Insight and the Travel Experience:
An Exploration into the Contributions of Liminality

Kelly S. Bloom* & Jasmine Goodnow**

*Middle Tennessee State University
Department of Health and Human Performance, Murfreesboro USA
**Western Washington University, Bellingham USA

Abstract

Insight is often described as the sudden solution to a problem that has been unsolvable for some time. In modern society, people are seeking answers to questions about lifestyle, freedom and happiness. It has been suggested that the travel experience may lead to cognitive space that allows for reflection and deep thought, which may, in turn, lead to insight regarding life's purpose and meaning. Data collected from a sample of travelers (N=335) suggests that liminality construed as being away cognitively, physically and psychologically has a relationship with the outcomes of lifestyle and spiritual insight.

Keywords: Insight, travel, insight, liminal, quest

Introduction

Insight is often described as the sudden solution to a problem that has been unsolvable for some time (Dunlap and Yerkes, 1931; Kaplan and Simon, 1990; Kean and Gihooly, 1992; Langley and Jones, 1988; Levitt et al., 2004; Ohlsson, 1984; Smith et al., 1995). In today's society, some problems for which people are trying to find solutions include the following: How do I live a happier or more satisfying life and why do I feel unhappy even though I have a great job that makes lots of money? Through questions such as these, insight may include new and novel thoughts about self and what is really important, meaningful, and real (Goodnow, 2008). Additionally, insight is a critical part of "self-understanding, … meaning-making, emotional processing and experiencing" (Hayes et al., 2007:231).

Environments that support insight are those that afford freedom to think and behave in nontraditional ways and where creativity is supported. It has been suggested that the travel experience may lead to cognitive space that allows for reflection and deep thought, which may, in turn, lead to insight regarding life's purpose and meaning (Goodnow, 2008). One mechanism through which this may be achieved is the experience of liminality. Turner (1966) describes liminality as a transition and "as a time and place of withdrawal from normal modes of social action" (p. 167). It is this freedom normal experience that creates the cognitive space for insight to occur.

Though liminal experience provides a powerful context for the experience of insight, there are barriers which may interfere. Conceptual, cultural, environmental, and

emotional blocks have been traditionally viewed as barriers to insight (Adams, 1974). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore characteristics of the liminal experience as they relate to the experience of insight in a sample of adventure travelers.

Literature Review

Insight

Insight as a construct is somewhat nebulous. In the realm of psychology and counseling insight has been explored as "the process of developing understanding and constructing new meaning" (Hayes et al., 2007: 231), intuitive understanding (Wampold et al., 2007), and the process of making new connections (Hill et al., 2007). From a philosophical perspective, the experience of insight "transforms you, quite suddenly from being stupid to being brilliant . . . meaning becomes perfectly clear, leaving you to wonder how you could have ever missed the point" (Flanagan, 1997:16). As a new or novel way of thinking, insight may also include new and novel thoughts about self and what is really important, meaningful, and real.

Hartig and Evans (1993), for example, suggested that insight is thinking about new solutions to life's bigger questions such as priorities, goals, and one's place in the world. Other examples of new ways of thinking are developing a more realistic outlook on personal strengths, weaknesses, and future potential (Kaplan, 1974). In addition, new perceptions of self and the relationship between self and environment were considered insight (Kaplan & Talbot, 1983; Walle, 1997).

Thursby (2005) explored the search for insight as a quest (both literal and metaphorical), or inner journey toward understating, personal insight and freedom by escaping the constraints of society and family expectations and norms. Other metaphors for insight have included a treasure hunt (Groom, 2005) where one searchers for treasures in the form of self, spirituality, freedom, and life's meaning and direction. Other outcomes of this quest include engagement, growth, healing and new freedom (Moir-Bussy, 2003).

No matter the mechanisms that lead to insight, such "Aha!" moments can lead to answers related to authenticity of life and self (Goodnow, 2008). Additional research suggests that due to insight "individuals…perceive themselves differently… [they]find out about their own feelings, they think of their futures, and they feel sure of who they are and what they want to do" (Kaplan & Talbot, 1983, p. 181). Insight is further described as being a powerful, sudden moment of consciousness resulting in a "vivid, surprising, benevolent and enduring personal transformation" (Miller and Bacca, 2001:4). For the purpose of this study, insight is defined as gaining a personal understanding into one's authentic self, how to live a life of meaning, fulfillment, contentment, and spirituality.
Barriers to Insight

Insight does not always occur. Sometimes, one is not able to find a workable solution to a problem or achieve new understanding. In fact, a person's everyday environment is full of potential block to insight. Insight solutions usually result from a new way of looking at a problem or through restructuring of problem components. Traditional and ordinary ideas may block new ways of looking at a problem or restructuring (Schooler and Melcher, 1995). To overcome this, new ways of looking at a problem or its components

must be combined and recombined in new or novel ways. This shifting of the problem into a new problem space is called restructuring.

