
Creating a new epistemology for tourism and hospitality disciplines

Alistair Thirkettle

Universidad Autónoma de Nicaragua, Leon,
2 Ivybank, Nightindale Road,
Godalming, GU 72JE, UK
and
Orchard House,
Stanford in the Vale,
Oxfordshire, SN7 8LH, UK
E-mail: nathirkettle@yahoo.com

Maximiliano E. Korstanje*

Department of Economics,
University of Palermo,
Larrea 1079, 3 Floor, BUE, ARG,
Buenos Aires, Argentina
E-mail: mkorst@palermo.edu
*Corresponding author

Abstract: The present paper develops the need for an all-encompassing view of tourism, exploring the limitations of other previous approaches. Under the premise that tourism is associated to a dream-like sub-system which controls social and personal behaviour, it is hypothesised that a new methodology of understanding tourism from a cross-cultural point of view, rather than purely a Western point of view, is needed. Our thesis is that there is not one unique definition of tourism, but many definitions, adjusted to the requirements of each society, and demanding a new systemic dialogue involving economics, religion, politics and security. This is an inter-linguistic effort to link the most representative studies in epistemology written and published in Spanish, English and Portuguese.

Keywords: leisure; social change; dreams; travels.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Thirkettle, A. and Korstanje, M.E. (2013) 'Creating a new epistemology for tourism and hospitality disciplines', *Int. J. Qualitative Research in Services*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.13–34.

Biographical notes: Alistair Thirkettle studied initially at the London College of Printing, where he obtained his Diploma. He received his MSc in Tourism at the University of Strathclyde in Scotland in 1993, with a thesis entitled 'Tourism development in Nicaragua'. Later, he was involved in the foundation of the School of Tourism received the support of Dr. Francisco M. de Escalona. Subsequently, he gained a position of Lecturer in the University of Nicaragua for long 15 years. Now, he dwells on UK where makes works related to translations.

Maximiliano E. Korstanje is an Associate Professor of University of Palermo and Editor-in-Chief of *International Journal of Safety and Security in Tourism/Hospitality*. His research area is risk perception and disaster-management. With more than 400 published papers and 15 books, he works as editorial board member of more than 20 tourism and disaster-related journals and international councils dedicated to the studies of risk.

1 Introduction

Many authors in different languages and historical contexts have attempted to define tourism and its opportunities to become in a scientific discipline (Jafari and Aeser, 1988; Jafari and Pizam, 1966; Jafari, 2005; Coles et al., 2005; Korstanje and Busby, 2010; Xiao and Smith, 2008; Pernecky and Jamal, 2010; Tribe, 2010). Even if there are interesting epistemological writings in this matter, a growing disintegration has led to them being almost incomprehensible to the reader and the specialised public (Meira-Martoni, 2011; Bortnowska-Marinho, et al., 2011). We agree with those that point out that it does not suffice to refer to the ‘scientification’ of tourism only based on the number of publications or conferences is not a pre-condition for the development of a scientific discipline. In the context of today, tourism is seen as a commercial activity, which is studied from the viewpoint of various disciplines, including economy, geography, sociology, psychology, and anthropology. The academic level, its interdisciplinary nature and body of knowledge are so great and so varied that they have either generated a supposed incomprehensibility or a simplification of the subject (Escalona-Munoz, 2011; Tribe, 2010).

In this context, the present article aims not only to rescue voices and contributions to the study of tourism which have, through time, been silenced, but also to propose a new neo-systemic paradigm, which will help specialists to understand the phenomenon of tourism and its complexity. This work synthesises more than eight years of research. For reasons of time and space, it is impossible to summarise all the authors and practitioners who have dealt with the subject. However, we will try to approach the theme with the depth it deserves, citing renowned authors in both the English and Spanish languages. The lack of dialogue between the two, or even the compliance by Spanish-speaking authors to Anglo-Saxon research (Korstanje, 2010b), amply justifies our efforts.

2 Defining tourism

Is tourism a simple voyage (displacement) which produces income for someone? In this context, it is interesting to read the recent article by Minnaert et al. (2011) who study ‘social tourism’ as a phenomenon related to the protection of the neediest in society. In their development of the theme, the authors ask whether tourism should be conceived of as a commercial activity associated to pleasure and luxury or as a right of all citizens independent of their acquisitive power. The answer may not be singled out. Capitalist countries exploit tourism from a purely mercantilist perspective, whereas socialist focus on this activity as a right. From this point of view, tourism has a different nature depending on the type of society, its economy and way of territorial organisation. The hot

point of debate was posed on the nature of work and leisure. If the utilitarianism which is fundamental to capitalism results in commercial tourism, the idea in asserting that socialist countries are developing a universal form of tourism is questionable. Modern capitalism, whether in industrialised countries or socialist countries, has characterised tourism as an all-encompassed institution, and the right to consumption as universal, as we discuss later in relation to our theory of the dream-like nature of tourism.

Modernity and the desire to see the different and new have shaped our way of travelling in the last few years. Up to a point, even touristic voyages have been transformed into a business which is not associated with recreation as such. Modernity, it would seem, has invaded every aspect of our social lives, including leisure. Today, a voyage must be, it would seem a commercial transaction, which does not really take into account the motive, or prior narrative. However, as we will see below, tourism should not be strictly considered as an income-producing voyage. The historian Pastoriza (2011) suggested that the consolidation of tourism occurred because of the increased movement of people, interventions by both the public and private sectors in urbanisation and the necessary infrastructure, and the romantic and visual appreciation of landscape. There is a consensus that while mobility does enable some social groups to be models to follow, it isolates others (Lash and Urry, 1998; Wood and Graham, 2006; Hannam et al., 2006; Urry, 2007). The act of travelling evokes the idea of a tourist vision, (or 'tourist gaze'), which has previously constructed the experience to be consumed (Urry, 1990, 1995; Da Silva-Santos and Soares-Marques, 2011). Tourism for certain authors may be seen as a cultural voyage or rite of passage (Berger, 2004), or the consumption of inter-woven signs in a coherent and organised discourse (Culler, 1981). For many years, researchers have tried to define tourism, even when the fragmentation of knowledge led to an epistemological lack of discipline (Tribe, 2010; Escalona-Munoz, 2011; Korstanje, 2007, 2008). According to the specialised bibliography tourism might be understood as:

- a A voyage to a sacred or special place, which by necessity involves the commercialisation of hospitality (Cohen, 1972; Graburn, 1983; Maccannell, 1988; Korstanje, 2010a, 2010b).
- b An agent of democratisation which destabilises the inequalities generated by mercantile colonialism (Turner and Ash, 1991; Palmer, 1994).
- c A stereotyped form of leisure (Dumanzedier, 1967; Nash, 1981; Muneo, 1999; Getino, 2002; Korstanje, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c).
- d A cultural expression (De Kadt, 1992).
- e An interconnected system of motivational factors. The 'push' factors are related to the characteristics of the tourism destination, and the 'pull' factors are associated to the psychological attributes of the traveller (Dann, 1977; Crompton, 1979; Turnbull and Uysal, 1995; Klenosky, 2002; Wu et al., 2009).
- f An inter-ethnic meeting between guests and hosts (Pi-Sunyer, 1977; Smith, 1977; Santana-Talavera, 2006).

The economist Escalona-Munoz (2011) comments that in recent years a current, arising from management studies, has developed, giving priority to tourism demand and ignoring the role of the offer or supply within the economic system. He states that those researchers who follow this current claim that the complexity of tourism merits an

inter-disciplinary study. Actually, far from clarifying the issue or arriving at unified paradigms, which would allow methodological and scientific development, their efforts seem to be directed at studying certain matters concerned with the image of tourism destinations and profitability. The culmination of the methodology employed by these researchers is the development of case studies using classic market and consumption research techniques. Thus, the function of tourism within society, for these researchers, has been simplified to a mere product. Thus, according to the author, commercialised hospitality has been misunderstood, as has been tourism itself.

