THE INDISCIPLINE OF TOURISM

John Tribe
Buckinghamshire College, UK

Abstract: This paper develops a new model which exposes the epistemological characteristics of tourism studies. Various claims and frameworks have been proposed with regard to the epistemology of tourism, mainly centering around the discipline/field debate. A critical review of these is undertaken and the idea that tourism studies is a discipline is rejected. It is proposed that tourism be conceptualized as two fields (the business of tourism and the non-business aspects of tourism) which are approached by four main methods of inquiry. The model provides insights into how tourism studies is developing, the way the tourism world is seen, and the reasons for divisions among academics and between academics and industrialists. **Keywords:** epistemology, discipline, field, multidisciplinary, interdisciplinarity, extradisciplinarity.

Resume: L'indiscipline du tourisme. Cet article developpe un nouveau modele qui explore les caracteristiques epistemologiques de l'etude du tourisme. Plusieurs arguments et structures de pensee ont etc proposes pour l'epistemologie du tourisme, se concentrant sur le debat discipline/domaine. On effectue une etude critique des deux termes, et l'idee que l'etude du tourisme est une discipline est rejetee. On propose de conceptualiser la notion du tourisme comme deux domaines distincts-l'industrie du tourisme et l'aspect non commercial du tourisme, pour lequel on utilise quatre methodes d'enquete. Le modele permet de comprendre le developpement actuel de l'etude du tourisme, la maniere de concevoir le monde du tourisme, et les divisions parmi universitaires et entre universitaires et gestionnaires. **Mots-des:** epistemologie, discipline, domaine, multidisciplinarite, interdisciplinarite, extradisciplinarite.

INTRODUCTION

Conscious of its youthfulness and thus its potential lack of intellectual credibility, tourism studies has sought to define itself in ways which would give it academic weight. While some analysts have attempted to describe tourism studies as a discipline, others have found evidence to support its conception as a multidisciplinary field. Underpinning by scientific method has also been sought in search of a rigorous approach. This paper offers a comprehensive review of the epistemology of tourism and proposes a new model for its understanding. Its method of inquiry uses the philosophy of knowledge and the sociology of knowledge.

THE INDISCIPLINE OF TOURISM

Epistemology of Tourism

The question of knowing about what one knows about tourism is an epistemological question, epistemology being that branch of philosophy which studies knowledge. Its essential concern is the analysis of the validity of a claim to know something. The epistemology of tourism thus inquires into the character of tourism knowledge, the sources of tourism knowledge, the validity and reliability of claims of knowledge of the external world of tourism, the use of concepts, the boundaries of tourism studies, and the categorization of tourism studies as a discipline or a field.

It is important to distinguish between different forms of knowing about tourism. First, "knowing that" represents propositional knowledge. The truth of a proposition must be validated against appropriate criteria generally provided by academic disciplines. Second, "knowing how" is procedural knowledge, or process knowledge which may be validated against performance to certain standards. While propositional knowledge characterizes tourism as an academic study, procedural knowledge is a key part of the professional practice of tourism management.

The importance of epistemology for tourism is two-fold. First, it promotes a systematic review of what is legitimate tourism knowledge. It is thus in the business of knowledge quality control—a business that is particularly important for areas which are relatively immature such as tourism studies. Second, the map or the boundaries of tourism studies are still not agreed on. Epistemology can help this debate to develop.

The word tourism is problematic, because it is used in common parlance. As such its use is often permissive and imprecise, and thus it can encompass a variety of meanings. The term seems to be a different kind of term from physics or philosophy or economics. These academic disciplines describe particular ways of analyzing the external world. However, tourism is the material of the external world of events and so is the data to be examined rather than the method of examination. But tourism means more. The term is like the term education, which describes phenomena in the external world, but also describes a field of academic inquiry. Additionally, there is something called tourism education which is distinct from tourism practice and connected with its study.

Analysis of the epistemology of tourism is going to be subject to confusion unless a clear distinction is made among the various meanings of the term tourism. These distinct meanings then need to be labeled and used consistently throughout this paper. The analytic strategy proposed to resolve this problem is what Soltis (1968) describes as a differentiation type analysis. The problem requiring resolution is that the concept of tourism is found to have more than one standard meaning. The purpose of differentiation type analysis is to clarify the logical terrain covered by different meanings of the concept of tourism. The initial survey of the terrain has revealed three possible separate types of use of the concept of tourism.

First, tourism is a phenomenon in the external world. Here tourism is what people are engaged in when they visit friends and relatives, or go skiing, or visit the three gorges in China. It is proposed to refer to this dimension of tourism as the external world of tourism or the phenomenon of tourism, or tourism for short. Second, tourism has generated interest among academics. Here one may envisage the emergence of an academic community (Becher 1989) whose business involves the investigation of tourism and the construction of a body of knowledge. This dimension of tourism will be referred to as the study of tourism. There is also a third dimension which has resulted from the emergence of courses in tourism. This dimension will be referred to as tourism education and training. It is the logical terrain of the first two dimensions that is explored in the rest of this paper as it attempts to conceptualize how the external world of tourism is interpreted through tourism studies.

The Phenomenon of Tourism

Tourism is essentially an activity engaged in by human beings and the minimum necessary features that need to exist for it to be said to have occurred include the act of travel from one place to another, a particular set of motives for engaging in that travel (excluding commuting for work), and the engagement in activity at the destination.

