A REVIEW OF AUTHENTICITY RESEARCH IN TOURISM: LAUNCHING THE ANNALS OF TOURISM RESEARCH CURATED COLLECTION ON AUTHENTICITY

1. Introduction
Authenticity is one of the oldest and most debated concepts in tourism research. Like many of our conceptual foundations, the earliest authenticity research was informed by theories and perspectives that came from outside the field, most notably, history (Boorstin, 1961), sociology (Cohen, 1988; MacCannell, 1973), and anthropology (Bruner, 1994). How much has our understanding of authenticity changed in the intervening decades? The last systematic literature review was published in this journal over 20 years ago (Wang, 1999). Not only does Wang (1999) offer a comprehensive review of the authenticity research to that point in time, he also conceptualizes the various approaches to its study and proposes an addition to the canon: existential authenticity. This opened a floodgate of research, followed by more recent developments of performative, phenomenological, and psychoanalytic approaches, as well as attention to authentication processes and alienation. Thus, we sit at an important time to reflect on the field and to contextualize the most recent years of scholarship with the first decades.

The overarching aim of this review is to identify major research trajectories in authenticity research within tourism studies over the past 42 years. While authenticity is a concept stretching across disciplines, this review focuses on tourism scholarship and begins with the first research article published on this concept in a tourism-focused journal in 1979. This review identifies and examines the major topics of authenticity research, specifically how these emerged and evolved over time. To do this, techniques of systematic literature review and bibliometric analysis were applied.

According to Linnenluecke et al. (2020), it becomes increasing difficult for academics to “keep track of new developments [in their field] due to the sheer amount of information and associated time requirements for assessing and evaluating,” and a systematic literature review can help overcome these challenges by identifying trends and gaps in knowledge (p. 177). In this review, the PRISMA method (Page et al., 2020) for a transparent and repeatable publication collection process was employed to collect a representative sample of the research articles on authenticity published in tourism journals. The sample (N = 458) was then analyzed using a mixed method approach of descriptive statistics, thematic analysis, and keyword analysis. These methods thus offer insights about the evolution of the field, which are followed by a discussion of challenges and opportunities for future authenticity research.

2. Methodology and results
A systematic literature review aims to collect academic publication data using a carefully designed, transparent, repeatable process and to evaluate that sample against predetermined criteria (Jiang et al., 2019; Linnenluecke et al., 2020). Thus, many employ the PRISMA technique (Page et al., 2020), which is stepwise process of collecting and refining publication data for (meta-)analysis. While this technique was developed within the medical and health sciences it has been increasingly adapted to social sciences and tourism studies reviews, specifically (see Yang et al., 2017).
Bibliometric analysis is comprised of a diverse set of tools developed to analyze how academic literature evolves over a specific period of time (Jiang et al., 2019; Zupic & Cater, 2015). Bibliometric techniques can be evaluative or relational. Evaluative techniques are used to measure impact of specific publications, and relational techniques assess relationships and trends within a field (Jiang et al, 2019). Despite the long history of bibliometric analyses (see Kessler, 1963), it has been the development of online databases and software packages that have stretched their analytical capabilities and complementarity to systematic literature review methods (see Jiang et al., 2019; Linnenluecke et al., 2019; Zupic & Cater, 2015).

For this review, Web of Science (2021) was chosen due to its extensive resources and pervasive usage as a research tool. It is an online resource that maintains multiple academic databases, providing comprehensive reference data. Working from data obtained from Web of Science, this review employed a mixed method approach in which the qualitative technique of thematic analysis was combined with descriptive statistics and bibliometric keyword co-frequency analysis. Thematic analysis was used to understand overall trends in the theoretical approaches to authenticity, as well as the methods by which it has been investigated. Thematic analysis was also integrated into keyword co-frequency analysis. This was conducted for the entire data set, as well as specific time series, in order to observe major research trends across the full sample and how topics emerged and evolved over time.

2.1 Sample collection

In January 2021, a Web of Science search was conducted using the Boolean operators: TITLE = AUTHENTIC* OR AUTHOR KEYWORDS = AUTHENTIC*. Accordingly, a version of authentic* was required to appear in either the publication title or the author keywords only. “Authentic*” was chosen to capture any iteration of the terms (in)authentic, authenticity, authentication, and so on. Due to the common usage of authentic*, the term often appears colloquially throughout research papers, thus requiring that the search criteria be limited to the title or the keywords in order to identify publications for which authenticity is a central concept.

Following a PRISMA approach, (Figure 1), the first step of the Web of Science search generated 44,238 results demonstrating the wide usage of the term across disciplines. Because this review is specifically focused on the field of tourism, the results category of “Hospitality, Leisure, Sport, Tourism” was selected. Additionally, the journal selection was refined to those with an emphasis on tourism content, rather than leisure, sport, and recreation. This was further limited to journals containing five or more publications that met the search criteria, as journals with fewer than five publications were also less tourism focused.
Figure 1. Adapted PRISMA sample collection process

However, upon browsing the sample, it was discovered that some journals’ full catalogue had not been searched due to the availability of only recent volumes on Web of Science. For example, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, for which authenticity is a popular topic, only generated results from 2015 onward, despite the journal dating to 2006. To confirm the representativeness of the sample, the search criteria were also deployed on each of the selected journals’ webpages. This generated 309 additional publications.

Next, the sample was screened for duplicates and for research articles only, in English, with full-text availability. This resulted in 528 articles, which were then assessed for suitability. The sample was further reduced to 458 papers when some false positives were discovered, and research notes, commentaries, and introductions to special issues had not been excluded by previous filters. It is important to note that the quality of the articles was not part of the assessment for inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Boolean operators: Title (TI) = authentic* OR Author Keywords (AK) = authentic*</td>
<td>• Non-English language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Web of Science Category: Hospitality, Leisure, Sport, and Tourism</td>
<td>• Papers published in non-tourism journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Published before 2021</td>
<td>• Research notes, commentaries, special issue introductions, books, etc…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• English language</td>
<td>• False positives: authenticity not a central concept or major variable of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Full-text availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tourism and Cultural Change (9.2%, n = 42), Tourism Management (9%, n = 41), and Journal of Heritage Tourism (6.7%, n = 39) (Figure 3).

While these insights provide a snapshot of the growth in interest in authenticity and concentration of publications, further analysis was required to understand the conceptual development over time. Indeed, the objectives of this review are to examine the conceptual development of authenticity in the field with specific interests in highlighting the various trajectories of its evolution. As a result, thematic analysis and bibliometric analysis were employed.

Figure 2. Authenticity research articles published in tourism journals (1979-2020)
Figure 3. Authenticity research articles published within each journal over time
2.3 Coding and analysis
To begin the thematic analysis, information for the 458 research articles were imported to a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, including reference details, keywords, abstract, and link to full-text. There they were coded according to the rationale for using the concept of authenticity, the theoretical approach to authenticity, and the study’s methodology (Figure 4). The majority (60.7%) were less focused on developing the concept of authenticity and more so on understanding its relationship to other variables under investigation. These articles were coded as “X.” The minority of articles (39.3%) indicated that building conceptual understanding of authenticity was a primary goal, and these were coded as either CB-E to denote empirical studies or CB-C to indicate conceptual papers.

![Figure 4. Theoretical and methodological coding process](image)

Next, the theoretical approaches to authenticity were coded: objective (Ob), constructive (Con), postmodern (Pomo), existential (Ex), performative (Per), phenomenological (Phen), and psychoanalytic (Psy). The theoretical approach codes were derived from open and axial coding. Using open coding, the theoretical approaches to authenticity were coded based on the information available in the articles. It is worth noting that most articles engaged more than one approach to authenticity. While an effort was made to capture all approaches to authenticity, in some cases an approach was not explicitly stated and had to be inferred from the context. For example, several papers spoke of an interest in tourists’ perceptions of authenticity but did not specifically refer to a theoretical approach that was being used to investigate authenticity. As a result, most of these articles were coded as “constructive.” Further, some singular approaches were subsumed under more prominent approaches to which they were related. For instance, modernist and essentialist approaches to authenticity
were each mentioned one time and so were incorporated into the broader objectivist approach. This latter step applied axial coding, which involves drawing together sub-categories.

Finally, the empirical articles (CB-E and X) were coded for methodology: qualitative (Ql), quantitative (Qn), mixed method (M). Purely conceptual papers (C) were excluded from this step. Coding was verified by two volunteers: academic researchers with an interest in authenticity who each coded 15 randomly selected papers. To offer an illustration, coding resulted in the following types of constructions:

- **CB-C: Ex, Per** = Authenticity concept-building paper, conceptually developed using existential and performative approaches
- **CB-E: Pomo (Ql)** = Authenticity concept-building paper, empirically developed using a postmodern approach and investigated through qualitative methods
- **X: Ob, Con (Qn)** = Authenticity as a key variable in another relationship, using objective and constructive approaches and investigated using quantitative methods

The majority of the sample (60.7%) uses authenticity as a key variable in another relationship under study, so that 39.3% of the sample engages with authenticity in an explicit attempt to build understanding of the concept. While this review could have focused exclusively on the concept-building papers, this would have overlooked the many insights that can be gleaned from the relationship of authenticity to other factors. Importantly, all included articles met the criteria of listing authentic* in either the title or author keywords. Further, there has been considerable research in recent years arguing that authenticity is a relational concept (Cohen & Cohen, 2012; Kolar & Zabkar, 2010; Rickly-Boyd, 2012a). As such, it was decided to examine both the concept-building and authenticity as a key variable research articles together.

Methodologically, qualitative approaches are most prominent and used in 56.8% of articles (Figure 5). It is particularly interesting to trace how this changed over time (Table 1). Quantitative methodologies were a fairly small portion of the authenticity research until 2011, when it grew to 25% of the 2011-2015 time series and 45.4% of the 2016-2020 time series. The proportion of mixed method papers were quite small across the sample over time, while conceptual papers appear to be declining.

The most prominent approach to authenticity was constructive, which is not surprising as it represents the most flexible usage (Figure 6). It was used in 85% of the articles (n = 390). It is important to note that it is common for articles to use more than one approach, and this is illustrated in Figure 7, which shows both the frequency of each approach used in the sample as well as the combinations of approaches. These are also delineated in Table 2 and Table 3, with bold font used to highlight the approach combinations that appear more frequently. It is particularly noteworthy that the papers using authenticity as a key variable in the study of another relationship are especially reliant on constructive approach (Table 3), while the papers more interested in concept building exhibit a much greater diversity of approach.
combinations (Table 2). The development of each of the theoretical approaches over time is discussed in more depth in the findings section (see Theoretical approaches).