Cultural, environmental, and emotional blocks also prevent insight (Adams, 1974). A cultural block is "acquired by exposure to a given set of cultural patterns" (Adams, 1974:31). Western society often considers fantasy and reflection a waste of time. In some contexts, they can even be interpreted as signs of laziness or even craziness (Adams, 1974). Negative attitudes toward fantasy may inhibit some people from engaging in play-like introspection or thinking about life in novel ways. Children often exhibit more creativity than adults because children may not be aware of practical constraints that are imposed on adults. However, society and culture may train out mental playfulness, fantasy, and reflectiveness (Adams, 1974). Thus, cultural taboos can also limit creative thinking and thus inhibit insight. A final cultural block suggested by Adams is that tradition is often preferable to change. The status quo is generally preferred because change is threatening. Thus, new ideas that may lead to change are also considered threatening. Individuals tend to censor new ideas by over-analyzing them, laughing at them, or ignoring them. Thus, tradition can inhibit the development of novel and new ideas which can facilitate insight.

Environmental blocks are those imposed by immediate social or physical environments that prohibit the problem solver from correctly understanding a problem or attaining its solution (Adams, 1974). One example of an environmental block is distraction, such as phone calls and noisy offices or work spaces. Constant interruptions severely impact solution attainment, focus, and attention. Additionally, most people are sensitive to criticism and may be unsure of their own ideas. "All ideas require an environment which will produce the support necessary to bring them to fruition" (Adams, 1974:47). Without support, it is difficult to develop a novel idea in a society that prefers tradition and the status quo.

Emotional blocks have the potential to interfere with the exploration of ideas, ability to conceptualize fluently and flexibly, and may prevent the expression and communication of new ideas. One important emotional block is the fear to make a mistake, to fail, or to risk. "People do not often realistically assess the probable consequence of a creative act. Either they blithely ignore any consequences, or their general fear of failure causes them to attach excessive importance to any "mistake," no matter how minor it will appear in the eyes of future historians" (Adams, 1974:55). Therefore, one may never take the risk of searching for novel ideas or solutions to problems.

Inability to relax, incubate, and "sleep on it" may block insight because insight often needs time to incubate. Incubation may allow the unconscious to take over and the solution may appear suddenly in one's consciousness. Adams (1974) suggested that the unconscious needs time to struggle with problems because solutions need adequate time for incubation. It is also important to relax in the midst of problem solving and to allow seemingly "silly" combinations of thought that may lead to fluent and flexible conceptualization.

Ordinary ideas and traditional thinking block unusual ideas or insight (Adams, 1974; Bergson, 1912; Polanyi, 1964; Smith et al., 1995). Problem presentation can inhibit insight because such presentation often contains hidden assumptions. In order to insightfully solve a problem, one must be creative and see things differently or, in other words, restructure the problem or the elements related to the problem. "The notion that the

context of a problem can cause subjects to adhere to false assumptions has been incorporated into the current cognitive conceptualizations" (Schooler and Melcher, 1995: 104). Therefore, changing the context may help lead to insight. New and novel experiences facilitate insight because they require new ways of thinking and must be dealt with in a novel ways (Polanyi, 1964). Novel ways of dealing will often encourage a problem solver to look for hidden possibilities and insights in new places.

Our early vision or understanding of the general nature of things colors and interprets our future experiences. Experiences are shaped by the culture and society into which we are born. Not only does early experience tell us what to believe, but it provides support structures that inhibit new ways of thinking in order support the current way, thereby hindering new and novel ways of thinking. Society rarely supports innovators, people who think differently, and society may actively hinder them (Ghiselin et al., 1985).

Additional types of blocks that prevent insight from emerging come from fears associated with questioning nontraditional thinking (Flanagan, 1997). As discussed above, traditional thinking may hinder or suppress insight. The first type of fear discussed by Flanagan is the fear of understanding ourselves. He posits that, as Freud suggested, many people do not really want to find out about themselves because they may not like what they find. Therefore, they repress and censor things that others or ourselves may disapprove of or hate. Therefore, this repression and censoring of our thoughts and questioning may suppress insight and understanding.