Mathieson and Wall encompass these points in their succinct definition of tourism as:

the temporary movement to destinations outside the normal home and workplace, the activities undertaken during the stay, and the facilities created to cater for the needs of tourists (1982:1).

Such a definition locates tourism as the sum of a number of subactivities, mainly travel, hospitality, and recreation. Ryan proposes a similar definition of tourism as:

a study of the demand for and supply of accommodation and supportive services for those staying away from home, and the resultant patterns of expenditure, income creation, and employment (1991:5).

This definition (which elides tourism and its studies) shares with the previous one an emphasis on the economic and business aspects of tourism. Such definitions are common since they set out an area of tourism which can essentially be described by monetary flows. These flows include consumer spending, business income, expenditure and profit, and the effects on the national and regional economies of the tourism generating country and host country.

However, tourism clearly encompasses more than just that which is measurable in monetary terms. Przeclawski (1993) has pointed out the psychological, the social, and the cultural as additional important elements of tourism. Ryan emphasizes the psychological aspects in his definition as:

the means by which people seek psychological benefits that arise from experiencing new places, and new situations that are of temporary duration, while free from the constraints of work, or normal patterns of daily life at home (1991:6).

But this is not so much a global definition of tourism as an initial foray into tourism motivation. It also portrays tourism as an activity that is essentially focused on the tourist. Tourism is a wider activity with important impacts on host communities. This wider world of tourism is captured in the definition provided by McIntosh and Goeldner:

tourism may be defined as the sum of the phenomena and relationships arising from the interaction of tourists, business suppliers, host governments, and host communities in the process of attracting and hosting these tourists and other visitors (1995:10).

However, this definition could be improved upon. First, the last part seems to unduly complicate and limit things, and its omission would enhance economy of expression. Second, the term host communities could be extended to "host communities and environments" to take account the physical environment as well as the human community. Third, one needs to consider not just businesses and the individual in tourism-generating countries but also governments, communities, and the environment in these generating countries. Thus, a modified definition of tourism might read:

the sum of the phenomena and relationships arising from the interaction in generating and host regions, of tourists, business suppliers, governments, communities, and environments.

Of course the phenomenon of tourism is ultimately just whatever is linked with the act of tourism and thus one must beware of seeking definitions which may lead to exclusions. But the above definition does reveal the key dimensions: those related to the tourist (including motivation, choice, satisfaction, interaction); those related to business (including marketing, organization and corporate planning of transport, hospitality, and recreation); those relating to the host community (including perceptions, economic, social, and cultural impacts); those relating to the host environment (including ecological impacts); those relating to host governments (including measurement of tourism, policy, and planning); and those relating to the generating country (including economic, environmental, and cultural effects). Tourism has thus been conceptualized by different writers in different ways. Some are narrow business-related definitions, but tourism can be stretched to encompass a wide range of phenomena. There do not appear to be any logical grounds for restricting the meaning of tourism, hence the wide definition proposed above is used for the purposes of this study.

It is now possible to map out the interrelationships between tourism as a phenomenon and the study of tourism. Popper's (1975) distinction between three worlds provides a useful framework for distinguishing between tourism as a phenomenon and as a study. The three worlds that Popper proposes are the external world (world 1), human con-

sciousness (world II), and the world of objective knowledge (world III). Tourism as a phenomenon is that external world (world I) where humans go about the business of being tourists. It is whatever humans decide to do within the fairly wide definition of the term which is large, messy, complex, and dynamic.

This is not the same world as the study of tourism. The latter consists of a tourism research community (world II) and a symbolic record of objective tourism knowledge (world III). It is an attempt by humans to capture, to represent, to describe, and to explain the phenomenon of tourism.

The study of tourism uncovers new ways of seeing tourism, maps out new concepts, elaborates new theories and builds up a body of knowledge. Tourism studies is however essentially much less than the activity that it describes. It is essentially in the business of making generalizations about the phenomenal world of tourism and the packaging of theories. Tourism studies is, therefore, only a microcosm of tourism. Indeed there may well be interesting aspects of tourism which are not as yet revealed or discovered by the study of tourism. The relationship between the study of tourism and the activity of tourism also points up the important issue of boundaries and concepts. For there is an issue of what parts of the phenomenon of tourism are studied in tourism studies, and how these parts are to be conceptualized. World I is illuminated by and conceptualized in world III. The epistemology of tourism therefore is the key to the phenomenon.

Wiry Tourism is not a Discipline

It has been tempting for some writers to interpret the development of tourism studies as an evolution towards disciplinary status, the implication being that the achievement of disciplinary status would resolve epistemological problems. Disciplinary status would provide the necessary tools and framework for promoting sound tourism knowledge. Tourism knowledge would become self-refereeing within its discipline, knowledge quality control would be assured, and tourism academics would take their place on an equal par with those from other disciplines.

Goeldner (1988) describes tourism as a discipline. He sees it as being in its formative stages on a parallel with business administration as it was developing in the United States about 30 years ago. On the other hand, according to Cooper, Fletcher, Gilbert and Wanhill, "While tourism rightly constitutes a domain of study, at the moment it lacks the level of theoretical underpinning which would allow it to become a discipline" (1993:1). Perhaps the debate as to whether the study of tourism is a discipline or a field is still unsettled. Hirst's (1965, 1974) work on disciplines and fields can serve as a useful framework for the evaluation of tourism studies in this respect. Although Hirst has changed his view regarding the forms of knowledge as being the essential features of a liberal education, he "still hold(s) that forms of theoretical knowledge can be distinguished in terms of the logical features and truth criteria of the propositions with which they are primarily concerned" (Hirst 1993:196).

