

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

| | |
|----------|---|
| Title | Escaping COVID-19 through webcam-travel: an application of the Social Psychological Model of Tourism Motivation. |
| Type | Article |
| URL | https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/43938/ |
| DOI | https://doi.org/10.3727/109830422X16600594683391 |
| Date | 2023 |
| Citation | Jarratt, David orcid iconORCID: 0000-0002-7244-428X and Gammon, Sean James (2023) Escaping COVID-19 through webcam-travel: an application of the Social Psychological Model of Tourism Motivation. Tourism Culture and Communication. |
| Creators | Jarratt, David and Gammon, Sean James |

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
<https://doi.org/10.3727/109830422X16600594683391>

For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>

ESCAPING COVID-19 THROUGH WEBCAM-TRAVEL: AN APPLICATION OF THE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL MODEL OF TOURISM MOTIVATION

DAVID JARRATT  AND SEAN J. GAMMON

The School of Business, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, Lancashire, UK

The use of webcams to virtually visit destinations has, over the last decade, generated much interest—none more so than during the COVID-19 lockdowns. As countless millions across the globe were forced to stay at home, the practice of webcam-travel significantly increased, with preliminary studies finding the key drivers for the growth in usage to be freedom, nostalgia, and connectiveness. However, it was unclear to what extent that such practice was born from a desire to escape from the lockdown experience or to seek out (virtually) new and familiar places. In order to explore this further the Social Psychological Model of Tourism Motivation (SPTMTM) was applied to findings related to webcam use during lockdown, which indicate that users were both escaping environments they found stressful and/or demanding, while at the same time seeking out specific compensatory environments that collectively helped in coping with lockdown restrictions. Furthermore, the model brought attention to the often hidden interpersonal components that impact upon the push and pull factors associated with webcam-travel, introducing and augmenting concepts such as virtual *flânerie* and anthropomorphic parasocial relationships.

Key words: Webcam-travel; Escape; Social Psychological Model of Tourism Motivation (SPTM); Virtual *flânerie*; Parasocial relationships

Introduction

Webcam-travel is the act of viewing places online through place-based webcams, and while this practice has been growing steadily over the last decade it became particularly popular during the COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) lockdowns as a way to (re)connect with the outside world. More specifically, recent studies have suggested that the key

motivational components that drove this activity were related to freedom, nostalgia, and connectiveness (Jarratt, 2021a, 2021b). However, no motivational framework has been offered to explain the nature of this phenomenon (i.e., the increased usage of webcam-travel during lockdown). To this end, this theoretical article explores the utility of applying Iso-Ahola's (1982) Social Psychological Model of Tourism Motivation (SPMTM) to

webcam-travel, shedding light on the complex multineeds that lay behind this relatively new form of imaginative travel. In doing so, the following discussion will explore the efficacy of SPMTM when applied to the more contemporary practices of virtual travel and parasocial interaction.

For many places, during the COVID-19 lockdowns, tourism was decimated, and leisure activities were restricted to the home and the local vicinity. Moreover, workplaces, schools, high streets, and other places where people usually congregate were closed or much quieter than prepandemic times. The lived experience of space was bounded as freedoms were curtailed; mobility, so often taken for granted, was now limited, and for many, the world seemed a much smaller place. Not only that, but for many around the world, lockdown meant that they could not work, and they had increased free time on their hands. Key workers continued in their workplaces, often under increased pressure. For others, time was spent home-schooling or working from home, sometimes trying to do both at the same time. In short, the pandemic impacted the spatial and temporal dimensions of everyday life, contributing to new uncertainties, concerns, and stresses. Many felt this strain and a surge in mood disorders was reported (Van Rheenen et al., 2020), which was exacerbated due to the reduced options of how many normally chose to relax, and the activities they would usually associate with happiness and/or well-being.

For many, these often highly valued activities were limited, or entirely off-limits, and spurred a host of alternative lockdown leisure activities (Gammon & Ramshaw, 2021). No activity was more restricted than tourism. Frustrated tourism plans can lead to increased demand once restrictions lift, as could be seen in the Asia post-SARs period; the response to deep privation may be an intense tourism recovery (McKercher & Pine, 2006). However, the focus this article takes is on what happened while tourism was restricted. One study compared frustrated tourists to caged birds and provides evidence that lockdown captivity and feelings of entrapment lead directly to travel craving, finding that, “individuals deprived of their tourist role seek escape in fantasies about past/future travels” (Irimiás & Zoltán Mitev, 2023, p. 10). The authors cite psychological reactance theory, which aims to explain when

freedom of behavior is restricted and individuals cannot have what they want, they experience a motivational state called reactance, prompting a response to the situation (Irimiás & Zoltán Mitev, 2023; Steindl et al., 2015). So, increased wanderlust or travel craving was experienced on one hand and alternative forms of (escapist) leisure boomed on the other. Little wonder then those virtual forms of travel grew in popularity during lockdown. In keeping with Irimiás and Zoltán Mitev’s (2023) analogy, webcam-travel during lockdown offers the frustrated tourist a different form of escape—one where the bird remains in the cage while the cage is moved to reveal different vistas.

