



Centre for Ethnicity & Racism Studies

## **Discussing the methodological inconsistencies of tourism research**

**Dr Maximiliano Korstanje**

**April 2015**

### **Introduction**

We argue that a popular approach to the study of tourism has been misrepresented as social scientific, but in fact its claims to scientificity are unwarranted. This is not meant as an attack on managerial or marketing literature in general, which are valuable in their place. Rather, this essay-review focuses its criticism against the analytic framework known as Rational Platform. It has been applied by some policy makers who camouflage their financial interests under the guise of social science. Rational Platform follows the legacy of Jafar Jafari. It appears to be based on some concepts and protocols of the social sciences, however its aim is to protect the financial interests of the status quo. Rational Platform is the fifth platform added to the four formulated by Jafari some decades back.

Rational Platform constructs its legitimacy with scientific protocols such as the peer review process, impact factor indexes, journal rankings, some naïve methodological discussions, but at the bottom their results consist in the administration of opinion polls to gain knowledge about the preferences of various market segments. Subject to demographic variables such as gender, income and age of tourists, these questionnaires are simulacra of scientific research. Under the appearances of scientificity their explanations are associated with profits and business-related programs.

The appetite for capturing more market segments engenders two consequences which lead to the fragmentation of the discipline of tourism studies. The first consequence is the accumulation of definitions, all of them apparently conducive to research, but in reality limited to businesses alone. Secondly, the ever-growing number of definitions about tourism militates against a unified epistemology. To compensate for the lack of unity, Rational Platform cites the importance of a multidisciplinary approach to understand the complexity of tourism. The intent is to comport with the standard for scholarship that maturation of a discipline depends on the richness of methods and voices. This discourse, far from being the sign of indiscipline as Tribe (2006) put it, is conducive to the elaboration of development-related programs in which peripheral nations ask for credits and financial aide in support of the tourism industry. The high degree of dependency between centre and periphery has been solidified by the Rational Platform approach. In the following, we explore the main thesis and contradictions of two authoritative voices of Rational Platform, to understand its impact on data and analyses issued by the World Tourism Organization about the possibilities that tourism offers for poor countries. We point out that the four platforms brilliantly studied by Jafari

needs to be complimented. A fifth, associated with globalized economies, was added during 1990s. The Rational Platform does not investigate in order to know more about tourists' minds, nor does it try to understand the context for how tourism evolves. Rather, it is oriented to work as a conduit to accumulate profits and protect tourist destinations as revenue sources. More interested in so-called good practices, Rational Platform is concerned with providing diagnoses identify sources of income restrictions and to solve glitches of the system. By the time Rational Platform formulates the question, the response is already determined.

### **The Four Platforms of Jafar Jafari**

Today, tourism is considered one of the fastest growing industries, not only because of the income it generates, but also because of its resiliency in the face of hazards of late modernity (Tarlow 2000; Clayton, Mustellier & Korstanje 2014). The ability of the industry to ameliorate poverty and promote economic stability situates tourism as an academic discipline (Leiper 1981; Jafari & Aeser, 1988). Many nations adopted tourism as a way to revitalize national economies, which contributed to its importance as an object of scientific study. Universities incorporated tourism in their undergraduate and graduate curricula (Kaspar, 1987; Graburn & Jafari 1991; Tribe 2004). As the study of tourism was joined with official and industry discourses, some scholars said that the maturation of tourism research would require the adoption of a scientific paradigm to help us understand the roots of tourism. Tourism, from its inception, was evaluated according to its effects instead of its socio-cultural context. The degree to which societies embrace tourism depends on its effects on local economies (Korstanje 2012). They tend to ignore other aspects of the issue such as the psychology of tourists or the deep anthropological roots of

tourism. The economic paradigm exerted considerable influence in the research that is produced in the field.

Jafar Jafari (2001) proposed a conceptual model that explains the evolution of tourism research. He identified four platforms or paradigms: advocacy, cautionary, adaptation, and knowledge-based. Since his seminal text, many studies have used one of these four platforms to classify the information related to tourism. Typically more than one platform may coexist with a cautionary platform within the same society. Some studies, which examined the positive aspects of tourism, were part of advocacy platform; others, focused more on economic and social problems brought by tourism were framed as part of the cautionary platform (Jafari 2001).