Meanwhile, the Spanish anthropologist Santana-Talavera (2006) states that, in spite of the taboo in anthropology concerning treating matters in an integrated and systemic way, in order to understand tourism it should be seen from a holistic perspective, which would not only describe the dynamics as observed in the field, but also the effects and changes caused by tourism over time. In contrast to his colleagues, Santana-Talavera suggests that the 'tourism system' is formed by three well-defined elements. The first refers to the demand by all the actors within the system, whether for prime commodities, or for goods to which value has been added. Secondly, he refers to a static element, in the form of infrastructure, which facilitates tourism, and territorial planning. Thirdly, he refers to the process by which the elements form a system.

More widely, it appears that tourism cannot be understood other than as geographical movement with the specific intention to return. Thus, Monterrubio Cordero (2011) has developed a systemic model which helps us to understand the evolution of the variables which make up the tourism system. Tourism has experienced many problems in recognition by more established disciplines partly because of the dispersal of texts on the subject, but partly because of a tendency to define tourism in terms of its effects on the economy, or the population, or the environment, without taking into account other essential components. The author states that even if travel is an essential part of tourism, not all travel can be considered as tourism, and therefore he prefers a definition of tourism based on recreation and leisure. However, to define tourism as being purely allied to leisure would be reductionist, because it would be seen purely from the point of view of the tourist. Tourism is much more than elements related to habitual residence or travel. According to Monterrubio Cordero tourism is:

“a complex system composed of various social, cultural, economic, political and ecological elements, structures, interactions, relations and consequences which involve travel by an individual or group from their usual place of residence and their stay in a specific destination, usually for recreation.”

3 The technical perspective and its limitations

From a superficial perspective, tourism might be understood as both an economic activity and a psycho-social activity (De Kadt, 1992; Jimenez-Guzman, 1986) whose implications have been little explored or publicised by comparison with other disciplines. On the other hand, it is also the case that each discipline (management, geography, psychology, sociology, for example) has proposed a different model for the study and resolution of tourism-related problems in the field. For some, tourism is a simple activity with well-defined geopolitical and economic roots (Heytens, 1978) while for others it is an immensely complex activity which merits inter-disciplinary study. Associated to two psychological necessities, a search for novelty, and for rest, the origins of escapement

might be studied from a biblical point of view. Judeo-Christian cosmology has been the ideological and mythical basis of tourism, as on the one hand it promotes curiosity as a form of renovation or the search for a new situation (sin and confession), while on the other it promotes travel as a form of rest (Korstanje and Busby, 2010). With the passing of years, this activity enrooted in the leisure sphere or escapement demanded attention not only from academics, but also from lay people. Thousand of students envisaged in tourism/hospitality programmes a valid alternative for their future. The growth of tourism started a new quandary linked to the fact or question whether it may be considered a science.

Segui-Linas suggests that one of the first to develop the idea of the science of tourism or 'touristology' was Georges Cazes, who promoted the disciplinary study of tourism from various perspectives – namely the regional analysis of tourism, the relation between tourism and the developing world, and the epistemology of tourism. Cazes, like many others, was concerned to create a science which would unify the technical and scientific perspectives on tourism – which would unite the profit motive of investors, and the 'science' of tourism. As for regional analysis, Cazes focussed on the development and expansion of the tourist industry in the Mediterranean in the middle of the twentieth century. The French geographer was also concerned about the negative effects of tourism on under-developed countries. The epistemological perspective examined the influence of tourism flows on the natural environment [Segui-Llinas, (2006), p.11]. However, Cazes falls into the same error as the majority of scholars as he assumes tourism development to be an epistemological rule (produced by the theory of the method of knowledge).

At present, there are two clear tendencies. The first is the 'technical perspective', the objective of which is to use the study of tourism as a tool, or as an instrument by which we can resolve certain incongruences in the system. Benefits of this method are manifold. For one hand, it provides clear definitions about tourism easily understood by practitioners. Secondly, technical approach allows the design of products and destinations. Larger organisations dedicated to install programmes of development in the world as International Monetary Fund, World Tourism Organization or World Bank employed definitions based on technical perspective. The problem lies in the complicity of market with status quo protecting their interests. These perspectives are not interested in the facts as object, but in the role of tourism to alleviate the situation of people. As a result, tourism should be used as a clinical tool, reducing poverty and strengthening social liaison but under the risk to reduce the understanding of tourism as a social institution. This is a type of corrective method which tries to involve as many of the actors involved in tourism as possible in a synergic way. One of the distinctive characteristics of such research is the absence of a critical conscience towards the object of study, and the necessity to improve the present situation by the efficient organisation of resources. The second is the 'scientific perspective' which tries to explain the reason and mechanism for the origin and development of the phenomenon of tourism. Although the scientific perspective, like the technical, is inspired by the desire to improve the quality of life of people, the priority is to validate or refute results, rather than giving any judgement during the process. The conclusion is the final result of the process. From this perspective, unlike the technical perspective, it is not important to make a value judgement as to what is, or should be, socially correct, but to study with objectivity how a phenomenon has evolved through time. Thus, we have the need to speak of 'sustainable tourism' (Boullon, 1985; Vitry, 2003; Silva-Santo, 2003; Jafari, 2005; Nadeau et al.,

2008; Alvarez and Korzay, 2008; Franch et al., 2008; Dwyer, 2008). However, the influence of mercantilism and the physiocratic school are still present in the technical tradition. The scientific perspective uses this mercantilism to criticise the technical perspective.

One of the fundamental aspects which determines the discourse concerning the technical perspective on tourism is territorial organisation and planning. Dosso (2005a, p.28) states that “certain urban areas have a territorial centrality (or transterritoriality) according to their dynamic role of the attraction they have on the surrounding area influencing economic and territorial development”. Taking other conceptual tools from marketing and management, Dosso states that the consolidation of the centrality which he mentions is possible only by the intervention of two factors:

- 1 competition
- 2 the use of the strengths in the economic base of the area.

His analysis derives from the supposition that the social dynamic does not imply a break in social order, and vice versa. The necessity for order and stability is the first element which we find in the technical perspective on tourism. The second refers to the rational use of resources to achieve a higher material benefit, not necessarily in financial terms. In other words, the technical perspective emphasises the necessity of creating a situation which is better than the present situation, which is always presented as being undesirable.

Dosso states that while the landscape is the principal attraction in tourism, there are other elements such as the transport infrastructure.

The territorialisation of the economic (although territory is part of the economy) is the third aspect in the technical perspective on tourism. The organisation of territory is seen always as being in the future, being linked to probable events. In the treatment of Dosso, there are essentially two areas which should be analysed. One is the time element concerning future ideal situations, and the second is the relationship between the technical rational use of resources in territorial planning and the desire of the principal actors to reach this efficiency.

Mantero (2005) introduces a new concept into the definition of tourism – the attraction and the nucleus. The nucleus, geographically speaking, is the point in space which serves as a centre of orientation to the rest of the landscape. The nucleus is not only a point of orientation, but also is unique with respect to the remainder of the visual universe. In part, this is the prerequisite of the unique nature and exclusivity which is constructed symbolically around a tourist destination. The future and physical position appear to relate to each other. However, even if in Spanish geographical and temporal destination are identical, in English this is not so – and we have ‘destination’ and ‘destiny’. In the summary of his presentation, Mantero (2005, p.49) clarifies that

“Because of the growth of tourism in the hinterland of Buenos Aires we will suggest and develop the idea of tourism as a territorial phenomenon, considering social density, an appropriate political and economic context, and both urban and rural tourism attractions.”