The second type of fear is that of not belonging to a group or society. This type of fear is consistent with Ghilselin et al. (1985) and Polanyi's (1964) thought that society does not support and may actively hinder original thinkers. Some may inhibit creative thinking in order to ensure conformity. It is important to reiterate that many original thinkers, even those who have contributed to that advancement of technology and science, were scorned as they were working on their new discoveries. The fear of being rejected by society or not being part of a group may inhibit and block some insights from emerging.

A third fear suggested by Flanagan (1997) is fear of violating group structures. Society attempts to suppress those who try to violate or surpass group structures. Norms are associated with each type of group structure and there are rewards for conforming to these norms. However, those who try to change classes or groups break norms and often forfeit the support and the rewards associated with their group and are not allowed the privileges of another group. Therefore, there is great fear of violating group/class structures and that fear may inhibit insight.

In summary, insight is a sudden solution to a problem that has been unsolvable for some time and the answer (insight) is often a creative idea or solution that may occur through restructuring the problem and its components. In this study, these creative ideas or solutions pertain to personal understanding into one's authentic self, how to live a life of meaning, fulfillment, contentment, and spirituality. Insight can be prevented by fixating on traditional solutions that are often the result of false assumptions, conformity to group norms and rules, and fears of violating norms. Certain environments or states that are free from the blockages to insight may allow insight to emerge or occur more readily than environments that contain such blockages. Environments that support insight are those that afford freedom to think and behave in nontraditional ways and where creativity is supported.

Travel and Liminality

Travel has long been viewed as a mechanism for insight and self-discovery (Borella, 2006; Campbell, 1968; Cousineau, 1998; Goodnow 2008; Goodnow and Ruddell, 2009; Moir-Bussy, 2003; Ross, 2010; Thursby, 2005). This is particularly true of adventure travel, as travelers typically journey to distant, foreign, novel, and exotic places including natural and sometimes wild environments (Hill, 1995; Jensen, 1985) while participating in activities with high levels of actual and/or perceived risk. These experiences frequently bear a stark contrast to the everyday experience of the traveler.

Adventure travelers typically stay in accommodations that are simple and rustic. For example, in wild areas, most travelers sleep in a tent; while sailing the ocean, most sleep in a berth; and when visiting a hill tribe in Thailand or traveling off-the-tourist-path in Africa, many travelers stay in low-budget hotels or rent a room in a local's home. Many adventure travel destinations have little or no tourist infrastructure. For example, the existing budget hotels may not have running water, toilets, or air-conditioning/heat.

Adventure travelers also find them find themselves in places that have different social norms that their home worlds, and as such, they may experience feelings of being away and find release from many social norms and rules of the ordinary world. Travel has been likened to dropping out of the continuity of life and that journeys described as *time space* that is demarcated from the rest of life (Elsrud, 2001). It is through these novel environments, escape from routine and freedom from social norms that travel experience become liminal.

Liminality comes from the Latin word *limen*, meaning "a threshold" (Russell, 2005).   A threshold is the *space between* one area or place and the next. It can also mean the *time between* the ending of something and the beginning of another. Further, Turner (1966) describes liminality as a transition and "as a time and place of withdrawal from normal modes of social action" (p. 167). Transition is described as having three phases: separation, margin (limen), and aggregation. Separation is the detachment of the individual or group from a social structure or set of cultural conditions and is a form of being psychologically away or in a normless state. The liminal phase is described as "moment in and out of time, in and out of social structure, generalized social bond that has ceased to be and has simultaneously yet to be fragmented into multiplicity of structural ties (Turner, p. 96). Aggregation, the last stage of transition, occurs when one returns or emerges into one's new phase or stage in life.

Liminality is a significant part of transition. One is separated from one's community and culture and may be free from many of the conceptual blocks to insight. Adams (1974) identified three types of blocks that may influence insight. These are cultural, environmental, and emotional blocks. Cultural blocks are imposed by the norms and expectations of one's culture. The cultural blocks identified were the following: fantasy and reflection are a waste of time; playfulness is only appropriate for children; masculine gender characteristics are preferable to feminine; tradition is preferable to change; and the restrictions of taboos. It may be possible that liminal space frees people from the constraints and pressures of conforming to cultural norms and expectations' because one is no longer in that culture. Furthermore, one is not part of a new culture during liminal experience. Therefore, liminal experience seems to provide freedom or release from cultural blocks or norms that may interfere with insight. Liminality should provide

cognitive space for reflection about life's goals and priorities and what to do about them (Kaplan and Kaplan, 1989).