Originally, the Jafari's followers believed that the maturity of the discipline would be measured by the number of published papers, journals, and scholarly conferences in tourism fields—the more bibliographical production the better. Although those bibliographic measures showed steady increases, tourism studies still do not have an agreed upon epistemology for applied research. The industrial vision of tourism as an economic activity never changed. The persistence of the industrial or business framework remained because there was a fifth platform that Jafari had not taken into account at time of elaborating his model. That fifth platform is the Rational Platform.

This fifth platform has been forged in the last few decades by a number of scholars interested in pedagogy and epistemology of tourism (Boyer, 1997; Tribe, 1997; Hall, 2005; Botterill, 2001; Schluter, 2003; Cohen et al, 2005;

2006; Coles & Hall, 2006; Dachary & Arnaiz Burne, 2006; Santana-Talavera, 2006; Monterrubio Cordero, 2011; Korstanje 2013).

Lacking a clear consensus about methodologies and epistemology, tourism research sought in other disciplines what it did not create itself. Instead of fixing the problem, it aggravated it by its multidisciplinary approach. Each discipline answers the question of what tourism is with its own, different definitions, epistemologies, and methodologies (Escalona 2004; Thirkettle & Korstanje 2013; Korstanje; 2013; 2014). Tourism is widely studied through the lens of classical social sciences thereby preventing the maturation of an epistemology distinctive to the discipline of tourism fields.

### **The Rational Platform**

We may define a platform, in Jafari's terms, as a space formed by a corpus of studies, concepts, and theories which shapes a certain attitude to tourism. It is safe to say he gives a similar treatment the term 'paradigm.' Jafari did not give details on the criteria to design the platforms. Tourism studies have adopted diverse approaches. Their most recent stage of evolution depends on enhanced bibliographical production. The Rational Platform (hereinafter RP) opens a new one space of discussions, studies, works, theses, and dissertations where tourism takes on a new meaning, which is increasingly linked to business. The term rationality is used as an explanation of fundamental reason designates a view of programs created to achieve other's purpose. Being rational implies fixing goals and moving resources for their achievement. Plans and programs are the best example of what a rationale platform work. They are not aimed to understand events, but to make things change. They are finally aimed at achieving certain purposes to be conducive to one or more groups. Concerned

in what “we need now”, deviations represent the main threat of rational logic, because they create a gap between goals and actions. This logic is present in “engineering plans”, or built context.

Policies and programs issued under the RP paradigm are aimed partially at protecting the organic image of tourist destinations, but they implicitly steer the ways communities should manage their tourism resources. Over the last 40 years a common aspect all these studies have is the valorization of rationality as maximization of profits from tourism. Moreover, this basic assumption, which is not always stated explicitly, has shaped the methodology of tourism research. From studies of sustainability to the effects of terrorism, research in the tourism field has relied on closed-ended questionnaires given to tourists at international destinations. Though researchers do their best not to fall into ethnocentrism by drawing samples from widely diverse nationalities, the outcomes of research consistently only reflect the tourists’ voices. Instead of explaining why events happen, as the founding parents of the discipline wanted to do, RP uses second order explanations based on indirect observations using standardized and rigid instrumentation and analytic techniques. This means that correlation among variables takes on more importance than a full explanation of facts. For example, one may hypothesize that males perceive fewer risks than females. It seems sensible that gender is a variable related to risk. This research designs sets up a second order explanation. But it leads to a fallacy, because females are socialized to express their emotions more than males who tend to re-direct their fears onto secondary emotions such as hate. Understanding how things happen is the goal of research science, while intervening to prevent anomalies is proper to engineering.

RP is especially prominent in business and managerial literature. Three typical texts using RP illustrate the way it is used. The selection of these studies is not meant to be statistically representative of the whole. They are illustrative and express the main point of discussion: namely that RP is used to justify requests by tourist destination nations to ask for foreign loans.

Applied research in RP is designed to justify or reject a product or a market segment of potential clients. Tourists are not viewed as agents of change but as consumers whose attitudes and hopes should be mapped to conduct correct business plans. With the passing of years, this platform, which prioritized the study of demand in lieu of the overall tourist system, did not pay sufficient attention to the signification of tourism. It focused on trends of market segmentation and the income of stakeholders so as to coincide with a discourse fabricated by World Bank to lead the world to a generalized financial hegemony. RP frames each theme to be studied depending on the interest of each market segment. For example, researchers studied tourism as cultural tourism, patrimonial tourism, dark tourism, ethnic tourism, and so forth. Every topic allows the creation of a new segment so that the travel corporations may adjust their marketing accordingly. Tourism management believed that diversification is the key for business success. This view of tourism corresponds with the need to protect destinations as products, by the identification of those pathologies which may affect their touristic appeal. In this vein, RP reconstructs an “engineering of marketing” based on five points: a) culture, b) patrimony, c) territory, d) sustainability and e) risk. Though it bows to the rites of science, such as the peer review, its main aims are not scientific research, but the valorization of tourist destinations, according to calculations of profits.