For Mantero, tourism is born in the convergence between the availability of a density of sites which are attractive to tourists in a given territory, and a landscape which is sufficient to attract a substantial flow of tourists. Tourism should not be conceived beyond its capacity to attract, and external infrastructure based on foreseeing future consumer expectation. However, Mantero’s view does see a clear subordination of

human and social factors to economic factors. Work and commercial exchange, a result of the free market, synthesises the relationship between mankind and geographical territory. Mantero follows by describing touristic necessities and experiences, concluding that tourism permits a 'union' of the tourist with the surrounding landscape, so that his environment not only provides the resources necessary for his very survival, but also gives added value to the commercial relationship between the resident and the tourist. One can conceptualise the argument of Mantero using the following key words: attraction, value, satisfaction, consumption, time, usefulness, tourism, and territory. Sometimes history is presented by the technical perspective on tourism as an example of scientific objectivity, but it is actually only a description of the 'tourism product' and not a history of tourism.

To summarise, the technical perspective in tourism research emphasises the following:

- a Tourism is, and should be, evaluated for its present principal function, and not for its historic function.
- b Tourism is an economic and commercial activity whose main characteristics are movement, and the transformation of the geographic landscape. The undesirable consequences of tourism can be mitigated by the rational use of resources, which should be directed towards the protection of heritage and ecology.
- c Work, which is the principal value in the West, relates four very different elements: territory, the individual, tourism, and the future. Tourism activity, as a type of leisure, has a geographic logic and an economic logic. By the imposition and reproduction of ideas and beliefs such as good, bad, better, worse, deterioration, growth, value, higher and lower, writers about tourism from the technical perspective promote the idea that tourism development is completed, but at the same time is subject to future events (or, in other words, business collapse).
- d The technical perspective emphasis attractiveness as the main criterion of academic discourse, while usefulness or the necessity of structure and order are seen to be secondary matters. The need to improve is associated with the anguish of not being able to predict the future; indeed, technical reports are written in the future tense rather than the past. Their horizon looks towards what is to come (in contrast to scientific reports which look towards the past or the present).

Among the principal limitations of the technical perspective is the wide variety of definitions concerning tourism, which, by their nature, are not mutually exclusive but rather abstract and general, referring to such activities as business, leisure and rest, among others. These generalising definitions are appropriate to the modern system of conducting business in which cohesion and synergy are seen to be the principal strengths. But these definitions, although maybe efficient for some purposes, are too superficial to analyse the phenomenon. Secondly, the technical perspective is more concerned with the profitability of the suppliers of tourism services and the attractions of the destination than understanding the real dynamics of the process of tourism development. Many studies from this perspective openly declare that tourism should be understood as a western and modern phenomenon, thus trivialising more than 2,500 years of history, and the value that other cultures and civilisations have put on their forms of tourism activity. As a form of leisure, tourism evokes the value which civilisations have always placed on social

order. Unfortunately, the systemic perspective, which could have helped the understanding of the functioning of tourism, has been co-opted by disciplines such as marketing and management, where efficiency and success are seen to be more important than understanding.

4 The three phases of science

Even if there are many important works concerning epistemology, so as not to confuse the reader we will discuss in this section the most important elements of the scientific system. This was without doubt one of the most important errors of Jafari when his thesis of the ‘scientification’ was developed. The American anthropologist precluded that the stage of scientification should be determined by the number of studies in lieu of the agreement of a common method. To be honest, in part, this error was caused by the fact that he had not taken into account the historic evolution of the different sciences, or their links to the economic systems within which these disciplines were born.

The scientific thought is determined by three basic pillars:

- a the inference of laws
- b the replicability of the data
- c the explanation of phenomena.

Following this reasoning, one may add that the scientific method always seeks to apply accumulated knowledge and the possibility of inferring universal laws which explain the relation between variables. The sources and processes should be duly documented and the results should be capable of being repeated by another researcher. Lastly, science should, by observation, permit the comprehension and explanation of the variation and connection of the variables of the problem. Thus, all scientific research begins with a question, which is answered by following a method.

Unfortunately, for a long time, the positivists, not knowing about the contributions of the Viennese School, introduced relativity in the evaluation of results. Thus, science came to be determined not by the method but by the falsability of the results. This suggests an investment in the production of knowledge in which the result comes to be more important than the intervening steps. As a result of this epistemological confusion, many scientists fell into conceptual relativity which has led to great fragmentation. The form of research then gave way to methodological subjectivity, which, being linked to the situation and politics, facilitates the consolidation of modernity as a general way of life.

In this context, it is worth clarifying that all science rests on two forms of generating knowledge. The first is called ‘1st state’ and is characterised by the isolation of those variables which are studied, generally in laboratories, and which seek to learn about the laws which govern the universe. Physics is one of the sciences which operates under the principle of direct observation. The environment, in this type of situation, is totally controlled. The scientist should always conduct experiments in the present in order to draw inferences about the future. However, ‘2nd state’ science is totally different. Under certain conditions, the grade of repeatability cannot be isolated in a determined frame of time and space, and the researcher must ‘reconstruct’ the causes of the problem from the past. Within this classification are the so-called social sciences, which include psychology and sociology, among others. As capital expands its influence, breaking

down the former notions of time and space with globalisation, knowledge is produced by a great variety of research centres with few links between them. Their results are so dispersed that there is little or no dialogue between the different schools of thought. The most established disciplines accuse newer bodies of knowledge of not being able to infer laws, and this becomes a motive for their rejection. Given the general laws of science, it is of interest to know that historical evolution of science has changed through the years. We may explain our model of 'The three phases of science' as follows:

From antiquity until the end of the middle ages, mankind was interested by questions concerning the connection between people and its cities. His economy was purely a subsistence economy linked to cattle farming and primary agriculture. There was an important link between a man and his territory and lineage, as there was no concept of salaried work as we know it today, or in other words the possibility of a person to choose where, for what wage, and for whom he would work. The disciplines which governed life were philosophy, astrology, medicine and astronomy among others. We term this phase 'the primary production of knowledge'. In the late middle age, we enter into a second phase, which we term 'the secondary production of knowledge' in which the Industrial and Cromwellian Revolutions have left their mark. Work and the relationship of a person with his lineage started to lose their strong linkage, due to the consensus that labour should be sold according to the conditions of the context. Little by little man ceased to be subject to God, his city, and his master in order to become part of the capitalist adventure based on speculation, control of the results, and calculation. During this process, from the 19th century until the middle of the 20th century, new disciplines were born. These included psychology, anthropology and sociology. These new disciplines were totally orientated to the study of man, but rather than seeking the answers to abstract universal questions, they were specific with emphasis on industrial work, poverty, and development, for instance.

The 'social sciences' entered into conflict with the established disciplines, and so sociology confronted philosophy, and psychology confronted medicine (and psychiatry). Without doubt, we inevitably begin to see a fragmentation in the method of generating and interpreting knowledge. These forms of the production of science cannot be studied outside the context of the standardisation of the modern means of production in general. Systemic standardisation (that is, the possibility of the accumulation of comparative data, as defended by the positivists) was directly proportional to mass production. Society and human behaviour begin to be considered as a systemic whole, where there are inputs, processes and outputs which indefinitely feed back into other systems. Social interaction is the conceptual base which these new sciences claimed to study.

