, 2002, p. 327). Brochures focus on safety and ease, and boast that tours offer the (high) thrill of “*the highest concentrations of wildlife in the area*” and low risk due to “*guides [who] have extensive experience in kayaking skills, leadership and Wilderness First Aid*”. Clients are assured they will be safe, and guides are there to make sure this happens, but guides also impart their personal passion for kayaking in their guiding and for Tom that has to do with the element of risk.

Guides create a sense of adventure for clients both intentionally and unintentionally, through their actions and embodiment of kayaking, but also through what they do and do not say when talking about kayaking. The tour space is therefore framed by, and contributes to, discourses of adventure, risk, safety, and guided experiences, and as is true of other social spaces, within the tour particular actions or utterances make no sense. As Laurendeau and Adams state, “discourse marks certain statements, actions and institutional arrangements as ‘within the true’, [and] it (un)marks others as ‘without’: it... limits and restricts other ways of talking, [and] of conducting ourselves” (2010, p. 434; also see Helstein, 2003). It follows that certain ways of speaking about risk, safety, and adventure are ‘within the true’ for the tour as a social location. Therefore the tour needs to be understood as a joint project which both guides and clients bring into existence through talk – including not only what is said, but also what is not said – and through action (Goffman, 1959). Due to the nature of the tour experience, guides are more authoritative, because of their knowledge and role as leaders, in their construction of the tour as a particular type of experience (Holyfield, 1999). Guides do not single-handedly create tour experiences, but they do exercise more influence over what counts as a tour experience both with clients and with each other, since discourse functions to authorize particular voices as ‘experts’ (Laurendeau and Adams, 2010).

“Terrified of getting wet”

Guides’ discursive creation of the tour begins in earnest during the land-demo, and most notably during their discussion of the possibility of capsizing. While capsizes²¹

²¹ Capsizes are referred to by guides formally as wet-exits and informally as swimming, tipping, going in, and dumping with equal regularity. To reflect these varied terms, I will use all four interchangeably throughout this thesis.

actually occur while on the water, they are constructed in particular ways before clients enter a kayak (beginning when clients see drowning on the waiver form). The result is that before the tour makes it onto the water guides need to (re)produce clients' understandings of capsizes. Capsizes aside, guides also encounter clients who do not see getting wet as fun, something that often becomes apparent before clients even get on the water. As a guide prepares clients for the tour, his/her clients ask what the spray skirt is for.

“Oh that will keep most of the water from running down your paddle and pooling in your lap [explains their guide]”. “What do you mean? I’m going to get wet?” [Clients ask.] “Ah. Yes. Kayaking is a water sport! If nothing else you have to walk through the water to get into your boat.” [The guide tells the clients this in an overly cheerful way with a smug grin] (Field notes, July, 2010).

When presented with clients who have unrealistic expectations of the tour, such as not wanting to get wet, guides are required to reframe the tour through how they present the tour experience and information. In particular most guides manage through humour and distraction to move the clients into a positive tour experience, but this is not without its challenges.

We must consider the emotional labour guides undertake around capsizing in the context of the creation of the tour experience described above. Kayak companies frame capsizes in particular ways, generally by de-emphasizing the possibility of the client capsizing, thereby creating clients that do not expect to capsize because they were sold the tour based on phrases such as, *“Our boats are stable, comfortable, and a smooth ride.* Guides build on these assumptions further creating a particular type of client within the tour based on the type and method of information they offer when they construct capsizing. For example, during a land safety demo Richard instructs clients:

Ok so to remove your spray skirts in case you go over, first close your eyes. It will be dark under the water. Now run your hands up along the cock pit to the tab. Pull on the tab or oh crap strap. Pull your legs away from the thigh braces and keep your legs strait. Place you hand of the side of the kayak and push yourself up and forward, like you're kissing the deck goodbye. This will propel you out of the kayak. Then just hold on to your boat and I'll pop you back in, we'll pump you out, and away we go. (Field notes, July, 2010).

Richard's story highlights how guides (re)construct client understandings of capsizes as something not to be worried about, even trivializing them through oversimplification and humour. Richard's story contains both real details, such as how to feel your way around in the dark water, and humorous depictions of the process of getting out of the overturned kayak: "*oh crap strap*" and "*kissing the deck goodbye*". Furthermore Richard ends the instructions by assuring his client "*Don't worry most people just flail about and come right out*" (Field notes, July, 2010). With this last statement Richard further trivializes capsizes through dismissing his own instructions. All of the instructions Richard told clients are useful and important, but because this is a novice tour and the spray skirts are not well fitting neoprene the last comment is the most accurate description of a capsize exit according to most guides (Field notes, July, 2010).

Guides further mark the experience through the way they construct capsizes in the moment. Guides will ask clients to say 'Saskatchewan'²² upon surfacing, for two reasons (Field notes, July, 2010). First, it denotes to clients that they are in no real danger otherwise their guide would not ask them silly questions. Second, the sheer oddness of the question distracts the client from their present situation and helps to calm them down. The performance guides give around capsizes is that they are nothing to worry about because they are unlikely to happen; guides assure clients that they will be fine. In reality,

²² Saskatchewan is just one example; some guides would ask clients what their favourite food was, their pet's name or any other question that made the client stop and think for a moment.

most kayak shops see about two client dumps every month from May to September (Field notes, July, 2011). Considering that a given shop can see between eight and forty-eight people per day in peak season, the odds of dumping are low, but it does happen. Despite the odds of clients capsizing, how guides discuss tipping constructs capsizing and kayaking in general in particular ways.

Guides' efforts at framing capsizes positively are not always successful. Tom tells of his experience with clients' reactions to the potential of tipping, and how he felt about that:

We were doing a safety briefing at the start of the trip and... When it got to the point when we're saying, 'OK this is your kayak, if this happens and this is what I need you to'. (CS: Were they even in the boats yet?) No, they just stood around the boat. I was explaining the boat to them, and so we are doing this safety briefing. You know, which you need to get out of the way it's the nature of 'so everyone knows what they are dealing with'... it was a novice trip. We were stopping at bed and breakfasts. We weren't camping on beaches etc. etc. It was very well organized. It was very expensive per person to do it [and] when we got to that bit [the potential of a capsized] they didn't realize that the boat was that tippy. It wasn't. It was big wide 34 inch²³ double sea kayak but you had to inform them of that kind of information, but they didn't expect to get wet and they got scared and went home.

For context regarding Tom's story, double kayaks rarely go over, and while it can happen, in general, they are considered more or less un-tippable. Tom describes the frustration he and his fellow guides experienced when the custom multi-day tour was cancelled because the clients "*didn't expect to get wet and they got scared and went home*". Tom saw himself and his fellow guides as experienced, knowledgeable, and able to handle any safety concerns that clients might have. His frustration comes because he

²³ Kayak widths range from 21 inches to 36 inches for both single and double kayaks. A 34 inch wide double kayak would be very wide and stable. The company I worked for had 30 inch wide doubles, which during guide training took two experienced guides rocking the kayak side-to-side multiple times to flip.

was unable to effect positive “feeling rules” through his assurances of their safety (Hochschild, 1979). Tom found his clients’ fear and inability to be reassured unproductive and a barrier to kayaking. Tom comments that he is required to inform clients of the potential of a capsized “*so everyone knows what they are dealing with’... it was a novice trip*”. The implication of his statement is that, as novices, the clients lacked an understanding of what kayaking entails, namely the potential of a capsized. Tom’s comment echoes those made below by both Cam and Lindy that, overall, clients are not prepared or do not think that they need to be prepared for a capsized. Therefore, guides’ presentation and construction of the tour experience needs to be understood as relational as it is impacted through how that presentation is received.

Kayak tours are sold with statements such as “*[tours are] safe, fun and informative and no previous kayaking experience is required*”. While this kind of statement is generally true, it does require guides to amend it with a dose of reality for safety’s sake and deal with client reactions to that. Most guides frame capsizes as unlikely to occur and leave it at that. A few guides had yet to encounter “live” capsizes and often used this to frame the potential of a capsized. Lindy has a “*clean record*” and tells her clients, “*Don’t ruin my record (laughing). I’m clean and I’m the only clean guide you’ve got so don’t mess it up and they didn’t.*” Lindy, and a few other guides who also have clean records, have never needed to deal with the framing of a capsized in the moment. These guides used their clean records to construct an experience where capsizing was not an option and enlisted clients to ‘help’ them maintain their record.

Capsizes present a unique challenge to guides, as they must to negotiate how to deliver the safety information required without scaring or desensitising clients to capsizes

(Holyfield, 1999). Guides carefully manage the capsizing experience both through omission, such as not mentioning to a nervous client that large boat waves put single kayakers at risk of capsizing if they are close to the shore, and/or through full disclosure such as Richard who tells clients, *“If you go too far ahead and dump you’re the one waiting in the cold water for me to paddle up and rescue you”* (Field notes, July, 2010). In this way, guides often utilize contradictory tactics when framing and reframing capsizes. Furthermore, how a guide reads the situation affects how he or she frames and reframes the possibility of a capsizing. A guide’s interpretation and presentation of a capsizing is part of the way the tour is constructed as an event (Urry, 1992; Palmer, 2002). The framing techniques that guides discuss highlight the messy and tenuous relationship between fun and not-fun and how ideas of fun are created (Palmer, 2002). Guides’ stories about capsizes also highlight their emotional involvement in creating and maintaining both their own and clients’ understandings of what a capsizing is, what it means, and how this relates to ideas of fun and adventure within the tour.

A significant amount of emotional labour goes into the framing of a capsizing. As Lindy (female, guide, 40s, five years guiding experience) says: *“I don’t think I ever felt like their life would be in danger [but]...I certainly didn’t want anyone mad at me”*. Her comment illustrates the pressure guides feel to produce a particular type of experience for their clients (Holyfield and Jonas, 2003). Similar to flight attendants (Hochschild, 1979), guides engage in emotional labour to produce a positive and happy emotional experience for their clients. Therefore, Lindy’s main concern is not that her clients’ lives will be in danger, but that they will lash out at her emotionally. Lindy’s focus is on how the clients feel about the experience of capsizing, marking a capsizing as something to manage

emotionally. As Holyfield and Jonas (2003) explain in their research with white water rafting guides, managing clients' emotions is a vital part of a guide's job. Guides create and maintain control over the emotional tone of the tour experience through stories, humour, and the way that they display their own emotions (Holyfield and Jonas, 2003). Lindy's concerns reflect how she feels about managing the emotional tone of the tour, and what happens if it does not work.

Cam expands on ideas of framing of the tour experience and explains how sometimes the framing of a particular type of adventure has unintended consequences.

Yeah, it's interesting. People's perception of getting wet is so different when they are in a kayak than it would be the rest of the time. I don't think that the average adult is terrified of getting wet or terrified of going swimming, but for some reason when a kayak is involved, it's no longer getting wet or going swimming, there's this whole other word for it, "capsize", or they make a big deal about it and I don't know why, because it's not that big of a deal.

Cam's tone during this story is one of frustration and exasperation. Through discussing her capsize experiences, Cam illustrates that she feels that clients should not get so worked up: "*it's not that big of a deal*". As a guide, Cam is unlikely to accidentally capsize herself and instead faces the prospect of dealing with a panicked client in the water. Cam's frustration comes from having to deal with a client who is unprepared for a capsize, while keeping herself upright, and keeping other clients calm and having fun. In the construction of this situation, the inexperienced client actually creates the need for emotional labour in manage the tour experience. This requires that Cam, through emotional labour, frame capsizes as positive adventure experiences for clients (Holyfield, 1999). In this situation the 'feeling rules' (Hochschild, 1979) Cam has about falling out

do not match up with those of clients, which requires Cam to reinterpret a capsizes in a way that make it acceptable.

How guides speak about capsizes illustrates the type of framing they do with clients. Below Lindy demonstrates positive self-talk on relation to how she feels about and deals with capsizes.

... as guides, because the people we were guiding were not highly experienced, we were always in a position of, in a sense, of visible power compared to them. We knew what we were doing, and the reality is that if the 25 year old guy fell out of that kayak, we would have been the one pulling him back in. He wouldn't have known how to do that.