Webcam/Virtual Tourism: An Overview

Both Ratz and Conk (2010) and Jarratt (2021a) identified a gap in the literature when it comes to the experience of viewing place/attraction-based webcams (i.e., Webcam-travel). The typical place-based webcam is static, although some sweep across a view, and a small minority allows the viewer to control the direction and focus on what is seen (Koskela, 2011). Most are purely visual, but some wildlife cameras have audio too. The settings are overwhelmingly outdoor landscapes, seascapes, or cityscapes. They often center on a particular feature such as a beach, mountain, watering hole, birds’ nest, beach, structure, building, or heritage site within those environments. Natural environments, wildlife, and historic city centers appear especially popular.

Webcam technology enables online connection between real places and people, and usually operates in real-time, and so is unedited. It is also a simple and affordable technology in comparison to virtual reality (VR). Jarratt (2021b) pointed out that webcam-travel does not neatly fit definitions of virtual tourism, which is often associated with VR and by which we mean an online experience designed to offer a substitute for a real place with the emphasis on immersion and interaction, usually within a simulated 3D environment, which can be manipulated (Ankomah & Larson, 2019; Prideaux & Singer, 2005). So virtual tourism and virtual reality often aim to replicate experiences in some form and are likely to be interactive. In contrast, webcam-travel does not; it simply provides a live image. The

only similarities are that both are accessed through the internet and viewed through some sort of screen. One can consider webcam-travel as either an outlying form of virtual tourism, albeit with some distinctive features that have been largely ignored by academics, or as fitting into another, broader, category of noncorporeal travel altogether, coined by some as imaginative travel (Gale, 2009; Larsen et al., 2006). Further examples of this form of travel experience include travel writing, travel photography, or viewing destinations on television. Yet webcam-travel is distinct within imaginative travel, as it does not need interpretation, or rely on an author, photographer, editor, or director. This unfiltered and real-time aspect of webcam-travel appears to be an important part of its appeal, as individuals can imagine themselves present at the chosen scene—and so feel connected to that place, potentially allowing them to feel transported, in a momentary reverie (Jarratt, 2021b). There is a feeling of transported immobility that is the spectacle of stability, against the backdrop of a new place, or to put it another way, the appeal of traveling without moving, thereby denying, what Barthes (1979) described as “the apparent constraints of the situation” (p. 144). The result is a feeling of freedom, which is likely to be intensified if those constraints are tightened. As we shall explore later, this feeling of freedom from constraints can also be thought of as escaping.

Webcam-Travel in Lockdown

During the initial UK lockdowns, Beddington (2020), Granville (2020), and others in the media suggested that webcam usage might be a way to connect to the outside world that was out of reach for many. Granville (2020) reported that Explore.org, which hosts nature webcams, saw an 85% increase in webcam views in March 2020, compared to the previous year. Jarratt (2021a) found a similar increase over that period at Skyline Cameras (a popular webcam host), with an increase from 70 to 120 million monthly page views. He contacted providers of nature-based webcams, finding one seaside resort webcam reporting an increase of over 800% users, while another at a UK nature reserve saw increases of over 1,500%.

Jarratt (2021a) also conducted an online survey during lockdown, finding that the cameras were

used more frequently and offered a sense of freedom, a nostalgia for happier times, and most of all, a sense of connection. Ninety percent felt connected to place or nature through Webcam-travel and 83% felt more positive post-webcam-travel; 69% were more likely to visit places they had viewed through webcams, with webcams featuring landscapes or nature being the most popular. The survey asked respondents to describe their experiences of webcam-travel in one word. They used positive words, for example, “connected,” “relaxed,” and “happy” but also words that reflect their challenging circumstances in lockdown such as “liberated,” “wistful,” “uplifted,” and “elsewhere.” Respondents were also given the opportunity to describe in more detail the experience of webcam-travel in lockdown; for some, it made them feel “less claustrophobic” and could “lift spirits” in a trying time (Jarratt, 2021a).