Culture and patrimony cement the legal foundation to create value in societies. Value is rooted in a specific territory. The concepts of sustainability and risk modulate the market for tourism product. Tourist destinations are the leisure merchandise that connects them to a much wider globalized economy where business plays the crucial role. In contrast, science has aims in a different direction. RP confounds the two, mingling business and science. It makes its claim for legitimacy according to the status of science. Tourism journal rankings reflect the virtual monopoly of editorial board members by standards set according to RP. Of course, to an extent this prevails in any discipline as a paradigm controls most of what gets published. Journals are monopolized by peers who place the manuscripts within a particular paradigm and according to a certain ideology. Manuscripts which are radically contradictory to the status quo are rejected or substantially edited. Those who access and read the journals accept and reproduce their basic values. At the same time, those authors who have substantially impacted fields are considered authoritative voices. The fever for author rankings is being criticized in the social sciences but seems to find a fertile ground in services fields.

### **The Importance of Rankings**

The monopolization by RP in tourism journals has led to prioritization of the key impact factor and the production of bibliography over other goals to substantiate the maturation of tourism studies as a science. The reputation of scholars does not rest on any other aspects than the number of citations in the professional literature (McKercher, 2005; Ryan, 2005; Jamal, Smith and Watson 2008; Zhao and Ritchie, 2007). Though, to some extent, this standard

for studies was necessary to establish the discipline, there are some objections to continued reliance on impact factors and bibliographic volume.

- a) The scholars who contribute to a discipline are not the most cited ones.
- b) Prizes are not awarded to the most cited scholars.
- c) The self citation is prevalent in tourism fields.
- d) Quantification of citations does not reveal the prestige of researchers. An investigation may be cited only 20 times by leading researchers, while other may be cited by 700 students.
- e) The quality of journals is not given by the key impact factors, but the content of its publications.
- f) Key impact factors create peripheral knowledge which is ignored by top ranked journals. Rational Paradigm has monopolized the production of first ranked journals.

The impact factors have not only adopted in the leading universities of the world, but also changed the steps to recruit lecturers and senior researchers and promotions to salient positions. Neither the reputation of a course, nor a university is comes from the number of citations their scholars have. Instead, the quality of journals and scholars are based on evaluation of the content of the produced texts.

To explain this better, one might see the main traits of RP as the following.

- 1- The belief that tourism should be measured by the profits it generates.
- 2- Tourism, which is an economic activity, is characterized by ongoing mobility and landscape transformation. Its undesired aftermaths may be

mitigated by the rational use of resources to preserve local an environment or patrimonial assets.

3- In the West, labor is considered a valuable instrument for progress. In tourism fields, work and leisure are dissociated. The tourist space represents a geographical point which may be ordered by the economy. The tourist site must be protected from other external factors that threaten its functioning.

4- RP prioritizes attractiveness and client loyalty as main criteria for research. Reports resulting from this logic not only yield plans of actions, but also are future oriented. The importance of research is directed to good practices as written in manuals or guidebooks.

RP is defined by the quest of profits, not by scientific theories. RP informs policy makers in designing their programs and plans for development. It is impossible to determine to what an extent the World Tourism Organization is influenced by RP scholars, but the connection between current literature and documents of this and allied organizations is unquestionable.

### **Business and Research**

RP is oriented to the achievement of business goals. It needs to enhance its legitimacy to gain further investors, programs of development, and financial support. Using the jargon, protocols, and terms of scientists puts on good face for scholars who embrace RP. However, since tourism does not have the status of a scientific discipline, they appeal to multidisciplinary research as a vehicle towards scientificity. Ordinary people valorize the science as an authoritative voice. Marketing and management, which are respectable disciplines of resource administration, give their audiences a reasonable discourse of policies which otherwise might be neglected. For tourism, marketing and management aim at soliciting international loans, especially in underdeveloped countries,

which look to cultural tourism as a source of national income. By conflating marketing and management with science, RP accelerates the dispersion of theories and beliefs necessary towards the creation of a shared epistemology. This occurs for two primary reasons.