Lindy understands her knowledge around capsizes places her in a position of power and she talks about this not in a domineering way, but as the “*reality*” of the situation. Her point is that, no matter of how fit or confident “*the 25 year old guy*” is she will be the one rescuing him. Lindy’s position as the knowledgeable guide who will rescue a client if he or she tips, places both her and her clients in a particular power relationship. This perceived power gives Lindy the confidence and the power to control clients’ actions, such as requiring them to stay within voice range to ensure they are close enough to rescue quickly. Julie (female, guide, 20s, ten years guiding experience) echoes Lindy’s feeling of competency and power with the statement, “*I mean I’ve only had four people go in, but they seem to be really grateful to you when you rescue them and kind of humbled*”. The “*grateful*” and “*humble*” response to being rescued contributes to guides’ understandings of themselves as knowledgeable and powerful actors within the tour. A

guide's role as knowledgeable and experienced is reinforced through every successful capsized rescue or capsized prevention²⁴.

“It’s a persona thing. It’s an acting job in part. Like you are putting on a bit of a show”

The discussion above might seem to suggest that the hazards of kayaking (e.g., capsizing) represent the main source of emotional labour for guides. Understanding the tour as an interactionally (re)created experience, however, requires a consideration of the emotional labour involved in even (perhaps especially) the most mundane circumstances. For guides, the tour experience necessitates intense emotional labour performances as they need to maintain a professional, pleasant, and excited demeanour while ensuring group safety (Holyfield, 1999). The emotional labour guides undertake is similar to that of Holyfield and Jonas's (2003) river rafting guides. Kayak guides engage in the performance of setting the tone of the tour through engaging emotionally and modelling excitement. As Lindy explains, guiding is *“a persona thing. It’s an acting job in part. Like you’re putting on a bit of a show”*. Guides must be able to shift their emotional performances to suit a wide variety of tour situations. Lindy explains, *“You are there to make them happy ... You’re not just a tool for them to go out and do something by themselves, you’re actually part of the experience for them”*. Lindy's statement highlights the responsibility that she (and other guides) feels to produce a particular type of tour experience; this is a theme that occurs throughout many interviews.

²⁴ A few guides did speak of capsizes that could have gone better. Mostly this involved a client being in the water longer than necessary. The guides who had these type of experience talked about how they immediately made changes to 'solve' the problem, by buying proper equipment (always carrying a stirrup which is used to assist heavy, or mobility-impaired clients back into their boats), or not placing their clients in that position again (keeping clients well away from the shore when ferry wash hits).

How guides understand and explain the high emotionality of their job differs greatly. Guides cite their emotional involvement in the tour experience as being due to a particular philosophy, such as safety, education, or a passion for outdoors. As Anna states, *“people [who] are in a kayak for the first time, if they have a bad experience, they will likely never come back again, or want to try again, so that first impression of being in a kayak is super important”*. Anna articulated that as a guide she was responsible for creating a positive introduction to kayaking, saying that *“not everyone one can be a good guide”* and that *“good guides require salt in their veins”*: a true passion for teaching people about the ocean and kayaking. Anna’s comment highlights how she understands the feeling rules of being a guide. Guides’ levels of personal investment in producing the tour experiences varied according to their guiding styles, how long they had guided for and what type of guiding they did.

When guides discuss the emotional labour they perform within the tour, they often do so by sharing stories about the “one” client that they helped. These types of stories involve guides helping clients to overcome fears around kayaking, or to fulfill dreams to go kayaking. The connection guides create with this type of client can last longer than the tour, when clients sending thank-you emails or pictures. For example, Julie tells a story about helping a client overcome her fear of deep water. Julie describes being told by her employers that *“the woman is terrified. She’s not going to go in the kayak: we know that. She wants to try, so just give her a try there in the kayak on the beach. She’s not going to go... she’s freaking out already. This is not even near the water, so just humour her...and [then] that’s fine. Just take her husband out”*²⁵. The following lengthy interview excerpt

²⁵ Most tours require a two person minimum. This company ‘knew’ that the woman was not going to paddle and ‘okayed’ Julie to take the tour with only the husband.

demonstrates how Julie, unable to accept that this woman could not kayak, spent time carefully and slowly allowing the client to become comfortable with the boat and water.

[The client said] 'I've wanted to do this for so long, and it looks like fun, but I'm terrified. I can't. I can't do this.' And I said, 'OK, you don't have to, that's OK. But why don't we just sit in the boat on the beach and I adjust your pedals, and you can see if you are comfortable just sitting in the boat on the beach.' And so she did, and I helped her adjust her foot pedals, and she says, 'Yeah OK, I can do this'. And I could see that she's breathing a little bit different and... She's not comfortable at all but she really wants to do it. So I say, 'OK, well why don't we just walk down to the beach with the boat, and we'll just put the boat in the water, and you can just stand in the water, and you don't have to get in it. We'll just do that.' And so she does that and she's OK with that. And she says, 'Yeah, I can do this.' 'OK, why don't we just sit in the boat while it's just in the water. Look, there is just an inch of water. You can touch the bottom with your hand.' And she does that, and she says 'OK, I can do this, it's OK', and [I say] 'OK, look, I'll walk along side you, and we'll get in to a little bit deeper water. We're still knee height, you're fine.' And she says, 'I can't do it, I can't do this. Go back.' I say, 'OK, you can go back. That's fine, but why don't we just sit here for one more minute?' And eventually we got kayaking along the shore, and it was wonderful. And I said, 'Wow, look at you', and she says 'Yeah, I'm doing it, I can't believe it'. And then she seemed to forget about it, and we were talking about the birds... And when we got back, and she was happy, and then she sent an email to my boss later being like '[Julie] is so great, we had the best time ever. I got to go kayaking!'

Julie's narrative shows how, through her words and actions, she carefully constructs kayaking as calm and fun until her client relaxes and believes her performance. Julie slowly walks her client through each stage of getting into the kayak and onto the water, pausing to allow the client to become comfortable. The performance in which Julie engages demonstrates how she models a particular emotion during this tour. Julie engages in a careful emotional performance of kayaking that is tailored to that particular client (Holyfield, 1999). Heading out for other tours, Julie normally hops in her boat and paddles, off before both her feet are securely on the pedals as she is comfortable and

confident in a kayak (Field notes, August, 2010). Julie's emotional performance during the tour described above demonstrates one of the ways guides engage in emotional labour to ensure tours match with what clients want (Holyfield, 1999). Julie's story also shows how guides emotionally connect with clients. Most guides only see clients once, but not only did this client email to thank Julie, Julie also recalls the woman by name and speaks of her and the experience fondly.

Julie's story captures a highly rewarding emotional labour experience, but the day-to-day undertaking of emotional labour can be much more mundane. Below, Will (male, guide, 60s, fifteen years guiding experience) discusses some of the challenges in creating an experience that is tailored to the client and talks about this as a "*client centred approach*":

[You have to be] focused on your client, and you're responding to their responses and you... have to stay in touch with their level of comfort, whether they are working too hard, or you know. Their physical well-being is really critical and important, and to do that you have to look people in the face you know, that's where the information is. Some people don't like to be looked in the face: city folks aren't use to that kind of thing. But you have to; really you know you have to maintain that.

Will's focus during tours is on connecting with his clients and making sure that he stays "*in touch with their level of comfort*". Will devotes emotional labour to ensuring the tour experience is enjoyable and safe, which sometimes involves negotiating with different types of clients, such as "*city folks*" who "*don't like to be looked in the face*". Here, Will's caricature of "*city folks*" also marks types of clients as presenting different challenges that he is required to work through. Will strives to create a safe tour experience and is willing to risk making clients a little uncomfortable to ensure that they are safe. Will equates safe with fun, as illustrated by his discomfort with a kayak shop he

worked for that had “*an attitude that it’s all right to have all these capsizes.*” He went on to say that “*it’s not all right to have all these [capsizes], especially with beginners. There should be no capsizes*”. While Julie is also focused on making sure her tour are safe, the different ways in which guides articulate their intent shows how they understand their role as guides in relation to the tour experience.

Cam’s interpretations of safety within tour are seen when she explains her emotional labour during a tour where she felt clients’ actions were negatively impacting her ability to guide. Cam tells of how, in order to make base camp during a multi-day trip, she pushed her clients a little further than they wanted to go. This is not something she does often, but based on the information she had, the extra thirty or forty-five minute paddle would make a substantial difference for their evening camping. Cam recounts the story of the windy, rainy crossing: “*We’re half way across, and then they tell you ‘by the way my legs are numb and I had a back injury I never told you about’ and what the heck? Why?*” Cam talks about her clients as a liability in this situation, as she needs to deal with her own emotions around her decisions along with those of her clients. Her frustration with the tour demonstrates how emotionally involved she is in a positive outcome (Hochschild, 1979). Cam ends her story by noting that it is important to “*leave as much room as you can because there is never as much room as you think there is*”. Cam’s statement highlights the idea of ‘leaving room’ both physically, around group limits, and emotionally, in regards to how much emotional labour she has to give to maintain the tour situation. Cam’s story also emphasizes how clients’ actions impact the type of emotional labour she performs and illustrates how, as a guide, she can only perform based on the information she receives from clients.

Other guides share stories with similar messages that also highlight the importance of respecting clients' boundaries, indicating that this is a significant issue collectively. Fred (male, guide/owner, 60s, ten years guiding experience) talks about the importance of ensuring that clients are comfortable by recounting a story of modifying a tour route to keep within a nine year-old's comfort level:

Initially when she went out, we got into a little chop, which was mostly from boats. It was flat calm that day, just out of side, out of the cove here, and she was saying, 'Well, I wanna go back , I don't like this', and you know, she started to shed a couple of tears. And I said, 'Well obviously we are not going to be able to go around... [the] point and around the bluffs because... there's a little bit of chop.' So I said, 'Let's just go over into [the] harbour because it's absolutely flat calm', and you know and that was perfect... When she came back, she said, 'Oh, why just that was just great.' So, [a] total change in attitude, but you know if we had kept going into the little bit of chop....when we came back I'm sure her attitude would have been... 'I don't ever want to do that again' or, 'I really didn't have fun'.

Fred maintains that you must “*always [keep] in mind that you don't want to exceed somebody's comfort level, that's really important*”. Fred's story echoes Cam's lesson about ensuring that one respects both clients' boundaries and one's own. While Fred and Cam's stories end in opposite results – a happy nine year old versus an unhappy group – their goal was the same: to provide the best possible tour experience given the situation. However, dealing with an upset client is exponentially more difficult if the guide is feeling stressed, unsure, or emotionally taxed by the situation (Holyfield, 1999). Both stories emphasize the responsibility that many guides feel to present the best possible tour experience in order to foster a love of nature, the ocean and kayaking, but going the extra mile to ensure clients' happiness can be an emotionally taxing experience (Holyfield, 1999).

“The family from hell”

Guides’ jobs involve constructing the tour experience for clients, but how they construct the tour for each other is equally significant. Guides discuss what happens during tours in very particular ways. Tours are private spaces, as most guides guide alone, and due to clients’ transient participation in the tour, the retelling of tour experience within the social space of the tour industry is done by guides alone. Therefore how guides construct the tour is done without contestation and serves an important role as it is a way for guides to bond over the collective typification of tours. When guides share tour stories between themselves, they often revolve around ‘crazy’ clients, funny stories, or interesting sea life. However, guides tell stories or accounts of tours in particular ways that position guides as in control of the situation. Furthermore, the structure of the tour (most often one guide having sole responsibility for a group of novice clients) constructs guides as independently responsible and able in any tour experience; this structure sets the frame within which these stories that construct guides as in control are intelligible. Lindy (female, guide, 40s, five years guiding experience), for example, described tours where *“people are fighting. Parents and children having a crappy day and being, unhappy with each other and just feeling like all you [as the guide] want to do is get them into the boat get them out on the water get them back get them out of the boats and make them go away”*. Lindy’s story tells how she persevered during a bad tour where a family was fighting. As noted above, guides often framed tour stories in ways that placed themselves in control of the situation. This position of control does not need to be one of dominance; it can simple involve surviving a tough tour or finding humour in awkward situations, as seen in Anna’s (female, guide, 40’s, fifteen years guiding experience) story:

I've had seals mating right next to my boat...you could see their penis...flip around. I had this family with me once and there are these seals they wouldn't stop and we were in a pretty good current, probably a 2 knot current and there I was with a dad and his two kids And you should have hear this kid, 'Daaaaaad'!?!.... When they are mating they are really, really aggressive. The male seals is biting the female, the back of her neck, and they role and it seems like he's trying to drown her. It's pretty wild. I said to the Dad 'Ahh have you talked to your sons about the birds and bees?' Oh it was so funny.