Hirst proposed a limited number of forms of knowledge or disciplines. He explained the meaning of a form of knowledge, or discipline, as "a distinct way in which our experience becomes structured round the use of accepted public symbols" (1974:44). Hirst's forms of knowledge have, in his later work, been articulated into mathematics, physical sciences, human sciences, history, religion, literature and the fine arts, and philosophy.

He proposed that these forms of knowledge are distinct and explains their distinctness in four ways. First, each form has a network of interrelated concepts. The central concepts of the physical sciences include, for example, gravity, heat and light, and acceleration. These concepts are particular to that form of knowledge. Second, these concepts form a distinctive network which give the form its distinctive logical structure. Third, each form has expressions or statements which are in some way testable against experience using criteria which are particular to that form. A fourth consequence of the classification of the disciplines or forms of knowledge proposed by Hirst is that they are irreducible. Irreducibility means that it is not possible to reduce these forms of knowledge any further, in other words these are the basic building blocks. Thus, Hirst is saying that these forms of knowledge or disciplines represent the main methodological ways of analyzing and conceptualizing the external world. Irreducibility is not to be confused with indivisibility though. For each of these forms of knowledge may be subdivided into subdisciplines, such as physics or chemistry. The point about these disciplines is that they each display a distinct set of concepts, theories, and ways of progressing the discipline in terms of research programs and research methodologies.

Based on Hirst's set of necessary characteristics for a discipline, tourism studies cannot be regarded as one for several reasons. First, tourism studies can, in fact, parade a number of concepts. These include, for example, the destination, the tourism multiplier, yield management, tourism impacts, and tourism motivation. But these concepts are hardly particular to tourism studies. They are concepts that have started life elsewhere and been stretched or contextualized to give them a tourism dimension. The tourism multiplier, for instance, borrows the concept of the multiplier developed by economists and uses it to illustrate the extent to which tourism spending stays in a particular region.

Second, tourism concepts do not form a distinctive network. They tend to be separate and atomized and indeed need to be understood generally within the logical structure of their provider discipline. They do not link together in any logical way to provide a tourism studies way of analyzing the world. Their only link is the object of their study which is tourism. They do not form a cohesive theoretical framework. Because of this there is not a distinctive logical structure to tourism studies. Tourism studies, of itself, does not provide a distinctive, structured way of analyzing the world as does say physics. Third, tourism studies does not have expressions or statements which are testable against experience using criteria which are particular to tourism studies. Hirst gives examples of the sciences' use of empirical experimentation, and of mathematics' recourse to deductive reason-

ing from sets of axioms. Tourism studies does not provide any truth criteria which are particular to itself but rather utilizes those criteria which are found in its contributory disciplines.

Does tourism pass the test of irreducibility? The way to resolve this question is to pose some typical tourism puzzles and ascertain whether such puzzles are soluble within a structure called tourism studies, or whether their resolution requires referral to other disciplines. Irreducibility would mean that tourism studies itself can provide the tool kit for analyzing the puzzle. By examining "tourism satisfaction" as a typical tourism puzzle, one finds that this concept is indeed reducible, but only through several other disciplines. The term satisfaction may be approached as a philosophical question when the aspect of "satisfaction with what" is probed. Satisfaction may contain psychological elements when one asks how satisfaction is perceived by the subject. Assuming that some of the issues of definition can be resolved, then one might move onto quantification of "tourism satisfaction" which is essentially a statistical matter.

In fact the substantive concept to be investigated in relation to "tourism satisfaction" is the concept of "satisfaction" which requires the most work. The tourism part of the concept is really an add-on which does not require any special tourism methodology. Once a methodology for defining and measuring "satisfaction" is devised, then it can be applied with relative ease to a tourism context. As such, this and other tourism concepts are built using contributory disciplines. Therefore, based on Hirst's criteria, tourism is neither a discipline nor a subdiscipline. Its main shortcomings in this respect are first a lack of internal theoretical or conceptual unity, and second a ready reliance on contributory disciplines.

Toulmin's (1972) epistemological tests for a discipline are similar to those of Hirst and comprise uniqueness in terms of a body of concepts, methods, and fundamental aims. Donald (1986) uses a similar categorization of knowledge based on the nature of concepts, the logical structure of disciplines, the truth criteria used, and methods employed. The criteria that King and Brownell (1966) use to define a discipline include some similar features to those used by Hirst such as the existence of a mode of inquiry, a conceptual structure, and a domain. Tourism studies fails the test for acceptance as a discipline on the above criteria in the same way as it failed in relation to the Hirst criteria. However, King and Brownell (1966) also include other criteria such as the existence of a community, a network of communications, a tradition, and a particular set of values and beliefs.

To what extent are these additional criteria met by tourism studies? First to the community aspects of tourism studies, Cooper, Shepherd and Westlake assert that "tourism has its own, albeit small academic community" (1994:54). But how is a community to be judged? A community must mean a grouping around something, and thus one might conceive of a community grouped around a faculty or a department. But there are very few faculties or departments of tourism. Moreover, academics are more likely to identify themselves within a community of others from a similar disciplinary or functional background, than place themselves within a tourism community. They will

certainly have a more common language with those of a similar disciplinary background, since there is little intersubjectivity for tourism. Thus, the tourism academic community turns out to be atomized and exert weaker influences than other social groupings. This analysis is supported by Henkel's findings for business studies that "as yet, there is no one business studies community in higher education and the academic identity of the subject is very weak" (1988:189).