In short, web-cam travel engendered positive feelings that connected people to a place. Another reason for webcam-travel appeared to be the possibility of viewing sights and sites that cannot easily be viewed, such as a close-up of an Osprey nest or a place that would be too dangerous or difficult to access (Jarratt, 2021a). At the same time, lockdown appeared to initiate respondents to escape the apparent constraints of the situation and access places they would normally visit, only virtually. Most respondents were viewing places they knew and planned to visit postlockdown. These experiences, “do not just offer a fleeting escape but promise possibilities of future days out and holidays” (Jarratt, 2021b, p. 176).

Methodology

While small studies on webcam use and experience have identified particular salient components such as freedom, connectedness, and nostalgia, none have, as yet, explored pertinent motivational frameworks that help explain such behaviors. Since preliminary findings suggest that the many leisure-based choices through lockdown were considered as both a form of escape and a seeking out of congruent opportunities, this article takes a *theory adaptation* research design (Jaakkola, 2020; MacInnis, 2011). This was undertaken in order to first explore the utility of applying Iso-Ahola’s (1982) Social Psychological Model of Tourism

Motivation (SPMTM) to lockdown webcam-travel, and second, to help identify the more nuanced personal and interpersonal dimensions that influenced webcam use. While analysis of various findings related to the lockdown experience will be referred to, it is Jarratt's (2021a) study that will represent the primary focus of the application.

Escaping From and Seeking to

Similar to the study of tourism, leisure scholars have identified a range of motivational theories that attempt to offer valuable insights into what drives individuals to participate in leisure as well as the accompanying behaviors that take place before, during, and after engagement (Beard & Ragheb, 1983; Neulinger, 1976, 1981; Walker & Wang, 2008). While many of these leisure-related theories have been applied and adapted in tourism contexts, it is Iso-Ahola's (1983) four-dimensional theory that has arguably generated the most debate. Although its application has been tested and validated on numerous tourism types (Crompton & McKay, 1997; Snepenger et al., 2006; Wolfe & Hsu, 2004), it is yet to be applied to the use of *webcam-travel*.

As intimated by its title, Iso-Ahola's (1982) tourism motivational theory is positioned within social psychology, which may first appear anomalous with an activity that tends to be undertaken alone. Yet, the social component of webcam-travel may be more pertinent than first believed. For example, the desire to escape a social situation in order to seek another (albeit a virtually led social interaction) is quintessentially social-psychological in its construct. Alport's (1968) much referred to definition appears to almost anticipate such virtual interactions by positing that social psychology is "an attempt to understand how the thoughts, feelings and behaviour of individuals are influenced by the actual, *imagined*, or *implied* presence of other human beings" (p. 4, emphasis added). Undoubtedly webcam-travel adds a different dimension to this form of social interaction, which requires further inquiry.

A further aspect of Iso-Ahola's SPMTM is that it was chiefly designed to help explain the choices that drive recreational activities. Studies that have explored webcam-travel both within and outside

lockdown conditions (Jarratt, 2021a; Ratz & Conk, 2010) indicated that webcam users perceive the activity as an effective diversion from present situations and mindsets that have the capacity to improve mood and well-being. Of course, the term recreation is very much context driven, in that it can refer to specific forms of restorative activities (Godbey & Parker, 1976), types of experiences linked to health, well-being, and wholesomeness (Shivers, 1967), social cohesion (Donnelly & Coakley, 2002), and motivational factors that are linked to the need for a temporary escape from environments and/or situations that are perceived undesirable (Iso-Ahola, 1983). Preliminary studies suggested that each of these contexts applies to webcam-travel, though some may be more salient than others. An additional reason for adopting the SPMTM is that recreation and tourism have a long connection (see Ryan, 2003), with studies drawing attention to the perceived recuperative properties that leisure-tourism experiences and behaviors can produce (Butler, 2004; Cohen, 1979). Lastly, an essential element of leisure and recreational episodes is that the experience should be founded upon a state of perceived freedom (Ellis & Witt, 1984). Integral to feelings of freedom is the belief that an individual has freely chosen to undertake any given action, which is reinforced by a belief that they have the choice of ending such action whenever they wish. Within a social-psychological construct, any acts of freedom are not determined objectively, relying only on the perception of freedom by the individual. Therefore, if the person believes themselves to be free—they are—even if the freedom is illusory (Kleiber et al., 2011; Neulinger, 1981). This obviously has significant implications for the imaginary travels of the webcam user.