While this coding and analysis yielded considerable insights in terms of theoretical engagement with authenticity and how it has been investigated in tourism studies, further analysis was required to isolate the themes through which authenticity has been studied and how this has changed over time. To do this, keyword analysis was employed.

### Table 1. Methodologies used in authenticity research over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Method</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(\% of full sample, N = 458)

### Figure 5. Methodologies employed in authenticity research (N = 458)
Figure 6. Frequency of theoretical approaches to authenticity in the sample (N = 458).
(Note: Many articles use more than one approach.)

Figure 7. Relationality of approaches to authenticity used in sample.
Table 2. Theoretical and methodological coding results for authenticity concept-building (CB) articles (n = 180).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual (C)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Ex</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Per</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Pomo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex, Phen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex, Psy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Ex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Ex, Pomo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Per</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empirical (E)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con (M)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con (Ql)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con (Qn)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Ex (Ql)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Ex (Qn)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Ex, Per (Ql)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Ex, Pomo (Qn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Per (M)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Per (Ql)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Per (Qn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Pomo (Ql)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Pomo (Qn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex (Ql)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex (Qn)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex, Per (Ql)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex, Phen (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex, Pomo (Ql)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con (M)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con (Ql)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con (Qn)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Ex (Ql)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Ex (Qn)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Ex, Pomo (Qn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Per (Ql)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Per (Qn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Phen (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Pomo (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Ex (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Ex (Qn)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Ex, Psy (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per (Ql)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per (Qn)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per, Pomo (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomo (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Theoretical and methodological coding results for authenticity as a key variable (X) articles (n = 278).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authenticity as a Key Variable (X)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con (M)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con (Ql)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con (Qn)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Ex (M)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Ex (Ql)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Ex (Qn)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Ex, Per (Ql)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Per (Ql)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Per (Qn)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Phen (Ql)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con, Pomo (Ql)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex (Ql)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex (Qn)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex, Per (Ql)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob (Qn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con (Ql)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con (Qn)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Ex (Ql)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Ex (Qn)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Per (Ql)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Per (Qn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Pomo (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Con, Pomo, Per (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob, Ex (Qn)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per (Ql)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per, Ex (Ql)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phen (Ql)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomo (Ql)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Keyword co-frequency analysis

This review used relational techniques of bibliometric analysis to uncover relationships, patterns, and trends in the field (see Cobo, Lopez-Herrera, Herrera-Viedma, & Herrera, 2011). Specifically, keyword co-frequency analysis is a type of content analysis performed to gain insight into the structure of the field and how it has changed over time. This analysis was performed with Textometría online software, which is an open access online tool that analyzes co-occurrences of words within discrete textblocks using connected concept analysis (Lingren & Palm, 2011). Textometría employs min-max normalization techniques to create network maps of textual corpora (see Shalabi, Shaaban, & Kasasbeh, 2006).

As a form of content analysis, Textometría enhances qualitative approaches to large textual corpora by acting as a compass pointing the researcher back to the text for subsequent review and analysis. In this way, it is a part of an iterative process of reviewing the textual corpus, analyzing, returning to the text for concept formation, re-analysis, further review, and so on (see Figure 8). In comparison to content analysis based on word co-occurrence frequency alone, Textometría’s reiterative process encourages qualitative engagement with the text towards concept building and mapping of concept relationships (Fellenor et al., 2018). Each co-occurrence in the Textometría map “represents qualitative concepts that the researcher has arrived at via their interpretive coding of textual elements” (Fellenor et al., 2018, p. 343). This enables an interpretivist approach, actively situating the researcher as the driver of the analysis and concept-building.

Analysis began by collecting the keywords for each of the 458 research articles of the sample and reading through them for familiarity. This was followed by a process of cleaning keywords for uniformity of spelling, consistency of usage, and the removal of common denominator terms, such as authentic, authenticity, and authentication, as this was a key search criteria and necessary commonality. Similarly, tourism, tourist, travel, visitor, and so on, were removed as all articles came from tourism journals (Step 1 in Figure 8). For
example, memory, memories, and memory-making became *Memorable Experience*. Similarly, terms that appear together denoting a single concept were edited to reduce obvious co-occurrences, such as social media (*Social Media*) and sharing economy (*Sharing Economy*).

Textometrica supported an iterative process of assessing the co-occurrences, returning to the textual corpus to develop concepts, and (re-)running the analysis. In this process, efforts were made to further focus the concepts and draw out the strongest co-occurrences (Step 3, *Figure 8*). This included removing redundancies. For example, when dining was listed with restaurant or local food it was removed as it did not add insight to the terms. Further, tangential information was removed, such as keyword references to the specific geographic locations of the research (e.g., Thailand, Arctic) or cultural group (e.g., Hmong, Maasai).

Next, the principles of axial coding were employed (Step 5, *Figure 8*). When terms had considerable overlap and were often found together, they were combined into one theme to reduce exaggeration of their co-frequency, which can overshadow the prevalence of other themes, such as culture and heritage becoming *Cultural Heritage*. Further, themes were developed to capture rather specific terms that were related but dispersed through the corpus. For example, *Moral Ethics* was developed to capture morality, ethics, justice, rights, responsible, and others, which each separately appeared a few times, but when combined appeared 21 times in the sample of 458 articles. Other examples include *Event Festival* developed from events, festivals, concerts, fairs, markets and *Social Interaction* developed from communitas, family, companions, and intersubjectivity (see *Table 5* for more examples).

2.4.1 Co-occurrence visualization. Textometrica allows the researcher to adjust the frequency range included in the analysis (Step 5 of *Figure 8*). When analyzing the entire corpus of keywords from 458 articles, the frequency range was limited to 6-138 (min.-max.) across 102 themes. However, the corpus was also divided into four distinct time series to investigate the change of research themes and emerging trends over time. Notably, authenticity research has demonstrated a clear acceleration from the year 2000. Due to the variable size of each time series, the frequency ranges were adjusted to reflect this exponential growth (*Table 4*).

The maps Textometrica produces use nodes and edges to represent co-frequency relationships. The size of the node indicates frequency of occurrence in the textual corpus, with larger diameters representing higher frequency, and the thickness of the edge connecting two nodes denotes the strength of their co-occurrence. These visual cues were used as a compass for returning to, refining the themes, and then navigating the sample for the discussion of the findings. Exploring the time series maps was useful for observing when concepts appear as nodes, suggesting emergence, and as they grow in size or rhizomatically over time, or even disappear. It is important to note that the maps do not visualize every connection, but only the strongest connections have been chosen for visualization. The specific patterns and trends are further discussed in the *Findings* section. Nevertheless, some broader trends can be observed.
Table 4. Keyword co-occurrence mapping by time series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time series</th>
<th>Articles represented</th>
<th>Number of themes analyzed</th>
<th>Theme frequency range analyzed (min.-max.)</th>
<th>Co-occurrence frequency range mapped (min.-max.)</th>
<th>Total co-occurrences mapped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FULL SAMPLE 1979-2020</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6-138</td>
<td>3-23</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Figure 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-2000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Figure 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2010</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3-30</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Figure 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3-29</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Figure 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4-70</td>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Figure 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The entire sample was analyzed for theme co-occurrence, with Figure 9 illustrating the most frequent co-occurrences, specifically CulturalHeritage, Existential, and StructuralEquationModelling (SEM in the visualizations). However, time series analyses reveal the evolution of research trends over time.

The first time series represents 1979-2000 (Figure 10), which comprises 34 articles over 21 years, including the first to use authentic* in the title or keywords for a tourism-focused journal. As a relatively smaller sample, we can observe a tighter pattern of themes in which the highest frequency theme appeared 14 times. In particular, CulturalHeritage, ArtCrafts, Photography, TouristBubble, and DestinationImage are central nodes.

In the next series, 2001-2010 (Figure 11), the sample increases to 95 articles published over a period of 10 years, while the themes analyzed grows to 51. Many of the same themes from the previous time series still appear, but there is a considerable growth and stretching of the concepts being brought into relation with authenticity. Notably, SocialInteraction and Identity move from peripheral nodes in the previous series to more connected areas of research. Further, we can observe the appearance of Stakeholders, Simulacra, and PopularMedia nodes.

Interestingly, a similar sample size of 100 papers is analyzed in Figure 12, but this represents just a five-year period of 2011-2015. Further, the number of themes nearly doubles from the previous time series to 90 and this is reflected in the visualization with many small nodes suggesting considerable diversification of authenticity research, as well as some cross-conceptual studies. For example, StructuralEquationModeling appears in this series as a popular method for investigating the moderating effects of many variables related to authenticity. Similarly, Existential, Interpretation, Development, and Stakeholders are situated in the center of clusters of activity.

Finally, the five-year period of 2016-2020 (Figure 13) represents tremendous growth in authenticity research with 229 papers analyzed. Due to this larger sample, the number of
themes for co-frequency analysis had to be reduced to 97 based on co-frequency range of 4-70 (min.-max.). This time series suggests an enfolding of research around key themes of *Existential*, *Structural Equation Modeling*, and *Cultural Heritage*, as these themes give rise to large concentrations of research, as well as new clusters of research appearing, including *Sharing Economy*, *PeerToPeerAccommodation* (*P2PAccommodation* in visualization), *Social Media*, and *Nature*.