First and foremost, international business and nongovernmental organizations such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and the World Tourism Organization operate with definitions that for scientific purposes beg the question. Putting together some different issues, tourism is defined as “cultural and economic phenomenon which entails the movement of people to countries or places outside their usual environment for personal or business/professional purposes. These people are called visitors (which may be either tourists or excursionists; residents or non-residents) and tourism has to do with their activities, some of which imply tourism expenditure (World Tourism Organization)

Since their primary goal is profit, the tourism industry and its associated organizations elaborate their programs on basis of a one sided interpretation of the object of study. Their implicit goal is the accumulation of more market segments. However, expansion of market segments depends only on methodology of marketing, not basic scientific research. This is why multidisciplinary fits as the perfect discourse for businesses.

RP is by nature non-scientific, because it serves the needs of forming management plans. Moreover, the platform defends the diversification of products as resources and the preservation of destinations to enhance competition among them. Tourism management is a solution in search of a

problem cloaked in the disguise of science. Consequently, the presumably scientific literature ends with what should be done, instead of observing what is. Future examinations should correlate the discourse and documents issued by the International Monetary Fund, the World Tourism Organization, and the World Bank, with the emergence of RP as a pseudo-scientific paradigm in the 1980s and 1990s. Perhaps the so-called indiscipline of tourism studied by Tribe (1997) was an all-encompassing program to create a hegemonic voice.

The efficacy of tourism industry advocates to persuade nations to ask for loans rests on their ability to present their discourses as a scientific, and it is based on four guiding beliefs.

- a- Tourism is good or bad depending on its effects in economies.
- b- Labor is the only way to improve the lives of people.
- c- Rational logic, which is based on the calculation and instrumentality, allows the implementation of plans and programs to prevent the glitches that might jeopardize arrival at tourist attractions.
- d- Underdeveloped nations can access the ladder of civilization by adopting rational programs successfully applied in developed countries.
- e- Tourism and cultural tourism are conducive to improve the asymmetries of national economies beset by cultural vices such as corruption, civil wars, crime, and so on.

### Development and Tourism

The terms ‘development’ and ‘modernization’ became watch words for international political economy in the post-WWII era. Championed and elucidated by Walt W. Rostow (1960), the concepts played a double role. They offered a blueprint for Third World countries seeking improved infrastructure

and growing economies. They also countered what the centers of capital believed were the attractions of communism, socialism, and similar collectivist ideologies. They also fit with the initiation of the Cold War initiated by the leader of the seat of the world capitalist system, US President Truman, aided and abetted by the old colonialist Winston Churchill. The basic thesis was that underdeveloped nations should be assisted by industrialized ones so that capital markets could expand. Frederick Buell argues convincingly that the efficacy of capitalism consisted not only in transcending the market, introducing the concept of cultures through post-war period, but creating a hierarchy of the world (three worlds) where first one was in the superior ladder than the other two. The third world represented the sign of deficiency but was morally authentic. The “inauthentic” west, which was characterized by greed, anomie and conflict, should help under-developing countries to reach modernization and rationality.

“Culturally, there is still stronger tendency toward hierarchy in the three worlds theory. This cultural hierarchy, however, has proven as brittle as is has been tenacious. Thanks to a vigorous survival of cultural attitudes from Eurocolonial Past, the first World sees itself and is seen as the source of high modern culture and scientific rationality, of universalism and universal literary and artistic genius” (Buell 1998: p. 23)

Whatever the case may be, Buell adds, what is important to discuss is how the whole world is subordinated to western imaginaries, where an apparent difference (culture) is ideologically used to legitimize the imposition of nation-state. Since from its inception the concept of culture was inextricably

intertwined to imperialism, globalization has not found serious obstacles to expand in the XXth century. The emerging troublesome nationalism, and the global capitalism that have liberty to invest elsewhere, are two side of the same coin (Buell, 1998).