Liminal experience may also include fewer emotional blocks than nonliminal experience because of separation from the judgments of important people. Some emotional blocks are fear of making mistakes, failure, or risk. There is still potential to make a mistake within liminal space; however, the perceived consequences may be lower than in ordinary life because liminality involves separation from one's community and society; thus, social status and many of the consequences, both positive and negative, are suspended. Because liminality provides freedom from many of the norms, expectations, and routines of everyday life and society, insight may be more easily achieved during liminality as opposed to normal life.

Liminal experience may provide an environment free from environmental blocks such as constant interruptions and distractions such as phone calls and noisy office or work space. This is similar to the construct "being away" in Attention Restoration Theory (Kaplan & Kaplan, 1989). In a liminal experience, the normal routines and tasks of everyday life are suspended. Instead, liminal experience is characterized by more freedom.

According to Goodnow (2008), the concept of being away introduced in Kaplan and Kaplan's (1989) Attention Restoration Theory has three components: physical, cognitive and psychological. Being away physically is the degree that a destination is physically and tangibly different from one's home town or country. Some indicators of feeling physically away are different or lacking infrastructure, language, ethnicity, values, traditions, and routines of daily life. All of these differences help a traveler feel more away and affords construction of a feeling of a new world where new ideas and new goals may be acceptable.

Being away cognitively means that the content of one's daily life is left behind and one's daily routine is different. While traveling, there is no work, errands, or any of the other normal obligations and tasks of American society. Adventure travel is comprised of experiencing new things, and having more time free from work to engage in new and novel activities and experiences. Feeling cognitively away may allow a traveler to think about new and novel things because time is not taken up with work and other obligatory tasks. Instead, there is freedom to think differently because there is cognitive space.

Feeling psychologically away means disengaging from life's goals and priorities. In adventure travel, one may discover that one is free from the norms and values of one's home country and is not subjected to those of the new host culture either. This form of being away seems to express liminality as freedom from norms and, coincidentally, freedom from many of the blocks to insight. "Insight problems are best solved by people who can escape from existing mental sets and perceive problems in a new way" (Sternberg, 1988:141). Feelings of freedom to think and act how one wants occur because one is released from the various consequences of thinking or acting contrary to culture. Therefore, being psychologically away is, in a sense, a feeling of permission to re-evaluate goals and to find new meaning in one's life. Developing new ways of thinking or thinking more deeply may be easier to do in a different country where one is free from the norms and expectations of one's own country. Many insights may be contrary to one's home country's values and it is easier to identify them and to act on them in a different country where one can feel a sense of psychological distance.

Travel is one way in which to experience feelings of being away and to find release from many social norms and where rules of the ordinary world are suspended; travel may represent liminal experience. During adventure travel, "previously familiar boundaries were no longer relevant and new ones as yet unformed. This sense of absent boundaries characterizes the transitional zone" (White and White, 2004:208). The transitional zone is liminality.

Through the experience of being away facilitated by liminality, travelers may be free of many blocks to insight. This may be the reason that travel is viewed as an ideal context for insight and self-discovery. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between the experience of liminality and insights gained in a population of travelers.

Methods

Drawing from Goodnow's (2008) study of travel narratives as well as other literature on travel and from Kaplan and Kaplan's (1989) Attention Restoration Theory, a definition of liminality was crafted for the context of this study. Liminality is the condition or experience of being away or free from the physical, cognitive and psychological norms and patterns of day-to-day life. Similarly, using Goodnow's study, a definition of insight was crafted and checked by articles from the literature. For the purpose of this study, insight is defined as gaining a personal understanding into one's authentic self, how to live a life of meaning, fulfillment, contentment, and spirituality. Based on both of these definitions the literature, scales were developed to measure both liminality (6 items) and insight (14 items) in the context of adventure travel. These items were pilot tested by measurement and content experts before final revisions were made.

The final instrument included both the liminality and insight items, as well as items addressing travel motivations, life events prior to travel, trip characteristics and demographics. Data were collected from travelers to Costa Rica in 2009 and to Australia and New Zealand in 2010. Travelers were intercepted at bus stations, airports, hostels, and restaurants, as well as at tourist locations throughout the countries.

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 20. In addition to basic descriptive statistics, reliability analyses and factor analyses were conducted on both the insight and liminality items. Through this process items were eliminated based on both statistics and the literature to create a more parsimonious measure. Standard multiple regression analyses were run for scale and subscale scores.

Results

Respondents (N=335) ranged in age from 14 to 68, with an average age of 26.0 and SD=9.3. The majority of respondents (60.6%) were female, and almost all of them (89.0%) had previous international travel experience. While the largest group of respondents was from the United States, the sample represented 27 different home countries. Trip length ranged from 1 day to 6 years (covering multiple countries) with a mode of 1 week (19.7%). Just over one third of the respondents (35.1%) were travelling from one to two weeks. Group sized ranged from solo travelers (18.8%) to groups as large as 60 persons. The mode

for group size was 2 people (33.5 %), with the majority of respondents (74.1%) travelling in groups of four or fewer people.