More specifically the SPMT suggests that visitors are driven to participate in leisure/tourism by the two simultaneous dimensions of seeking and escaping. In other words, the two forces determining leisure/tourism behavior are essentially escaping from the everyday environment and escaping to a contrasting environment to obtain psychological rewards:

Satisfaction that individuals expect to derive from involvement in a leisure activity is linked to two motivational forces: approach (seeking) and avoidance (escape). In other words, individuals

perceive a leisure activity as a potential satisfaction-producer for two major reasons: it provides certain intrinsic rewards, such as feelings of mastery and competence, and helps them leave the routine environment behind themselves. It is important to note that any leisure activity (e.g., tourism behaviour) has these two components. Whether the approach element is more central than the avoidance component for a certain group of individuals, under certain conditions, and for certain activities is simply an empirical question. (Iso-Ahola, 1982, p. 258)

Iso-Ahola makes the point that one should not attempt to separate the two forces of *reasons* and *benefits*, as some reasons for travel, such as “escaping the everyday,” can be viewed as a benefit too. Therefore, leisure tourism motivation is formed by a dialectical process that simultaneously provides an opportunity to avoid and seek something.

These two forces (identified above), that shape leisure tourism motivation, are in turn subdivided into personal and interpersonal influences:

In deciding the relative importance of the two forces, he deals with their personal and/or interpersonal dimensions. He may escape the personal world (i.e., personal troubles, problems, difficulties and failures) and/or the interpersonal world (i.e., co-workers, family members, relatives, friends and neighbors) and he may seek personal rewards (e.g., feelings of mastery, learning about other cultures, rest and relaxation, recharge and getting renewed, ego-enhancement and prestige) and/ or interpersonal rewards (e.g., varied and increased social interaction, interacting with friendly natives or members of the travel group, interacting with old friends in a new place or with new friends in an old place). (Iso-Ahola, 1982, p. 260)

In sum, the SPMTM has been chosen as a particularly fitting theory in which to explore webcam-travel during lockdown, as it is based upon recreational pursuits, acknowledges the significance of freedom and escape, while also drawing attention to the hidden social-psychological components that influence this form of activity.

Results and Discussion

Applying SPMTM to Webcam-Travel

Webcam-travel is an online activity that relies on viewing a 2D image on screen. Furthermore, Jarratt

(2021a) found when discussing webcam-travel that it most often seems to be a solitary activity. As such it would be reasonable to conclude that emphasis should be placed on the personal dimension of the four-dimensional theory. Yet the interpersonal contexts that contribute to initiating webcam-travel, along with the desire to (re)connect with the outside world, suggest otherwise. Also sharing the accessed images with someone else, such as exploring somewhere with a child for educational purposes, indicates an additional interpersonal context. Consequently, there appears significant, though often hidden, social factors that drive webcam usage, connecting to escape and seeking out virtual connections with people, animals, and places, which will be explored further in the following sections.

There is also uncertainty regarding where webcam-travel sits in terms of escaping from (reasons) or escaping to (benefits). For longstanding fans of webcam-travel, both will be relevant but for those with specific interests, such as birdwatching or steam railways, the benefits may take precedence. However, COVID-19 clearly accounts for a surge in this activity. In this case, many of the webcams have not changed, especially those in the most popular category: natural settings and wildlife. However, there is clearly a wholesale change in everyday life images, which appear to offer more strongly felt reasons to partake for webcam-travel elicits a sense of freedom and therefore escape, especially during lockdown. Here we see a wistful nostalgia and daydreaming about future visits coming into play.

There is one exception to this, which is the city center cams, which are also popular. Some were fascinated by the eerily deserted streets of different cities across the world. Here we can see a curiosity—one respondent even stated “disbelief”—of what was happening across the world. The connection here is with current events and a curiosity to see the wider world in lockdown, perhaps as a means in which to empathize with others.

Personal Escape

A salient feature of each of the four dimensions is that they are heavily influenced by a combination of individual (micro) and broader situational and societal (macro) circumstances (Sharpley, 2018).

To this end, it would be unwise to suggest a consensus exists across all types of tourist motives and forms. For example, Snepenger et al. (2006) characterized escaping from an individual's *normal* environment to be an appropriate example of the personal escape dimension. However, during pandemic lockdowns it is likely that individuals would be motivated to escape from the *abnormal* circumstances they find themselves in and will likely seek out more *normal* experiences and environments. Furthermore, preliminary findings (Jarratt 2021a) suggested that for some webcam users there was a desire to escape from a specific negative mind-state (brought on or intensified through lockdown). Findings from Banks and Xu (2020) concluded that there had been a significant increase in mental health problems (particularly among women and children) during the first lockdown. Further studies undertaken across Europe and in the US found similar results (Adams-Prassl et al., 2020; Ahrens et al., 2021; Rossi et al., 2020). Consequently, there appears a need to momentarily escape from the self, especially for those living by themselves.