Figure 9. Co-frequency of research themes 1979-2020
Figure 10. Co-frequency of research themes 1979-2000
Figure 11. Co-frequency of research themes 2001-2010
Figure 12. Co-frequency of research themes 2011-2015
2.4.2 Meta-themes. To determine an organizational structure for the findings, a series of meta-themes were developed. Working with the themes developed from the keywords, 19 broader categories were created. Table 5 details these meta-themes, a sample of the themes that were subsumed within them, and a sampling of the keywords that comprised the themes. These meta-themes were applied to the textual corpus and analyzed for co-occurrence frequency. Figure 14 offers a visualization of the meta-themes and the strength of their co-occurrence in the sample. In particular, CulturalHeritage was the most prominent meta-theme. While all meta-themes had some co-occurrence in the sample, only the strongest co-occurrences were mapped. Focusing on the strength of the co-occurrence frequencies, which is represented by the thickness of the edge connecting the nodes, facilitated an organizational structure for the discussion that follows. In particular, the section Culture, heritage, and commodification is comprised of a discussion of the research trends within the co-occurrences of the meta-themes CulturalHeritage, Commodification, Staged, Marketing, TouristPractices and Performance, while the section Experiential dimensions considers the overlaps of EmbodimentEmotions, SocialInteraction, Identity, and HostGuest. The section Consumer behavior takes up the co-occurrences of ConsumerBehavior, CulturalHeritage, Marketing, and EmbodimentEmotions. Power, stakeholders, and
**sustainability** incorporates the co-occurrences of **CulturalHeritage**, **Sustainability**, **Development**, **Stakeholders**, **Power**, HostGuest, MoralEthics, and Othering. Finally, **Socio-technologies and sharing economies** discusses the meta-themes of **Technologies**, **Hospitality**, **ConsumerBehavior**, and HostGuest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-theme</th>
<th>Sample of themes compiled to produce meta-theme</th>
<th>Sample of keywords comprising the themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staged (n = 110)</td>
<td>Staged, Simulacra, Hyperreality, Atmospherics, ThemePark, ThemeRestaurant, TouristBubble</td>
<td>Staged, Simulacra, Hyperreal, Theming, Atmospherics, Theme Park, Theme Restaurant, Tourist Bubble, Tourist Trap, Phantasmagoria, Illusion, Fantasy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmbodimentEmotions (n = 108)</td>
<td>Embodiment, Emotions, SenseOfPlace, Phenomenology, MemorableExperience, Anxiety, Wellbeing</td>
<td>Embodiment, Emotions, Feelings, Affect, Sense of Place, Belonging, Phenomenology, Memory, Pleasure, Happiness, Anxiety, Wellbeing, Flow, Liminality, Aura, Wellness Tourism, Adventure Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodification (n = 106)</td>
<td>Commodification, ArtCrafts, UNESCOSite, Reproduction, PopularMedia</td>
<td>Commodification, Commoditization, Souvenir (Production/Retail), Art, Handicrafts, Replica, Reproduction, UNESCO, Literature Tourism, Film Tourism, Music Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing (n = 89)</td>
<td>DestinationMarketing, DestinationImage</td>
<td>(Destination/Place) Marketing, Place Branding, Destination Image, Promotional Materials, Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance (n = 68)</td>
<td>Performance, GuidedTour, Storytelling, Interpretation</td>
<td>Performance, Performative, Dance, Concert, Guided Tour, Tour Guide, Storytelling, Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocialInteraction (n = 61)</td>
<td>SocialInteraction, Involvement, CoCreation</td>
<td>Communitas, Family, Crowd, Companion, Involvement, Co-creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (n = 54)</td>
<td>Power, Governance, Resistance</td>
<td>Power, Politics, Government, Resistance, Protest, Colonialism, Post-colonial, Ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>Keywords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Stakeholders, SocialCulturalChange, PlaceIdentity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technologies</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>SocialMedia, SocioTechnological, VirtualReality, OnlineInformation, OnlineTravelWriting, OnlineReview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HostGuest</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>HostGuest, CulturalDistance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Othering</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Othering, Gender, Racism, Gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitality</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hospitality, HotelAccommodation, PeerToPeerAccommodation, SharingEconomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TouristPractices</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Photography, Sightseeing, Souvenir (Purchase/Display), User-Generated Content, Selfie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sustainability, EcoEnvironmental, Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MoralEthics</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>MoralEthics, CorporateSocialResponsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholders, Community, Social Change, Cultural Change, Host Identity, Community Identity, Place Identity, NIMBY

Technology, Social Media, Socio-technical, Virtual Reality, Gamification, Online Review, Online Information, Travel Blog,

Host-Guest Relations, Host-Tourist, Cultural Distance, Volunteer Tourism, Home Stay

Other, Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Gaze, Sexuality, Age, Orientalism,

Photography, Sightseeing, Souvenir (Purchase/Display), User-Generated Content, Selfie

Sustainability, Ecological, Environmental, Ecotourism, Nature Tourism, Eco-conscious, Green Tourism, Last Chance Tourism

Ethics, Morality, Rights, Justice, Values, Care, Corporate Social Responsibility, Responsible Tourism, Sincerity
3. Findings and discussion
What follows is a discussion of the structure, trends, and evolution of authenticity research in tourism studies using the findings from the thematic analysis and keyword co-occurrence analysis. It begins with how the theoretical approaches to authenticity have developed over time. Next, the major areas of research are presented. A discussion of potential future research directions follows.

3.1 Theoretical approaches
In 1999, Wang established theoretical categories for much of the authenticity research in tourism: objective, constructive, postmodern, and existential. Since his seismic paper there have been distinct efforts to further explore these theoretical approaches, making them more robust, as well as introducing new perspectives to enhance the breadth and depth of our investigations. This section takes each of Wang’s four observed approaches and discusses their evolution. Then, the newer approaches are discussed, taking note of their theoretical trajectories.
3.1.1 Objective. Wang (1999) declares objective authenticity “the authenticity of the ‘original’” (p. 353). The use of objective authenticity is premised on measurable qualities of originality, genuineness of (re)production, and as such requires the knowledge and skill of experts. That knowledge and skill are also verifiable and linked to authoritative bodies of certification (Harkin, 1995). Thus, objective authenticity is an epistemological experience (Wang, 1999). Through its use in tourism contexts, it has been further extended and shaped by modernist, essentialist, and realist perspectives.

Objective approaches form the earliest foundations of much of the research on authenticity. Boorstin’s (1961) notion of the “pseudo-event” suggested tourists’ preference for imitation, which inspired MacCannell’s (1973, 1999) “staged authenticity” to counter Boorstin’s condemnation of tourists. MacCannell thus extended authenticity beyond a knowledge claim (a measurable quality) to a feeling, and his front-back stages highlight the role of the imagination in tourist experience, which led to postmodern authenticity. Nevertheless, an emphasis on originality and authority have remained, with researchers aiming to locate objective authenticity in destinations and attractions through “genres of authenticity” (Andriotis, 2013) or “authentic concepts” (Engeset & Elvekrok, 2015). Over time, research has drawn inconsistent conclusions about objective authenticity. While some suggest it is of less importance to tourists, although not completely irrelevant (Mkono, 2013a; Ricky-Boyd, 2012b), others find it a central factor of motivation (Kontogeorgopoulous, 2017b; Waller & Lea, 1999).

There have also been efforts to revise objective authenticity. Reisinger & Steiner (2006a) drew considerable attention by using existential philosophy to advocate for its abandonment. They argue that object-oriented approaches to authenticity are too unstable and “should be replaced by more explicit, less pretentious terms like genuine, actual, accurate, real, and true” (p. 66). Lau (2010), however, suggests a social realist approach to object authenticity as a broader approach that is independent of motivating forces and experiential outcomes.

While objective authenticity is based on measurable qualities, there has been considerable research on the relationality of objective and constructive approaches especially in cultural and heritage contexts (see Chhabra, 2005, 2008, 2012). For example, Bruner (1994) observed four uses of authenticity at a heritage site: original, historical verisimilitude, genuine reproduction, and authorized. Revilla and Dodd (2003) note five factors in art produced for tourists: appearance/utility, tradition and certification, rarity, local production, and cost (see also Littrell & Anderson, 1993). Most recently, Wang, Huang, and Kim (2015) developed a framework for integrating authenticity and integrity, a key principle of UNESCO World Heritage. As a result, it is understandable that tourism research often necessitates the use of both objective and constructive approaches (Figure 7).

3.1.2 Constructive. While also an object-oriented approach, constructive authenticity is used to capture the socially constructed nature of authenticity. As Wang (1999, p. 355) summarizes, “the experience of authenticity is pluralistic, relative to each tourist.” As such, constructive authenticity engages symbolic aspects that are emergent (Cohen, 1988), ideologically informed (Ehrentraut, 1993; Silver, 1993), diffused via globalization (Hughes, 1995), contextual (Salamone, 1997), negotiated (Chhabra, 2008), and a result of compromise (Bernardi, 2019). Thus, it is not surprising that this is the most prevalent approach used in the sample (Figure 5).
Under the broad umbrella of constructive authenticity, we can include studies of the semiotics of authenticity. Culler (1981) works from semiotics in the development of his idea of symbolic authenticity, which highlights the willingness of tourists to perceive objects as authentic (see also Thomsen & Vester, 2016). Indeed, an important aspect of a constructive approach is that it accommodates the multiple and sometimes contradictory elements of authenticity noted in tourists’ experiences (see Bruner, 1994; Chhabra, Healy, & Sills, 2003; Dueholm & Smed, 2014; Rickly-Boyd, 2012b; Tan & Kusumo, 2020; Yi; Fu; Yu; & Jiang, 2018; Wang, 2007).

While tourists’ perceptions are often the focus of constructive approaches, there are also investigations of the authors of authenticity discourses (Cohen, 2002; Cole, 2007; Duffy, 2019; Fawcett & Cormack, 2001; Hughes, 1995; Maddox, 2015; Robbie, 2008) or what is termed “a producer view” (Bryce, Murdy, & Alexander, 2017; Chhabra, 2005; Farrelly, Kock, & Josiassen, 2019; Lunchaprasith & Macleod, 2018; Mantecon & Huete, 2008; Xie & Shi, 2019; Zatori, Smith, & Puczko, 2018). Such research often considers the role of power in the production of authenticity and authentication processes. Moreover, we can observe a cluster of research on the changing perceptions of authenticity among tourism stakeholders (Schilar & Keskitalo, 2018; Tiberghien & Xie, 2018; Wall & Xie, 2005).

Importantly, the social and cultural processes that underline constructive authenticity mean that it changes over time, which is why Cohen (1988) conceptualized it as emergent. In the last decade, this has been more thoroughly developed with performance theories (Cohen & Cohen, 2012; Zhu, 2012). For example, Olsen (2002) uses ritual theory to extend constructive authenticity beyond object-oriented scenarios to social experiences (see also Carter, 2019). He argues that theories of performance and ritual illustrate how some experiences of existential authenticity are socially constructed. The social construction of authenticity has become essential to considering the roles of intersubjectivity, emic experience, and power in authentication processes. While still related to constructive authenticity, authentication is better captured under the performative approach and is therefore taken up below.