What of "a network of communications"? Tourism has developed a network of communications which include professional associations, conferences, books, and journals. However, there is only a superficial similarity between some journal titles. It is possible to classify journals into those which are primarily about the business of tourism (e.g., *Tourism Management*, *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*) and those which have a more open agenda (e.g., *Annals of Tourism Research*, *Journal of Tourism Studies*, and *Travel and Tourism Analyst*). Thus, the case for tourism studies as a homogeneous project based on its communications networks tends to disintegrate. As to a tradition and particular set of values and beliefs applicable to tourism studies, Graburn and Jafari traced scholarship in tourism and reflected that "most studies have taken place since 1970 and 50 percent of them since 1980" (1991:1). Thus, tourism studies has not established anything that could be called a tradition that might impose its own unity.

Given the breadth of tourism, it would be surprising if there were to be a shared set of values among its scholarly community. Cotgrove (1983) explored the notion of competing social paradigms in business studies. He contrasted sets of values and beliefs which reflected what he termed the dominant social paradigm with those that reflected an alternative environmental paradigm. Cotgrove's competing paradigms apply readily to tourism studies. Within the community of tourism scholars one can contrast those whose core values are "material" and favor "economic growth" against those with "non-material (self-actualization)" values; those who value the natural environment as a resource against those who value its intrinsic value; and those who seek "domination over nature" against those who seek "harmony with nature". The different value systems which inform different scholars in the tourism studies community mean that different puzzles and different solutions will be followed. For example, national park management will have different aims and objectives according to whether the environment is seen in resource terms as opposed to intrinsic value terms.

Leiper registered an enthusiasm for developing tourism as a discipline:

to overcome the defects stemming from a fundamentally fragmented curriculum, a new discipline needs to be created to form the core strand in comprehensive programs especially at the professional level (1981:71).

Leiper's paper sets out what he terms a general tourism theory which he argues gives a system overview. His general tourism theory is based on the articulation of the system as composed of tourists, generating regions, transit routes, destination regions, and the industry. But

while this is a useful mapping of the dimensions of tourism, it hardly constitutes a unifying theory of tourism. Leiper further suggests that the term *tourology* be used to describe the discipline that he sees as developing on the basis of his general tourism theory. It is a "suitable name for the scientific study of tourism". Some 15 years after the publication of Leiper's paper, there is no evidence of such a term being used.

One may conclude from the above analysis that tourism is not a discipline. However, recent theorists who have subjected the concept of disciplines to critical scrutiny have found them to be lacking the tight, unifying structure that was once imagined:

When one begins to look closely in to [the epistemological structures of the disciplines] it becomes apparent that most of them embrace a wide range of subspecialisms, some with one set of features and others with others. There is no single method of inquiry, no standard verification procedure, no definitive set of concepts which uniquely characterizes a particular discipline (Becher 1989:43).

Thus, the attempt by some to legitimate tourism studies by packaging it up as a discipline not only fails on logical grounds (i.e., tourism studies does not pass the test), but is also an empty and fruitless one (i.e., disciplines are not the *sine qua non* of knowledge production).

Tourism as a Science

In the absence of disciplinary status, tourism may turn to science for an appropriate framework. For example, Gunn notes that an important way of "gaining [tourism] knowledge is through science". Gunn sees in science a quality of paramount importance, that is its method of "questioning and systematic check" (1987:4). Science certainly provides one appropriate epistemology for tourism studies. While limiting tourism studies to the use of scientific method solves some problems (provides a valid test for knowledge), this poses others. Scientific method does provide systematic check, but can only provide systematic check of parts of the tourism phenomenon which allow systematic checking. Thus, in proposing scientific method as *the* method of tourism analysis, one would necessarily exclude large parts of the phenomenal world of tourism which are not scientifically quantifiable and are not indeed scientific puzzles.

Hirst's (1965) initial classification of forms of knowledge show what aspects of tourism knowledge would be foregone. Thus, while the scientific embraces empirical forms of knowledge, what of mathematical, philosophical, moral, aesthetic, historical, and sociological forms? Tourism studies requires greater epistemological breadth than that suggested by Gunn. There are many significant moral and aesthetic questions facing tourism.

Leiper's (1981) proposed science of *tourology* makes a similar presupposition to Gunn that tourism studies is a scientific study. This is redolent of the development of economics as a discipline. Economics sought respectability in the rigor of the scientific method. But the effects of developing orthodox economics on scientific and math-

ematics methodologies have been that first economic theory has increasingly become separate from the phenomenal world that it seeks to describe, and second that phenomenal world is seen in a particular way. The methodology of orthodox economics as it has developed has become something of a strait-jacket. Schon (1983) has also cautioned against what he terms the "technical rationality" model which dominates professional practice. He sees this as promoting knowledge which is of a propositional nature and based on scientific method at the expense of process knowledge. Schon (1987) sees this latter knowledge as an essential part of the skills base needed, for example, by those employed in tourism management.

Tourism as a Field

Hirst (1965, 1993) has also turned his attention to the notion of fields of knowledge. These are not, in his view, disciplines or subdivisions of disciplines. This is because a field does not have the coherence of a discipline. In a sense fields and disciplines relate to the phenomenological world in different ways. A discipline provides a particular tool kit in terms of concepts, acquired knowledge, and methodology, and this tool kit is used to illuminate a particular part of the external world. A pair of disciplinary spectacles is provided by a discipline, and these spectacles reveal particular truths about the world. Thus, a physicist would see the external world in a particular way. For example, a physicist's interest in the world of tourism might include aspects such as the reasons that aircraft fly, using concepts such as aerodynamics and lift.