Nevertheless, the situation changed radically towards the end of 20th century, or to be more exact in about 1970 when capitalist countries began to realise that they could not guarantee serial production for ever in a sustainable way. This was due to the energy crisis provoked by the Arab-Israeli War, in which industries had to introduce a new form of consumption so that capital, which had been born out of the Industrial Revolution, could become electronic. The production of capital for the purchase of goods did not now seem to be as important as the opposite situation, where goods become a pre-condition for the production and general accumulation of money. The classic relationship is replaced by symbolic mediators, such as money, generating a total solipsism, or the view that the self is the only thing that really exists. We may call this third state the 'fragmented stage of knowledge' in which the new disciplines (communication,

journalism, tourism, gastronomy, management and publicity, for example) begin to gain ground in comparison with second stage disciplines such as sociology. As two of the main characteristics of post-modernity have been social fragmentation and subjectivity, these new forms of knowledge have been oriented towards consumption and the aesthetic. These new values of society are rejected by the already established second stage sciences. Sociology and anthropology claim that tourism is a science which does not have its foundations in serious reason. These are the same claims that sociology had confronted from its own predecessors. In order to summarise this model and enable the reader to achieve a greater understanding of the phenomenon, we might synthesise the main aspects which distinguish third stage sciences as follows:

- 1 They are disciplines which are linked to the creation of necessities, in order to explain them.
- 2 They consider social reality as a product.
- 3 They follow parameters which are similar to market engineering.
- 4 Their considerations and findings are isolated, and cannot be integrated into a coherent whole.
- 5 They show great fragmentation or lack an academic base to orientate research.
- 6 Information plays an important role in the construction of their discourse, but is not integrated.
- 7 They appeal to multi-disciplinarity but their results are mere second-order explanations.
- 8 They are purely descriptive.
- 9 They are strongly influenced by the aesthetic and appearance.
- 10 They focus on experience as their principal strength, but lack an integrated methodology.
- 11 They confuse the form of data collection with method.
- 12 They are disconnected elements of knowledge which prioritise reason and not the pursuit of truth. In other words, as they define reason as an abstract form of thought, these new sciences can express principles which do not have any real direction.

The new post-industrial sciences are, above all, incomplete sciences which try to explain what to do in the face of particular problems rather than investigate the cause of the problem. They are linked to the effects and not the causes of behaviour. The discussion in this article has aimed at contributing to those epistemologists interested in the existence or otherwise of the science of tourism. Jafari precluded that one measures a discipline by the quantity of bibliographic production, ignoring the essential characteristics of science. It must be admitted that this belief is widely accepted in scientific works, and therefore must be seriously considered.

Epistemologically speaking, to define tourism we need first to understand what the object of the discipline is. In so doing, it is important to determine if tourism is a modern activity, surfaced as a consequence of industrial revolution, or depends upon millenarian

social institutions many centuries before this event. As stated, travels and mobilities played a vital role in the formation of tourism but were not determinant.

This poses an interesting question, to what an extent systemic paradigm is still alive?

The relationship between agency and structure has been a question frequently developed by scholars from the social sciences. The theory of agency emphasises the role of the individual as the principal axis of society, whereas the structure theory emphasises social norms as the mechanisms imposed by society on individuals. Knorr-Cetina (1989) considers that sociology has gone astray by considering macro-structural events on the one hand, and individual behaviour on the other. In reality, by definition the macro system must be understood as the sum of social events on the micro scale (Knorr-Cetina, 1989). The hypothesis of this summation thus suggests that individual experience restructures the norms to the point where the norms condition the individual (Giddens, 1979; Cicourel, 1981).

5 The legacy of systemic paradigm

The questions concerning where tourism was born and what is its nature are unresolved questions which experts in tourism have been pondering for years. For a long time, the founding fathers of the systems theory in the study of tourism have argued that tourism is a social act whose effects and functions should be studied in a comprehensive and holistic way. For Leiper (1979), the tourism system has three well-defined components: *tourists*, who put into effect the rest of the system by their own actions; *geographic elements*, which are sub-divided into the region where tourists live, the regions they pass through on their journey, and the destination region; and lastly, the *tourism industry* itself, which is composed of a whole range of businesses which operate within the dynamics of the market. For this author, each part of the model interacts with the rest establishing a chain of transactions (Leiper, 1979). Rather, for Molina (1986), tourism is articulated by a series of sub-systems related to a common objective. According to the model of Molina, the tourism system is composed of:

- a a *superstructure*, which is formed by laws, norms and rules
- b *demand*, which is represented by the tourists
- c *infrastructure*, whose function is to support and permit communication between the other elements, as is the case of airports and roads, for instance
- d *attractions*, which might be classed as natural or cultural
- e a *host community* in the destination (Molina, 1986).

Basically, the tourist system is composed of the demand, or tourism emitting region; transport sub-systems; and the offer, which is composed basically of accommodation [Calizo-Soneiro, (1991), p.18]. Gunn and Var (2002) define the tourism system as the convergence between the offer (or supply) and demand. Among the indicators which form the offer are transport, attractions, information, services and promotion. Demand is formed by natural resources, human and financial capital, public policy and organisations.

One of the most important attempts at theorising a system at present is that of the Mexican sociologist Osorio-Garcia, for whom tourism should be regarded as a number of elements which communicate between themselves in a closed system. At the same time, the systems are not distinguished by their limits, but by their complexity. There might be interaction between two systems in the same environment (Osorio-Garcia, 2004, 2007). At first sight, it would appear that the principal element to study in tourism is the motive of the journey. According to an interesting comparative study, the researchers Gil-Moreno and Quintana-Aguilar (2006) suggest that there are two types of tourists: *executive clients* who have a rational tendency to planning and control, and *vacational clients*, whose motivation is primarily emotional. Other authors, also focussing on businessmen, and business travel, mention reputation, prestige, amiable attention and security as being the main aspects in the choice of accommodation (Gee, 1994; Revilla and Bernard, 1998). One of the problems with the tourism system as a theory is its incapacity to explain whether there is a hierarchy of importance between the different elements.

A group of Brazilian researchers conclude that salary is the most sensitive element of tourist demand. However, they also mention other factors such as security, the cost-benefit ratio, and the geographic proximity between the destinations and the regions where the tourists live [Cruz et al., (2007), p.458]. One must remember that there are other factors to be taken into account in the study of the problem such as: the objective of the voyage, the level of importance of the voyage for the tourist, the length of stay, the cost structure of the journey, the season, the type of accommodation, the means of transport, the use of travel agents, and the type of tourism (which may be receptive or emissive (Nieffer, 2006). Travelling may be understood as a process of temporary 're-signposting'; or, as suggests Gastal (2006) brilliantly "a process after which one should emerge as a better person". Travel organises and structures a large part of the tourism system. Panosso-Netto (2006) states that: "the infrastructure, the destination region, and other aspects of tourism are only considered by tourism because a human being decided to undertake a journey".

In Anglo-Saxon countries, as opposed to France, tourism is considered from the perspective of the product, which is considered to be the destination. This vision leads to the supposition that tourism can be reconstructed as a phenomenon by different elements of the offer to the marketplace such as hotels, excursions, restaurants, and nightlife, among others. Petr and Gueguen (2006) warn about the necessity of changing the epistemological prism which is used to study the relationship between the voyage itself, the rational process of decision, and tourism. The authors deny that income is the only variable concerned with the decision to travel. They also deny that the rational evaluation of dangers and risks is the main variable which determines travel demand. Tourism, they say, has an ambivalent relationship with the society of which it is a part. Whether it is the vector of expression in which the prevailing culture is expressed, or the individual impulse for revitalisation, tourism opens the door for the consumer, creating a curious paradox. If the tourist needs escape as a form of reconstructing his or her essential being, we may say that there is an asocial component in tourism itself. In particular, conclude Petr and Gueguen (2006) tourism should be understood as a practice motivated by consumption but whose principal function is 'dreaming' and the creation of situations which help to reconfirm the identity. Here, we see the importance of the dream-like (or dream-like component) in the French school of the sociology of tourism. This is a theme to which we will return later.