In this context, any adoption of development programs was backed by the United States and its nongovernmental instrumentalities like the World Bank and later the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Their programs consisted of a battery of financial aids to build infrastructure, promote health, education, and encourage foreign investment. Modernization theory is based on the linear evolution of societies (Korstanje 2012). It supposes that evolution is determined by the volume of production and its maturity measured by economic value. Older centers of capital first in Europe and then in North America evolved by adopting more efficient means of production. Traditional social orders disintegrated before the advance of capitalism (Korstanje 2012). This paternalist and hegemonic discourse outlived the era of modernization which found its counterpart in Third World political economies that followed an import substitution strategy for economic growth. The crisis of world capitalism of the 1970s undermined import substitution, especially in the more advanced national economies such as those in South America like Argentina, Brazil, and Chile (Robinson 2008). It was replaced by globalization and neoliberalism. Nonetheless, modernization theory persisted even into the twenty-first century in tourism fields where it accentuated the wall between a developed center and its underdeveloped periphery. Modernization theory reflected two aspects of Western ethnocentrism. The first was the complicity of science with imperialism. Secondly, science—really the misconception of science or scientism—was associated with the linear conception of reason, based on

European thought and derived from classical Greece. The wedding of scientism with twentieth century capitalism and imperialism led to the assessment of societies in which their economies determine their level of civilization. Detractors of modernization theory pointed out that development and modernization are just manifestations of ideological power. By embracing modernization, non-western societies accept the cultural values of West (Esteva, 2000; Escobar 2011; Korstanje, 2011).

In the 1980s tourism research turned to claims by local natives about the economic and social effects of tourism. The industry was seen to involve similar costs to hosting societies regardless of their locale (Butler, 1999; Bramwell & Lane, 1993; Scheyvens, 2010; Scheyvens & Momsen, 2008; Ritchie & Crouch, 2003). When the tourism industry was seen as an instrument for boosting regional economies, less attention was given to the role played by capital (Britton, 1982) and the historical distinction between center and periphery as a criterion for the failure or success of tourism programs (Kadt, 1979). Hopes and promises of development offered by industrialized countries to control peripheral nations became a problem. Induced by the idea that loans would serve to improve the infrastructure and attract an international contingent of tourists, local governments asked international banks for credit. Needless to say, local destination finances did not improve. Instead the incurred debt created increased dependency in the underdeveloped world. The specialists at the World Tourism Organization and the World Bank attributed limitations of adopting tourism as a main industry were related to so-called cultural pathologies, such as political corruption, instability, and civil war. The failures to expand development to other peripheral nations resulted in the “blaming the

victim tactic” (Fujikura, 2001; Kiely 1999; Gasper 1996; Esteva, 2000; Korstanje, 2011).

For example, de Kadt (1979) wrote a series of reports explaining how history and the cultural values of hosting communities were the real reason for the failures of financial aids given to periphery. The social problems created by a legacy of colonialism were ignored, and solutions to the failure to develop were sought in more rational planning. The world was led to think that plenitude and happiness only could be reached through the paradigm of development and tourism.

As Jafari pointed out, the cautionary platform did correctly raise the adverse consequences of tourism industry, but at the same time it created an attachment to the doctrine of sustainability. The program of a sustainable environment is based on the need to protect the tourist product, from dysfunctional aspects of the economy. The persistence of academic themes such as cultural shock or sustainability suggests a need for intervention. But the problem in both the theory of colonization and that of development fall into the same fallacy of ignoring the political role of tourism in the configuration of the global economy. What these theories overlooked was the hegemonic role of the United States as the unique power of the world. To some extent, the studies of colonialism inaugurated by de Kadt, overly valorized culture while minimizing criticism of the pervasive role played by the World Bank in issuing loans which never could be repaid. This financial strategy of dependency was obscured by talk of culture as a pretext for the failures of peripheral nations to correct their material asymmetries (Rist, 2002; Escobar 2011; Korstanje 2012). In the next sections we will explore the texts of two seniors scholars who camouflaged of

social scientists are the exegetes of RP: Emanuel de Kadt & Konstantinos Andriotis.

### **Konstantinos Andriotis**

A leading journal in Anthropology published the paper “Brits behaving badly” authored by K. Andriotis (2010). This work explores the behavior of British travelers about sex, drinking, and risk-taking. These tourists go on tours in Greek summer resorts. The research method relies on content analysis of newspapers, and offers a clear example of the kind of methodology associated with RP. For many young tourists, vacations are an opportunity to liberate themselves from the rules of routines. They engage in very risk-behaviors such as binge drinking. Quite aside from the profound bibliographical review done by Andriotis, the research starts from needs of identifying the segments of market.