Fields work from the opposite direction. Fields are formed by concentrating on particular phenomena or practices such as tourism or housing or engineering. They then call on a number of disciplines to investigate and explain their area of interest. Knowledge flows in different directions between fields and disciplines. Henkel contrasted disciplines which "are held together by distinctive constellations of theories, concepts, and methods" with fields which "draw upon all sorts of knowledge that may illuminate them" (1988:185). Hirst described fields as being "formed by building together round specific objects, or phenomena, or practical pursuits, knowledge that is characteristically rooted elsewhere in more than one discipline". Hirst conceded that disciplines might borrow from each other, but that fields were separable from disciplines because "they are not concerned to validate any one logically distinct form of expression" or in "developing a particular structure of experience" (1965:130).

Several writers have considered tourism as a field as depicted by the above definitions. Gunn lists the main disciplines that he sees as contributing to tourism as marketing, geography, anthropology, behavior, business, human ecology, history, political science, planning and design, and futurism. Futurism is defined as "applied history" and results when "philosophers, scientists, technicians and planners have joined in making insightful studies of trends" (1987:8). According to Gunn:

Tourism knowledge today is building through a variety of means ...First tourism practitioners know certain things because of tenacity ...second is the method of authority ...A third way of gaining tourism knowledge is by means of intuition ...The fourth way of gaining knowledge is through science (1987:4).

Other than science, Gunn's analysis, however, includes ways of knowing which are clearly no such thing. Tenacity is explained as firmly held views, authority as the word of someone important, and intuition speaks for itself-none of these can be serious contenders in justifying the existence of knowledge.

Jafari and Brent Ritchie (1981) presented a model of tourism studies as a field (Figure I). This model helps to illustrate the multi-disciplinary nature of tourism studies. But in the light of Hirst's work on the nature of disciplines, and on other grounds, several modifications are proposed. The inner circle of boxes are referred to

Figure 1. Study of Tourism Choice of Discipline and Approach. *Source:* Jafar Jafari, University of Wisconsin-Stout

as tourism courses and the outer ring of shaded boxes are denoted as disciplines or departments. The mixing of disciplines and departments can cause confusion and the model could gain in conceptual clarity by putting together the various tourism puzzles (i.e., the objects of study) on the inner ring and the methods of analysis (i.e., the disciplinary approaches) on the outer ring. Thus, while sociology, economics, and psychology represent disciplines, parks and recreation, education, hotel, and agriculture clearly do not. Parks and recreation, transport, and education, for instance represent something to be studied-not a way of studying. They thus belong in the inner ring.

Additionally, the positioning of marketing and business poses problems. Marketing represents a business function which utilizes a set of principles. It is not a discipline in its own right, but rather uses disciplines such as economics, sociology, and psychology, as well as codifying practice from the world of business. In fact marketing is often considered as part of the field of inquiry of business studies and law could be added to this grouping too. It is useful here to note Henkel's analysis that the "techniques required in business studies are derivative partly from the disciplines that contribute to them and partly from the world of business practice" (1988:188). In other words, part of its knowledge is being validated outside of the academy.

Business studies and marketing thus pose problems for Jafari and Ritchie's model and a quite significant reformulation of it is required before their accommodation can take place. This is because there are now two fields of inquiry emerging from the model-tourism and business studies. Although it has seemed convenient and makes for a neat solution to wrap up the field of tourism a single entity called tourism studies, this approach perhaps causes undue confusion. Rather there seem to be (at least) two fields of study discernible under the umbrella of tourism studies. One field is readily identifiable as tourism business studies. The identity of this is borrowed from the increasingly mature field of business studies which has now tentatively carved out a particular territory as its own. Tourism business studies shares a similar territory to business studies but in a tourism context. It includes the marketing of tourism, tourism corporate strategy, tourism law, and the management of tourism.

The other field of tourism studies does not have such an obvious title, because it is little more than just the rest of tourism studies (or non-business tourism studies), is less obviously purposeful than tourism business studies, more atomized, and lacking in any unifying framework other than the link with tourism. It includes areas such as environmental impacts, tourism perceptions, carrying capacity, and social impacts. This may be called tourism field two (TF2), using TF1 to denote tourism business studies. Therefore, the field of tourism (TF)=TF1 +TF2. However, it should be noted that there is some overlap between the two. Concepts such as environmental impacts of tourism development reside essentially in TF2, but since they indirectly affect the business of tourism they also overlap into TF1.

Squires has recorded similar problems with other new fields when they have been conceptualized as a unitary entity. With regards to communications studies he notes "doubts...(about) whether it does

not constitute two distinct fields of machine and human communication, for which information theory *cannot* provide a unifying paradigm". Similarly, he noted that environmental studies "range from the physical to the social with...almost nothing in common between these two extremes" (1990:45).

One may further adjust Jafari and Ritchie's model by incorporating in it examples from Hirst's model. Its modified outer circle would include Hirst's irreducible disciplines such as philosophy (Figure 2). This is a useful point of reference since Hirst's forms of knowledge can help in understanding the variety and type of question being raised by a tourism puzzle and in reaching for an appropriate methodology for analysis of the puzzle. The outer circle would also include disciplinary subdivisions, representing the disciplinary tools of analysis (space in Figure 2 permits only partial representation of the disciplines and discipline "n" is used to denote those that have been left out). The middle circle ($TF1 + TF2 = TF$) would then represent the two tourism fields. Figure 2 may be used to demonstrate developments and knowledge creation in the fields of tourism. Between the outer and the middle circle TF, the one which represents the field of tourism, is an area within which tourism theories and concepts are distilled. This may be called band k.