Many of the respondents (58.7%) reported staying in average scale accommodations such as budget hotels and hostels with warm showers and electricity. When asked about the type of environment they spent most of their time in, the majority (63.3%) reported travelling to towns through nature, creating a blend of urban and natural experiences. More than half of the respondents (59.1%) reported travelling independently without the use of paid guides or travel service. Finally, 88.1% of travelers reported spending most of their time in a mid- to highly novel environment that was different from their home culture.

Both the Travel Insight and the Liminality Scales were processed through multiple iterations of reliability analyses, factor analyses, and item elimination. Items were eliminated due to poor model fit, and decisions were informed by the literature. The resulting Travel Insight Scale (α = .88) contains of 11 items which comprise two factors (Table 1). Factor one (Personal Insight), explaining 38.8% of the variance, contained nine items and had a Cronbach's alpha of .89. Factor one loadings ranged from .61 to .79. Factor two (Spiritual Insight), explaining 18.6% of the variance, consisted of two items with a Cronbach's alpha of .55. Factor two loadings ranged from .73 to .78. Despite the comparatively low reliability score, both items were retained in the factor for theoretical reasons, mainly that they address a relationship to something outside the self. Together the two factors explained 57.5% of the total variance.

Table 1: Factor loadings – Insight items

Items	Factor 1	Factor 2
Discovered a better way to live life	**.789**	.060
Discovered that simple living is happy living	**.778**	-.025
Figured out how to be happy	**.751**	.148
Discovered a new perspective	**.653**	.398
Discovered personal strengths	**.648**	.391
Discovered life's meaning, purpose or direction	**.648**	.463
Discovered my place in the world	**.625**	.461
Realized something important regarding myself	**.616**	.371
Figured out how little I need to be happy	**.607**	.075
Experienced connection to nature	-.064	**.783**
Experienced connection to a higher power	.264	**.726**

Exploratory factor analysis for the liminality items also yielded two factors (Table 2). Factor one, explaining 47.0% of the variance, contained four items and had a Cronbach's alpha of .85. Factor one loadings ranged from .78 to .89. Factor two, explaining 23.0% of the remaining variance, consisted of only two items and had a Cronbach's alpha of .55. The two items had factor loadings of .78 and .87. Together the two factors explained 70.0% of the total variance for the Liminality Scale.

Table 2: Factor loadings – Liminality items

Items	Factor 1	Factor 2
Felt free to act, think, and be, my authentic self without concern of judgment from others	**.887**	.039
Felt like I don't have to worry about disappointing others	**.823**	.045
Felt free to be myself, think what I want, and do what I want without the fear of judgments from others	**.815**	.130
Felt free from all judgments of family, friends, society, and the culture visited	**.775**	.058
Entered into a new, novel, or different world that is physically or environmentally very different from home	-.107	**.867**
Felt free from the daily routines of ordinary life at home and spent my time on new and novel things	.281	**.779**

Standard multiple regression was conducted to determine which independent variables (Liminality Scale items) were the best predictors of scale scores on the Travel Insight scale items. Regression results indicated a model that accounted for 25% of the variance in Insight scores ($R^2 = .249$, $R^2_{adj} = .234$, $F (6, 310) = 16.777$, $p < .05$). A summary of the model is presented in Table 3. Among the six predictors, only three, freedom to be myself ($t = 5.146$, $p < .05$), freedom from routine ($t = 2.942$, $p < .05$), and experiencing a new or novel world ($t = 2.370$, $p < .05$), and were significant predictors of Travel Insight scores.

A second standard multiple regression was conducted to determine which independent variables (Liminality Scale items) were the best predictors of Personal-Insight sub-scale scores. Regression results indicated a model that accounted for 21% of the variance in Insight scores ($R^2 = .205$, $R^2_{adj} = .190$, $F (6, 310) = 10.666$, $p < .05$). A summary of the model is presented in Table 3. Among the six predictors, only freedom to be myself ($t = 5.649$, $p < .05$) and freedom from routine ($t = 2.806$, $p < .05$) were significant predictors of Personal-Insight sub-scale scores.