“Given the gregarious social behaviour, young tourists are recognized as being as highly differentiated market segment. This behaviour has led Shields to introduce the concept of liminality that refers to the temporary loss of social bearing of holidaymakers that often results in risks which contrast with the norms and values that shape behaviour in their home environment” (Andriotis 2010: 16)

The investigation concludes that it is vital to fix the problems generated by tourists who adopt risky behavior in tourist destinations. In view of that, the quantitative analysis of newspapers will help. Andriotis states the problem to solve. It is not the history of alcoholism, or the impact of secular societies on alcoholism, but rather he laments that newspapers do not offer “demographical

instruments” to infer variables to understand the complexity of liminality with respect to tourists. Andriotis adheres to the thesis that:

“Education can be only one component of a strategy to address risky behaviour. Stronger enforcement of substance abuse related laws and restrictions on antisocial behaviour should be an additional measure. It may be advisable that the Greek authorities to attempt to alter the behaviour of young people by seeking advice from their counterparts in UK. Rather than letting the problems escalate, and leaving local resident to suffer from youngsters` misbehavior, they can draw on the experience of British police in dealing with British youngster outrageous lifestyle”. (Andriotis, 2010: p 29)

As mentioned above, RP takes concepts from social science to create an ideological discourse; to present its outcomes as the only rational policies for tourist destination countries. Subsequent to his 2010 study, Andriotis addressed the issue of authenticity in relation to tourism and national policies. Historically authenticity has played a role in governmental applications for international financial assistance. Andriotis and Agiomirgianakis (2013) distinguish between market tourism and that based on authenticity. They explain that there are two types of hospitalities in the tourism industry. One is that of the market, which is represented in hotel chains and infrastructure, and the other kind emerges from the social organization and cultures of indigenous peoples.

Andriotis and Agiomirgianakis proceed by constructing a preliminary conceptualization of home-exchange or swapping to understand how lived

experience can lead to local authenticity. The whole argument derives from the idea that capitalism is confined by economic forces of the so-called free market. Two implications emerge from their argument. One is based on non-market practices while the other refers to goods and commercial trade-offs monetized in economic transactions. Like the theory of authenticity versus staged authenticity, the economy is presented in this paper as a dichotomy between two contrasting forces. According to Andriotis & Agiomirgianakis, exchange plays a pivotal role in a conceptual framework to understand capitalism.

Although Andriotis and Agiomirgianakis profusely cite anthropologists such as Marshall Sahlins and Claude Lévi-Strauss, they do not develop their argument accordingly. They state that through anthropological studies have contributed to the advance of economic goods exchange, the issue has not been properly interpreted by scholarship. Their point seems especially relevant to the discipline of tourism. The concept of non-commercial hospitality deserves attention because it represents the space where negotiated exchange exists. In contrast, commercial hospitality, with its links to infrastructure, capital owners, and hoteliers, should be understood in sharp contrast with a non-commercial hospitality.

As stated in their 2013 article, it appears that Andriotis/Agiomirgianakis have no idea of what hospitality means or its history. They exclude non-commercial hospitality from the study of tourism, despite its ancient roots in Greece. Unfortunately, they are also not familiar with the minimal background of anthropology in the study of hospitality. As a social institution, hospitality was present in Celtic and Germanic tribes and in African cultures as an inter-tribal mechanism of defense. Hospitality is not only a Greek invention, and it does

not only relate to exchange of goods. Etymologically, hospitality and hostility share the same origin, the Indo-European root ‘ospes’ which means that which belongs to the master. Since strangers represented a serious threat, hospitality referred to the scrutiny of the intentions of travelers. At the same time, hosts were constrained to give protection to their guests, at least on a temporary basis. Tribes established pacts of non-aggression and intertribal defense in contexts of war, but in peace they committed to celebrate hospitality as a sign of friendship. Far away from what Andriotis and Agiomirgianakis wrote, hospitality is the sign of reciprocity, as Sahlins (1962) put it (Korstanje, 2010).

The article by Andriotis and Agiomirgianakis has two important implications. First and foremost, they present a proposition whereby hospitality, an ancient institution, is regulated by the market. Their view is not only economic, but also over-valorizes the role of a particular kind of exchange in human relations—one that is culturally and historically bound to modern, industrial capitalism. In fact, what defines hospitality is not just exchange, but also social trust. This was the point made by Marcel Mauss in the anthropological classic, *The Gift* (1950): namely that exchange is a type of reciprocity which is both shaped by and constituent of culturally and historically situated social relations and the values, beliefs, and symbol systems of peoples. It is an important part of the glue that holds societies together, and it helps shape the kind of society and the kinds of relations found within it. Secondly, the article’s true aim is not analysis but policy advocacy. It expatiates on actions and opportunities to make a monetary profit from the formation of “experience.” They neglect the fact that many tourists do not just seek authenticity but also escape from the contemporary capitalist market.