Anna's anecdote exemplifies tour stories that tell of awkward client moments, stories commonly retold among guides. Anna's story focuses on the entertainment her clients offer her, and positions her as in control (i.e. not embarrassed) during the story. Tour stories are also frequently told in a one-up manner of comparing who has the worst/weirdest tour (children peeing in the kayak, clients getting sea sick and throwing up, loud mating seals during a family tour, screaming couple, fighting teenagers). The competitive telling of tour stories serves to reinforce the independence of the role of guides and to collectively create archetypes of clients, like the "*the family from hell*," that guides have conquered, and archetypes of how guides should deal with these situations:

They were fighting as they came across the grass. They got out of their cars and they were arguing. We usually had one per summer. And they were not having a good holiday, they didn't like being together, and by gum they were going to go kayaking if killed them (laughing). It just about killed us. (Ruth female, guide/owner, 60's, thirty years guiding experience)

What guides do not overtly discuss is the emotional fallout that can happen after a tour. Even goods tours can end badly. Having to tow a client, long days, or having to clean-up after the tour alone can leave guides feeling emotionally drained. Furthermore, as guides use tour stories to create positive reinforcement by forming a narrative of control and competency amongst themselves, this absence of negative reporting is not surprising. By only telling the 'good' stories (or the entertaining parts of stories of

‘tough’ tours), guides are acknowledging the emotional labour – through silence. When Ruth told about the “*family from hell*” she did not mention how she felt during or after the tour, as this would not have served to bolster her or her co-workers at the end of the day. The “*family from hell*”, and other difficult tours, require a large amount of emotional labour, hinted at through Lindy’s statement above, “*get them out of the boats and make them go away*”.

“OK, bye-bye guys”

Guides’ narratives of the tour are also constituted by what they leave out. Above, I explored how guides create a particular version of the tour through how they retell their own tour experiences to each other. This type of tour talk is normalized and frequent, but not exclusive and it is these exceptions in guides’ tour narratives that offer particular insight into guides’ emotion labour. In the quote below, Julie breaks from the tour telling mould and discusses a situation in which she pushed herself both physically and emotionally for her clients’ happiness and how she felt about it afterwards:

It was something like a 13 hour day, just being on, just doing different tours [and] hauling boats back and forth. I remember at the end of the day I did not want to do the sunset tour at all, but there was no one else left to do it, and [my boss said] “You are not obligated to do this. You’ve done two tours already today”. But basically if I didn’t do it, they couldn’t go... “This is these people’s vacation. I can do this for them. It’s alright.” And so I did and it was fine, but I just got back to that beach, and I did not want to be there, I was just upset because there was no one there to help me. There was no one cleaning boats with me or anything and I had no solidarity. And I remember [my boss] showed up and gave me a big hug and [said] “You’ve been working so hard today. It’s so great. We really appreciated it”... and then I was happy.

Despite Julie’s boss telling her she did not have to take the tour, she felt obligated to her clients: “*This is these people’s vacation. I can do this for them. It’s alright*”. She pushed

herself emotionally and physically to the point in which she lost her positive sense of self as a guide. Julie tells me that after giving emotionally to her clients for three tours she “*did not want to be there*”. When Julie receives a “*big hug*” from her boss, her sense of self as a guide is reaffirmed through the gratitude of her employer. This is not to say that her clients did not thank her at the end of the tours, but more that Julie requires the emotional support of her peers to help her through the stress and fatigue of a long day (Lois, 2005). Furthermore, Julie comments specifically on the emotional impact she felt as a result of emotional labour. Julie’s story is an anomaly as it is told in way that acknowledges her dependency on other guides, something not done within the frame of tour storytelling. Other guides only hinted at these types of feelings through comments about “*being on*” during tours, or “*feeling tired*” after tours. Despite her candidness about her feelings, Julies nonetheless still emphasizes perseverance even beyond the call of duty.

Guides are required to engage in some amount of emotional labour, but how much and for how long are dependent on the tour and their workload. Guides generally work alone and depending on the tour schedule, may not see other guides for any length of time during their work day. This means that guides will sometimes remain at work long after they are finished their tours, just to chat and socialize with coworkers (Field notes, July, 2010). However, sometimes after a bad, slow, or frustrating tour, guides do not have the opportunity to ‘debrief’ with co-workers. Julie highlights this in her comment, “*I did not want to be there, I was just upset because there was no one there to help me. There was no one cleaning boats with me or anything and I had no solidarity*”. In that moment Julie felt both emotionally tired and isolated from a sense of community with her co-workers.

As Lois (2003) explains, the completion of emotional participation involves the release of emotions *with* other participants. For guides, this means ways of letting down the mask of being “on”, for clients, and engaging in a different type of emotional labour with their co-workers. The completion of the emotional experience of guiding takes place after the clients have left, when guides and land crew can talk about the tour (Lois, 2003). In Julie’s case, she was alone during this time and suffered from a lack of “*solidarity*” with her coworkers. Solidarity among guides is not gained by explicitly talking about the tolls of emotional labour, but instead guides actually do emotional labour with their co-workers by showing strength through *not* openly discussing how hard tours can be. Furthermore, a sense of solidarity between guides also comes from sharing in the hard work together, such as cleaning dirty boats or hauling boats up and down the beach (Field notes, July, 2010). Julie illustrates camaraderie she has shared with coworkers through a story about hauling doubles. On that occasion, Julie describes how, “*We had to carry ten doubles weighing 100 lbs each down the beach at low tide, which was about a 0.5 km walk. Despite the unpleasant work we joked and laughed about how we ‘loved’ to haul doubles at low tide*”. Using humour allowed guides and land crew to develop a sense of community with each other and release the stress of the situation.²⁶

The nature of the job means that guides are required to be “on” with clients and therefore only have the opportunity to be “off”²⁷, during the down time between tours, time that is often filled with cleaning and prepping for the next tour. Lindy, a part time

²⁶ Despite how heavy the boats were, guides never let clients see that they dislike or resent carrying clients’ boats for them. If asked by clients if the boats were heavy, or if they got tired of carrying them day, after, day guides would respond with some form of “Carrying boats builds great muscles!” or “No, it’s great exercise!” (Field notes, July, 2010).

²⁷ My use of “on” and “off” is in reference to clients and not emotional labour. In the absence of clients guides turn off their client selves, but still engage in emotional labour with each other through how they talk about the tour.

guide, talks about how she understands the emotional labour that she performs during tours and what happens between those performances:

I think some of us especially were very good at putting on a mask and doing the top hat and cane show and then say, 'OK, bye-bye guys', and wave the clients off. And then you'd kind of slump and go, 'OK, they're gone.' And then you'd wind yourself up for the next one, so maybe full time would have killed me, I don't know, probably would have because ... I'm not extroverted.

Lindy's conclusion that, "*maybe full time would have killed me ... I'm not extroverted*", is indicative of the amount of emotional labour involved in her performance for clients. Lindy also attributes how she does emotional labour, and how she feels about it, as a combination of her own personality and her part-time job status. Lindy accepts the emotional requirements of the job, but also doubts her ability to perform these requirements full time because she's "*not extroverted*". Lindy's admission, like Julie's story above, is an anomaly, as most guides discuss emotional labour by telling success stories emphasizing how well they dealt with it successfully. And while Lindy and Julie both show elements of this stratagem in their narratives, they also talk more explicitly about the toll of emotional labour.

Lindy and Julie offer us two examples of the types of emotional labour in which guides engage, and demonstrate how varied they can be. A discussion of emotional labour requires an exploration into the boundaries of this type of labour, such as burnout. When guides spoke about burnout, they did not comment on the physical exertion of working, but the emotional wear of being "on" for and with their clients (Hochschild, 1979). Guides employ the term burnout to describe guides who had "*less patience with the tourist mind set*". Seasonal burnout, which is more common, is captured by Lindy's comment that, "*By the end of the season, the end of October beginning of November ...*

there's a point where you just go 'I just want them all to go home. I'm tired of making my home look like a good place to them; I just want it to be my home again'. Lindy's statement suggests that the emotional labour she does during tours does not merely create the tour as a positive experience, but also frames the general location, and her home, as a "good place". It is this type of emotional labour framing that creates burnout among guides. As a few guides describe, even after paddling three tours a day (two tours a day is a full eight hour shift and three tours a day is rare) *"it wasn't the paddling, it was the land stuff that was hard. It was getting on and off the water and the paddle demo"* (Field notes, July, 2010). For these reasons, guides comment that they are happy when kayaking ends for season, not because they are tired of paddling (although that did sometimes happen), but because it means the end of producing kayaking, wildlife, and their home as an exciting experience (Field notes, May, 2010).

Cam recounts a conversation she had with a less experienced co-worker on the subject of stress and burnout after a multi-day trip they did together.

Cam: There's a [fairly] young guide at the place where I work now [and] ...the first question she asked me when I got back from my last four day was 'Do you feel burned out?' I said 'No'... She was thinking about it and I remember thinking about it afterwards. Was she burnt out?

Carlin: And she was trying to broach that conversation [with you]?

Cam: Yeah, it was interesting, and I told her 'I don't give it all anymore. I don't fake it too much anymore. I give what I give, but I'm not going to fake it to the point of totally destroying myself, because it's not worth it'...and she said 'Yeah. Yeah. I'm starting to realize that too.' So she's feeling it.

Cam's story highlights how guides move through different stages of coping with emotional labour throughout their careers, and indicating that finding a balance can be challenging (Lupton, 1998; Hochschild, 1979). The young guide Cam refers to is in her

first year of guiding, whereas Cam is in her tenth. Overall, the more experienced guides discussed going through a period of burnout or high stress during their careers before eventually finding a happy middle ground for themselves by changing the type of guiding they did (such as only guiding part-time or no longer doing overnight trips), and how they guided (such as relaxing control over clients and not requiring clients to be in perfect pod formation). Above, Cam implies that in her first few years of guiding, she gave more to her clients, and consequently felt burnout by the end of the summer.

Cam's story also illustrates how guides do talk to is both a performance of emotional labour and about the emotional labour that they perform. Cam did not suggest to her co-worker that what she was feeling was burnout, but she did talk to her about the toll of emotional labour "*I don't give it all anymore... but I'm not going to fake it to the point of totally destroying myself, because it's not worth it*". In the same way that talking about the emotional impact of the tour is done in particular and careful ways, how guides negotiate and deal with emotional labour is also not something they overtly discuss.

Below Cam highlights how she understands burnout and risks within the guiding industry.

I think everybody's responsible for their own burnout management. You know, if an employer can see it coming it would be nice if they would look out for that, but not everybody does. I've worked for some people where you would never burn out working for them because they wouldn't allow it. They're aware of burnout, they know what it looks like, [and] they would be able to predict what would put you there. And I've worked for other people who don't seem to have a concept of that and would maybe make you feel bad for suggesting that you needed to change the way things were in order to make it sustainable.

Although, Cam contrasts two different types of working environments where burnout would and would not occur, she begins by stating that she thinks "*everybody's*

responsible for their own burnout management". The attitude that each individual guide is responsible for dealing with their emotional labour is common amongst guides and fosters a working culture where burnout and emotional labour are talked about indirectly through success stories. As most guides are alone during their tours the self-reliance narrative of tour stories mimics the realities of guides' working environment. Guides cannot become dependent on each other, because their job requires an ability to deal with the tour competently and effectively alone. Cam also comments that she paddles for herself now, and picks her guiding employment based on her own kayaking needs, to ensure that she does not burn out. Unlike Lois' (2003) rescue workers, kayak guides often have the opportunity to tailor their work to fit with their desires to participate. Guides are able to change the type and frequency of their kayaking participation and the amount of contact they have with clients over time. While that ability to adjust the type and frequency of guiding is a benefit, it also places the burden of responsibility on guides.