A final standard multiple regression was conducted to determine which independent variables (Liminality Scale items) were the best predictors of Spiritual-Insight sub-scale scores. Regression results indicated a model that accounted for 14% of the variance in Insight scores ($R^2 = .138$, $R^2_{adj} = .121$, $F (6, 310) = 8.129$, $p < .05$). A summary of the model is presented in Table 3. Among the six predictors, only one, experiencing a new or novel world ($t = 5.596$, $p < .05$), was a significant predictors of Spiritual-Insight sub-scale scores.

Table 3: Regression model summaries

DV: Insight Total Scale Scores

	B	β	t	p
dmyself	2.716	.355	5.146	.000
droutine	1.481	.161	2.942	.004
dnovel	.966	.125	2.370	.018
dfamily	.684	.090	1.314	.190
ddisapp	.100	.014	.191	.849
djudge	-.290	-.037	-.449	.653

*$F_{(6,310)} = 16.777$, p < .05
$R^2 = .249$

DV: Personal-Insight Sub-Scale Scores

	B	β	t	p
dmyself	.436	.401	5.619	.000
droutine	.206	.158	2.806	.005
dfamily	.123	.114	1.613	.108
ddisapp	.030	.029	.396	.692
dnovel	-.055	-.050	-.927	.355
djudge	-.156	-.139	-1.654	.099

*$F_{(6,310)} = 13.102$, p < .05
$R^2 = .205$

DV: Spiritual-Insight Sub-Scale Scores

	B	β	t	p
dnovel	.348	.317	5.596	.000
djudge	.176	.157	1.794	.074
dmyself	.048	.044	.591	.555
droutine	.015	.011	.193	.847
ddisapp	-.010	-.009	-.123	.902
dfamily	-.051	-.047	-.642	.521

*$F_{(6,310)} = 8.129$, p < .05
$R^2 = .138$

Discussion

Participants in the study cover a wide range of demographics. The sample tends toward younger people travelling in pairs for approximately one week. While a majority of respondents were from the United States, the 26 other countries represented were largely first-world with similar lifestyle characteristics.

Additionally, a majority of respondents reported travel styles and experience that are in line with the literature on liminality. They reported staying in budget hostels,

experiencing a blend of urban and natural settings, travelling independently without a guide, and spending a majority of their time in new or novel environments. These factors combine to create a travel experience high in novelty, freedom from cultural norms, and the ability to creatively control their experiences.

Goodnow's (2008) work constructed liminal space as having three dimensions, being away physically, cognitively, and psychologically, with being away psychologically as the most important, yet most elusive, liminal dimension. The scale items for liminality were based on these three dimensions, however, in this study liminality loaded on only two factors. One factor contained the items addressing being away psychologically and explained the most variance (47.0%). The second factor contained the items addressing being away physically and cognitively (Table 2). This seems to support Goodnow's (2008) conclusion that psychologically being away was the most important dimension of liminality. Perhaps this is due to the fact that being away physically and free from daily routines are inherent parts of travel, freeing the mind from cultural and cognitive blocks (Adler, 1985) and creating the cognitive space to think in new and novel ways. The wording of the physical and cognitive items make the characteristics objective and easy to identify, while the items loading on being away psychologically are more subjective and require deeper thought. Future research should explore these variables and their relationship more deeply, perhaps by attempting to tease out the subtle differences in influence of each factor, as well as exploring the possibility of antecedent or mediating variables.

The 14 insight items in this study were originally conceived as comprising three dimensions: self-discovery, how to live a satisfying life, and spirituality (Goodnow, 2008). After several iterations of dimension reduction and item elimination, eleven remaining insight items loaded on only two factors (Table 1). The first factor contains items primarily related to lifestyle, self, and happiness and was renamed Personal Insight. This factor largely represents a combination of the hypothesized self-discovery and satisfying life dimensions. The second factor, containing two items, remains similar to the originally conceived Spiritual Insight dimension. This suggests that insight actually broke down to revelations about self and revelations about self in relation to other.

Results of the multiple regression analysis reveal some interesting insights in relation to both the liminality and the insight scale items. The only significant predictors of total Travel Insight scores were three items that correspond closely with the original conceptualization of liminality as related to being away: freedom to be myself (being away psychologically), freedom from routine (being away cognitively), and experiencing a new or novel world (being away physically). Two of these items appear again as the only significant predictors of Personal Insight subscale scores: freedom to be myself and freedom from routine. Meanwhile, one of these items remains as the only significant predictor of spiritual insight: experiencing a new or novel world. None of the remaining items from the revised Liminality Scale serve as significant predictors of Travel Insight.