Of course, in terms of webcam usage, all travel is imagined—as is the perception of both escaping from, and to, another destination and/or situation. Yet studies have found that even virtual forms of tourism offer numerous potential restorative and recuperative benefits to health (Bec et al., 2021; Gammon & Ramshaw, 2020; Mannell & Kleiber, 1997; Mattila et al., 2020), which indicate the potential betterment of well-being through webcam-travel. A further characteristic of webcam-travel is that many virtual journeys are as much temporal as they are geographic. In other words, users will often use webcams to access familiar places that, in turn, will trigger nostalgic memories originating from their own pre-pandemic visits. Gammon and Ramshaw (2020) found that during the height of the pandemic many chose to (re)discover actual and imagined activities from their pasts:

nostalgia-inspired leisure has been widely used, broadcast, and consumed, perhaps as part of a “cocktail for coping” meant to have a palliative effect during the initial stages of the pandemic. For some, the ability to reflect on the knowable and comforting past is perhaps far more enjoyable—and far less anxiety-inducing—than contemplating a traumatic present and a potentially bleak future. (p. 132)

Interpersonal Escape

The desire to escape from the immediate social environment, which was likely intensified for many who worked from home during lockdown, may very well have been the driving force behind much webcam use. The stress of enforced confinement with family members, partners, and friends, contrasted with prescribed social distancing outside the home, which no doubt deepened the craving for some form of escape or respite. In addition, anxieties of potential infection emanating from any necessary journeys, such as food shopping, placed many in a hopeless situation—a desire to escape from the tensions and boredom at home while being restricted to any other social contact outside.

There were both positive and negative assessments from those who were able to work from home, with many reporting a rise in productivity while others complaining of stress due to increased workloads and a less favorable work–life balance (Platts et al., 2022). The inherent flexibility of online meetings meant that in some cases online meetings exceeded the pre-COVID-19 face-to-face gatherings, with employees unable to organize required breaks away from the screen. And while the virtual interaction in such meetings was welcomed, it was tempered by feelings of separation, brought on through a lack of physical socializing and vital eye contact, which in turn negatively affected the sense of organizational belonging by participants (Kaptelimini et al., 2021). As a result, it would be intriguing to explore the extent to which escape from the online demands of employment contributed to an increase in webcam use.

Personal Seeking

Unsurprisingly, the key characteristic of personal seeking for webcam users is that it is purely experiential. The diversity of choices, outlined earlier, indicate a rich array of options, ranging from cityscapes or specific urban streets to natural landscapes and wildlife, though the motive that lies behind these options is likely to involve a search for a positive distraction of some kind. Diversionary activities (especially leisure related) have been found to have positive impacts on mental health and well-being (Caldwell, 2005). However, at this

time, it is unclear to what extent webcam-travel improves mood, and whether it helps in buffering against negative life episodes. Previous studies that have explored the numerous health benefits of having access to views of natural landscapes (Gammon & Elkington, 2019; Gladwell et al., 2012) may point to similar benefits through webcam images.

Even though the nature and make-up of personal seeking will vary depending on individuals' circumstances and specific biographies, there is still likely to be some traditional tourism drivers that are also relevant to webcam-travel. For example, studies by Snepenger et al. (2006) and Wolfe and Hsu (2004) highlighted, *to tell others about my experiences; to feel good about myself; to experience new things by myself; and to escape from problems*, as prominent personal seeking attributes. While it would be reasonable to assume that these tourism-based personal seeking statements are congruent with webcam users' motives, there are likely to be specific webcam intentions that are more noticeable during lockdown. Jarratt's (2021a) study found that webcam users indicated a desire to feel free, and a need to be reacquainted with familiar places to be particularly powerful. Such topophilic motives and experiences (Tuan, 1990) also indicated a longing to return to prepandemic times—equating to a nostalgic search of past memories.

Interpersonal Seeking

The interpersonal seeking dimension of webcam-travel differs substantially from the more common personal drivers found in corporeal forms of tourism travel. In these cases, studies focused on a thirst to physically meet up with like-minded individuals or to bring the family closer together (Snepenger et al., 2006). For webcam users, the social components appear more nuanced, in that the search for others is not pushed by a desire for social interaction, but rather by a need to be connected to a community, primarily through place. More simply put, by accessing views of places, the people who reside in and around them are, by implication, also accessed. For those places that have moving cameras or those that have a remote-controlled option (Koskela, 2011), the webcam user becomes a type of virtual flâneur (Featherstone, 1998; Hartmann & Goldhoorn, 2011). However, in this case, the

individual is not traversing the virtual world but the real one in real time. The advantage of this type of travel (especially during a pandemic) is that the individual can roam unseen while also remaining in a safe environment.