"Even if people kind of suck"

The stories that guides tell demonstrate different understandings of, and engagements in, emotional labour, and highlight that the types of emotional labour guides do can be both in and out of their control. Guides are paid to emotionally produce and manage a tour experience. Guides construct the tour for and with clients within the social space created through brochures, company policy, Canadian Coast Guard regulations and common ideas of adventure and fun. Within these constraints, guides interpret, perform, and create an experience that reflects their own personalities and guiding styles, and how they themselves understand and experience kayaking.

Lindy succinctly describes guiding as being “on”, stating that, “*you have to be on enough to know what they want...You don’t have to be bouncy, but you do have to be on in the sense of aware of what they’re expecting or what they’re wanting [from the tour]. So it’s a high-energy job. It’s emotionally a high-energy job. Even if you’re paddling really slow you’re going to come back tired of doing the listening work*”. Lindy’s account of a guide’s job, or role, highlights many of the tenets discussed in this chapter. Lindy touches on many of the points guides make when she outlines how guides are required to be on for their clients, to be aware of what their clients want from the tour, and to be emotionally present. Implied in Lindy’s statement, “*You don’t have to be bouncy, but you do have to be on*”, is the emotional labour required in guide’s creation of the tour experience. Guides’ stories produce a picture of how this community understands and constructs the role of a guide. The emotional labour can either “make” or “ruin” the tour, and guides discuss how they negotiate these experiences, how they (re)interpret the tour through the collaborative creation of tour archetypes and how they deploy a range of techniques to frame the tour experience. This discussion is a form of mutual support. However, the interactional rules governing guides debriefing requires that the mutual support remain implicit, lest it encourage self-reliance which is a necessary quality for guides are individually responsible for their tours.

Chapter Five: “I think females make way better guides, just because of the maternal thing: Guiding and Gender

“I thought, ‘but she’s a girl’, and then I thought, ‘what the fuck am I doing?’”

The tour is experienced and (re)produced relationally. As guides negotiate and construct the tour space, they also (re)produce, interpret, and resist gendering practices. Below will explore how guides interpret and create gendered archetypes of clients. Ruth and Joe highlight gender as ‘natural’ when they talk about their experiences with which clients (men or women) capsize more often:

Ruth: Oh men! (Laughs)

Joe: Men.

Ruth: (Laughing) Men. Women are built for kayaking –

Joe: Yeah

Ruth: – our weight is from our waist down our primary weight; men’s weight is in their chest and upper body and so their centre of gravity is different.

The statement, “*women are built for kayaking*” demonstrates how Ruth and Joe understand and construct women as naturally advantaged when kayaking. By citing a wide hip base and low centre of gravity they construct and position women in particular ways within the tour. Ruth and Joe’s narrative locates women as natural kayakers and attribute women’s aptitude in a kayak to feminine bodily traits – low center of gravity. The gender logic that Ruth and Joe use to explain capsizes is also used by guides to ‘explain’ how women are risk-averse and have weaker upper body strength and low confidence of their physical ability (West and Zimmermann, 1987, Palmer, 2002; Laurendeau and Adams, 2010). Furthermore, women are also constructed in direct contrast to men.

In the following excerpt, Tom describes the differences between men and women (clients) in kayaking:

Tom: I'd say that...women have a perfect technique: they use the paddle instead of their muscles ... men use lot more brute force and ignorance to actually to move their paddle. ... [It comes down to] tactical vs. practical ... men just think, 'Oh, I just need to pull on this really hard to make it go', and women think, 'Well, that paddle is kind of this shaped like this and ... I probably don't need to pull on it that hard, I just need to stroke it in the right direction, oh, it's a lever so if I actually push the top you know that would actually work better'. So yea, I think women do take a different approach to the art of padding. I certainly do. Men take I guess the same approach to everything, you know without being chauvinistic to my gender.

Tom does not deny that gender differences exist (some guides did) and his answers draw on common gendered tropes within sports more broadly. Furthermore, Tom's categorization demonstrates the limited gendered subjectivities that are intelligible in the cultural space of the kayak tour. Tom's story is a producer of, as well as a *product of*, gender within the tour. By highlighting and attributing particular characteristics to male and female clients in accordance with 'natural' gender traits Tom (and other guides) further positions gender as a biological 'trait' rather than something that is performed (West and Zimmermann, 1987).

Cam talks about how she perceives male and female clients' approach to kayaking, and what that looks like within the tour.

In general, I think men tend to be more confident and independent. They have more of a tendency to want to go in singles ... they are typically more aggressive in their paddling, would be more inclined or comfortable to be in front of the group, being uncomfortable being at the back of the group ... women tend to see themselves as less capable, I think, and would tend to be a little more nervous or apprehensive ... they take less responsibility ... [and] are quite willing to hand the responsibility over to me or over to their husband.

Cam attributes the differences between genders as stemming from confidence and skill issues, an 'explanation' that came up in a number of interviews. Cam links these to particular genders and then links gender to boat preference (men "want to go in singles"),

confidence and skill level (“*women tend to see themselves as less capable*”), and paddling style (men “*are typically more aggressive in their paddling*”). Gender performances are therefore perceived as traits not performances and as less about gender and more about kayaking. Furthermore, guides’ stories construct female clients as more hesitant towards kayaking initially, a construction that both encourages and is produced by guides’ practice of reassuring women during the tour. Guides tell female clients not to worry and offer them encouragement through statements such as, “*You’ll be fine, you have a low centre of gravity so you won’t fall out*” (Field notes, July, 2010). Moreover, all female clients are offered reassurance, not just the ones that might need and/or want it; this creates a version of “doing” femininity in kayaking that reinforces ideas of women as weak and in need of this encouragement (West and Zimmermann, 1987; Kay and Laberge, 2004). For example, guides teach all clients how to rotate their bodies when paddling and to push and pull on the paddle during the land demo, but these tips are marketed to women in particular through phrases such as “*If your shoulders get tired, remember to rotate your torso and use a lever action in your paddling*”, or, “*if you have shoulder issues or a weaker upper body, here are a few tricks to help make paddling easier*” (Field notes, July, 2010). The result is that guides construct particular ideas about femininity and athleticism thereby perpetuating a situation where particular gender performances are normalized. Furthermore, these types of gendering statements were often at odds with how guides articulated their understanding of clients’ gender. As West and Zimmermann assert “gender itself is constituted through interaction” and guides’ actions towards clients, and their perceptions of clients’ actions (re)construct gender in

particular ways, and, in the process, make certain ways of “doing gender” more intelligible than others (1987, p. 129).

Julie explains that during a tour with a group of exchange students, the lead guide informed students (and guides) that, “*if you’re a Japanese girl you need to be in the front of a double with a German boy*”²⁸. The rationale given for this requirement was that a kayak with two Japanese girls would have been too slow and therefore held up the group or fallen behind and become a safety issue. Julie’s comment illustrates how the creation of gendered archetypes (the weak female and the strong male) allows guides to make gendered decisions ostensibly based on safety concerns.

Boating practices did not feature strongly in interviews or informal chats, but in practice guides routinely checked bookings for the gender of their clients when picking kayaks for a tour. For example, after seeing his clients and quickly asking about their experience, Richard pulled a small and sleek boat down for a female client instead of the larger boat prepped on the beach (Field notes, July, 2010). The basic guideline for boating is that given no prior information about the clients, female clients should be placed in the smallest boat available as larger boats can be harder to paddle as they are heavier and less responsive. Conversely, men should be placed in wide (and thus more stable) boats to help combat their high centre of gravity. Boating practices mark the disjuncture between talk and action within guiding as guide who claimed not to gender their clients, still engaged in these types of boating practices as they are constructed as safety decisions, not decisions based on gender. Furthermore, the construction of men and women within the tour fits with the discourses of gender prevalent in many sports

²⁸ The race and ethnicity implications of this statement require further exploration, but are outside of the scope of this thesis.

activities, namely that men are competent and skilled and women require help, protection, and assistance (Kay and Laberge, 2004; Palmer, 2003, Laurendeau and Adams, 2010).

Furthermore, these dominant narratives (re)produce and naturalize gender differences that also constrain guides' actions (Laurendeau, and Adams, 2010).

As the unexamined norm, men (particularly male guides) are the standard against which women are compared (Kay and Laberge, 2004; Palmer, 2003). Within kayaking, as in other sports, women are "read" as female guides, female clients (female climbers, female skydivers, etc.) and men are "read" as guides, clients (climbers, skydivers, etc.) (Palmer, 2003; Laurendeau and Adams, 2010). Furthermore guides (re)produce particular gender positions through how and what they "read" as gendered in their clients behaviour. For example, Emma observes that,

40-50 year olds were definitely way more timid. You'd have to spend more time with the women than the men, but the thing is the men ended up being worse than the women (laughs) more often than not because the women weren't afraid to ask questions and the men just wanted to do it.... God I'm really, sounding sexist. But [this is just] in general.

Emma's comment demonstrates contradictions as she works through how she produces and understands clients' gender performances. Emma's last comment "God I'm really, sounding sexist" shows how she is uncomfortable with her statements even though they reflect her perceptions. She is fighting the common gendered archetypes that she (and other guides) draws on with how it sounds when verbalized as a formula. Guides do not think of themselves as segregating by gender and Julie even comments that she thought "kayaking could be considered a genderless sport, or at least a sport where gender doesn't matter" (Field notes, July, 2010). Kayaking, like any other activity, is not

genderless, but gender performances often play out in hidden ways that conceal and (re)produce the conditions that normalize particular gender performance.

When asked if she saw differences between genders in how clients approached kayaking Julie comments;

I don't know. I mean I'm thinking right now about the stereotypes that we talk about in guiding. You'll have a big macho guy who will come out with his girlfriend trying to impress her, and this is what you [guides] say and they'll [the big macho guy] go farther ahead and then they will tip over. That's kind of a joke.

Julie acknowledges that clients' performances are gendered in particular ways, but rejects these as given because they do not reflect her own experiences. Specifically, Julie dismisses the gender assessments of these types of clients (not that they exist) highlighting that it is often guides who construct clients gender in particular ways. Regardless, how gender is understood as so pervasive as to seem 'common sense' and 'natural' (West and Zimmermann, 1987). Below Julie highlights the personal struggle she had around the assumptions she made about her clients during a teen kayaking camp.

We had paddlers who were not the strongest but we had to decide which we were going to put in a single²⁹ [kayak] for this current section. The current was going with us so we decided it would be way better to put the girl in a single...I don't know, I think I had this moment of hesitation where I thought "but she's a girl", and then I thought "what the fuck am I doing?"

Julie describes a moment of indecision when required to choose which teen to place in a single and how she almost defaulted to the boy. Julie's instinct to put the boy in the single over the girl reflects how gendering can be subconscious. Similar to Emma's reflective comment about how she sounded, Julie's story, and her ambivalence, reflects the disjuncture and tensions between talk, thought, and action that persist (West and

²⁹ Most members of the group were in double kayaks and so the few teens in singles need to be able to paddle well enough to keep up with the rest of the group and be stable enough in their kayak not to be at high risk for tipping.

Zimmermann, 1987). Furthermore, Julie mentions that they were doing work *with* the current which means that there would not be a lot of hard paddling. Julie uses this as the “logic” for putting the girl in a single. So even though Julie does put the girl in the single her reasons suggest that she might have done otherwise if they were paddling against the current. In this way Julie’s logic shows a disconnect between how she acts and what she thinks. Conflating the gendering of particular traits with safety decisions, such as placing men in the back of doubles because they are strong, not only (re)produces particular gender performances as more accessible within the tour space, but renders them invisible *as performances of gender* (West and Zimmermann, 1987). Gender performances are fundamentally relational, and (re)produce the conditions within which they are performed. Therefore how guides understand their own gender and how gender operates within tour is partly understood by the above exploration of how guides read clients’ gender performances and how guides engage in the gendering of clients.