It appears that the only necessary condition for spiritual insight is the sense of being away physically, or experiencing a new or novel environment. This finding resonates with the literature on spirituality and the sacred (Driver et al., 1987; McDonald, 1989; Nash, 1982). Respondents in this study noted that a significant portion of their travel time was spent in natural environments. Being in such a novel environment can induce feelings of awe or feelings of being a part of something larger than one's self, which are key

components of spirituality (Stringer and McAvoy, 1992). The same reactions may be elicited by being immersed in a cultural landscape that is new or novel.

The other subscale, Personal Insight, is significantly impacted only by a sense of freedom, both to be one's self and from routine. It appears that physical environment is not a factor. This, too, is intuitive, as it is difficult to have personal insights if behavior or thought process is constricted in some way. This speaks to the blocks to insight blocks that are present in traditional processes and norms of society. It appears travelers in this sample have, consciously or not, successfully navigated through such barriers to insight.

It is not surprising that these three predictors of the subscales work together to best predict overall Travel Insight scores. While some types of insight can be gained through the experience of sub-components of liminality, insight in a holistic sense requires all three components. These findings do, however, appear to contradict the factor structure that emerged in this study. As previously discussed, the items related to freedom from routine and experiencing a new or novel environment were strongly associated with a single factor. As regression results indicate, they play a separate and distinct role in predicting insight. Future research should further explore this discrepancy.

One limitation of this study is that the authors did not include motivation data in the analysis. It is possible that the traveler's motivation serves as a mediating or intervening factor in the experience of insight. Additionally, future research with a larger sample size could allow exploration into whether factors such as group size and trip length play a role in the experience of both liminality and insight.

As more people seek insight into life's larger questions, research such as this can shed light on the travel characteristics that best facilitate solutions. Travelers who can create opportunities to experience new or novel environments, break from their daily routines, and allow themselves to feel freedom to be who themselves are more likely to experience insight. Travel is a leisure experience, a hallmark of which is that individuals feel free to be themselves and to try out new possibilities (Kelly, 1983). While it could be argued that any leisure would therefore facilitate insight, everyday leisure patterns may not provide the cognitive break from routine that is requisite for lifestyle insight. During travel, the unique combination of a sense of being away cognitively, physically and psychologically set the stage for insight to occur.

References

Adams, J. (1974). *Conceptual Blockbusting*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Alumni Association.

Adler, J. (1985). Youth on the Road: Reflections on the History of Tramping. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 12(3): 335-354.

Bergson, H. (1912). *An Introduction to Metaphysics*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Borella, S. S. (2006). *The Travel Narratives of Ella Maillart: (En)gendering the Quest*. New York: Peter Lang.

Campbell, J. (1968). *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. New York: Princeton University Press.

Causineau, P. (1998). *The Art of Pilgrim: The Seeker's Guide to Making Travel Sacred*. York Beach, ME: Conari Press.

Dunlap, K. and Yerkes, R. (1931). Reasoning in Humans. *The Journal of Comparative Psychology,* 12, 181-194.

Driver, B. L., Nash, R. and Haas, G. (1987). Wilderness Benefits: A State-of-Knowledge Review. In R. C. Lucas (Ed.), *Proceedings, National Wilderness Research Conference: Issues, State-of-Knowledge, Future Directions* (General Tech. Rep. INT-220, pp. 294-319). Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station.

Elsrud, T. (2001). Risk creation in traveling: Backpacker adventure narratives. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(3), 597-517.

Flanagan, J. (1997). *Quest for Self-Knowledge: An Essay in Lonergan's Philosophy*. Toronto: University Press.

Ghiselin, B . Poincare, H, Kuniyoshi, Y. and Gerard, R.W. (1985). *The Creative Process*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Goodnow, J. (2008). <u>Adventure Travel Narratives: An Illustration of the Relationship Between Insight Attainment and Liminal Experience.</u> Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University Utah, Salt Lake City.

Goodnow, J. and Ruddell, E. (2009). An Illustration of the Quest Genre as Spiritual Metaphor in Adventure Travel Narratives. *Leisure/Loisir,* 33(1): 241-268.

Groom, E. (Ed.). (2005). *Methods for Teaching Travel Literature and Writing: Exploring the World of Self*. New York: Peter Lang.

Hayes, A. M., Feldman, G. C. and Goldfried, M. R. (2007). The Change and Growth Experiences Scale: A Measure of Insight and Emotional Processing. In L. G. Castonguay and C. E. Hill (Eds.), *Insight in Psychotherapy* (pp. 231-253). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Hartig, T. and Evans, G. (1993). Psychological Foundations of Nature Experience. In T. Garling and R. G. Golledge (Eds.), *Behavior and Environment: Psychological and Geographical Approaches* (pp. 427-457). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Pub.