Figure 2. The Creation of Tourism Knowledge. Outer Circle=Disciplines and Subdisciplines; Middle Circle=Fields of Tourism; Inner Circle=World of Tourism; TF1=Business Interdisciplinarity; TF2=Non-Business-Related Tourism

Band k represents an interesting area where tourism knowledge is created. Several activities take place in band k. First, at a simple level, it represents the interface between the disciplines and the fields of tourism. Thus, where economics enters a field of tourism, the theory of the tourism multiplier is born. In essence this is just the application of an existing theory to a new field. Tourism knowledge that results from this and similar activity may be conceived of as being multidisciplinary. The term multidisciplinary describes a number of discrete disciplinary approaches to the field. Epistemologically speaking, each discipline provides the methodology to justify knowledge claims.

However, band k does not just represent the interface between a single discipline and the field of tourism and, therefore, it does not solely represent multidisciplinary activity. It is also possible for band k to represent a place where disciplines interact with one another and the field of tourism. This represents a powerful area for the generation of new ways of analyzing the external world of tourism. For example, the concept of carrying capacity emerges from a combination of disciplines including sociology, economics, and biology. (Biology provided a powerful analogy in its study of how organisms behave and interact on the limited resources of an agar dish.) This combining of disciplinary tools to create new insights into the external world of tourism represents an interdisciplinary approach. Interdisciplinarity generates an epistemology "characterized by the explicit formulation of a uniform, discipline-transcending terminology or a common methodology" (Gibbons, Limogues, Nowotny, Schwartzman, Scott and Trow 1994:29). One can conceive of not only multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary activity but also of a particular cluster of interdisciplinary activity in the field of tourism. That cluster constitutes the perspective of business analysis. This cluster of activities is distilled partially from the disciplines and partially from the world of business practice and includes aspects such as tourism marketing, tourism finance, and tourism corporate planning. This is identified as a coordinated and distinct set of activities which turns out to be TFI, the field of business tourism or business interdisciplinarity. As such, one has identified multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary dimensions of tourism studies each of which projects a particular view of the external world of tourism and carries a particular set of criteria for knowledge evaluation.

Gibbons et al refer to this mode of knowledge production as mode 1 which is "generated within a disciplinary, primarily cognitive context" (1994:1). It is also knowledge which has been primarily generated and nurtured within institutions of higher education. Therefore, band k can be conceived of as being within the gamut of higher education and the site of mode 1 knowledge production for tourism. On the other hand, business interdisciplinarity resides only partially in band k since it has recourse to the disciplines but also reaches deep into the world of practice.

Gibbons et al have identified a new form of knowledge production which they label mode 2:

The new mode operates within a context of application in that problems

are not set within a disciplinary framework ...It is not being institutionalized primarily within university structures...[and] makes use of a wider range of criteria in judging quality control (1994:vii).

Mode 2 knowledge production may be located on the model in Figure 2. It occurs in the center circle, that is within the external world of tourism. The majority of mode 2 tourism knowledge production takes place in the upper part of the center circle and relates to allocated to the TFI area of the world of tourism. This is because the main sites of mode 2 knowledge production include industry, government, think tanks, interest groups, research institutes, and consultancies. This way, the majority of mode 2 knowledge production occurs within the business of tourism. Mode 2 knowledge production in tourism includes developments and applications of information technology for tourism such as smart hotel rooms, yield management systems, and computerized reservations developments--developed in the industry for the industry.

Furthermore, Gibbons et al explain mode 2 knowledge in terms of transdisciplinary:

knowledge which emerges from a particular *context of application* with its own distinct theoretical structures, research methods, and modes of practice but which may not be locatable on the prevailing disciplinary map (1994: 168).

However, it is proposed to use the term *extradisciplinarity* to describe mode 2 knowledge production. This is because the term *transdisciplinarity* (across the disciplines) is easily confused with *interdisciplinarity*. But mode 2 knowledge is being produced outside the disciplinary framework, hence the term *extradisciplinarity* is seen as being more appropriate. The important points to note about mode 2 knowledge production are first that it occurs outside of higher education, the traditional center for knowledge production, and second, that it is developing its own epistemology. Disciplinary-based methodology and peer review are the hallmarks of quality control for mode 1 knowledge. Mode 2 knowledge, however, judges success by its ability to solve a particular problem, its cost effectiveness, and its ability to establish competitive advantage (i.e., its effectiveness in the real world). Its results are often highly contextualized for a specific project.

An analysis of the epistemology of tourism would be incomplete if it failed to consider postmodernist analysis. Indeed Lyotard's hypothesis in *The Postmodern Condition* is

that the status of knowledge is altered as societies enter what is known as the post-industrial age and culture enters what is known as the postmodern age (1984:3).

Lyotard develops the concept of *performativity* which is seen as a key force driving the progress of scientific and technological knowledge. The argument is that as science becomes more complex, it requires ever more technologically complex proofs. Technology is dominated by performativity (the maximum output for the minimum input) and technology and performativity come to dominate scientific progress. The importance of this is that "an equation between wealth, efficiency,

and truth is thus established" (Lyotard 1984:45). In other words, science demands complex proofs which cost money, and knowledge which is useful to the economy will tend to be favored:

The production of proof...thus falls under control of another language game, in which the goal is no longer truth, but performativity-that is the best possible input/output equation (Lyotard 1984:46).