“I was 19 years old, I weighed around 103 pounds, and I was 5 foot 4, so....that I think had its challenges”

How guides think clients view them and their performance of gender highlights the tensions of power and gender within the tour. Furthermore, guides’ positioning as leaders within the tour places them, and their performances, within a highly visible location. Guides’ performances are read as gendered and so it is imperative that their experiences are understood and explored as gendered experiences that speak to how gender performances manifest and operate within the tour space. As such, below will investigate how guides understand guide-client relations to be impacted by gender. These stories focus on gender as a performance by examining both the said and the unsaid.

In the following exchange between husband (Fred, male, guide/owner, 60s, ten years guiding experience) and wife (Jane, female, owner, 50s, ten years ownership experience), we see their comments on the ways in which clients read guides:

*Carlin: Have you seen client's respond differently to a male or female guide?*³⁰

Fred: Uhm (pause)

Carlin: Or does it more have to do with experience or age category?

Fred: Uhm not really (pause) I don't think (trails off and pauses)

Carlin: If you have seen it just?

Fred: Yea. That make me think here (pause) ahum (long pause) I can't say there is much-any difference. I've had male and female guides in the past.

Jane: I think stamina. I think that because there is a lot of packing boats.

Fred: That's the issue for me it seems for a female guide.

Jane: That's hard on the women.

Fred was unable to think of any ways that client might treat female guides differently from male guides, and he noticed no differences in the way clients treated his female co-worker and himself. Fred and Jane instead comment on how the physical demands of kayaking are harder on female guides. Though this has nothing to do with how clients respond to guides, it highlights the gender divide and constructs women as weaker and men as stronger. Furthermore Fred's hesitation and trouble answering the question demonstrates how unconscious gendering can be within guiding. Fred begins by stating no difference, but quickly naturalized female guides weaker than male guide, without an apparently realization of how his statements are gendering and what impact they could have on tour organization (e.g. If female guides have difficulty hauling boats does that mean that the scheduling ensures that there is always a male (guide) around to help with this task?).

³⁰ I recognize that the question itself constructs and reifies binary understandings of gender. When I asked guides about gender I tried to ask questions that made sense to guides. Who capsizes more, men or women, is a long standing debate among guides and guides often swap stories about that one woman they had go over. Nevertheless my contributions to the gendering of particular actions will be discussed in the coda.

Conversely, Lindy explains how she understands her and her male coworkers' performances to be gendered and somewhat flexible.

My initial off the top of my head response is yes of course [clients] were [responding to me based on my gender]. I was at the point a fairly young female guide and...I don't think that didn't play into how certain people reacted to me... When you are doing the guiding your personality and who you are is sort of a tool in what you're doing. You also change your behaviour too depending on who you've got as a client. So with the portly 60 years old gentleman going out with you, you sort of do the courtly flirtatious thing. He would never treat a male or older male guide that way, but he'd treat me the way and that's not just one person that's a pattern.

Lindy understands her gender as a visible and embodied performance that she can use to create a particular experience, as seen with the comment “*who you are is sort of a tool in what you're doing*”. Lindy discusses actively taking on a gender performance that matched her perception of what clients expected – “*the courtly flirtatious thing*” – as a way to enhance and shape the tour experience. Lindy's acknowledgement of the particular way she and others (in this case other clients) perform gender within the tour emphasizes the interactionality and relationality of “doing gender.”

While gender is performed, it is also relational, meaning that each performance is in relation to others who judge and comply or reject the performance through how they act in response. Specifically, Cam outlines how (particular) others' responses to her gender (which constitute part of their own gender performances) became a barrier within some tours. Below, Cam discusses a multi-day school kayaking trip she guided for a group of teenage girls and their male teacher.

The male teacher who did not help lift kayaks with the group. Did not help cook... we couldn't find him when it was time to eat. He wouldn't tell us where he was camping, he would just go and set his tent up somewhere and actually borderline refused to tell us where it was. He would question and undermine our authority on the water, pretty much constantly. He would leave the group would paddle away would go on the other side of, actually

quite large little islets and be out of sight. He didn't talk to us pretty much that whole time [and] would wake up and inform us what the weather was and what he thought we should do.

Cam and her fellow female guide felt gender discrimination on this tour, feeling belittled and perceiving that the male teacher undermined their authority. This highlights the sense in which gender performances are relational as the teacher's 'performance' of masculinity is a personal one which constrains Cam's gender performance. Cam also perceived that his actions compromised her ability to perform her role as guide in a safe way. Cam concludes the story by relating what happened at the end of the tour:

The thing that really got me was the male owner of the company showed up and it was like this person [the male teacher] turned into somebody I had never met. He was engaging with the owner of the company he helped carry kayaks... wanted to talk about his boat, wanted to talk about buying boats, these were all things he had never engaged with us about on the entire trip... we [Cam and the other female guide] were appalled... I was completely in shock.

Cam cites the radical change in the male teacher's attitude as "proof" that his treatment of her and her co-worker was gendered. Cam comments that she "*was completely in shock*" and did not talk to her boss about the male teacher's behaviour change. Cam's lack of action towards the male teacher's treatment of her is also a gender performance, one of tacit acceptance (West and Zimmermann, 1987). By not calling out the male teacher or reporting his behaviour she is allowing this type of behaviour to "pass" within kayaking which 'makes sense' in a community in which gender is not thought to 'matter'.

Cam was aware of how gender and gender performances impact social interactions and at this point in the interview she segued to a story about how her young son treated her male boss as more knowledgeable and interesting during a tour:

I went kayaking with my own son and the owner of our company and my own son was asking him all these questions and I'm thinking to

myself like I have way more experience than this guy and this my own son... but simply because maybe he owns the company or maybe he's male there was this different... and I found it interesting. Not so much as threatening, but just interesting. It's like "oh wow I was not expecting that".

Regardless of whether either of these scenarios were rooted in gender discrimination, Cam *understood* the experiences as gendered. The interactions between Cam and her son, and Cam and the male teacher are personal accounts of how gender impacts her as a guide. Cam used these personal interactions to understand general social interactions and experiences as (re)producing particular gendered spaces.

After this story I asked Cam to elaborate on how she feels about her gender in general. Cam explains that when she first started guiding: *"I was 19 years old, I weighed around 103 pounds, and I was 5 foot 4, so....that I think had its challenges"*. She did not elaborate on why these 'stats' had their challenges, but left them to speak for themselves. Cam understood her experience as an embodied one that hinged on how she looked, her age and gender (Olstead, 2011). During the interview Cam stated that guiding *"got better"* (i.e. she felt less hassled because of her age and gender) as she got older; she chalked it up to gaining experience and looking older. Not only do others locate female guides as gendered in particular ways, but Cam's way of sharing of these 'stats', without elaboration, creates a particular type of gendering. Olstead highlights how risk participation is performed within relational gender politics and actors are constrained by the options available to them within these gender politics (2011). Particularly, Cam's lack of elaboration speaks to how female guide feminized themselves and how they understand their own experiences as feminizing in particular ways.

“A male guide just wants to kayak, kayak, kayak, kayak”

The notion of guides' gender performances as relational is best seen when guides discuss each other's gender performances. Tom demonstrates this when he explains why he prefers to hire female guides over male guides.

I did like the technical part of their application ... but the other thing that was a huge consideration for especially overnight guiding was women are a lot more organized, they are better cooks, they are a little more [domestic], so you know, and they are a little bit more soft in their skills to deal with clients on a base camp type environment ... a male guide just wants to kayak, kayak, kayak, kayak. Doesn't matter what the world is doing: 'let's just kayak', 'let's get back late', 'let's not worry about eating on time.'

Tom discusses his female co-worker as being “*a little bit more soft in their skills to deal with clients,*” an idea that aligns with the conclusions of both Lois (2005) and Kay and Laberge (2004). The feminization of particular skills translates into those jobs or roles being occupied mostly by women (Lupton, 1998), and consequently devalued (even as they are lauded). Moreover, through this kind of narrative, female guides are discursively constructed as those concerned with, and skilled at, *managing* the experience (making sure that participants are well fed and rested). Tom's description of female guides implies that they engage in significant emotional labour with and for clients, *because* they are female and that male guides often neglect this because they are male. Tom's comments need to be understood as relational as female guides are only “*more organized*” and “*better cooks*” in relation or comparison to their male co-workers. Female guides' actions and emotional labour are only “*more*” in comparison to the standard of male guides, and male guides are only kayak obsessed in comparison to female guide's clients-focused approach. Additionally, Tom's observations construct gender performances in particulars

ways, by locating particular actions and guiding styles as inherently male or female (West and Zimmerman, 1987; Olstead, 2011).

Emma comments, “*I think females make way better guides, just because of the maternal thing - sorry if that’s sexist.*” This echoes Tom’s characterization of female guides as naturally possessing superior people-skills because they are female (West and Zimmermann, 1987). Tom and Emma’s stories also locate females guide and their gender as highly visible and create space for observing and remarking on the gender of female guides in ways that are not done with male guides. For example, no one commented that they hired or preferred male guides because they could lift heavy boats, or because their deep voices carried well over the water. Implicitly, the desirability of male guides, then, requires no explanation. Conversely female guides’ desirability was almost always attributed to their femininity, with words like “*soft*” and “*maternal*”. In this way female guides are read as *female* guides. Their identity as guides is strongly tied to their gender and they are constructed as being good guides *because* they are female. Tom attributes male guides’ desire to “*just kayak*” to them being male, but it is presented in an unremarkable way, normalizing the behaviour. In so doing, Tom marks male guides as the norm against which female guides are necessarily compared. This effectively makes the gendered embodiment of male guides invisible and heightens the awareness of female guides’ embodiment in comparison.

The visibility of female guides’ embodiment is further seen when Emma references a capsized one of her young female guides performed, commenting “[*she*] developed a lot of respect from those guys [male clients] because...Guys came up to me afterwards, and said, ‘Yeah, we saw this small little girl doing this thing [rescuing a man

more than twice her size], you wouldn't expect that she'd be strong and save me''. While this story relates how the clients responded to the young female guide rescuing a client, Emma's interpretation of the situation shows how she views her female co-workers. Emma's telling of the story demonstrates that she is aware of the gendering to which female guides are subjected, particularly around their strength and ability to perform in safety and capsize situations. The role of a female guide is a highly visible which becomes amplified during a rescue, particularly the rescue of a man twice her size and age which contradicts traditional ideas of femininity (West and Zimmermann, 1987). As the literature highlights, no action is done in isolation, especially from gender. Moreover, certain gender performances are more intelligible within particular gender regimes, and *all* are relational (Lois, 2005; Olstead, 2011; Laurendeau, 2008; and Palmer, 2002).

Below, Lindy describes her first kayak tour and how she decided to pursue guiding after that trip: *"I'm not physically someone who sees herself as being physically athletic, and I felt able, and I felt graceful, and I felt more competent doing that than I have felt doing other physical activities"*. Lindy's impression of her physicality is that she is not someone who does physical activities and feels good about it. This is also indicated by her account of the conversation with the owner about possible employment *"And I remember her saying, 'There's no reason why you can't actually be a guide. We can train you' and it was just she was reasserting the fact that I felt competent at it and she said 'Yeah you are'"*. Lindy's boss, Carole, is a strong proponent of encouraging women to become guides and creating a women-friendly working environment with supportive mentorship for each other. Carole also makes statements about female guides naturalizing their skills within kayaking similar to Emma's comment, *"I think females*

make way better guides, just because of the maternal thing". Within this working environment Lindy expresses self-doubt about her role as a guide in a manner similar to the self-doubt expressed by volunteer rescue workers (Lois, 2003). As West and Zimmermann note, the "best" gender performance is an invisible one, one that is not worthy of note; if a gender performance is called out then it in some way falls outside of the norm and must be (emotional) managed (1987). Carole genders Lindy's self-doubt through how she describes Lindy's guiding style - as "*motherly*", and "*cautious*". Furthermore, under the mentorship of Carole, Lindy performs and thinks about her guiding in feminized ways, highlighting her people skills, organization, and risk aversion during the interview. Carole supports Lindy and other female guides by working to create a positive work environment, and at the same time as this constructs a positive and supporting environment for the women working for her, it also perpetuates a particular gender regime (Laurendeau, 2008) within kayaking.