At the same time, it is important to point out that travel is considered to be an intra-systemic and temporal connection. Indeed, Osorio-Garcia maintains that tourism is a construction of various sub-systems which communicate between themselves. The voyage (and as a derivation, the voyage of pleasure) is the communicator connecting the different components of the tourism system (Osorio-Garcia, 2004, 2007). Even though the systemic perspective explains a great part of the tourism system itself, this pattern has, for some reason, trivialised the role of history as a tool for understanding the activity. Thus, non-western peoples have been catalogued under a new form of tourism which is to be preserved – cultural tourism. Unfortunately, once again, as affirms Escalona-Munoz (2011), the mercantilist paradigm has not understood the value of ‘otherness’ to understand the phenomenon of tourism. From the aymara of the altiplano of Peru, to the ancient Germans, to the Iberians, every human group has developed its own constructions to denote the process of territorialisation, and the frontiers of its power. All groups have also practised tourism in their societies, in one way or another. Thus, in coded form, reciprocity, hospitality and tourism have been archaic institutions present in every epoch of humanity. The understanding of these different, but also surprisingly similar, forms of conducting tourism indicates the importance of cross-cultural research as a new methodology which allows us to arrive at a truly comprehensive model by which we can understand tourism as a total social phenomenon (Barretto, 2010).

Darbellay and Stock (2012) propose a conceptual model for understanding why the systemic paradigm has failed, in spite of voluminous, and good, research into tourism. The first problem arises when it tries to define tourism as being self-organised and closed, autonomous from social life in general. This paradigm helped the original systems theorists to infer general rules which were observable and comparable. However, with tourism came the possibility of establishing a relationship with ‘others’ whose practices did not correspond with those of the society of origin. In part, the lack of understanding of the ‘other’ by western reasoning led the first researchers to think of tourism as a single entity. The theory of the method of studying tourism, however, went through various changes from a holistic view, to a specialised and fragmented viewpoint, to a multi-disciplinary emphasis. In fact, it was precisely this multi-disciplinarity in which each discipline saw tourism as an object of study from its own viewpoint, without dialogue, which did not permit the maturity of tourism as an autonomous system of knowledge. The object should have achieved an inter-disciplinarity in which there was co-production of knowledge (Darbellay and Stock, 2012). To our point of view, the admiration of tourism related scholars for social science explains the lack of identity. Secondly, Jafari was wrong when he suggested that the maturity of tourism as a science is associated to the number of theses, congresses, books or journals about the subject. Science historians know that the years of investigation do not define a discipline; psychoanalysis became in a scientific discipline in 15 years. Are business and management part of the problem?

It is necessary to understand that businesses are anchored in the necessity to generate the ‘need to consume’, while for science the commercialisation of necessities and the satisfaction of these necessities is a taboo. While for a business there is a defined timescale in which tasks must be completed, scientific tasks do not have such timescales. Tourism is monopolised by the logic of business. Threats are deemed as potential events that can affect the product. This has been considered by marketing and management which insisted on forms of thinking about tourism related to business, or even more

specifically, the destination. The destination would explain many of the dynamics of tourism. Thus, the studies from the 1950s until today which have characterised the method of generating knowledge about the discipline focus strongly on the organisation. These studies are, unfortunately, more focussed on isolating those factors which prejudice the destination as a business unit than in understanding the complexity of the phenomenon. Their findings are based on pseudo-scientific studies, not because they are false, but because they depend on 'second order explanations' and avoid formulating 'first order explanations'. Second order explanations refer to descriptive possibilities in a given situation given different variables. This type of explanation is functional in market research, where the objective is to reveal the demands and necessities of the consumer. The fact that 80% of a sample of 300 students prefers Disney World in France to that in the USA refers to a situation rather than an explanation of the first order. On contrary, we see another situation when we read that the subjects of the survey perceive the USA to be a dangerous place since the attacks of 9-11, due to the massive media coverage. Thirdly and most importantly, the epistemologists confuse the methodology with data collection tools. An ethnographic study is more than an interview, and it is not necessary to transcribe a mass of data to demonstrate scientific objectivity. One might conduct good ethnographical studies by simple observation, without talking to anyone. All these errors combine to justify the opinion of social scientists that tourism 'experts' show major methodological deficiencies in their work. We often also see the opposite situation, where many very good anthropological and sociological works are rejected by tourism journals because they challenge the basic rules of management and its paradigms concerning hospitality, development, and the nature of the product, among other issues. Lastly, the answer to the question as to why the systems paradigm has failed in relation to tourism does not concern the studies themselves, but their lack of connection with the social system. The majority of systemic researchers in tourism are not sociologists and only work with this paradigm from a commercial perspective, which perfectly explains the function of tourism itself, but not its relationship with other sub-systems such as those in such areas as economics, religion or politics. This arises an interesting question: Is systemic paradigm condemned to be forgotten or may it be improved? In summary, few have really tried to explain the relationship between tourism and society. As tourism is a construction which is derived from the social system, it cannot be understood outside, or unconnected from, other components.

Structuralism and systemic view facilitates the things in many ways. First and foremost, this paradigm allows inter-cultural comparisons among the diverse forms of practicing tourism. In lieu of taking the phenomenon in isolation, it is important to note tourism is enrooted in other components as religion, economy or politics. Unfortunately, if tourism is studied as a unique institution, scholarship will have serious problems in understanding how it works. In accordance to Levi Strauss, we need to make a periodic table contemplating all forms of making tourism in the world. Societies may be understood by their ways of practicing leisure and tourism. The new model to be explained in detail in the next section will attempt to close this gap. To cut the long story short, tourism may be equalled to dreams. Both recreate the self-revitalising the asymmetries suffered during daily life. As part of leisure, tourism plays a pivotal role in avoiding the social fragmentation.

6 Leisure and dreamlike system

At some perspective, tourism in practice is an inherent part of the sub-system of leisure (which is associated with other institutions and activities such as reading, films, sporting spectacles, and the theatre, among others). One of the most important functions of leisure is to maintain a balance in the social system. As Elias and Dunning (1998) state, leisure is the foundation not only of work, but also of the socialisation of individuals in the different cultural aspects and values which are important for society. Initially, authors such as Freud and Jung defined the dream-like state as a psychical and biological regulatory mechanism, associated with sleep. For both authors, dreams are an activity of the unconscious produced by the libido whose principal characteristic is to compensate the psychic system for the different frustrations experienced while awake (Freud, 2000). By fulfilling the repressed desire, dreams combine and articulate levels of thought into one coherent whole. However, for Jung, dreams should be de-codified in a message concerning our own 'self-knowledge'. In contrast to Freud, Jung maintains that dreams should be understood as rather more than a mere result of the repression of fear and desire, but function under the principle of fantasy evoking 'truths' about which the subject is unaware or has not registered while awake (Jung, 1999). Does this mean that tourism is an industry of fantasy? Tourism, whether for vacations or not, is defined by a dream-like process, which follows on from the pre-touristic phase, defined above as being concerned with hospitality.

According to our perspective, the dream-like sub-system of society has two functions:

- a release of stress
- b re-accommodation to a new situation.