Jarratt's (2021a) study also found that webcam users were drawn to wildlife scenes, some of whom would access scenes from hidden cameras on a regular basis. "Zoo-cams" also proved very popular during lockdown; Edinburgh Zoo saw webcam views rise from 100,000 to more than 5 million per month (Beddington, 2020). It is unclear whether the draw to view such images was principally educational, aesthetic, or inquisitive in nature. But given the regularity of viewership, it is possible that webcam users developed an emotional bond with the animals. These types of connections usually occur between viewers and media figures and are known as parasocial relationships—a term first coined by Horton and Wohl in 1956. A key characteristic of this virtual relationship is that any emotional investment derives only from the viewer, with the media figure being completely unaware of any connection. There is, as Kowert and Daniel (2021) asserted, "no reciprocal (i.e., two-way) interaction between the viewer and performer. It is the one-sided nature of these relationships that makes PSRs unique and distinct from other kinds of social relationships" (p. 100). Of course, live coverage of animals cannot be considered as similar to human media performers, whose job is to increase viewership and build upon their celebrity status. Nevertheless, the relationships that humans can forge with animals are undeniable, as are the numerous psychological benefits that such interactions spawn (Melson, 2002). Therefore, any parasocial interaction is likely to be anthropomorphic in nature, the reason for which is unclear, though Haraway's (1991) assertion that, "we polish an animal mirror to look for ourselves" (p. 21) may offer some explanation.

Conclusion

The aim of this article was to explore the efficacy of applying the Social Psychological Model of Tourism Motivation on webcam-travel during lockdown. The model helps support preliminary studies on webcam use during lockdown that implied


users were both escaping environments they found stressful and/or demanding, while at the same time seeking out specific compensatory environments that collectively helped in coping with lockdown restrictions. Also, the SPMTM sheds light on the hidden interpersonal components that impact on the push and pull factors associated with webcam-travel, introducing and augmenting concepts such as virtual flânerie and anthropomorphic parasocial relationships.

Initial studies on webcam-travel during lockdown (Jarratt, 2021a) found that a key *seeking* motive was to find images that would offer a positive distraction to the lockdown experience, lifting spirits and offering a welcomed respite from present circumstances. While this feedback related specifically to lockdown and not necessarily to webcam use in general, it would be intriguing to explore to what extent such positive experiences are relatable to other circumstances. For example, it could be hypothesised that webcam-travel may provide an outlet for imaginary travel by the housebound or by those suffering from an illness that inhibits extensive journeys. Furthermore, the health-related advantages of providing views of natural landscapes are well founded (Gladwell et al., 2012), and may be applicable to the live images imparted through webcam-travel.

Lastly, research is required to explore whether those who actively engaged in webcam-travel continued the activity after lockdown or changed to more traditional forms of travel. In other words, is it a placeholder or does it represent a change to how we should see travel and tourism? Theoretically, it seems likely that webcam-travel will become less common, as the need to “escape from” dissipates, assuming that restrictions on freedom of movement are lifted. That said, whereas lockdown has led to a change in behaviors that may not prove to be temporary (e.g., more online meetings and working at home), the question is to what extent webcam-travel will be a part of this change? Indeed, it could be hypothesised that more time spent online and at home could continue to reinforce the desire for webcam-travel. Therefore, we predict that webcam-travel will see a dip in popularity as restrictions lift, but it will see growth from pre-pandemic levels. It seems likely that virtual forms of tourism, including the use of webcams, will grow

longer term—not necessarily to *replace* tourism, but rather to supplement it and even reinforce the desire for it, as suggested by Jansson (2002). Furthermore, webcam-travel, which appeared to translate into increased motivation for a physical visit during lockdown, has the potential for more use in tourism marketing (Jarratt 2021a, 2021b). All this highlights the need for further research in this area.