Andriotis /Agiomirgianakis propose a new product that helps vacationers find other ways of connecting to new places and ways of life beyond the alienating conditions of commercial tourism. The tourism product they tout promises to help tourists find an ideal, and pristine type of authentic experience far from the staged authenticity characteristic of commercial tourism.

“Local authenticity is an attribute widely promoted by home exchange agencies. For instance, the internet leader agency in home swapping HomeExchange.com has placed on the front page of its website the slogan “live like a local, not a tourist”. The fact that home swappers spend their holidays in local homes offers them the opportunity to absorb the local atmosphere and experience local life”. (p. 11)

To what an extent home exchange agencies provide genuine forms of hospitality?.

Jennifer Germann Molz (2014) offers a good opportunity to debate the limitations of existent marketing literature that thinks home exchange officers or another networking softwares are something that leads tourist to escape from modernity and industrial exploitation. One of the paradox of ITCs applied to tourism and mobilities, are that social relations are disposed to be switched off or on according to user’s discretion. In view of that, we are living now in a more mobile world, where social relations not only are more fluid, but weaker.

The opportunities for ordinary tourists to live in accordance with market exchange have led to alienation, oppression, and distress. To correct this,

Andriotis and Agiomirgianakis advocate for a new hospitality, billed as more authentic, where the exotic ventures beyond the hegemony of market. Non-commercial hospitality attracts many people interested by home-swap through the internet from their homes. This represents a new type of alternative vacation. Although Andriotis/Agiomirgianakis do not even attempt to explain how modern capitalism has affected the quality of reciprocity and exchange, especially with respect to Mauss's concept as of the gift as a social bond, their explanation leads to the opportunities of the market in anyway. What do they understand by capitalism?

Capitalism according to Weber is not defined by the amount of capital circulating in a society but by a kind of bureaucratic logic with its hyper rationality and impersonal social relations. The rise of a new type of nation-state coincided with the emergence of modern capitalism, and along with it imposed a new legal rational spirit which subordinated other forms of social control like the traditional or charismatic. Economic gain is calculated according to rational means and ends. The same kind of calculation then pervades all social relations. It is a clear error to link the capitalism only with economy, since it affects all social life and introduces wide cultural change which is not limited to the exchange of goods in a market.

“From one point, home swap is often linked in sequence with other forms of non-commercial hospitality and shares some of their features. For instance, although WWOOF and house exchanges serve different purposes, their commonality is that both have a certain degree of perceived risk and uncertainty involved, due to the fact that arrangements are initiated online amongst

strangers. On the other hand, home swap presents significant departures from other forms of exchange of non-commercial hospitality” (Andriotis / Agiomirgianakis 2013: 29)

RP's exegetes like Andriotis/Agiomirgianakis present their products as digital cyber-space exchange as a way to reduce uncertainty and therefore transactional risk. This investigation does not have the goal of understanding either hospitality or the minds of cybernauts. Rather, it is based on the following troubling points.

- a) Employed terms are badly defined.
- b) Equality is not synonymous with reciprocity or networking, as Sahlins said, it may be of three kinds: general, balanced or negative. Money in a capitalist system elevates balanced reciprocity to the dominant kind, but a symmetrical exchange does not mean all exchange in hospitality should be balanced. Other kinds of reciprocities are possible beyond those of the market (Sahlins, 1962).
- c) This is neither clear distinction between alienable and inalienable possessions, nor the type of authorities the circuit of gift-exchange generates (Weiner, 1992).
- d) Inequities do not affect exchange; they are part of exchanges.
- e) Housing is only one little aspect where the concept of reciprocity operates. Visas are another important aspect. Reciprocal covenant of protection and visa is one of the modern aspects that today define hospitality.
- f) Reciprocal swap and hospitality reduce uncertainty and risk.
- g) There is no empirical validation of the Andriotis/Agiomirgianakis thesis.
- h) Home Swap is commodified as commercial hospitality.

It is impossible to think of hospitality in terms of market only, simply because it is a result of hospitality as a ritual game of reciprocities.