Whereas the first tends to reduce conflict by loosening the ties which unite society and thus leading the individual towards selfish behaviour, the second refers to a dynamic whereby the subject re-inserts himself into a slightly different role. This role, which confers identity on the subject, follows cyclical processes. To the contrary to the position of Turner and Cohen, a vacationist does not change either his status or his role when he takes a holiday in a particular destination (Korstanje, 2009b). The function of the dream-like (or dream-like) system is to preserve the different components of society, such as the political system and the productive system, thus avoiding dramatic social change. The dream-like system itself rests on three principal pillars. The first is *scarceness*, without which it cannot operate. Relationships between the actors cause situations of everyday deprivation, and even symbolic frustration. To avoid a situation where the members completely abandon the group, as we see in the case of migration, the dream-like system gives back to the dreamers a 'motive' to belong to the group, and a theme which makes it worthwhile, and even necessary, to belong to the group. The second element is the *extra-ordinary*, which reminds us of the first heroes. The dream-like sub-system, like dreams themselves, permits the subject to do things which are prohibited in the waking state. In a film or sporting spectacle or other event the subject experiences a type of dream-like cathartic meeting with his heroes, who is destined to mediate between men and the gods. Lastly, *predestination* gives to society concrete examples of activities which might put its very survival in danger.

The dream-like system (conformed by scarcity, the extra-ordinary, and predestination), and by means of leisure activities as described by Huizinga (1968), redefines the limits of uncertainty so that the subject might anticipate an accident. Distraction and entertainment acquire a didactic character, by means of which the suffering of others (in the news, terror films, natural disasters, video games, and even museums dedicated to genocide) imply a reinforcement of one's own perception of security (Bruner, 1996; Stone, 2011; Dann and Seaton, 2001; Tarlow, 2005; Blasi, 2002). Predestination and stories of the disaster play an important role in cases of emergencies as they give to the subject specific moral survival guides. In any case, as we will see, the dream-like subsystem does not operate alone but linked with four other sub-systems, which are just as important, or more important. Just as each fracture is bound to be re-adjusted, the dream-like system of regulation is determined by the conflicts in the future and past of humanity, and its hopes, frustrations and contradictions.

Society is composed of five sub-systems which are mutually interconnected: the political sub-system, which accumulates and distributes power, the economic sub-system (which regulates scarcity), the mythical-religious sub-system (which tries to explain cosmic incongruences), the geographic sub-system (which maintains the identity, and the security of borders), and the c sub-system (which absorbs the tensions and conflicts generated by the other four sub-systems, and forms a consensus which is disputed by no-one). Leisure is a part of the dream-like sub-system, and tourism is one of the many forms of leisure. Tourism, furthermore, generates a discourse which regulates the wish of the individual. Mobility, as a supreme cultural value of the west, is a right transmitted to children through differing means of socialisation from their earliest years. This same 'right' to mobility is encouraged by holidays (as sacred spaces dedicated to the practise of tourism, and whose objective is the creation of economic wealth), and by specific economic interests. The geographic sub-system is also important, in the planning of tourism routes where tourism for recreation is safe (or unsafe). Entertainment, which is an element of all voyages which alternate relaxation with moderate risk, is the basis of tourism as a total phenomenon and applicable to all cultures.

Returning to the theme of the Spanish conquest of US, in which there are inconsistencies either generated within the system or by an external system or society (that is, the meeting between two ethnic groups), leisure and tourism not only followed the discourse of the dominant society, and therefore its political subsystem, but created a cosmic vision with sufficient symbolic power to justify the very act of territorial expropriation. When the dream-like system cannot perform its function of regulation and balance, social change is the result. On the other hand, the mythical-religious sub-system (which includes all those who preserve knowledge such as priests, scientists, and journalists) needs a story to give any sense to the world and the events which happen. The process of the construction of myths is the foundation for cultural values which support society and around which are created different rituals, heroes and cultural practices. The link between the mythical-religious subsystem and the dream-like sub-system is of great complexity. Cultural values which are considered to be unquestionable, such as rest, mobility, and the return, are essentially transmitted by myths of origin, or genesis, and may be observed in the different religious doctrines of the world. A temporary journey therefore requires a psychic relocation of the voyager, who thus experiences, in his fantasy, the necessity of a change of narrative and identity, and subsequent return to his situation of origin.

7 Conclusions

Of course, this fascinating theme should not be exhausted in this paper because of spatial limitations. This essay-review explored the initial questions to validate the reconstruction of systemic view. Discredited by scholars who indeed did not understand it, system theory has today much to say in tourism fields. The promises of hermeneutics, adopted by social sciences and tourism discipline resolved some points but left many others unresolved. Hermeneutics created many forms of exploring tourism, which was positive at some extent but weakened the epistemology. The fragmentation of views and epistemological chaos that characterised today the tourism-related research seems to be a result of three combined factors such as:

- a the advent of postmodernism
- b exacerbation of hermeneutics logic
- c the lack of a clear object of study.

Leisure is an important aspect of the dream-like or dream-like sub-system of society, and therefore is a social phenomenon. We may define tourism as a social institution whose commercial consolidation is to be found in England and the Industrial Revolution, and which may be defined as a voyage in which the traveller returns to the place of origin within six months of departure. However, even this definition is insufficient to deconstruct the real nature of tourism which is enrooted into psychological necessity to escape. This impulse is the origin of the touristic motivation towards exploration and novelty, even though it would appear to be in contradiction to a second tendency to return home in the face of too much uncertainty. The possibility of losing something precious by travel to an unknown destination demands a return from a touristic voyage (George et al., 2010). Otherwise the tourist becomes a migrant. The oppression of everyday life encourages us to go to distant places, but at the same time a necessity for the familiar causes the tourist to return to his place of origin. From this, double pattern is born the touristic voyage (Wenge, 2007). Even though commercialisation and monetary interchange are a condition of the touristic experience, it is not the determining factor. A tourist voyage may or may not be commercialised. Anyway, there is no doubt that monetary interchange in capitalism has invaded every sub-system of society, including the dream-like or dream-like sub-system.

A tourism voyage must comply with the three prerequisites of the need to find equilibrium implicit in the dream-like system – scarceness, an extraordinary nature, and predestination. The tourist feels privileged to belong to his home. He feels special, compiles information about the destination before travelling, and by travelling regulates his internal frustration with his everyday life. The touristic voyage has a motive and a previously defined role, and therefore the touristic voyage as a whole is premeditated. From a hermeneutic perspective many authors, such as Cohen, suggest that the tourist should define his own role which leads her to choose a particular destination. In contrast to Urry, whom this author criticises, Cohen suggests that the journey is a process by which a traveller returns to his home with a status which is different from that on his departure. Following this definition, tourism is a 'right of passage' (Cohen, 1988). The work of Cohen, like that of Turner, has one fundamental problem: when a person returns from his voyage, his status has not in fact changed, but rather he is re-introduced into his

former status. A souvenir does not imply a change of status, but rather exactly the opposite. It is proof that the traveller has indeed been where he claims, but on his return, the traveller returns to his previous role. As such, tourism may be understood as a ritual which obeys a cyclical process of renovation and destruction and subsequent renovation. The function of the tourist voyage, as a form of leisure, is stability. In summary, tourism might be defined as “a cyclical process whose function is the dislocation of the identity, and physical movement, to a place far from the usual residence of a person, with recreational purposes, and with subsequent re-insertion in his or her permanent environment, temporarily fulfilling the psychic necessities of escape, curiosity and extraordinariness, which are common to all forms of leisure”.

As a social practice, tourism bears a code whose objective is educational and socialising in respect to the rest of society. The contents of this discourse vary depending on the socio-economic and political context. The particular time and space in which tourism as a multi-cultural phenomenon takes place is a discussion which is secondary to its definition. The most important issue is to understand, not only the evolution and different forms of tourism in other cultures and times, but also its function within the complex system which is society. Thus, even if there is one form of tourism which is predominant, imposed by the cultural constructions of empires, there are also local forms of tourism which confront, and dialogue with, this narrative imposed from outside. To understand the relation between tourism and society is to explore conquests, imperialism and territorial expropriation. Did not the Azande, Navajo and Aymara, among others, also travel for escape or pleasure? Scientists have forgotten that there are non-western practises of tourism which should also be studied.