3.1.3 Postmodern. For the most part, postmodern authenticity has come be associated with cynicism (Vidon et al., 2018). According to Wang (1999, p. 357), “implied in the approach of postmodernism is the justification of the contrived, the copy, and imitation.” However, this justification extends to the ways that staged authenticity can be a protective substitute for touristic experience of vulnerable communities and landscapes, as well as enhancing experience through greater aesthetic enjoyment and technological augmentation (Cohen, 1995; Douglas & Raento, 2004). Thus, to understand the significance of fantasy, simulacra, and hyperreality to authenticity, postmodern approaches are applied.

This is particularly prominent in studies of media-inspired tourism, including film and television (Buchmann et al., 2010; Larson et al., 2013; Lovell, 2019; Rittichainuwat et al., 2017). Such research highlights the significance of locating fictional places in physical landscapes and tourists’ use of imagination to experience the story, which Lovell (2019) terms “fairytale authenticity.” Further, Vidon et al. (2018) extend the notions of hyperreality and simulacra beyond the built environment to natural settings, where the “fantasy of authenticity” arguably remains seductive. However, to understand how and why this fantasy beckons has led to the recent infusion of psychoanalytic approaches, discussed below.

(1999) was not the first to suggest an existential approach (see Hamilton-Smith, 1987; Pearce & Moscardo, 1986), he was the first to develop a framework with the distinct dimensions of intrapersonal (bodily feelings and self-making) and interpersonal (communitas and family ties). Indeed, this approach has witnessed considerable uptake. It is used by 22.2% of the sample overall (Figure 6). However, this is not without challenges and limitations.

Existential authenticity is informed by a broad interpretation of existentialism. As a result, the intrapersonal and interpersonal dimensions attend to various forces that activate an experience of an authentic self. The dimensions have been widely applied and supported (see Breathnach, 2006; Gillen, 2016; Kim & Jamal, 2007; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2017a; Rickly-Boyd, 2012c). However, researchers have also demonstrated that existential authenticity is more than a purely subjective experience but is enacted through the interaction of objective and constructive components (Belhassen et al., 2008; Buchmann et al., 2010; Cook, 2010; Gillen, 2016; Kirillova et al., 2017a, 2017b; Kirillova & Lehto, 2015; Kolar & Zabkar, 2010; Kontogeorgopoulous, 2017a; Lamont, 2014; Moufahim & Lichrou, 2019; Rickly-Boyd, 2013b; Zerva, 2015).

Further, the dimensions of existential authenticity have been explored and contextualized within broader lifestyle choices. Kirillova and Lehto’s (2015) existential model of the vacation cycle, noting the role of liminality, awe, and fade-out effects has been particularly innovative. Indeed, the liminality of tourism has been highlighted as a key facilitator of self-discovery and self-change (Brown, 2013; Canavan, 2018; Wearing et al., 2016), while existential estrangement (Serhat & Uzuncan, 2020) or existential avoidance (Canavan, 2020) are proposed as motivators for tourism choices. More recent research has sought to extend beyond the established dimensions of existential authenticity to incorporate mindfulness (Lengyel, 2020), happiness and wellbeing (Yu et al., 2020), and inauthenticity and hypocrisy (Mkono, 2020). While much of this research casts a positive light on existentially authentic experiences, it has been suggested that these experiences can also induce existential anxiety (Kirillova et al., 2017a, 2017b; Sharma & Rickly, 2019; Vidon & Rickly, 2018).

Existential authenticity has proved a useful addition to the canon, as it was severely lacking a means for interrogating activity-based experiences of authenticity. However, the problem now is that it is too widely used, and increasingly distanced from existential philosophy, and encompassing any experiential dimension. This poses a serious problem, but also presents opportunities (see Kirillova, 2019). Many have turned to Heidegger (Brown, 2013; Light & Brown, 2020; Pearce & Moscardo, 1986; Steiner & Reisinger, 2006a), as well as Sartre (Brown, 2013; Wassler & Kirillova, 2019) to enhance its philosophical depth, but not without critique (Shepherd, 2015).

3.1.5 Phenomenological. Broadly understood as the study of lived experience, phenomenology offers potential to extend studies of authenticity and experience beyond existentialism. However, it remains peripheral in the field. Phenomenology is concerned with consciousness, intentionality, embodiment, and first-person experience. While Husserl’s phenomenology is more realist and descriptive, it was incorporated into some facets of existentialism, such as Heidegger’s hermeneutic phenomenology and Merleau-Ponty’s embodiment. Some researchers use phenomenology to inform their studies of tourist experience, such as Kirillova’s et al. (2017b) use of a phenomenological method in their study of existential authenticity; yet it is less often linked directly to the conceptualization of authenticity (see also Andriotis, 2009).
There is a small cluster of researchers who take a distinctly geographic approach when relating authenticity and phenomenology. For Li (2000), it is the manifestation of geographical consciousness in experiential learning and tourists’ person-place bond that are essential to authentic experiences. Jamal and Hill (2004) use the concept of sense of place to articulate the phenomenological interaction between embodiment and space that results in a “personal authenticity.” Hayllar and Griffin (2005) engage with place more broadly to link intimacy and authenticity. Collectively, these suggest there are also performative aspects to phenomenological approaches.

3.1.6 Performative. Beyond Wang’s (1999) activity-oriented approach, many instances can be observed in which experiences of authenticity are enacted, giving rise to social belonging, emotional connection, and so on (see McIntosh & Prentice, 1999; Olsen, 2002). As such, performative approaches have been particularly illuminating for examining tour guiding, storytelling, and audience participation (see Cohen-Aharoni, 2017; Overend, 2012). More broadly, performance theories are useful for capturing the relationality of various approaches that may be acting together. For example, Rickly-Boyd (2012a) applies the concept of aura to understand the intersubjective experience of authenticity as tourists simultaneously engage with objective and constructive authenticities. Szmigin et al. (2017) further extends the intersubjectivity of aura to the socio-spatial dimensions of existential authenticity.

Performative approaches also include research on the social processes that drive authentication. Authentication incorporates objective, constructive, and existential approaches, but specifically attends to the social processes that enact them. Cohen and Cohen (2012) identify two authentication processes: hot and cool. Cool authentication comprises formal or official acts which use knowledge and/or expertise to declare authenticity. Hot authentication consists of informal, reiterative acts that are accumulative and self-reinforcing, accompanied by emotional commitments to the object of veneration. Importantly, Cohen and Cohen (2012) remind us that these are not mutually exclusive and are often observed operating in tandem. In particular, the role of power in authentication processes has been a popular topic of investigation (see Bear et al., 2020; Chatzopoulou et al., 2019; Frisvoll, 2013; Martin, 2010; Taylor, 2001; Xu et al., 2014; Zhou et al.; 2015; Zhu, 2012). Increasingly, this research is moving into online environments through studies of socio-technological authentication (Lugosi, 2016) and algorithmic authenticity (van Nuenen, 2019).

3.1.7 Psychoanalytic. Comprising just four of the papers in the sample, a psychoanalytic approach is among the newest additions to the canon. It offers unique potential for new avenues of research by addressing a distinct gap. Currently, existential authenticity is the only approach that addresses issues of self-identity. However, psychoanalytic theory suggests that authenticity is a fantasy that can never be fully grasped, but nonetheless remains a salient motivator (Knudsen, et al., 2016).

A psychoanalytic approach begins from the premise of alienation, as does existentialism and Marxism; however, it argues that alienation creates a lack for which the fantasy of authenticity promises to assuage. Thereby, it enhances a postmodern approach by informing investigation of tourist desire, motivation, and identity (see Vidon, 2019; Vidon et al., 2018; Vidon & Rickly, 2018). Moreover, a psychoanalytic approach is unique in highlighting the ways that negative aspects of experience can, in fact, contribute to or be rationalized as authentic. Thus, it returns to a fundamental issue highlighted by MacCannell (1973, 1999) – “the quest for authenticity” – and in doing so it foregrounds the quest. As MacCannell (2008, p. 337) himself states, reflecting on the common misreading of his concept: “staged
authenticity has never been anything more than a screen for our unrealizable dreams and desires, an opportunity for make-believe, a chance to enter a myth, a fantasy-land.”

3.1.8 Alienation. While this review is specifically about authenticity, in recent years there has been a revival of authenticity’s dialectical, alienation (Canavan, 2018, 2019; Groot & Horst, 2014; Kirillova, 2019; Knudsen et al., 2016; Rickly-Boyd, 2013a; Serhat & Uzuncar, 2020; Vidon, 2019; Vidon & Rickly, 2018; Xue et al., 2014:). It is a concept that cuts across Marxism, existentialism, and psychoanalysis as an underlying experience or condition of (post)modern life. According to both Boorstin and MacCannell, alienation is the driver of tourists. While alienation is accepted by Boorstin’s tourists, according to MacCannell it is resisted in the touristic quest for authenticity (see also Hamilton-Smith, 1987). Thus, alienation and its embodied feeling of anxiety have been at the center of recent research on experience and authenticity (Canavan, 2020; Kirillova et al., 2017a, 2017b; Serhat & Uzuncar, 2020; Sharma & Rickly, 2019; Vidon, 2019; Vidon & Rickly, 2018). Yet, some research suggests that tourism itself may create or enhance alienation, so that resistance to either tourism market forces (Hughes, 1995) or information technology-infused tourism (Tribe & Mkono, 2017) are where moments of authenticity can be found.

3.2 Culture, heritage, and commodification
One of the most prolific and persistent themes of authenticity research in tourism relates to culture and heritage. This comprises the most prominent meta-theme (see Figure 14 and Table 5), often in relation to staging and commodification. These themes are found throughout each time series and remain strongly represented within the full sample. Exploring its pervasiveness, this section highlights the ways culture and heritage are examined in relation to authenticity and how this has changed over time.