The consequence of Lyotard's analysis may be recorded in Figure 2. It is that the TF 1 part of the field of tourism exerts a strong *pull* on knowledge production and that much tourism knowledge is generated for profitability. Therefore, TF 1 is expanding. Performativity influences what knowledge is to be produced (it must be economically useful) by providing the technological (expensive) means of validation of knowledge:

the fact remains that since performativity increases the ability to produce proof, it also increases the ability to be right: the technical criterion, introduced on a massive scale into scientific knowledge, cannot fail to influence the truth criterion. (Lyotard 1984:46).

The postmodern view is that epistemology is led by functionalism and the aim of knowledge production becomes not an impartial uncovering of truth but a search for truths which are useful in terms of marketability and efficiency. Lechte summarizes the postmodern era as "one in which power and knowledge come into contact with each other as never before" (1994:247).

CONCLUSION

Far from making a smooth transition towards disciplinary status by way of an overarching paradigm and a unifying theory, tourism studies faces a much more messy prospect. Tourism studies is not a discipline and is not one but two distinct fields. But this distinction between fields and disciplines merely suggests that one is witnessing an object of study (field) rather than a way of studying (discipline). Therefore, one needs to understand how the field of tourism is studied. Figure 2 attests to the complex epistemologies associated with tourism studies which result in four main methods of inquiry: multidisciplinary, interdisciplinarity, business interdisciplinarity, and mode 2 (extra-disciplinarity). These methods are outlined in Table 1, which distinguishes between those approaches which reside essentially in the world of thought (band k) and those which reside in the world of practice (mode 2).

There are a number of approaches to tourism studies which are not mutually exclusive. Hence, rather than to talk of the discipline of tourism studies, it would be more apt to talk of its indiscipline. There are eight important implications for tourism studies that result from the above analysis.

First, while there are four main approaches, the tourism studies that is developing in higher education tends to be crystallizing around the business interdisciplinary approach. This is because the field of tourism business studies has some coherence and structure and a

Table 1.Approaches to Tourism Studies

	Approach	Epistemology	Example
World of Thought	Multidisciplinarity	Provided by individual discipline	Tourism multiplier
	General Interdisciplinarity	Agreed between agents of the disciplines being used	Destination carrying capacity
	Business Interdisciplinarity	Sometimes from the disciplines	Marketing of tourism
World of Practice		Sometimes from the world of practice	
	Extradisciplinarity	Ability to solve problem/performativity	Yield management

framework of theories and concepts-albeit borrowed from the field of business studies. It offers an area where clusters of theory and practice can be brought together in a coherent whole. The increasing critical mass of this area exerts a sort of gravitational pull on business-related knowledge that emerges from the disciplines and from the world of practice. However, the other tourism field (TF2) does not appear to have a unifying element and there is no comprehensive aggregation of non-business tourism knowledge. Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary knowledge that is created around TF2 has no framework upon which to crystallize. The major gravitational pull upon these bits of atomized knowledge emanates from the disciplines themselves. Leiper's (1981) tourology has failed to materialize. It still makes sense here to talk of the economics of tourism, the sociology of tourism, and the like, as there is no "TF2 of tourism".

Second, on account of the relative strength of the business of tourism, because of the increasing importance of mode 2 knowledge and because of the power of the performativity principle, the part of Figure 2 represented by TF1 (the business world of tourism) is pushing out at the expense of other parts of the diagram. Third, the external world of tourism which is actually distilled into tourism studies depends crucially on what one is seeking for and how one has gone about this search. Tourism studies turns out to be not an objective, value free search for tourism knowledge, since the epistemological characteristics of the approaches of different fields perform a selector role.

Those operating within field TF1 will make different inroads into the external world to tourism from those who are operating within field TF2. Each will fall back on different epistemologies. For example, within the disciplinary approach, each discipline provides a particular pair of disciplinary spectacles. These spectacles cause certain parts of the terrain to be thrown into sharp relief as one casts a disciplinary

gaze across the territory of tourism. This way, the economist may see tourism in terms of its resources, and may see resource utilization in terms of the production unit-the firm. The economist may explore the territory of efficiency of resource use, profitability, and resource allocation within tourism. On the other hand the anthropologist may wish to explore those issues of tourism that result from tourism generated contacts between the host and guest cultures.

Fourth, from an empirical perspective what constitutes the study of tourism is a relatively simple business of recording how the field has developed. If tourism studies is overwhelmingly populated by researchers of the business of tourism, tourism studies becomes the business of tourism. But from a theoretical perspective, tourism studies can be whatever aspect of tourism might be carved out for study by a particular field of inquiry and the answer to the question as to what constitutes tourism knowledge becomes a very broad one.

Fifth, following Cotgrove (1983) one is warned that the values held by those operating from different approaches to tourism may be quite different. Indeed the different approaches may add up to different ideologies making communication between the two fields quite difficult. This is perhaps best illustrated by the difficulties in communications existing between those operating in the business of tourism and those operating from an environmental tourism approach. There can be a lack of intersubjectivity (i.e., the different camps speak a different technical language and thus find it difficult to communicate), and problems may be framed differently (with disputes about what factors should rightfully enter the frame). Moreover, each camp may legitimate knowledge and truth in different ways. This may result in a condition termed by Lyotard as a differend: "a case of conflict between at least two parties that cannot be equitably resolved for lack of a rule of judgment applicable to both arguments" (1988:xi).