8 Practical implications for future

Last but not least, it is necessary to develop a new method to understand social practises with respect to tourism, or tourisms. This new method should take into account history, inter-cultural comparison, the interpretation of myths, and ethnography to discuss tourism as symbolic voyages in which the individual meets others in order to recognise himself. Ethnocentricity leads many to consider modern tourism as the only form of travelling in a civilised manner, and it is here that one can find a series of erroneous descriptions of tourism. The ‘other’ or the non-western, or the indigenous, forms merely the object of ‘cultural tourism’ or ‘ethnic tourism’. Western paternalism obliges the protection of other cultural forms in order to reinforce the ethnocentricity itself.

References

- Alvarez, M. and Korzay, M. (2008) ‘Influence of politics and media in the perception of Turkey as a tourism destination’, *Tourism Review*, Vol. 63, No. 2, pp.38–46.
- Barretto, M. (2010) *Turismo, Reflexividad y Procesos de Hibridación Cultural en América del Sur Austral*, Colección Pasos Edital Nro 4, Tenerife.
- Berger, A. (2004) *Deconstructing Travel: Cultural Perspective on Tourism*, Altamira Press, California.
- Blasi, A.J. (2002) ‘Visitation to disaster sites’, in Swatos, W.H. and Tomasi, L. (Eds.): *From Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism*, pp.139–155, Praeger, Westport, Ct.

- Bortnowska-Marinho, K., Alberton, A. and Vieira-Marinho, S. (2011) *Análise das dissertações defendidas no Mestrado em Turismo e Hotelaria da Universidade do Vale do Itajaí e do Mestrado em Turismo da Universidade Caxias do Sul. Seminário de Associação Nacional Pesquisa e Pós-graduação em Turismo*, UNIVALI, Brazil.
- Bouillon, R. (1985) *Planificación del Espacio Turístico*, Trillas, México.
- Bruner, E. (1996) 'Tourism in Ghana, the representation of slavery and the return of the black diaspora', *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 98, No. 2, pp.290–304.
- Calizo-Soneiro, J. (1991) *Aproximación a la Geografía del turismo*, Editorial Síntesis, Madrid.
- Cicourel, A. (1981) 'Notes on the integration of micro and macro levels of analysis', in Cicourel, A. and Knorr-Cetina, K. (Eds.): *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro and Macro Sociologies*, Routledge, London.
- Cohen, E. (1972) 'Toward a sociology of international tourism', *Social Research*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp.164–182.
- Cohen, E. (1988) 'Traditions in the qualitative sociology of tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp.29–46.
- Coles, T., Duval, D. and Hall, M. (2005) 'Sobre el Turismo y la movilidad en tiempos de movimiento y conjetura post-disciplinar', *Política y Sociedad*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp.85–99.
- Crompton, J.L. (1979) 'Motivation for pleasure vacation', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp.409–424.
- Cruz, M., Rollim, F. and Vempre, G. (2007) 'Aplicación del modelo de datos en paneles en la identificación de los determinantes del turismo internacional', *Revista Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp.436–463.
- Culler, J. (1981) 'The semiotics of tourism', *American Journal of Semiotics*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.127–140.
- Da Silva-Santos, F.A. and Soares-Marques, A.P. (2011) 'The importance of the consumption of semiotic sign for the competitiveness of the tourist destinations', *European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp.105–113.
- Dann, G. (1977) 'Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp.184–194.
- Dann, G. and Seaton, A. (2001) *Slavery, Contested Heritage and Thanatourism*, Routledge, London.
- Darbellay, F. and Stock, M. (2012) 'Tourism as complex interdisciplinary research object', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp.441–458.
- De Kadt, E. (1992) *Turismo: ¿pasaporte al desarrollo?*, Editorial Endymion, México.
- Dosso, R. (2005a) 'Centralidades Territoriales', *Aportes y Transferencias*, Vol. 2, No. 9, pp.12–26.
- Dumanzedier, J. (1967) *Toward a Society of Leisure*. Nueva York, Free
- Dwyer, L. (2008) 'Destination competitiveness and policy making for poverty reduction', *Conference VIII, Sustaining Quality of Life through Tourism*, 24–28 June.
- Elias, N. and Dunning, E. (1992) *Deporte y Ocio en el Proceso de la Civilización*, Fondo de Cultura Económica, Buenos Aires.
- Escalona-Munoz, F. (2011) 'La Visión convencional del Turismo según sus primeros codificadores (los grundisse de Hunziker y Krapf, 1972'. Turydes', *Revista de Investigación en Turismo y Desarrollo*, Vol. 3, No. 8, pp.1–20.
- Franch, M. et al. (2008) '4I tourism (landscape, leisure, learning and limit) responding to new motivations and expectations of tourist to improve the competitiveness of alpine destination in sustainable way', *Tourism Review*, Vol. 63, No. 1, pp.4–14.
- Freud, S. (2000) *La interpretación de los sueños*, Edición centenario, Traducción José Luis López-Ballesteros y de Torres, Biblioteca Nueva, Madrid.
- Gastal, S. (2006) 'Tiempos post-modernos: posibilidades para el turismo', *Revista Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp.270–281.

- Gee, C. (1994) *International Hotels Development and Management*, Educational Institute of the American Hotel & Motel Association, Michigan.
- George, B., Inbakaran, R. and Poyyamoli, G. (2010) 'To travel or not to travel: towards understanding the theory of nativistic motivation', *Tourism, An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, Vol. 58, No. 4, pp.395–407.
- Getino, O. (2002) *Turismo: entre el ocio y el negocio*, Ediciones Ciccus, Buenos Aires.
- Giddens, A. (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Gil-Moreno, S. and Quintana-Aguilar, T. (2006) 'Diagnóstico, tendencias y estrategias de futuro para las agencias de viaje: el caso del sector español', *Revista Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp.327–349.
- Graburn, N.H. (1983) 'The anthropology of tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp.207–226.
- Gunn, C.A. and Var, T. (2002) *Tourism Planning: Basics, Conceptos Cases*, Routledge, London.
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M. and Urry, J. (2006) 'Mobilities, immobilities and moorings', *Mobilities*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.1–22.
- Heytens, J. (1978) *Les Effects du Tourisme Dans les Pays en Vie de Développement. Implications Economiques. Financières et Sociales*, Les Cahiers du Tourisme. Centre des Hautes Etudes du Tourisme. Provence, Universidad de Marsella.
- Huizinga, J. (1968) *Homo Ludens*, Emecé, Buenos Aires.
- Jafari, J. (2005) 'El Turismo como disciplina científica', *Revista Política y Sociedad*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp.39–56.
- Jafari, J. and Aeser, D. (1988) 'Tourism as a subject of doctoral dissertations', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp.407–429.
- Jafari, J. and Pizam, A. (1996) 'Tourism management', in Warner, M. (Ed.): *International Encyclopedia of Business and Management*, Routledge, London.
- Jimenez-Guzman, L.F. (1986) *Teoría Turística: un enfoque integral del hecho social*, Universidad Externado de Colombia, Bogotá.
- Jung, G. (1999) *Obra completa*, Editorial Trotta, Madrid.
- Klenosky, D. (2002) 'The pull tourism destinations: a means-end investigation', *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 40, No. 4, pp.385–395.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. (1989) 'The micro social order: toward a reconception', in *Fielding, Action and Structure: Research Methods and Social Theory*, pp.21–53, Sage, London.
- Korstanje, M. (2007) 'Aportes de los viajes a las Ciencias Sociales: un relevamiento bibliográfico para un análisis teórico', *Gestión Turística*, No. 8, Universidad Austral de Chile.
- Korstanje, M. (2008) 'Epistemología de la Palabra para las Ciencias del Turismo', *Nómadas. Revista Crítica de Ciencias Sociales y Jurídicas*, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp.93–111.
- Korstanje, M. (2009a) 'Reconsidering the roots of event management: leisure in ancient Rome', *Event Management Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp.197–203.
- Korstanje, M. (2009b) 'Interpretando el Génesis del Descanso: una aproximación a los mitos y rituales del turismo', *Pasos, Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp.99–103.
- Korstanje, M. (2009c) 'Maccannell em Perspectiva: análise critica sobre a obra El Turista', *RBTUR, Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp.80–111.
- Korstanje, M. (2010a) 'Searching the roots of patrimony and its appliance in tourism fields', *South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp.30–40.
- Korstanje, M. (2010b) 'Supremacy of English in tourism research', *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp.383–387.
- Korstanje, M. and Busby, G. (2010) 'Understanding the Bible as the roots of physical displacement: the origin of tourism', *E-Review of Tourism Research*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp.95–111.