Female guides (and sometimes clients) are simultaneously depicted as naturally superior due to their "*soft*" interpersonal skills and as physically weaker. Furthermore, female guides draw on and (re)produce dominant discourses of gender and at times police other women for not fitting within these discourses³¹ (Laurendeau and Sharara, 2008). While guiding may be feminized, the act of rescuing a client, as seen above, is still understood as a masculine act (i.e., one requiring skill and strength). Female guides are caught within the constraining nature of what "goes" as a gender performance within risk and guiding, but their own actions and self-talk (re)produce the gendered conditions that they experience. Male guides are in as much of an embodied position as female guides,

³¹ During my time guiding I observed senior female guides teasing and admonishing a young shy female guide, for not being talkative and bouncy with clients like she was supposed to be, because she was female.

but theirs is the embodiment of the invisible as the performance of a guide fits with conventional ideas of maleness (strong, skilled, confident, and experienced). This is especially pronounced when we consider how guides re-telling of tour stories are done in individualistic ways, as discussed in chapter four. This is consistent with dominant cods of masculinity that emphasize individuality and control (West and Zimmermann, 1987). Female guides are always *female* guides and good guide because they are female. Male guide are guides and guides because of their skills or experience. Therefore, female guides' gender location also defines and constrains male guides' possible gender performances as their both gender performances are relational to each other.

Stories and the spaces in between

Guides' discussions of their roles as guides illustrates the performativity of gender; these performances are mediated by others' readings of them. Guides therefore need to be understood not as just guides, but as male and female guides who are gendered through talk and action. As West and Zimmerman (1987, 2009) maintain, gender is an ongoing project of defining and redefining what counts as gender, through (lack of) action, talk, and social settings. The silences and spaces between actions and words are often as important the words and actions themselves and need to be accounted for. Tours operate within discourses of risk, emotional labour, and gender and the intersections of these create a space where each of these ideas can be (re)produced and contested. Within the tour, guides' stories and the words they choose to use to speak about themselves and others demonstrate how guides both question and accept performances of gender within kayaking in different ways. The best examples of these are when guides highlight their gender in reflexive ways. Emma's comment, "*I think females make way better guides,*

just because of the maternal thing - sorry if that's sexist", shows her making a statement that she believes in and practices and then her reaction to that statement. Similarly Cam explains *"I was 19 years old, I weighed around 103 pounds, and I was 5 foot 4, so....that I think had its challenges"*. The comment *"that I think had its challenges"* implies and insinuates the way gender is performed and 'read' by clients. Cam's silence within the interview on how those 'stats' had their *"challenges"* further denotes the particular space female guides occupy. But female guides' gender performances are also tools that they use. Lindy explains this: *"You also change your behaviour too depending on who you've got as a client. So with the portly 60 years old gentleman going out with you, you sort of do the courtly flirtatious thing"*. Lindy's comment of the positive benefits of maintaining and (re)producing gender assumptions for female guides was one of a few comments of this type made during interviews. Conversely male guides talked less about their gender as a performance and more as a trait as seen through Tom's comment that within kayaking *"men take I guess the same approach to everything"*. And while gender was *attributed* as a trait to female guides, many of them understood their own gender as a performance. Male guides conversely made no reference to changing their behaviour to match with clients. As the unexamined norm, their gender is both unremarkable and unexamined and the lack of experiences that male guides discussed which they attribute to their gender demonstrates the silences that exist around being a male guide. But these silent stories fill in the space between the reflexive stories creating an understanding of how gender operates within the tour space as a relation and embodied performance.

Chapter Six: “You’ve still got to put on that happy face”: Conclusion

Contributions

The tour is a particular social space within which guides’ experiences are situated. In this thesis, I have explored how the tour is created and in what ways its social structure impacts guide-client relations. Tours are designed for clients and within the research area they are designed for inexperienced tourist clients, but they also produce clients in particular ways. Tour brochures sell tours with glossy pictures of sea stars and bald eagles, and assurance of safe and fun kayaking experiences. They market the tour experience as new and exciting, and while this is true for one-time tourists, it excludes local clients due to a lack of tour variety or scalability for growing experience levels. Furthermore, clients’ participation within kayaking is constructed through how the tour ‘calls forth’ particular (gendered) performances. Specifically, female clients are constructed as more cautious about kayaking at the outset, therefore guides reassure their female clients more. Guides offer tips and encouragement to female clients that they do not do for male clients, and all female clients are given this type of encouragement, not just those clients who might require and/or desire the help. In this way a particular version of “doing” female participation in kayaking is created (Kay and Laberge, 2004). Therefore the tour can be understood as a social space that markets to specific clientele while simultaneously producing it. Furthermore within the tour space participation particularly around gender is also produced and normalized. Understanding these aspects of the tour space assists in situating guides’ experiences and narratives within the social location that helps to produce them.

Kayak guides represent an unexamined group within sociology literature.

Therefore I have drawn on studies that explore other types of guided tours and leadership activities (such as volunteer rescue workers) where emotional labour is performed (Lois, 2003). The few studies that do examine guided tours, such as white water rafting, hint at the complex nature of this type of experience but leave gaps in our understandings (Holyfield, 1999). Specifically, Holyfield's (1999) exploration the emotional labour of white water rafting guides served as the jumping-off point for my thesis. But emotional labour is necessarily tied to gender; as Lupton (1998) and Hochschild (1979) explain, this results in women being over-represented in jobs that involve caring roles. Furthermore, even within jobs that involve emotional labour women are often constructed naturally suited to this role (Kay and Laberge, 2004). This is evident in Tom's comment that female guides are "*a little bit more soft in their skills to deal with clients*". Kayak guides, like rafting guides, are paid to emotionally manage an adventure experience for clients during the tour, but in order to more fully understand their experiences we must explore their social location within the tour.

The emotional labour in which guides engage is best described by Lindy who calls it "*the top hat and cane show*". Richard elaborates in this idea when he explains, "*you're always on and you can't have a bad day. So even if you're not feeling well or you didn't get enough sleep or something like that ... you're still working. So you've still got to put on that happy face*". Richard's comment demonstrates how guides perform the tour through eliciting a particular mood in both their clients and themselves (Hochschild, 1979). The emotional labour component of tours is described by guides as "*being on*", and represents how guides are both constrained by and (re)produce discourses of gender

and emotional labour while they engage in performing kayaking, fun, and gender for and with their clients. And while emotional labour can be the difficult part of guides' jobs, ("*maybe full time would have killed me*", Lindy) it can also be the best (recall Julie's story about helping client overcome her fear of deep water and fulfill a dream to go kayaking). But the more important contribution of this thesis is the suggestion that we should go beyond a consideration of guides' emotional labour, examining their experiences as *gendered* emotional labour.

Lindy hints at how emotional labour is always, already gendered when she explains, "*You are there to make them [clients] happy ... You're not just a tool for them to go out and do something by themselves, you're actually part of the experience for them*". In this way not only does Lindy engage in emotional labour through how she talks to her clients about aspects of the tour experience (such as potential capsizes) but her very performance of herself as female in the context of the tour is also a performance of emotional labour. Lindy's comments show how the particular way she and others (in this case other clients) perform gender within the tour emphasizes how "doing gender" as interactional and relational. Furthermore, Lindy highlights that guides need to be understood not just as guides, but as male and female guides who are gendered relationally *through* interactions with other guides and clients.

How guides perform their gender (re)produces and contests gender within the tour space; the best examples of this are when guides highlight gender in reflexive ways. Emma's comment, "*I think females make way better guides, just because of the maternal thing - sorry if that's sexist*", for example, serves to construct particular gender performances as more intelligible than others within the tour. Similarly, Cam's lack of

elaboration after her comment, “*I was 19 years old, I weighed around 103 pounds, and I was 5 foot 4, so....that I think had its challenges*” also creates a particular gendered space. These comments demonstrate how “doing gender” (West and Zimmermann, 1987) is a process that guides continually negotiate within the tour space.

Furthermore, guides’ understandings and embodiments of gender within kayaking reflect, (re)produce, and resist particular constructions of gender. Female guides spoke of their gender and gendered experiences as personal and relational, as experiences they produced, and as experiences they had produced for them. In particular female guides’ stories and experiences demonstrate the disjuncture between talk and action. For example Julie comments that she thinks that kayaking is a genderless sport, but later explains how she (nearly) placed a teenage boy in a single over a girl. This example also highlights boating practices as the moment in which guides gender their clients regardless what they say about the way they understand gender within kayaking. Boating clients according to gender is constructed as a safety decision and rarely talked about among guides, illustrating how “gender is at once interactional and institutional” (West and Zimmermann, 2009, p.114).

When male guides did speak to gender it was to the gender of their female co-workers. For example Tom explains that he prefers to hire female guides because they are naturally better at emotional labour, citing their organizational skills, and cooking ability as being both inherently female traits and what make females good guides. Male guides did not speak of their gender experiences, not because their gender does not matter but because their gender is largely unexamined. The silence of male guides’ stories around gender and the plethora of female guides’ stories demonstrate the ways gender is

performed within kayaking and the way experiences are both talked about and not talked about. The silences within guides' talk are particularly important as they serve to mark out the boundaries of what it means to be a guide and also how aspects of being a guide or the tour experience are unexamined within the community. While all guides spoke to the performativity of emotional labour, but not all guides spoke to gender as performative. Some guides did understand their gender as performative, but collectively gender is naturalized as a trait, not a performance. Furthermore, gender performances within kayaking are understood through discourses of risk and safety, and therefore, guides' experiences offer us insight into how participants negotiate the constraints and freedoms of these discourses. This research sensitizes us to the relational, situational, and embodied experiences of kayak guides. Guides' stories offer an understanding of how characteristics such as age, gender, and experience, create particular social locations that shape how guides understand and experience kayaking and guiding.

Limitations

Critics of qualitative research often cite generalizability and the 'impact' of the researcher on the research as weaknesses of this kind of inquiry. As a critical sociologist I do not seek one social truth accessible through rigorous research, but instead seek social knowledge which is collaboratively produced and understood, and interweaves and intersects with multiple positions and understandings. To that end, this thesis undertook an exploration of kayak guides' embodied experiences.

Guides' stories reflect, (re)present, and (re)produce the locations and environments in which they guide. Guides' personal accounts are located in the specific waters they paddle in and the type of tours they do, but guides' understandings of the

emotional labour and gendered experiences they have as guides are transferable to similar situations. The west coast of British Columbia is a varied coastline resulting in a range of different types of tours and kayaking experiences. My research area is limited to day tours with clients that have little-to-no experience. While guides within this research may have overlapping experiences with other types of guiding (such as multi-day expeditions), further work would be needed to account for the different structure and paddling conditions of other tours.

This research is also impacted by my presence as a researcher. I began this research due to my own experience as a guide, and I am in many ways still a guide, and so my location to research participants is arguably one of an insider. The practicality of researching with an insider status means that ‘basic’ knowledge is more difficult to access. Conversely, my insider experience as a guide allowed me to enter fieldwork easily and become accepted by research participants. Therefore, my position in relation to research participants, guiding, and kayaking impacts my research in both positive and negative ways and needs to be addressed. This is not to be understood as a true “weakness”, but as a reality of the social and relational production of research and knowledge. To this point, my exploration of the embodied experiences of guides and their gender is complicated through gender interactions between myself and participants. My own embodied gendered self influenced the type and depth of stories guides told me. As a female researcher, I am located in ways that shape how I conduct research and how participants respond to me. This means that as a guide I am able to relate and bond with female guides over shared experiences that I do not share with male guides. The bond and understanding I possess about what it means to be a female guide meant the female

guides' stories could be less explicit while still informing me of their experiences. Male guides would not have been able to do this type of relational sharing with me due to my gender location. Therefore, male guides' silences speak as much about their location within guiding as they do to the interactional aspect of research.