In the first time series representing 1979-2000 (Figure 10) CulturalHeritage and ArtCrafts are central nodes connected to themes of Souvenir, Commodification, and Architecture, among others, that give rise to questions of objective and constructive authenticities. Wang (1999) observes a similar evolution in authenticity research, inspiring him to summarize an object-oriented prevalence of authenticity research. The earliest work in this regard focused on the accuracy of culture and heritage representations (see Cohen, 1988; Mellinger, 1994; Pitchford, 1995; Silver, 1993; Sternberg, 1997) and the commodification of culture and heritage through the consumption of art, handicrafts, and souvenirs (see Anderson & Littrell, 1995; Cohen, 1993; Littrell, Anderson, & Brown, 1993; Shenhav-Keller, 1993).

3.2.1 Representation. Broadly, there has been an interest in examining the authenticity of culture and heritage representation. This includes tourists’ photographic representations (see Aiello & Gendelman, 2008; Chalfen, 1979; Cohen et al., 1992; Herath et al., 2020; Katahenggam, 2020), as well as representation in destination landscapes and built environments (see Gotham, 2007; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2017b; Mura & Lovelock, 2009; Rockett & Ramsey, 2017; Vesey & Dimanche, 2003) and in specific attractions, including museums and living history sites (see Metro-Roland, 2009; Ramshaw & Gammon, 2010; Rickly-Boyd, 2012b; Tiberghien & Lennon, 2019). Within this research, there are particular clusters employing critical approaches that shed light on othering practices, including post/neocolonialism in the marketing and representation of culture (see Mellinger, 1994; Waitt, 2000; White, 2007; Yea, 2002). While this appears in the earliest time series (Figure 10), over time this research becomes more aligned with studies of Power, stakeholders, and sustainability, and so is taken up further in that section.
The representation of culture and heritage in destination marketing has been a prolific topic. In fact, the globally renowned brand of cultural heritage, UNESCO World Heritage, occurs so often as a keyword in the sample that it appears as a distinct node from 2011-2015 (Figure 12) onwards. While initially linked to CulturalHeritage and GuidedTour, in 2016-2020 (Figure 13) it moves to CulturalHeritage and Loyalty. Much of this research is focused on the effect of perceived authenticity on consumer behavior at UNESCO sites (see Fu, 2019; Kim, et al., 2018; Park et al., 2019; Shen et al., 2014; Shi et al., 2020; Yi, et al., 2018).

Inevitably, the interest in culture and heritage representations shifted online, particularly to destination marketing websites, travel blogs, and social media. As a result, netnography has been a popular methodology (see Banyai, 2010; Bernardi, 2019; Jyotsna & Maurya, 2019; Pearce et al., 2015; Torabian & Aria, 2013; Walter, 2016). Indeed, the node Netnography first appears in the 2011-2015 map (Figure 12), linking Constructive authenticity to Staged and OnlineReview. This work continues a trend towards more critical analysis of authenticity and representation by drawing attention to the staging mechanisms that influence tourist perceptions (see Mkono, 2012, 2013a, 2013b; Zerva, 2015). The role of online environments and social media have had a considerable impact on authenticity research, so it is the focus of a separate later section: Socio-technologies and sharing economies.

3.2.2 Souvenirs. While the theme of Commodification is substantial in series 2001-2010 (Figure 11), it reduces in prevalence in subsequent time series as it returns to more firmly link CulturalHeritage and Souvenir, similar to how it appears in the mapping for the full sample (Figure 9). Indeed, there has been an interest in cultural heritage representations in souvenirs, specifically exploring the effects of globalization on souvenir symbolism (see Dumbrovksa & Fiavlova, 2020; Hashimoto & Telfer, 2007; Schilar & Keskitalo, 2018; Soukhathammavong & Park, 2019). However, more prominent has been an examination of authenticity and souvenir purchase behavior, which is examined through the lens of Consumer behavior below. This is particularly observed in time series 2011-2015 (Figure 12) where the node of PerceivedValue appears connected to Souvenir illustrating the rise of the cluster of quantitative research on the relationship of souvenir authenticity to perceived value and purchase intention. This is in line with trends around CulturalHeritage, more generally, which increasingly attend to authenticity as a variable in consumer behavior.

3.2.3 Staging. Commodification and representation of culture and heritage have also been studied from the perspective of staging in which aspects of cultural simplification, stereotyping, and homogeneity are actively employed to meet to tourists’ expectations. In fact, some of the earliest theories of authenticity in tourism research came from research with a particular interest in its pseudo-events (Boorstin, 1961) and staging mechanisms (MacCannell, 1973).

Staging has remained a common thread of inquiry over time (see Chhabra et al., 2003; Crang, 1996; Daugstad & Kirchengast, 2013; Moscardo & Pearce, 1986; Wang, 2007). It has been research on staging, replica, and fantasy that has given rise to postmodern approaches to authenticity, which transition from object-oriented to activity-oriented by highlighting the significance of the imagination in transforming objects into fantastical experiences (see Douglass & Raento, 2004; Lovell, 2019). This can be observed in the 2001-2010 time series (Figure 11) where Postmodern authenticity arises in connection with PopularMedia, which is further connected to Simulacra. Interestingly, this cluster of research disappears from
subsequent time series, thus explaining its relative peripheral location on the full sample map (Figure 9).

Importantly, tourism inspired by popular culture, including film, television, and literature, tends to combine aspects of objective, constructive, postmodern, and more recently existential authenticity, to explore the storytelling mechanisms required to transition from fictional media to on-site tourists’ experiences (see Buchmann et al., 2010; Carter, 2019; Cohen-Hattab, 2004; Fawcett & Cormack, 2001; Larson et al., 2013; Rittichainuwat et al., 2017; Torchin, 2002). However, attention to authentic experiences can be identified as a distinct area of research on its own, and so is the focus of the following section: **Experiential dimensions**.

3.2.4 Performing culture and heritage. In the 2001-2010 time series (Figure 11), the growth of research on the themes of Performance and EventFestival illustrate the move away from static objects of culture and heritage to interest in more dynamic settings (see Chhabra, 2005; Taylor, 2001; Terry, 2008; Valdez, 2007). In particular, Xie and Lane (2006) develop a lifecycle model of aboriginal arts performances as a way to capture the organic and ever-evolving nature of cultural performances within the context of tourism attractions and visitor expectations.

More specific themes of GuidedTour, Interpretation, and Storytelling also engage performance theories and performativity to understand meaning-making processes of museum interpretations, historical re-enactments, and tour guiding (Carnegie & McCabe, 2008; Gijanto, 2011; Io & Hallo, 2011; Knox, 2008; Martin, 2010; Overend, 2012; Soewarlan, 2019; Walby & Piche, 2015; Williams, 2013; Wong, 2013; Zhu, 2012). This research often concerns objective and constructive approaches to authenticity, while also incorporating the emotive nature of performances thus giving rise to the significance of experiential dimensions of authenticity.

3.3 Experiential dimensions

The articulation of an activity-oriented approach to authenticity by Wang (1999) has been a fountainhead for authenticity research. Existential authenticity, as it was originally devised, offers a broad framework for examining the intrapersonal (bodily feelings and self-identity) and interpersonal (communitas and family ties) dimensions of authenticity and tourism experience. Experiential dimensions are addressed in many different areas of authenticity research, but most prominently occur within the meta-themes of EmbodimentEmotions, SocialInteraction, Identity, and HostGuest (see Figure 14 and Table 5).

In time series 2001-2010 (Figure 11), existential authenticity first makes an appearance linked specifically to Identity, which is a central node for SocialInteraction, NarrativeAnalysis, and Backpacker. More peripheral in this time series are Emotions and Embodiment, demonstrating the burgeoning research interest in these experiential dimensions. By the 2016-2020 time series (Figure 13), Existential is the most prominent node, with connections highlighting both efforts at theoretical development of authenticity (see Theoretical approaches) and trends to understand experiential dimensions of consumer behavior, mainly through quantitative analysis (see Consumer Behavior). Indeed, the explosion of research on existential authenticity in the last decade is also captured in analysis of the full sample, where it is also a central node (Figure 9).
Relatively, *Phenomenology* began to surface as a peripheral theme in the first time series *(Figure 10)*, connected to *TouristBubble*, and then in 2001-2010 *(Figure 11)* it was connected to *SenseOfPlace*. Its usage offers a theoretical lens for examining the lived experience of authenticity (see Andriots, 2009; Hayllar & Griffin, 2005; Jamal & Hill, 2004; Li, 2000). However, it largely disappears from the sample after this and is not represented in the subsequent mappings. It is suspected that phenomenology was subsumed under the concept of place in subsequent research and the lived experience of authenticity was also captured under an existential approach which grew in popularity over time.

3.3.1 Identity. Experiential dimensions have been especially useful for researchers interested in the role of authenticity in tourists’ self-identity (see Brown, 2013; Cary, 2004; de Groot & van der Horst, 2014; Hough, 2011; Noy, 2004; Spracklen et al., 2013), with backpacking (Canavan, 2018; Kannisto, 2018; Maoz, 2006; Noy, 2004; Obenour, 2004; Serhat & Uzuncan, 2020) and volunteer tourism (Crossley, 2012; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2017a) being particularly popular areas of investigation. This research sheds light on the ways tourists seek to find themselves through tourism, the performative aspects of identity, and the construction of self through touristic practices, including photography, blogging, and social media. For example, Mcwha et al. (2016) uncover the identity politics and anti-tourist sentiments used by professional travel writers, while Kane (2012) and van Nuenen (2016) turn to travel bloggers who use discourses of existential authenticity to simultaneously sell and perform their self-identities. While some research is focused on individual identities, it is also acknowledged that interpersonal relations play important roles in self-making and in the experiential dimensions of authenticity.

3.3.2 Social interaction. Being among others, whether companions, family, or in a crowd, can have a considerable impact on touristic experience. This is evidenced across the sample, which resulted in the meta-theme *SocialInteraction* comprising many aspects of sociality *(Table 5)*. This area of authenticity research first took note of tourists’ social interactions as communitas – short-lived friendships in the destination (see Foster, 1986), and later how the presence of others can be essential to the co-creation of touristic experience (see Loureiro & Sarmento, 2019; Smizgin, et al. 2017).