- Lash, S. and Urry, J. (1998) *Economías de Signo y Espacio: sobre el capitalismo de la postorganización*, Amorrortu Editores, Buenos Aires.
- Leiper, N. (1979) 'The framework of tourism: towards a definition of tourism, tourist and the tourist industry', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp.390–407.
- Maccannell, D. (1988) 'Turismo e Identidad cultural. En Todorov, Tzvetan', *El Cruzamiento entre culturas*, Ediciones Jucar, Madrid.
- Mantero, J.C. (2005) 'Nodalidades Turísticas', *Aportes y Transferencias*, Vol. 2, No. 9, pp.49–71.
- Meira-Martoni, R. (2011) 'A Dialectica na Perspectiva do Materialismo historico: un procedimiento Epistemologico para la Leitura do Turismo em sua Essencialidade', *VIII Seminario de Assocacao Nacional Pesquisa e Pos-graduacao em Turismo*, 02 al 04 de Octubre, UNIVALI, Brazil.
- Minnaert, L., Maitland, R. and Miller, G. (2011) 'What is social tourism?', *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 14, No. 5, pp.403–415.
- Molina, S. (1986) *Planificación del Turismo*, Nuevo tiempo Libre, México.
- Monterrubio Cordero, J.C. (2011) *Turismo y Cambio Socio-cultural, una perspectiva Conceptual*, Plaza y Valdez y Universidad Autónoma de México, México.
- Munee, F. (1999) *Psicosociología del Tiempo Libre: un enfoque crítico*, Trillas, México.
- Nadeau, J. et al. (2008) 'Destination in a country image context', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp.84–106.
- Nash, D. (1981) 'Tourism as an anthropological subject', *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 22, No. 5, pp.461–481.
- Nieffer, I.A. (2006) 'Segmentación por beneficios de los visitantes de la Isla Superagui: análisis multivariado para la identificación de segmentos del mercado eco-turístico', *Revista Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp.197–218.
- Osorio-García, M. (2004) 'La Complejidad del Turismo', *Ponencia presentada en el VI Congreso Nacional de Investigación Turística*, 22 al 24 Septiembre.
- Osorio-García, M. (2007) 'El carácter social del Turismo: un análisis sistémico sobre su complejidad', *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp.464–492.
- Palmer, C.A. (1994) 'Tourism and colonialism: the experience of the Bahamas', *Annals of tourism Research*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp.792–811.
- Panosso-Netto, A. (2006) 'Filosofía del turismo: una propuesta epistemológica', *Revista Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp.389–402.
- Pastoriza, E. (2011) *La Conquista de Las Vacaciones: breve historia del turismo en la Argentina*, Edhasa, Buenos Aires.
- Pernecky, T. and Jamal, T. (2010) 'Hermeneutic, phenomenology in tourism studies', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp.1055–1075.
- Petr, N. and Gueguen, N. (2006) 'Beginner research on tourism and the tourist: beware of words and caricatures!', *Tourism Analysis*, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp.251–264.
- Pi-Sunyer, O. (1977) 'Percepciones Cambiantes del turismo y de los turistas en un centro turístico catalán', in Smith, V.L. (Ed.): *Anfitriones e Invitados*, pp.281–300, Endymion, Madrid.
- Revilla, G. and Bernard, A. (1998) 'Análisis de las necesidades y preferencias de la mujer de negocio en relación a la oferta hotelera', *Gestión Turística. Número*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp.91–106.
- Santana-Talavera, A. (2006) *Antropología y Turismo. ¿Nuevas hordas, viejas Culturas?*, Ariel, Barcelona.
- Segui-Llinas, M. (2006) 'Hacia una Ciencia del Turismo: siguiendo los pasos de Georges Cazes', *Aportes y Transferencias*, Vol. 2, No. 10, pp.11–16.
- Silva-Santo, L.M. (2003) 'El Quibe en la mesa bahiana: la influencia árabe en la gastronomía de Bahía, Brasil', *En Gastronomía y Turismo: cultura al plato. Lacanau Gloria y Norrild Juana (coordinadores)*, CIET, Buenos Aires, pp.267–274.
- Smith, V.L. (1977) *Anfitriones e Invitados*, Endymion, Madrid.

- Stone, P. (2011) 'Dark tourism and the cadaveric carnival, mediating life and death narratives at Gunther Von Hagen's body worlds', *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 14, No. 7, pp.1-17.
- Tarlow, P. (2005) 'Dark tourism: the appealing dark side of tourism and more', *Niche Tourism, Contemporary Issues Trends and Cases*, pp.47-58, Elsevier, Oxford.
- Tribe, J. (2010) 'Tribes, territories and networks in the tourism academy', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp.7-33.
- Turnbull, D.R. and Uysal, M. (1995) 'An exploratory study of German visitors to the Caribbean: push and pull motivations', *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp.85-91.
- Turner, L. and Ash, J. (1991) *La Horda Dorada*, Endymion, Madrid.
- Urry, J. (1990) *The Tourist Gaze*, Sage, Londres.
- Urry, J. (1995) *Consuming Places*, Routledge, Londres.
- Urry, J. (2007) 'Introducción, Culturas Móviles', in Zusman, P., Lois, C. and Castro, H. (Eds.): *En Viajes y Geografías*, pp.17-31, Prometeo, Buenos Aires.
- Vitry, C. (2003) 'Fiesta Nacional de la Pachamama: el ritual de alimentar a la tierra', *En Gastronomía y Turismo: cultura al plato. Lacanau Gloria y Norrild Juana (coordinadores)*, CIET, Buenos Aires, pp.227-244.
- Wenge, C.O. (2007) 'Razones para Viajar. Factótum', *Revista de Filosofía*, No. 5, Edición Viajes y Viajeros, pp.88-91, Disponible en [online] <http://www.revistafactotum.com/>.
- Wood, D. and Graham, S. (2006) 'Permeable boundaries in the software-sorted society: surveillance and the differentiation of mobility', in Sheller, M. and Urry, J. (Eds.): *Mobile Technologies of the City*, Routledge, Londres.
- Wu, J., Xu, J. and Ekiz, E. (2009) 'Investigating the push and pull motivation of visiting domestic destination in China: a means-end approach', *Journal of China Tourism Research*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp.287-315.
- Xiao, H. and Smith, S.L.J. (2008) 'Knowledge impact: an appraisal of tourism scholarship', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp.62-83.