Further directions

This thesis examines guides' gendered emotional labour experiences within the context of the tour, but the tour experience involves both guides and clients and this thesis has explored only the experiences of guides. Further work needs to be done with respect to how clients understand the tour as a type of experience. By understanding clients' experiences of the tour space we can further explore how discourses of gender and emotional labour are understood and perpetuated. Additional work that explores other activities that share similar components to kayaking, such as other guided tours, will add to our understanding of these unique experiences. The discussion of guides' gendered and embodied experiences would also benefit from an understanding of clients' perspectives as guides perform *for* as well as *with* their clients.

This thesis specifically explores the gendered and emotional experiences of guides, and to this end, my embodied experience as a female researcher limits me to some extent in accessing male guides' experiences. Further research is needed to fully understand the embodied gender experiences of male guides. Additional research is also required around other social factors, such as age, social class, and race, as interviewees made comments that indicated that these issues are salient within guiding and require attention.

More research is also needed to expand on ideas of reflexivity of the researcher. I have attempted to be as reflexive as possible, but reflexivity is an ongoing process. Research “should be governed by a theorem of reasonable and responsible incompleteness, in which fieldwork self-consciously accomplishes something unfinished” (Rabinow and Marcus, 2008, 82). Critically examining our own experiences as researchers and participants in the field will allow a greater depth of understating of the relational process of creating meaning and understanding of the social world.

Coda

Before leaving for fieldwork, I was stressing over my “fake” guide identity and commented to my supervisor, Jason, during a meeting that, “I am just barely sporty enough to pull off being a guide”. “You didn’t think I knew this already?”, chuckled Jason. “You don’t ‘pass’ as they say” he told me. And he was right – I don’t “pass”.

So, how do I deal with expectations of other kayakers and guides if I don’t pass? Especially in relation to whom I am, how I view myself, and perhaps more importantly, how I think others view me?

Am I the person that you meet and associate with kayaking....no, not really...I can kayak, but I don’t imagine people look at me and think - kayak guide. But I also don’t try and hide it too much. I did my fieldwork in little cotton shorts and cute tees, but I can carry two doubles down to the water, so it was ok. I ‘dealt’ with my dressy or un-guide-like appearance, by doing what I know how to do: haul, clean, and fit boats. But my way of ‘dealing’ only served to feminize me as I performed my role as knowledgeable guide/land crew. And as I worked through my own experiences and feelings about fieldwork and my guiding identity I realized that a lot of how I identify as a guide is tied up in how I look and regardless of what I am wearing I always “look” feminine. And while I at first thought that my skills plus feminine presentation equaled resistance I now realize that it does not. As a female guide I could have been stereotyped as ‘girly’ or ‘sissy’, or as ‘bitchy’ but by ‘conforming’ through feminine dress I inhabited a ‘safe’ space by visibly marking myself as feminine as a way to ‘make up’ for being skilled.

At the fieldwork site there were two young women. Sarah was cautious and did gender in conventional ways, but I heard a few of the male guides comment that her guiding was not up to snuff (even the owner said something to that effect). I watched her do the paddle and safety demo and thought she seemed a bit shy and maybe scattered, but all the information was there. And the clients seemed to like her quiet manner. The other young female guide, Jane, was definitely one of the boys. All of the male guides respected her and her skills. She guided lots of the bigger tours, had lots of experience, kayaked personally in the off-season and presented a different version of femininity than Sarah did. It’s not that Jane didn’t look or dress feminine (because she did), but each of these women perform feminine in different ways. Sarah dressed sporty (read a bit genderless) for her tours, while Jane wore scarves and flower tees (clothes that obviously read feminine).

I’m not as experienced or as “into” kayaking as Jane, but I strived to be placed in a category with her (which meant looking feminine, even if I didn’t realize it at the time) and attempted to avoid being placed in the

same category as Sarah. In terms of skill and guiding-style, Sarah and I are very similar, while Jane and I had more in common personally. Tellingly, I fostered a relationship with Jane over one with Sarah. I in no way needed to form a friendship with either, or only one of these women, but my interactions with these two guides indicate how I did gender within guiding and researching, and relate to my own fears of not being enough of a guide.

So, when Jane tipped out to me after a tour I took this a good sign that I was managing my identity effectively. One of the male guides first tipped out to me, and did so in a very casual but deliberate way in front of Jane and I rejoiced that this meant that I had effectively joined the group and was being taken seriously. Regardless, I still felt like a bit of a fraud.

The two stories I share above outline how I gained group membership and how I negotiated and combated my own choice of a feminine appearance through a strategic association. But as I explored my fieldwork experience critically I become increasingly aware of how the choices I made around how I presented myself, how I acted, my group membership, and my feminine appearance, constitute emotional labour. How I negotiate gender, group membership, and the struggles around them are the visible markers of my emotional labour. Emotional labour is not necessarily invisible, but the process of critically examining one's own emotional labour is complicated.

After reading a piece of critical writing about my fieldwork experiences Jason commented to me "This seems really good but what about your emotional labour?" "What emotional labour?" I asked.

Further reflection has made me realize that my un-guide-like appearance *was* the emotional labour of being in the field. Cotton is the most unsuitable cloth for kayaking (it is very heavy when wet and takes a long time to dry) and no guide would wear it during a tour. By "choosing" to wear cotton I also chose not to go on the water as I was not dressed for it. Furthermore, by presenting a un-guide-like appearance and then hauling two doubles I positioned myself in particular ways. I had fears and concerns about presenting myself as a guide and then not measuring up – my master's was riding on this

research and my ability to talk to guides as one of them. But my logic does not quite hold. I distanced myself far enough away to ‘protect’ my guide identity and close enough to be accepted by other guides, while still sharing authentic guiding moments with interviewees.

Cam’s comment “*I was 19 years old, I weighed around 103 pounds, and I was 5 foot 4, so....that I think had its challenges*” struck a chord with my own guiding experiences as my ‘stats’ matched hers when I started guiding. Within the interview, I shared my own experiences with Cam and we talked about tours we both had that we felt “went wrong” because of who we were at the time and how clients responded to us. Furthermore Cam and I did not elaborate on why those ‘stats’ were challenging; we just looked at each other smiled and laughed, both knowing why. Cam and I both spoke about our experiences as embodied experiences which hinged on how we looked, our age, and gender. Cam and I also agreed that guiding “*got better*” (i.e. we felt less hassled because of our age and gender) as we got older; we chalked it up to gaining experience and looking older. Cam’s, and my own, comments and shared understanding of our experiences demonstrate how gender and gender performances are fundamentally relational as our words and actions simultaneously construct both our own gender projects and those of others.

These moments of shared experiences demonstrate the fluidity of research. I began and ended the interview with Cam (who I only met once for the interview) a researcher, and to some degree an outsider, but during the interview there were moments of just being two guides chatting about guiding. My movement between researcher and guide roles also represents shifts in the type of emotional labour I was doing.

Furthermore, the roles of guide and researcher are not discreet categories, but are instead underpinned by continua of membership and that are constantly changing.

Looking back to when I guided I realized that I never had the guide persona I associated with guides, but I did this on purpose.

If I'm being truthful I like surprising people that this cute young woman who walked up to them with the dimples will be their guide and yes I can pull your 40 year old ass out of the water if you happen to fall in by not listening to me. Trust me, I've done it before. I kind of thrive on the shock value of that.

In my last summer as a guide I would play up “the young cute female guide act”, sometimes because it worked for that tour’s demographic and sometimes just because I could. Reflecting on my own experience of dealing with my guide appearance, I realize that the “shock value” I had with clients only worked because of how gender in performed within kayaking and while it felt empowering at the time, I was playing with gender in somewhat predictable and uncritical ways. But this was in a situation where I was established as a “real guide” and the general manager of the kayak shop in the last few years. My guide persona with clients obviously constituted significant emotional labour, but so did my relationships with my co-workers. Specifically the re-telling of tour experiences, while not always done at work, was still work and during these moments I collectively created and re-created both my own guiding persona and shored up what it means to be a guide. During fieldwork I was working with new guides that I did not know and after being off the water for three years I felt considerably less confident. Furthermore, my liminal space as volunteer, guide, and researcher complicated my relationships with other guides. Therefore, within the field I performed my role as land

crew for clients but I also performed the role of (former) guide and researcher for other guides.

So what do I do with my reflective experiences and how do they help me as a researcher?

During the first few meetings I had with Jason to discuss my thesis topic and directions I could take my topic I emphatically informed him that I would not be exploring gender. I refused “to be one of those women studying gender because they are women”. Jason, to his credit, did not push the issue. A year and half later I was working through my fieldwork experiences, through reflective writing, and realized that I was and am “doing gender”. This was quite the revelation to me, and forced me to work through some of the issues I have outlined above. Furthermore, by critically examining my own experiences I have come to understand how the research process in general, and specifically my particular gender presentation, constitutes emotional labour.

As I explain in the proem, I have been as reflexive as possible throughout my thesis and the depth of this reflexivity has increased significantly in the latter stages of this project. It is important to acknowledge my position, as a female, as a researcher, and as a (former) guide, within this research as it affects how I discuss and understand the guides’ stories and impacts the type and depth of information from interviewees. While I could ask questions that might induce male guides to talk about their gender I lack the ability to relate to their embodied experiences in the way I could (and did) with female guides. Male guides also do not share with me because the type of sharing I am requesting is at odds with the type of re-telling of tour experience, but with female guides that is overcome due to sharing a gendered social location. In a sense female guides are able to tell me less and still create understanding in a way that I could not foster with

male guides. The point is not solely how far I have come reflexively, but that I have consciously endeavoured to be ever more reflexive. Furthermore, reflexivity has assisted in understanding that gender is not just performed within the tour and kayaking, but gender (along with other traits, such as guide, or researcher) is also performed within interviews and fieldwork.

References

- Blackman, S. J. (2007). 'Hidden Ethnography': Crossing Emotional Borders in Qualitative Accounts of Young People's Lives. *Sociology* 41(4), 699-716.
- Butler, J. (1986). Variations on sex and gender: Beauvoir, Wittig, and Foucault. *Praxis International*, 5(4), 505-516.
- Burgess, R. (1990). Sponsors, Gatekeepers, Members, and Friends: Access in Educational Settings. In *Experiencing Fieldwork: An Inside View of Qualitative Research*. Edited by William Shaffir and Robert A. Stebbins. Sage Publications: London. 43-52.
- Dingwall, R. (1997). Accounts, interviews and observations. In *Context and method in qualitative research*, Edited by. Gale Miller, Robert Dingwall. Sage Publications: London, 50-65.
- Donnelly, P., & Young, Kevin (1988). The construction and confirmation of identity in sport subcultures. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 5(3), 223-240.
- Esterberg, K.G. (2002). *Qualitative Methods in Social Research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: a methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA. Altamira Press, 2004
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday & Company Inc.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In *The Sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed.)*. Edited by N.K Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 191-215.
- Helstein, M. (2003). 'That's Who I Want To Be: The Politics and Production of Desire Within Nike Advertising to Women'. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 27, 276-92.
- Hochschild, A. (1983). *The Managed Heart: The Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: The University of California Press.
- Hochschild, A. (1979). *The Unexpected Community (Second edition)*. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.
- Holyfield, L., Jonas, L., and Zajicek, A. (2005). Adventure Without Risk Is Like Disneyland. In *Edgework: The Sociology of Risk-Taking*. Edited by S. Lyng.