Research in this area also considers how social interaction relates to self-identity practices (see Belhassen & Caton, 2008; Buchmann, et al., 2010; Kim & Jamal, 2007) and assessments of social interactions between tourists and host communities (see Gale et al., 2013; Hough, 2011; Mehmetoğlu & Olsen, 2003; Mura, 2015; Tiberghien et al., 2017; Tucker, 2001; Unger et al., 2020; Uriely et al., 2009; Wassler & Kirillova, 2019) *(Figure 11 and Figure 12)*. Finally, in 2016-2020 *(Figure 13)*, and as captured in the analysis of the full sample *(Figure 9)*, *SocialInteraction* becomes more firmly connected to *Existential* and *Emotions* illustrating the ways these aspects of authentic experiences so often overlap.

3.3.3 Emotions and embodiment. Through the rise of experiential dimensions of authenticity also came greater attention to emotions, feelings, and embodiment, which first appear in the 2001-2010 time series *(Figure 11)* as peripheral nodes stemming from *SocialInteraction*. Research during this time broadly considered intrapersonal dimensions of authenticity, including medical and wellness tourism (Cook, 2010; Steiner & Reisinger, 2006b) and musical events (Connell & Gibson, 2004; Matheson, 2008).

By 2011-2015 *(Figure 12)*, these themes move in separate directions with *Emotions* shifting to be more strongly connected to *Atmospherics* and *StructuralEquationModeling*, illustrating
the rise of existential authenticity variables in consumer behavior studies. Then, in 2016–2020 (Figure 13), Emotions re-positions to be most strongly connected to Existential, Identity, SocialInteraction, and WellBeing. As discussed in the previous sections on identity and social interaction, emotion is a crucial variable for understanding oneself. It can be influenced by seeking experiences that are solitary or with others, as is observed in diaspora tourism (see Bryce et al., 2017; Carter, 2019).

While still relatively new, as suggested by the small peripheral node of WellBeing connected to Emotions in Figure 9, there is a small cluster of research forming around the relations of authenticity, happiness, and mindfulness (see McIntosh & Prentice, 1999; Yu et al., 2020; Lengyel, 2020), as well as the feelings of anxiety (Canavan, 2018; Kirillova & Lehto, 2015; Kirillova et al., 2017a; Vidon & Rickly, 2018).

Concurrently, Embodiment maintains its position as a peripheral node related to Performance in 2011–2015 (Figure 12) and Nature in 2016–2020 (Figure 13). This suggests emerging and evolving areas of authenticity research, which are also captured in the assessment of the full sample (Figure 9). Indeed, authenticity research which attends specifically to embodiment is particularly concentrated in nature, adventure, and sport tourism (see Lamont, 2014; Maddox, 2015; Mordue, 2016; Vidon et al., 2018; Vidon, 2019), which is not surprising given the active role of the body in these experiences. Further, researchers can also be observed examining embodied practices to identity politics (see Gillen, 2016; Sharma & Rickly; 2019; Zhu, 2012).

3.3.4 Experience economy. In a sub-set of the research on authenticity and touristic experience, there has been a distinct effort to understand the producer and managerial implications of authenticity and experiential design (see Duan et al., 2019; Le et al., 2020). In particular, the notion of staging has been further refined in terms of atmospherics, where researchers are attuned to multisensory experiences that spark feelings, emotions, and memories. The theme of Atmospherics first appears in 2001–2010 (Figure 11) as a peripheral node connected to EventFestival, with research examining the role of the built and social environments of events, markets, and festivals on visitor experience (see Carnegie & McCabe, 2008; Chhabra, 2005; Chhabra et al., 2003; Connell & Gibson, 2004; Matheson, 2008; Terry, 2008).

In 2011–2015, Atmospherics moves to being situated between StructuralEquationModeling, EthnicRestaurant, and Emotions (Figure 12), then transitions to a peripheral node again connected to EthnicRestaurant in 2016–2020 (Figure 13). This concentration of research is specifically related to gastronomic experience (see Albrecht, 2011; Hillel et al., 2013; Jang et al., 2012; Wong et al., 2016) and tourists’ restaurant choice (see Kim & Jang, 2016; Skinner et al., 2020). Some of this uses structural equation modeling to ascertain the subtle relations of experiential and consumer behavior variables (see Domínguez-Quintero et al., 2019; Kim & Jang, 2016; Shafieizadeh et al., 2020; Zatori et al., 2018).

3.4 Consumer behavior
Consumer behavior is one of the meta-themes of the review (see Table 5), under which the earliest themes incorporate authenticity as a broad variable of motivation, decision-making, and satisfaction can be found (see Apostolakis, 2003; Moscardo & Pearce, 1986; Waller & Lea, 1999). In the 2011–2015 time series (Figure 12) motivation is more specifically linked to CulturalHeritage and StructuralEquationModeling, which is a central node for many distinct
aspects of consumer behavior: BehaviorIntention, Involvement, Loyalty. Further, in the 2016-2020 time series (Figure 13), the connections to StructuralEquationModeling grow to include PerceivedQuality, Satisfaction, VisitIntention, and Existential dimensions. This emergence and growth of structural equation modeling of authenticity as a variable of consumer behavior is also reflected in the marked uptick in quantitative analysis (Table 1). Prior to 2016, quantitative methodologies represented only 19.2% of the sample, from 2016-2020 they represent 45.4%.

Notably, Kolar and Zabkar’s (2010) study has been influential in this trend. Considering the various interpretations and attributes of authenticity, the authors adopt a managerial standpoint to understand how the concept is related to motivation and satisfaction. In particular, they ask if “authenticity is primarily the driver (motive) or the outcome (experience, evaluative judgment) of tourist behavior” (2010, p. 653). Through structural equation modeling, they develop a processual, consumer-based model suggesting that while related, object-based and existential authenticity are not “standalone” concepts, but they should be understood as mediators of behavior intentions (2010, p. 660).

3.4.1 Authenticity as a variable of consumer behavior. As is shown throughout the time series visualizations, subsequent research following Kolar and Zabkar (2010) continue a trend towards quantitative models that situate authenticity as a variable in tourist motivation and/or satisfaction (see Dominguez-Quintero et al., 2018; Lin & Liu, 2018; Park et al., 2019; Shi et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2012). This also includes, more specifically, perceived authenticity of destination image to behavioral intention (see Abascal, 2019; Jimenez-Barreto et al., 2019; Ramkissoon & Úysal, 2011; Taheri et al., 2018).

Further, a cluster of research interrogating the subtleties of satisfaction in relation to authenticity, including brand loyalty, (re-)visit intention, perceived quality, and perceived value is observed (see Akhoondnejad, 2016; Fu, 2019; See & Goh, 2018; Yi et al., 2017; Yi et al., 2018). There is also considerable interest in the relationship of perceived value to souvenir purchasing behavior (see Fu et al., 2018; Lin & Wang, 2012; Xie et al., 2012). Additionally, a concentration of research on involvement as a strong indicator of perceived authenticity develops (see Gao et al., 2020; Lu et al., 2015; Scarpi et al., 2019; Zhang & Xie, 2019).

Interestingly, food and restaurants appear as a distinct cluster of research in this sample. This first appears in the 2011-2015 time series (Figure 12). This research examines perceived authenticity of food to destination revisit intention (see Chung et al., 2017; Robinson & Clifford, 2012); the role of authenticity in food familiarity/novelty and perceived risk (see Ozdemir & Seyitoglu, 2017; Youn & Kim, 2018); and how restaurant purchase intention is influenced by perceived authenticity of food attributes, restaurant image, and emotions while dining (see Kim et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2019; Youn & Kim, 2017).

3.4.2 Market segmentation. Overarching these efforts to explore the nuances of consumer behavior there is a concentration of work aiming to identify tourist market segments that can be labelled as “authentic tourists” or “authenticity seeking tourists” (see Lenglet & Giannelloni, 2015; Rittichainuwat et al., 2017; Yeoman et al., 2007). For example, Chhabra (2010) focuses specifically on Generation Y’s perspectives on authenticity, uncovering the ideologies that influence their distinctive heritage tourism decision-making.
3.5 Power, stakeholders, and sustainability
The theme of Power is present in all the visualizations, although it changes positions slightly over time. In the first series, 1979-2000 (Figure 10), it is connected to CulturalHeritage, Architecture, and HostGuest. In 2001-2010 (Figure 11), Power reduces in size slightly, while connecting to the emerging theme of Stakeholders and Development. Then, in 2011-2015 (Figure 12) Stakeholders becomes a central node for Power, Development, Sustainability, and Production, and while less prominent in 2016-2020 (Figure 13), the thematic connections remain similar during this time and in the sample as whole (Figure 9).

3.5.1 Power and ideology. The earliest research on authenticity and power is focused on ideology and politics. This includes studies of tourists’ photographic practices capturing host-guest interactions (see Chalfen, 1979; Cohen, Nir, & Almagor, 1992) and studies of authenticity and the ideological agendas of tourism promotion (see Ehrentaut, 1993; Pitchford, 1995; Shenhav-Keller, 1993). While a small sub-set of the earliest research on authenticity, this quickly grew to studies of host-guest agency and stakeholder engagement.

3.5.2 Host-guest relations. In the earliest time series (Figure 10), HostGuest and Power were connected, but in 2001-2010 (Figure 11) HostGuest becomes more associated with Gaze, Staged, and SocialInteraction. It then disappears from later time series, subsumed under the broader theme of Stakeholders or the more specific theme Indigenous depending on the research focus. These shifts illustrate both a change in language used in tourism research, where “host-guest” began to fall out of fashion in favor with the rise of stakeholder theory and shifts in research began to locate power outside of politics, broadly, and within tourist gazes (see Halvakisz, 2006; Maoz, 2006) thereby highlighting the specificity of marginalized groups, notably indigenous cultures. Thus, much of this research has shed light on the unequal power relations of hosts and guests, wherein tourists’ preferences supersede local residents’ place identity (see Bear et al., 2020; Bell, 2015; Soukhathammavong & Park, 2019; Su et al., 2019; Wang, 2007). This disparity in agency can result in practices of unwelcome against tourists (see Fan et al.; 2019; Gale et al., 2013) and acts of resistance (see Sorokina et al., 2018; Wei et al., 2017).