ORCID

David Jarratt:  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7244-428X>

References

- Adams-Prassl A., Boneva T., Golin, M., & Rauh, C. (2020). *The impact of the coronavirus lockdown on mental health: Evidence from the US* (Working Paper 2020-030). Human Capital and Economic Opportunity Working Group. [http://humcap.uchicago.edu/RePEc/hka/wpaper/Adams-Prassl Boneva Golin etal 2020 impact-coronavirus-mental-health.pdf](http://humcap.uchicago.edu/RePEc/hka/wpaper/Adams-Prassl%20Boneva%20Golin%20etal%202020%20impact-coronavirus-mental-health.pdf)
- Ahrens, K. F., Neumann, R. J., Kollmann, B., Plichta, M. M., Lieb, K., Tüscher, O., & Reif, A. (2021). Differential impact of COVID-related lockdown on mental health in Germany. *World Psychiatry*, 20(1), 140–141. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20830>
- Allport, G. W. (1968). *Social psychology*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Ankomah, P., & Larson, T. (2019). Virtual tourism and its potential for tourism development in sub-Saharan Africa. In M. Khosrow-Pour (Ed.), *Advanced methodologies and technologies in digital marketing and entrepreneurship* (pp. 584–595). IGI-Global. <http://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-7766-9.ch045>
- Banks, J., & Xu, X. (2020). The mental health effects of the first two months of lockdown during the COVID-19 Pandemic in the UK. *Fiscal Studies*, 41(3), 685–708. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-5890.12239>
- Barthes, R. (1979). *The Eiffel Tower and other mythologies*. Hill and Wang.
- Beard, J. G., & Ragheb, M. G. (1983). Measuring leisure motivation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 15(3), 219–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1983.11969557>
- Bec, A., Moyle, B., Schaffer, V., & Timms, K. (2021). Virtual reality and mixed reality for second chance tourism. *Tourism Management*, 83, 104256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104256>
- Beddington, E. (2020). Watch the birdie: Why birdcams are the new box sets. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/apr/26/watch-the-birdie-why-birdcams-are-the-new-box-sets>
- Butler, R. (2004). Geographical research on tourism, recreation and leisure: Origins, eras and directions. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(2), 143–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461668042000208453>

- Caldwell, L. L. (2005). Leisure and health: Why is leisure therapeutic? *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 33(1), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069880412331335939>
- Cohen, E. (1979). A phenomenology of tourist experiences. *Sociology*, 13(2), 179–201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003803857901300203>
- Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 425–439. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(97\)80010-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(97)80010-2)
- Donnelly, P., & Coakley, J. (2002). *The role of recreation in promoting social inclusion*. Laidlaw Foundation. https://laidlawfdn.org/assets/wpsosi_2002_december_the-role-of-recreation.pdf
- Ellis, G., & Witt, P. A. (1984). The measurement of perceived freedom in leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 16(2), 110–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1984.11969579>
- Featherstone, M. (1998). The “flâneur”, the city and virtual public life. *Urban Studies*, 35(5/6), 909–925. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02F0042098984619>
- Gale, T. (2009). Urban beaches, virtual worlds and ‘the end of tourism’. *Mobilities*, 4(1), 119–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450100802657996>
- Gammon, S., & Elkington, S. (2019). Landscapes of leisure: A view worth seeing? In P. Howard, I. H. Thompson, & E. Waterton (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to landscape studies* (2nd ed., pp. 366–376). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315195063>
- Gammon, S., & Ramshaw, G. (2021). Distancing from the present: Nostalgia and leisure in lockdown. *Leisure Sciences*, 43(1–2), 131–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2020.1773993>
- Gladwell, V. F., Brown, D. K., Barton, J. L., Tarvainen, M. P., Kuoppa, P., Pretty, J., Suddaby, J. M., & Sandercock, G. R. H. (2012). The effects of views of nature on autonomic control. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 112(9), 3379–3386. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-012-2318-8>
- Godbey, G., & Parker, S. (1976). *Leisure studies and services: An overview*. W. B. Saunders Company.
- Granville, A. (2020). *Coronavirus: How to get a hungry hippo in your living room*. Stuff. <https://www.stuff.co.nz/travel/news/121022199/coronavirus-how-to-get-a-hungry-hippo-in-your-living-room>
- Haraway, D. J. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.
- Hartmann, T., & Goldhoorn, C. (2011). Horton and Wohl revisited: Exploring viewers’ experience of parasocial interaction. *Journal of Communication*, 61(6), 1104–1121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01595.x>
- Horton, D., & Wohl, R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations on intimacy at a distance. *Psychiatry*, 19(3), 215–229.
- Irimiás, A., & Zoltán Mitev, A. (2023). Tourists as caged birds: Elaborating travel thoughts and craving when feeling captive. *Journal of Travel Research*, 62(1), 91–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875211056684>
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: Arejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9(2), 256–262. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(82\)90049-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(82)90049-4)
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1983). Towards a social psychology of recreational travel. *Leisure Studies*, 2(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614368300390041>
- Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches. *AMS Review*, 10(1–2), 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0>
- Jansson, A. (2002). Spatial phantasmagoria: The mediation of tourism experience. *European Journal of Communication*, 17(4), 29–443. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02F02673231020170040201>
- Jarratt, D. (2021a). An exploration of webcam-travel: Connecting to place and nature through webcams during the COVID-19 lockdown of 2020. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 21(2), 156–168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358420963370>
- Jarratt, D. (2021b). Webcam-travel: Conceptual foundations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 91, 103088. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.103088>
- Kaptelinin, V., Danielsson, K., Kaiser, N., Kuenen, C., & Nordin, M. (2021). Understanding the interpersonal space of online meetings: An exploratory study of “we-ness”. In *Companion Publication of the 2021 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing* (pp. 79–83). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3462204.3481780>
- Kleiber, D. A., Walker, G. J., & Mannell, R. C. (2011). *A social psychology of leisure*. Venture Publishing.
- Koskela, H. (2011). The other side of surveillance: Webcams, power and agency. In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorising surveillance* (pp. 163–181). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781843926818>
- Kowert, R., & Daniel Jr., E. (2021). The one-and-a-half sided parasocial relationship: The curious case of live streaming. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 4, 100–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2021.100150>
- Larsen, J., Urry, J., & Axhausen, K. (2006). *Mobilities, networks, geographies*. Ashgate.
- MacInnis, D. J. (2011). A framework for conceptual contributions in marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 75(4), 136–154. <https://doi.org/10.1509/02Fjmkg.75.4.136>
- Mannell, R., & Kleiber, D. A. (1997). *A social psychology of leisure*. Venture Publishing Inc.
- Mattila, O., Korhonen, A., Pöyry, E., Hauru, K., Holopainen, J., & Parvinen, P. (2020). Restoration in a virtual reality forest environment. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 107, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106295>
- McKercher, B., & Pine, R. (2006). Privation as a stimulus to travel demand? *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 19(2–3), 107–116. https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v19n02_09
- Melson, G. (2002). Psychology and the study of human-animal relationships. *Society & Animals*, 10(4), 347–352. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853002320936791>
- Neulinger, J. (1976). The need for and the implications of a psychological conception of leisure. *Ontario Psychologist*, 8(2), 13–20.