Sixth, the academic world has tended to overlook mode 2 production of knowledge. This is because this mode is not communicated in academic journals and does not seek validation from higher education. There is a danger here of a potential schism between mode 1 and mode 2 production. Cooper, Shepherd and Westlake seem to dismiss mode 2 knowledge observing that:

the big problem with applied research is that it usually fails to add anything substantial or significant to the body of knowledge...This is because the problem is too company- or sector-specific and relatively limited in its scope, i.e., it is usually concrete and operationally-oriented rather than abstract or conceptual in its nature...and therefore, frequently does not progress the body of knowledge (1994:126).

Perhaps more collaborative projects between industry and higher education would help resolve this industry/academic divide.

However, seventh, Lyotard's analysis of performativity as the new justification for research suggests that the production of tourism knowledge may be subject to undue influence from economic quarters:

Although inexpensive, pure research in search of truth is still possible, expensive research is becoming the norm and this means getting funding assistance (Lechte 1994:247)

Funding requires justification and performativity creeps in. Thus, the pursuit of impartial tourism knowledge needs to be protected so that non-economic aspects of tourism can be studied.

Finally, the search for tourism as a discipline should be abandoned. It is a sign of nostalgia (hankering after an overly idealized concept) and insecurity (lack of academic self-confidence) and would involve casting adrift important parts of tourism studies in the quest for conceptual coherence and logical consistency. Tourism studies seems likely to remain in a pre-paradigmatic phase (Kuhn 1962) but this should not be seen as a problem. Rather tourism studies should recognize and celebrate its diversity.

Acknowledgments- The author would like to thank Ronald Barnett, Dean of Professional Development, Institute of Education, University of London, for comments on this paper.

REFERENCES

- Becher, T.
 1989 Academic Tribes and Territories. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Cooper, C., J. Fletcher, D. Gilbert and S. Wanhill
 1993 Tourism: Principles and Practices. London: Pitman.
- Cooper, C., R. Shepherd and J. Westlake
 1994 Tourism and Hospitality Education. Guildford: University of Surrey.
- Cotgrove, S.
 1983 Risk, Value Conflict and Political Legitimacy. *In* The Hidden Curriculum in Business Studies, D. Groves, ed., pp. 47-54. Chichester: Higher Education Foundation.
- Donald, J.
 1986 Knowledge and the University Curriculum. *Higher Education* 15:267-282.
- Gibbons, M., C. Limoges, H. Nowotny, S. Schwartzman, P. Scott and M. Trow
 1994 The New Production of Knowledge. London: Sage.
- Goeldner, C. R.
 1988 The Evaluation of Tourism as an Industry and a Discipline. International Conference for Tourism Educators mimeo. Guildford: University of Surrey.
- Gunn, C.
 1987 A Perspective in the Purpose and Nature of Tourism Research Methods. *In* Travel, Tourism and Hospitality Research. R. Ritchie and C. Goeldner, eds., pp. 3-12. Chichester: Wiley.
- Henkel, M.
 1988 Responsiveness of the Subjects in Our Study: A Theoretical Perspective. *In* Higher Education and Preparation for Work, C. Brennan et al, eds., pp. 134-195. Chichester: Wiley.
- Hirst, P.
 1965 Liberal Education and the nature of Knowledge. *In* Philosophical Analysis and Education, R. D. Archambault, ed., pp. 113-140. Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 1974 Knowledge and the Curriculum. London: Routledge.
- 1993 Education, Knowledge and Practices. *In* Beyond Liberal Education, R. Barrow and P. White, eds., pp. 184-199. London: Routledge.
- Jafari, J.
 1991 Tourism Social Science. *Annals of Tourism Research* 18(1):1-9.
- Jafari, J., and J. R. Brent Ritchie
 1981 Towards a Framework for Tourism Education. *Annals of Tourism Research* H:13-33.
- King, A. R., and J. Brownell
 1966 The Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge. New York: Wiley.

- Kuhn, T. S.
1962 *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lechte, J.
1994 *Fifty Key Contemporary Thinkers*. London: Routledge.
- Leiper, N.
1981 Towards a Cohesive Curriculum in Tourism: The Case for a Distinct Discipline. *Annals of Tourism Research* 8:69-83.
- Lyotard, J.
1984 *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
1988 *The Differend: Phases in Dispute* (trans. G. Van den Abbeele). Minneapolis MN: University of Minneapolis Press.
- McIntosh, R. W., and C. R. Goeldner
1995 *Tourism: Principles, Practices and Philosophies*. New York: Wiley.
- Mathieson, A., and G. Wall
1982 *Tourism: Economic, Physical and Social Impacts*. London: Longman.
- Popper, K.
1975 *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Przeclawski, K.
1993 Tourism as the Subject of Interdisciplinary Research. *In* *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges*, D. Pearce and R. Butler, eds., pp. 9-19. London: Routledge.
- Ryan, C.
1991 *Recreational Tourism: A Social Science Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Schon, D. A.
1983 *The Reflective Practitioner*. London: Maurice Temple Smith.
1987 *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. London: Jossey-Bass.
- Soltis, J. F.
1968 *An Introduction to the Analysis of Educational Concepts*. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Squires, G.
1990 *The Undergraduate Curriculum*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Toulmin, S.
1972 *Human Understanding* (Vol. 1), Oxford: Clarendon Press.