3.5.3 Stakeholder engagement. Power remains an undercurrent of much stakeholder research in the sample. Some of which highlights the loss of community identity and authenticity that can result from the lack of stakeholder engagement and the othering practices of tourism (see Koot, 2016; Ounanian, 2019; Montero, 2020; Robbie, 2008; Xie, 2010; Xu et al., 2014; Yea, 2002). Conversely, some studies focus on the empowerment that comes with inclusion in development processes (see Croft, 2018; Davis, 2007; Domenico & Miller, 2012; Xie & Shi, 2019). Further, research that aims to give voice to destination stakeholders by investigating their perceptions of authenticity in the tourism developments taking place in their home communities is observed (see Cole, 2007; Lunchaprasith & Macleod, 2018; Macleod, 2009; Mantecon & Huete, 2008; Thomsen & Vester, 2016; Zhou et al., 2015). A particular cluster of this research frames stakeholder engagement and authenticity within sustainability discourses (see Alonso et al., 2010; Cohen, 2002; Deville et al., 2016; Tucker, 2001; Wall & Xie, 2005) or social corporate responsibility (Parrish & Downing, 2020).

3.5.4 Responsible, ethical, sustainable. Of the meta-themes, MoralEthics is among the smaller and more peripheral (Figure 14), representing research generally interested in ethics, morality, responsible tourism, justice, rights, and so on (Table 5). These themes do not appear in the time series analyses until 2011-2015 (Figure 12) and then as a small, fringe node connected to SocialInteraction, and in the following time series, 2016-2020 (Figure 13), it
remains relatively peripheral, but grows to be connected to both *Nature* and *Discourse Analysis*. When examining the whole sample, this theme can be found situated between *Sustainability* and *Identity* (Figure 9).

Most broadly, research within this area is interested in the consequences of tourist behavior, including tourists’ moral or ethical judgments of themselves and others (Foster, 1986). Tourism with ethical or responsible undertones, such as volunteer tourism and ecotourism, are used as a way of rationalizing or elevating touristic choices, while also linking them more directly to personal identities (Canavan, 2018; Crossley, 2012; Kontogeorgopoulous, 2003; Mcwha et al., 2016; Rickly & Vidon, 2017). For example, Mkono (2020) applies a moral hypocrisy framework to uncover the eco-hypocrisy and inauthenticity of supposedly environmentally conscious tourism behavior represented in social media.

Additionally, a sub-set of this research considers the role of sustainability on authenticity of experience. While Sims (2009) examines local food choices as a means of enhancing sustainability and authenticity of experience, Biraglia, et al. (2018) assess sustainable tourism decision-making and tourists’ attraction to the altruistic images of tourism companies (see also Wu et al., 2020).

### 3.6 Socio-technologies and sharing economies

Considering the time scale of this review, 1979-2020, it is to be expected that the role of technologies would not be observed until the later time series. However, what was not anticipated was the significance this research would have when analyzing the full sample, thus comprising the meta-theme *Technologies* (Figure 14, Table 5). While relatively peripheral, this meta-theme is most prominently connected to *Marketing*, *Consumer Behavior*, and *Hospitality*, and by examining the emergence and evolution of its comprising themes over time, it is forecast to grow in prominence.

#### 3.6.1 Technologies

The themes *Technology* and *Virtual Reality* first appear in the 2011-2015 time series (Figure 12) as peripheral nodes stemming from *Interpretation*. However, these themes disappear from the subsequent time series and do not appear in the analysis of the full sample. This suggests a distinct burst of research period that has since evolved towards other areas. Indeed, there was a particular interest in examining the role of digital technologies and virtual/augmented realities on tourists’ experiences and perceptions of authenticity. This research assessed virtual reality as a tool for offering potential tourists a glimpse of the on-site experience (see Guttentag, 2010; Jimenez-Barreto et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2019).

Moreover, virtual reality and digital supplements may offer opportunities for expanding touristic experience within vulnerable sites (see Bohlín & Brandt, 2014; Dueholm & Smed, 2014; Frenzel & Frisch, 2020; Guttentag, 2010). This is an area of research that has tremendous potential for understanding the extent to which gamification, augmented realities, and digital enhancements affect authenticity.

#### 3.6.2 Social Media

While the themes *Online Review* and *Netnography* first appear in the 2011-2015 time series (Figure 12), in 2016-2020 they shift to form part of a cluster of research centered on *Social Media*, which is also branches to the themes of *Online Travel Writing* and *Destination Image* (Figure 13). A similar cluster of research is observed in the analysis of the whole sample (Figure 9). While some of this research has focused on the analysis of cultural representations in online environments (blogs, social media, destination information, etc.), which was discussed above in the section *Culture*. 
heritage, and commodification, we can also observe broader trends that investigate the distinct ways authenticity discourses surface and users engage in authentication processes on social media.

Tourism related user-generated content places the individual in a position of power and privilege. Yet, this content is shared on platforms that espouse populist, egalitarian, and non-elitist values, which inspires questions about authentication processes. Social networking sites and social media platforms are virtual spaces where objects, actions, and experiences are ascribed value by users, and the negotiation of this value employs authentication processes connecting human and non-human actors (see Kim & Kim, 2020; Wang & Alasuutari, 2017). More specifically, van Nuinen (2019) terms this algorithmic authenticity in his analysis of online review sites.

3.6.3 Sharing economies. In the 2016-2020 time series (Figure 13), SharingEconomy and PeerToPeerAccommodation appear as peripheral yet rather large nodes that are strongly co-occurring, with weaker connections to Loyalty. Indeed, these themes appear as strongly co-occurring in the full sample analysis as well, while adding a connection to PurchaseIntention (Figure 9), illustrating that the current research on these themes in relation to authenticity is largely focused on consumer behavior.

In the context of the sharing economy, much of the research in the sample focuses on peer-to-peer accommodation (Airbnb, HomeAway, homestays, home swap, etc.) as offering a more authentic experience than hotel accommodation (see Andriotis & Agiomirgianakis, 2013; Akarsu et al., 2020; Mody et al., 2019; Mura, 2015; Souza et al., 2019). Relating to the themes in the Consumer behavior section, there is an interest in examining the significance of perceived authenticity to (re)purchase intention (see Liang et al., 2017; Mody et al., 2019; Paulauskaite et al., 2017). Further, due to the nature of the sharing economy offering non-traditional forms of hospitality, some studies examine authenticity specifically through the lens of hospitality and host-guest relations (see Shi et al., 2019; Shuqair et al., 2019).

The sharing economy often includes interactive platforms, which are essential to social networking, crafting destination image and tourists’ expectations, as well as bookings (Akarsu et al., 2020). Andriotis and Agiomirgianakis (2013) suggest that the sharing economy builds upon virtues of hospitality through technologies. As a result, the sharing economy connections to collaborative consumption can be observed through various online platforms that allow for hosting electronic word-of-mouth and sharing user-generated content (see Kim & Kim, 2020; Liang et al., 2017). Thus, it is predicted that future research on authenticity in these areas will likely bring together social media and the sharing economy.

4. Research challenges and opportunities

While authenticity is a much-debated concept, it has been suggested that the crucial question should not be “what is authenticity?”, but rather “how has authenticity been used?”, “who needs authenticity and why?”, and “what does authenticity do?” (Bendix, 1997; Rickly-Boyd, 2012a). In the Findings presented above, much of the research to date has been focused on the question of how authenticity is used, with the latter two questions leaving considerable research opportunities. However, the overuse of the term authenticity and divergent methodological approaches present serious challenges for the future of the concept.
4.1 Challenges

4.1.1 If authenticity is everything, it is nothing. As this review has evidenced, authenticity discourses have found their way into nearly every corner of tourism research. While some have argued that its omnipresence creates an unstable concept in need of simplification (Reisinger & Steiner, 2006a), for the most part researchers have found its multifurcations to be an asset. As the time series analyses show, research interested in the concept has only grown exponentially. Nevertheless, there must be a care in its use, otherwise we risk negating it entirely.

Most critically, due to the colloquial usage of the term, it is common to find authenticity used as simply descriptive of an attraction or experience without interrogating its conceptual significance or theoretical undertones. This creates a serious hurdle for researchers trying to gain a robust understanding of authenticity, impinging upon both its conceptual development and its investigation. Thus, this is a challenge for the broader tourism research community as much as it for authenticity researchers, specifically.

Further, and perhaps because of its pervasiveness, there is a tendency to carve out convenient “new” labels, rather than build upon the existing approaches of objective, constructive, postmodern, and existential authenticities. While many of these efforts find their way to publication, unfortunately few add value to the conceptualization of authenticity. Instead, what results is a growing number of qualifiers that do little more than limit the concept within specific case studies. That is not to suggest that these four approaches to authenticity are the only ones that can exist, and indeed, as outlined above in Theoretical approaches, carefully considered, robust scholarship has diversified our theoretical avenues, infusing phenomenology, performance theories, and psychoanalysis into the canon. Thus, a major challenge for tourism researchers is to uphold the well-evidenced approaches to authenticity, to enhance their analytical potential, and to anchor additional approaches in substantial schools of thought that will have longevity in the field.

4.1.2 Methodological silos. As evidenced in Figure 5, the majority of authenticity research is qualitative. However, looking at this over time, we can observe that quantitative analyses are growing, particularly in the last five years (Table 1). While the diversification of methodologies is welcomed, there appears to be also be a silo-effect beginning in which qualitative and quantitative researchers infrequently cross this boundary to incorporate and build upon the findings of colleagues. For example, Kolar and Zabkar’s (2010) study is an exemplar of an early quantitative assessment of authenticity that built its variables from previous qualitative studies. As a result, the model speaks across this divide and inspires further research (see also Kirillova et al., 2017a). However, many of the subsequent quantitative studies in this sample that work primarily from Kolar and Zabkar (2010) to build further quantitative models, most often structural equation models, focus on specific case studies and do not engage in broader conceptual discussions. Similarly, qualitative researchers most often build their investigations from other qualitative work, thereby excluding the observed mediated effects of various authenticity dimensions from their research design. If this continues, a lack of cross-methodological conversation will hinder the conceptual development of authenticity.