- Routledge: New York. 173-186.
- Holyfield, L. and Jonas, L. (2003). From river god to research grunt: Identity, emotions, and the river guide. *Symbolic Interaction*, 26 (2), 285–306.
- Holyfield, L. (1999). Manufacturing Adventure: The Buying and Selling of Emotions. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 28 (1), 3-32.
- Holyfield, L. and Fine, G. (1997). Adventure as Character Work: The Collective Taming of Fear. *Symbolic Interaction*, 20(4), 342-363.
- Kane, M. J., & Zink, R. (2004). Package adventure tours: markers in serious leisure careers. *Leisure Studies*, 23(4), 329-345.
- Kane, M. J. (1995). Resistance/Transformation of the oppositional Binary: Exposing Sport as a Continuum. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 19. 191-218
- Kay, J. and Laberge, S. (2004). ‘Mandatory equipment’: women in adventure racing. In *Understanding Lifestyle Sports: Consumption, identify and difference*. Edited by Belinda Wheaton. Routledge: London. 154-174.
- Kleinmam, S. (1991). Field-Workers’ Feelings: What We Feel, Who We Are, How We Analyze. In *Experiencing Fieldwork: An Inside View of Qualitative Research*. Edited by William Shaffir and Robert A. Stebbins. Sage Publications: London. 184-195.
- Laurendeau, J. (2011). “If you’re reading this, it’s because I’ve died”: masculinity and relational risk in BASE jumping. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 28(4), 404-420.
- Laurendeau, J. and Adams, C. (2010). ‘Jumping like a girl’: discursive silences, exclusionary practices and the controversy over women’s ski jumping. *Sport in Society* 13(3), 431-447.
- Laurendeau, J. (2008). "Gendered Risk Regimes": Theoretical Consideration of Edgework and Gender. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 25. 293-309.
- Laurendeau, J., and Sharara, N. (2008). “Women Could Be Every Bit As Good As Guys”: Reproductive and Resistant Agency in Two “Action” Sports. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 3, 24-47.
- Laurendeau, J. and Gibbs Van Brunschot, E. (2006). Policing the edge: risk and social control in skydiving. *Deviant Behavior*, 27. 173-201.
- Laurendeau, J. (2004). The “crack choir” and the “cock chorus”: The intersection of gender and sexuality in skydiving texts . *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 21(4), 397-

417.).

- Lofland, J. and Lofland, L.H. (1995). *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. New York: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Lois, J. (2005). Gender and Emotional Management in the Stages of Edgework. In *Edgework: The Sociology of Risk-Taking*. Edited by S. Lyng. Routledge: New York. 117-152.
- Lois, J. (2003). *Heroic Efforts: The Emotional Culture of Search and Rescue Volunteers*. New York: University Press.
- Lupton, D. (1998) *The Emotional Self: a Sociocultural Exploration*. London: Sage.
- Lyng, S. (2005). Sociology at the Edge: Social Theory and Voluntary risk taking. In *Edgework: The Sociology of Risk-Taking*. Edited by S. Lyng. Routledge: New York. 173-186.
- Lyng, S. (1990). Edgework: A Social Psychological Analysis of Voluntary Risk Taking *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(4) 851-886.
- MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 79. 589-603.
- Palmer, C. (2002). 'Shit Happens': The Selling of Risk in Extreme Sport. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 13(3), 323-336.
- Palys, T (2008). Purposive Sampling. In *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods Vol.2*. Edited by Lisa M. Given. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA. 697-698.
- Rabinow, P. (1977). *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*. University of California Press: Berkeley.
- Rapley, T. (2004). Interviews. In *Qualitative Research Practice*, Edited by Clive Seale, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber F. Gubrium, and David Silverman. London: Sage Publications.
- Schippers, M. (2000). The Social Organization of Sexuality and Gender in Alternative Hard Rock: An Analysis of Intersectionality. *Gender and Society*, 14(6), 747-764.
- Schostak, J. (2006). *Interviewing and representation in qualitative research projects*. New York: Open University Press.
- Shaffir, W. & Stebbins, R.A. (1991). *Experiencing fieldwork: An inside view of qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.

- Sharpe, E. K. (2005). "Going Above and Beyond:" The Emotional Labour of Adventure Guides. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 37(1), 29-50.
- Thorne, B. (2004). "You Still Takin' Notes?" Fieldwork and Problems of Informed Consent. In *Approaches to Qualitative Research: A Reader On Theory and Practice*. Edited by S. Nagy Hess-Biber and P Leavy. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Urry, J. (1992). The Tourist Gaze "Revisited". *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36, 172-186.
- Van Maanen, J. (1990). Playing Back the Tape: Early Days in the Field. In *Experiencing Fieldwork: An Inside View of Qualitative Research*. Edited by William Shaffir and Robert A. Stebbins. Sage Publications: London. 31-42.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender & Society*. 1(2), 125-151.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D. (2009). Accounting for Doing Gender. *Gender & Society*. 23(1), 112-122.

Appendix A

Interview Guide

Interview Guide

Carlin Sharpe
Graduate Student
Department of Sociology
University of Lethbridge
4401 University Drive West
T1K 3M4, CANADA
carlin.nicholson@uleth.ca

Personal Involvement – for current and former guides, shop managers and owners as appropriate

- How did you become involved in kayak guiding?
- Did your participation in kayaking begin as a guide or as a personal activity?
- Number of months or years kayaking?
- Number of tours or years touring?
- Do you consider the sport hazardous?
- If so, why do (did) you choose to participate?
- Are there any circumstances under which you could envision giving up the sport (why did you give up the sport)?

Guiding etc. – for current and former guides, as appropriate

- Why did you decide to become a kayak guide?
- What sort of training have you done to become a guide?
- How often do you guide per week?
- Have you ever guided for a different company? If so tell how that guiding experience compares to your current one?
- Have you ever had a client capsize during a tour? If so how many capsizes have you have over you guiding career?
- Telling me about you best tour and why?
- Tell me about you worst tour and why?

Clients etc. – for current and former guides, shop managers and owners as appropriate

- What sort of clients does this company attract?
- What do you think about the level of experience that clients have?
- Where to most clients come from (local, tourists)?
- What experience level is required to rent kayaks from this company?
- Do you think the rental requirements are good (too low, or too high)?

- How (if at all) do you encourage clients who want to become involved in kayaking more seriously (such as taking lessons)?
- Have you seen any changes over that time (who's getting involved, kinds of people who are kayaking, sport regulated, etc.)? How (if at all) has your own involvement changed over time?

Other

- Do you hold employment other than guiding? If so where do you work?
- What percentage of kayak guides are women?
- Why do you think there are so few women (relatively) in the sport?
- Do women and men seem to engage in the sport in similar ways?
- Do you see clients responding differently to men and women guides?
- Are women and men treated similarly in the sport?

Personal Info

- Highest level of education completed?
- Occupation?
- Age?

Appendix B

Consent Form



Department of
Sociology

4401 University Drive West
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada
T1K 3M4, CANADA

Phone 403.329.2551
Fax 403.329.2085

Carlin Sharpe
Graduate Student
Department of Sociology
University of Lethbridge
4401 University Drive West
T1K 3M4, CANADA
carlin.nicholson@uleth.ca

By receiving this consent form you have been offered a formal invitation to participate in the thesis research project of Carlin Sharpe. This research project offers the benefits of participation by contributing to research, and risks and discomforts surrounding time and anonymity. Your participation is completely voluntary.

This consent form, a copy of which has been given to you, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, please ask. Please take the time to read this form carefully and understand any accompanying information.

The purpose of this project is to explore several issues related to the sport of guided kayak tours. Kayaking has received very little academic attention. As such, this study will explore how kayaking activities are organized, how participants understand the attendant risks, and other dimensions of the sport that seem important. The initial data will be gathered by simply hanging around while you engage in guiding. From there, I will approach a small number of guides to engage in semi-structured personal interviews. The interview (usually one to two hours in duration) will take place at a location that is convenient and comfortable for you. During the interview, you will be asked questions about personal experiences in the sport. You may refuse to answer any question or

withdraw from the study at any time **without prejudice**. Following this initial interview, a short informal follow-up interview will be arranged at your convenience. During this interview, you will be encouraged to give feedback on the researcher's interpretations of the issues which arose during the course of the research. Full results of the study should be available in early 2011. If you wish to obtain a copy of these results, or to review materials being submitted for publication, you may contact me **any time after September of 2010, either by email or by snail mail, at the address provided at the top of this page.**

With your permission, the initial interview will be audio taped and later transcribed by the researcher or a research assistant into text form. These texts will be used as data for Carlin Sharpe's thesis project and subsequent published articles and presentations. You or the interviewer may stop the audio taping at any time during the interview. The audiotapes will be stored securely at the University of Lethbridge, and will be kept separate from the master list of participants' names. The tapes and the list will be accessible only to the researcher and research assistant(s). Your name, as well as other potentially identifying information will remain confidential and any subsequent reference to you will be done through the use of pseudonyms. Any publications stemming from the research may include information gathered from the interviews. Despite every attempt to protect your anonymity, some readers may be able to deduce your identity from the experiences or opinions that you describe. *Complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed.*

You will not incur any financial costs nor receive any financial reward for participating.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the investigators, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation. Questions regarding your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to my supervisor Jason Laurendeau (Phone: 403- 329-2717, Email: jason.laurendeau@uleth.ca) or the Office of Research Services, University of Lethbridge (Phone: 403-329-2747).

_____	_____
Participant	Date
_____	_____
Investigator	Date

A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

Appendix C

Minor Consent Form

University of
Lethbridge



Department of
Sociology

4401 University Drive West
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada
T1K 3M4, CANADA

Phone 403.329.2551
Fax 403.329.2085

Carlin Sharpe
Graduate Student
Department of Sociology
University of Lethbridge
4401 University Drive West
T1K 3M4, CANADA
carlin.nicholson@uleth.ca
(250) 538-8336

By receiving this consent form the minor been offered a formal invitation to participate in the thesis research project of Carlin Sharpe. This research project offers the benefits of participation by contributing to research, and risks and discomforts surrounding time and anonymity. The minor participation is completely voluntary.

This consent form, a copy of which has been given to you and the minor, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you and the minor the basic idea of what the research is about and what the minor's participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, please ask. Please take the time to read this form carefully and understand any accompanying information.

The purpose of this project is to explore several issues related to the sport of guided kayak tours. Kayaking has received very little academic attention. As such, this study will explore how kayaking activities are organized, how participants understand the attendant risks, and other dimensions of the sport that seem important. The initial data will be gathered by simply hanging around while you engage in guiding. From there, I will approach a small number of guides to engage in semi-structured personal interviews. The interview (usually one to two hours in duration) will take place at a location that is convenient and comfortable for the minor. During the interview, the minor will be asked questions about personal experiences in the sport. The minor may refuse to answer any question or withdraw from the study at any time **without prejudice**. Following this initial

interview, a short informal follow-up interview will be arranged at your convenience. During this interview, the minor will be encouraged to give feedback on the researcher's interpretations of the issues which arose during the course of the research. Full results of the study should be available in early 2010. If you and the minor wish to obtain a copy of these results, or to review materials being submitted for publication, you may contact me **any time after September of 2009, either by email or by snail mail, at the address provided at the top of this page.**

With your permission, the initial interview will be audiotaped and later transcribed by the researcher or a research assistant into text form. These texts will be used as data for Carlin Sharpe's thesis project and subsequent published articles and presentations. The minor or the interviewer may stop the audiotaping at any time during the interview. The audiotapes will be stored securely at the University of Lethbridge, and will be kept separate from the master list of participants' names. The tapes and the list will be accessible only to the researcher and research assistant(s). The minor's name, as well as other potentially identifying information will remain confidential and any subsequent reference to you will be done through the use of pseudonyms. Any publications stemming from the research may include information gathered from the interviews. Despite every attempt to protect the minor's anonymity, some readers may be able to deduce the minor's identity from the experiences or opinions that the minor describe. *Complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed.*

You or the minor will not incur any financial costs nor receive any financial reward for participating.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to the minor's participation as a subject. The minor will also be give a consent for to sign Participation in this thesis research will only continue with written consent from both you, the parent or guardian, and the minor. In no way does this waive your or the minor's legal rights nor release the investigators, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. The minor is free to withdraw from the study at any time. Your and the minor's continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you or the minor should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation. Questions regarding your and those of the minor's rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to my supervisor Jason Laurendeau (Phone: 403- 329-2717, Email: jason.laurendeau@uleth.ca) or the Office of Research Services, University of Lethbridge (Phone: 403-329-2747).

Parent or Guardian of Participant

Date

Investigator

Date

A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.