- Neulinger, J. (1981). *The psychology of leisure*. Charles C Thomas.
- Platts, K., Breckon, J., & Marshall, E. (2022). Enforced home-working under lockdown and its impact on employee wellbeing: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*, 22(199), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-12630-1>
- Prideaux, B., & Singer, P. (2005). Space tourism—A future dream or a cybertourism reality? *Tourism Recreation Research*, 30(3), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2005.11081484>
- Ratz, J., & Conk, S. (2010). *Use of wildlife webcams*. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report, 2010–1306. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2010/1306/>
- Rossi, R., Succi, V., Talevi, D., Mensi, S., Niolu, C., Pacitti, F., Di Marco, A., Rossi, A., Siracusano, A., & Di Lorenzo, G. (2020). COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown measures impact on mental health among the general population in Italy. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11, 790. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2020.00790>
- Ryan, C. (2003). *Recreational tourism*. Channel View Publications.
- Sharpley, R. (2018). *Tourism, tourists and society* (5th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315210407>
- Shivers, J. S. (1967). *Principles and practices of recreational service*. The Macmillan Co.
- Snepenger, D., King, J., Marshall, E., & Uysal, M. (2006). Modeling Iso-Ahola's motivation theory in the tourism context. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(2), 127–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2F0047287506291592>
- Steindl, C., Jonas, E., Sittenthaler, S., Traut-Mattaush, E., & Greenberg, J. (2015). Understanding psychological reactance. New developments and findings. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 223(4), 205–214. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1027%2F2151-2604%2Fa000222>
- Tuan, Y. F. (1990). *Topophilia: A study of environmental perception, attitudes, and values*. Columbia University Press.
- Van Rheenen, T. E., Meyerb, D., Neill, E., Phillipou, A., Tan, E. J., Toh, W. L., & Rossell, S. L. (2020). Mental health status of individuals with a mood-disorder during the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia: Initial results from the COLLATE Project. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 275, 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.06.037>
- Walker, G. J., & Wang, X. (2008). A cross-cultural comparison of Canadian and Mainland Chinese university students' leisure motivations. *Leisure Sciences*, 30, 179–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400802014420>
- Wolfe, K., & Hsu, C. H. (2004). An application of the social psychological model of tourism motivation. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 5(1), 29–47. https://doi.org/10.1300/J149v05n01_02