Hill, B. J., (1995). A Guide to Adventure Travel. *Parks and Recreation,* 30(9): 56-65.

Hill, C. E, Castonguay, L.G., Arnkoff, D. B., Barber, J. P., Bohart, A. C., Borkovec, T. D., Bowman, E. A. … Wampold, B. E. (2007). Insight in Psychotherapy: Definitions, Processes, Consequences, and Research Directions. In L. G. Castonguay and C. E. Hill (Eds.), *Insight in psychotherapy* (pp. 441-454). Washington, D. C.: AmericanPsychological Association.

Jensen, C. (1985). *Outdoor recreation in America* (4th ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Burgess Publishing.

Kaplan, R. (1974). Some Psychological Benefit of an Outdoor Challenge Program. *Environment and Behavior, 6*(1): 101-162.

Kaplan, R. and Kaplan, S. (1989). *The Experience of Nature: A Psychological Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kaplan, C. A. and Simon, H. A. (1990). In Search of Insight. *Cognitive Psychology*, 22, 274-419.

Kaplan, S. and Talbot, J. F. (1983). Psychological Benefits of a Wilderness Experience. In I. Altman & J.F. Wollwill (Eds.), *Behavior and the Natural Environment* (pp. 163-203), Human Behavior and the Environment Series, vol. 6. New York: Plenium.

Kean, M. T. and Gilhooly, K. J. (1992). *Advances in the Psychology of Thinking. Vol. 1.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Kelly, J. R. (1983). *Leisure Identities and Interactions.* London, UK: Allen and Unwin.

Langley, P. and Jones, R. (1988). A Computational Model of Scientific Insight. In R.J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The Nature of Creativity: Contemporary Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 177-201). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levitt, H., Frankel, Z., Hiestand, K., Ware, K., Bretz, K., Kelly, R, McGhee, S., Nordtvedt, R. and Raina, K. (2004). The Transformational Experience of Insight: A Life Changing Event. *Journal of Contructivist Psychology*, 17, 1-26.

McDonald, B. L. (1989). The Outdoors as a Setting for Spiritual Growth. *Women in Natural Resources,* 10(2): 19-23.

Miller, W. R. and Bacca, J. (2001). *Quantum Change: When Epiphanies and Sudden Insight Transform Ordinary Lives.* USA: The Gilford Press.

Moir-Bussy, A. (2003). Travel That Leads to Wisdom. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling,* 21(1): 5-9.

Nash, R. (1982). *Wilderness and the American Mind* (3rd ed.). New Have, CT: Yale University Press.

Ohlsson, S. (1984). Restructuring Revisited II. An Information Processing Theory of Restructuring And Insight. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 25, 117-129.

Polanyi, M. (1964). *Personal Knowledge: Toward a Post-Critical Philosophy*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Ross, S.L. (2010). Transformative Travel: An Enjoyable Way to Foster Radical Change. Revision, 32(1), 54-61.

Schooler, J. W. and Melcher, J. (1995). The Ineffability of Insight. In S.M. Smith, T. B. Ward, and R.A. Finke (Eds.), *The Creative Cognition Approach* (pp. 97-134) Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Smith, S.M., Ward, T.B. and Finke, R. (1995). Introduction: Cognitive Processes in Creative Context. In S.M. Smith, T. B. Ward, and R.A. Finke (Eds.), *The Creative Cognition Approach* (pp. 1-8). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (1988). *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stringer, A. and McAvoy, L. (1992). The need for something different: Spirituality and wilderness adventure. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 15*(1), 13-20.

Russell, R. (2005). *Pastimes: The Context of Contemporary Leisure,* 3rd ed. Urbana, IL: Sagamore.

Thursby, J. S. (2005). American Travel Literature in the Classroom: Inward and Outward Journeys. In E. Groom (Ed.), *Methods for Teaching Travel Literature and Writing: Exploring the World of Self* (pp. 31-42). New York: Peter Lang.

Turner, V. (1966). *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structures*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Walle, A. H. (1997). Pursuing Risk or Insight: Marketing Adventures. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 24(2): 265-282.

Wampold, B. E., Imel, Z. C., Bhati, K. S. and Johnson-Jennings, M. D. (2007). Insight as a Common Factor. In L. G. Castonguay and C. E. Hill (Eds.), *Insight in Psychotherapy* (pp. 119-139). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

White, N. R. and White, P. B. (2004). Travel as Transition: Identity and Place. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 31(1): 200-218.

Kelly S. Bloom, PhD   Jasmine Goodnow, PhD
kbloom@mtsu.edu   Western Washington University
Middle Tennessee State University