4.2 Opportunities

4.2.1 Theoretical development. For those critical of authenticity, who suggest that it is too complex and unstable, there may already be too many approaches afoot. However, this
review has illustrated the great breadth and depth to which authenticity stretches across tourism research, thus supporting the need for distinct approaches to its study. Wang’s (1999) objective, constructive, postmodern, and existential approaches are now firmly entrenched in the field. Further, the increased attention to the processes of authentication and relationality of approaches have evidenced the importance performative authenticity, and it is gaining popularity as a distinct approach. Most recently, Canavan and McCamley (2021) suggest the incorporation of post-postmodern theory into authenticity research to capture the shift from modernist (objective, constructive) to postmodernist (deconstructive, subjective, hyperreal) to post-postmodernist (reconstructive, performative, alterreal) manifestations.

While cognizant of the challenge that the overproduction of new authenticities presents, there remains a gap in our approaches in terms of how we account for the role of authenticity in negative or traumatic experiences. Instead, authenticity is most often interpreted as a positive feeling. In recent years, there has been growing attention to anxiety (Kirillova et al., 2017a; Sharma & Rickly, 2019; Vidon & Rickly, 2018), avoidance (Canavan, 2020), estrangement (Serhat & Uzuncan, 2020), and inauthenticity (Mkono, 2020). Notably, Zhou et al. (2018) highlight the phenomenon of collective amnesia as “negative authenticity” in which host communities and/or tourists actively “forget” unwanted aspects of the destination’s past. While drawing together constructive and postmodern approaches, negative authenticity suggests a kind of creative destruction. Relatedly, a psychoanalytic approach to authenticity is a newer approach to consider the ways tourists rationalize their behavior, whether refusing to acknowledge unwanted elements of destination culture as authentic (Knudsen et al., 2016) or reframing unpleasant experiences as enjoyable adventures (Vidon et al., 2018). Thus, this an area of opportunity for authenticity research.

4.2.2 Experiential versus existential authenticity. A keen observer of the themes and meta-themes produced in this review would have noticed that “experience” is not present. Yet, in the discussion of the findings, the broad notion of authentic experiences appears quite often. This is the result of two factors. First, discussion of the authenticity of tourist and/or host experience is so pervasive in the sample that it was deemed a common denominator early in the open and axial coding processes. Second, “authentic experience” presents challenges for concept building, as it is not always clear what exactly is under analysis, which made coding and theme development a challenge.

As Wang (1999) notes in his rethinking of authenticity, much of the earlier research was object-oriented so that experiences of authenticity were assessed epistemologically. This substantiates the need for an activity-based approach to what activates tourists’ experience of an existential state of Being. The dimensions of intrapersonal and interpersonal further establish an applicable framework for existential authenticity. However, in the wave of research that has followed we can observe a loss of rigor in applying the concept. Existential authenticity came to account for any experience, even if not activating a sense of self. Thus, tourists’ reports of “authentic experiences” are too often interpreted as “existential authenticity” and positive in nature.

This presents a research opportunity to both clarify our terms and enhance their analytical power, thereby raising questions for future research:

- How do we conceptualize experience and authenticity outside of existentialism?
- Can phenomenology’s relationship with consciousness, intentionality, embodiment, and lived experience be of use to supplement or extend existential authenticity?
Is experiential authenticity captured by performative authenticity, even if it has not yet been fully adapted into the research jargon?

Efforts to refine existential authenticity through the infusion of existentialist philosophy are making headway, as scholars are explicating the nuances of existential authenticity in relation to other existential concepts, such as freedom, responsibility, and ambiguity (see Brown, 2013; Kirillova, 2019; Wassler & Kirilova, 2019; Light & Brown, 2020; Reisinger & Steiner, 2006a; Steiner & Reisinger, 2006a). Most recently, Rickly et al. (2021) expose the ethical deficit of existential authenticity, evidencing that most research that has attempted to bring together ethics and existential authenticity is lacking philosophically, and that future research should consider Beauvoir’s existential ethics as a way forward. However, more broadly, Moore et al. (2021) argue that the dualism of authentic experience – “experiences of the authentic” (objects, places, cultures) and “experiences of authenticity” (personal feelings) – can be reconciled by approaching authenticity as negotiated and relational through signifyng processes.

4.2.3 Relationality of authenticity. The relationality of authenticity has been gaining acceptance and studies increasingly employ multiple approaches in their research design (Andrade-Matos et al., 2022; Cohen & Cohen, 2012; Kolar & Zabkar, 2010; Rickly-Boyd, 2012;) (Figure 7). This is a positive direction for future research and suggests the possibility of greater conceptual development. Specifically, this is an opportunity for qualitative and quantitative research to be brought into conversation and reduce a potential silo effect. Considering the research to date, attention to the relationality of authenticity suggests that authenticity performs work, and therefore is essential to answering the broader question: what does authenticity do? It also inspires further questions:

- How do we reconcile the various scales (individual to society, producer to consumer, etc.) at which authenticity and authentication processes operate?
- How do material encounters, embodiment, and subjective meaning-making influence one another in the experience of authenticity?
- Is authenticity a factor in mindfulness, well-being, ethics, or happiness? If so, how to account for alienation and anxiety in this relationship?
- How do we investigate authenticity in virtual environments, including online, social media, and virtual and augmented reality?

The issue of relationality is explored in the most recent research by Anastasiadou and Vettesse (2021) on 3D printed souvenirs. The transience of the souvenir’s physical state and performativity of tourists’ engagement with the production process suggests a personal infusion of aura and enhancement of authenticity. Similarly, Andrade-Matos et al., (2022) introduce complexity paradigm to analyze authenticity as an integrated co-creation system in their investigation of the situational, contextual, and actor-related factors of cacao plantations turned tourist attractions.

4.2.4 Authentication processes. The hot/cool framework proposed by Cohen and Cohen (2012) has been monumental for uncovering the social processes that drive authentication (see also Zhu, 2012). Importantly, it provides a perspective for highlighting the power dynamics of authenticity. As such, research on authentication moves beyond the uses of authenticity to suggest the means to address the broader question: Who needs authenticity and why? In addition, it inspires the following questions:
• How do we situate individual uses of authenticity discourses, particularly in terms of responsible/ethical/sustainable tourism behavior, into broader social processes that authenticate such practices?
• Can we account for multiple stakeholder voices and various levels of power and privilege in authentication research?
• How do the social processes of authentication operate in online contexts? In what ways are they influenced by and/or contribute to technological and algorithmic processes?

Some aspects of these authentication research opportunities can be observed in the latest publications. Salet (2021) considers the production of authenticity in online travel writing platforms, highlighting the roles of competition and participatory journalism. Further, Lovell and Thurgill (2021) expand upon hot authentication by incorporating imagination and the suspension of disbelief in their investigation of tourists’ pursuit of urban legends.

5. Conclusion
This paper has aimed to produce a systematic literature review of the authenticity research in tourism studies. The challenge of conducting this review is the incredible ubiquity of the concept in the field as a colloquial as well as analytical term. As a result, search criteria were established to identify research articles interested specifically in the concept, either for concept-building or as a key variable in another relationship under study. The review began with the first paper meeting the search criteria, published in 1979, and includes articles through 2020, thus representing 42 years of research. While the first 10 years of publications on the topic appear at a relatively slower rate, we can observe an exponential increase in research activity over time.

The analysis incorporated mixed methods of thematic coding, descriptive statistics, and keyword co-frequency analysis to facilitate an examination of the sample from various perspectives. Coding revealed major trends in theoretical approach and methodology. Constructive authenticity is the most prominent approach, although the majority of articles use more than one approach. Performative authenticity is an emerging approach of the last 10 years and gaining recognition, and most recently a psychoanalytic approach offers potential for novel insights. The majority use qualitative methods, while quantitative analysis has been on the rise in the last five years.

Keyword analysis, which incorporated open and axial coding, was instrumental for gaining insights to the sample as a whole and for distinct time series. Topics related to culture and heritage were most prevalent, with specific interests in its commodification, staging, and performance, as well as consumer behavior in relation to tourists’ perceptions of authenticity. Notably, following Wang’s (1999) publication, existential authenticity emerged as a popular area of research incorporating experiential dimensions. Recent emerging topical interests incorporate stakeholders’ perspectives on authenticity into sustainability studies and examine authentication processes in relation to power and agency. The latest emerging trends are in the areas of technologies, including social media and virtual reality.

From this analysis, the review suggests two main challenges for future authenticity research: the colloquial overuse of the term and the threat of methodological silos. First, the overuse of the term without connections to existing analytical approaches weakens it overall. Second, research trends suggest that there is little cross-methodological consideration in the
development of new research, which threatens to foster divergence rather than collectively building authenticity as a concept. However, the review also revealed research opportunities related to: 1) theoretical development – there remain aspects of authenticity not fully addressed by current theoretical approaches; 2) experiential versus existential authenticity – currently there is an over-reliance on existential authenticity for all experiential dimensions of authenticity; 3) relationality of authenticity – understanding the value of multiple approaches to understanding authenticity; and 4) authentication processes – considering the power dynamics and social processes that drive authenticity.

The papers included in the launch of this Curated Collection take steps towards addressing these research opportunities and evidence the robust potential of future interest in authenticity. Canavan and McCamley (2021) and Andrade-Matos et al. (2022) introduce potential theoretical interventions to capture the evolving and relational character of authenticity. Moore et al. (2021) address the duality of experiential dimensions, while Rickly et al. (2021) highlight the ethical deficit of existential authenticity and its misuse. The other papers delve into various aspects of the production/consumption of authenticity and nuances of authentication processes that accompany it, including 3D souvenir printing (Anastasiadou & Vettesse, 2021), tourist imagination and urban legend (Lovell & Thurgill, 2021), and online travel writing (Salet, 2021).

Finally, this review has a few notable limitations. It has aimed to review a large time scale (1979-2020), thereby generating a large sample (N = 458), which means some finer details may not be elaborated and the strict search criteria may have excluded some relevant papers. Authenticity and tourism research stretch far beyond the boundaries of the Web of Science category “Hospitality, Leisure, Sport, and Tourism,” and there many papers that use tourism as a context of study but publish in sociology, cultural studies, anthropology, geography, economics, and many other journals. However, when considering where and how to establish the boundaries of in/exclusion for this review, the objectives were carefully applied to focus on authenticity research with tourism journals. Further, this review was limited to English language publications. Due to the popularity of authenticity research in the field, there are likely many noteworthy publications in other languages that would be valuable for future reviews. Additionally, future reviews might take a specific interest in the geographic scope of authors, collaboration networks, and co-citation to understand the trends of the production of authenticity research.
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