**Emmanuel De Kadt.**

One of the points that characterize the academic legacy of De Kadt (1979) to applied research seems to be his concerns about the failures of development programs in the Third World. In *Tourism: Passport to development?* de Kadt observes that tourism that is not dully regulated can generate a gap between tourism-receiving and tourism-sending societies. Instead of being a mechanism toward development, tourism may be a double-edged sword. He takes three study cases (Bali, Cyprus, and Malta) to explain why tourism failed to develop those destinations. Local communities, which are want adopt tourism as primary industry, may face serious economic imbalances that can affect their economies. The development of a local tourism industry demands heavy international investments so that the local current infrastructure can be enhanced. The quality and luxury that First World tourists are accustomed to needs destinations to make substantial changes in their hotels and other accommodations. Tourist destinations face derivative problems from tourism, such as inflation real-estate speculation, and various cultural pathologies as drug abuse, alcoholism, and conflicts with older generations. De Kadt acknowledges that tourism may not the way to prosperity that, policy makers thought. It generates asymmetries in the local economies that affect the quality of life in the destination. Investors repatriate the profits to their own countries leaving the destination community in a marginal condition. Nonetheless, instead of criticizing tourism development, de Kadt explains that those nations that had a past experience of slavery and colonization are prone to have a bad

experience with tourism, due to “cultural” pathologies. He contrasts them with tourist destinations that were independent and kept a sustainable and autonomous economy, which runs less risk of financial dependency. Since the slaved-like folks have not developed a rational logic to make good decisions, they are subject to the great power politics.

Following the blaming the victim tactic, the econo-centric viewpoint in de Kadt leads to the view that the past experience with colonialism is a key factor in explaining why tourism is not successful in creating wealth and welfare in some destination countries. Needless to say, de Kadt thesis rests on a shaky foundation, but also he never questions the doctrine of development where western values outweigh all others. Even within his criticism, de Kadt still assumes that regulated development may fix the unexpected glitches in some peripheral cultures. Like the first supporters of development, he takes for granted that corruption, civil wars, ethnic cleanings, and the like are cultural problems that prevent the correct development in Africa, South America, and Asia. Neither the uncontrolled financial loans issued by international financial concerns nor the role of the US and its experts in training Third World politicians are scrutinized in de Kadt’s book. The program of development from the 1980s and 1990s was accompanied by neoliberal policies, which ranged from cuts in national budgets to direct intervention in salient economic processes. Neoliberal development mongers demanded that national governments change their labor laws to pulverize the worker’s rights. In doing so destinations gained further competitive benefits for attracting international market demand.

In “Making the Alternative Sustainable” a chapter included in the seminal book *Tourism Alternative*, originally edited by Smith & Aedington (1992). De Kadt repeats his earlier argument. Though the Third World is always associated with poverty and debt crises, it is important to understand the mechanisms which are involved in mass tourism. The concept of alternative development encompasses a set of approaches that take the problem of renewability as a paradigm. The protection of the environment and non-renewable resources are vital for the perpetuation of tourism, but these needs are subordinated by de Kadt to the financial function. At a first glance, scholars like de Kadt devoted considerable time and effort to denouncing the imbalances accelerated by tourism in the Third World. Nonetheless, de Kadt is unable to see beneath the ideological truisms in the tourism and development discourses. Since de Kadt is not as much a market monger as Andriotis, but a camouflaged social scientist, there are some aspects in his works which should be revisited.

The works of Escobar and Esteva on the pervasive nature of development are helpful in this revision. The efficacy of the West in expanding commerce beyond the national boundaries consisted in making believable the ideology of progress. As we noted above, for the early ethnologists culture evolved in a linear fashion. The economy set the pace from inferior to superior forms of production according to competitive outcomes—a sort of cultural survival of the fittest. Big fish eat the smaller ones. The disappearance of aboriginal cultures marked as inferior accompanied this viewpoint which not coincidentally went along with the neocolonialism of the latter part of the nineteenth century. According to this story the intervention of the West was not only desirable but also necessary to protect the rights of aborigines—a White man’s burden.

This European type paternalism gave ideological support to colonialism (Korstanje, 2012).

An additional problem of this paternalistic ideology was that it assumes that Western values of beauty, rationality, and progress were the best the world has known. Western culture effaced aboriginal cultures in two senses. On one hand, local cultures embraced the superiority of Western colonialists and their concerns, and at the same time, fieldwork notes written by anthropologists were read and used by officials to control the native populations. The anthropology of colonial powers was manipulated for reasons of empire to dilute the natives' resistance. Somehow, this ideal of paternalism persisted into other forms as development and sustainability. The concept of the rational as such was never explored in the West, at least by Western administrators and businessmen. The success of West in expanding their values as universal to the rest of the world was marked by conceptual theories to think that Western rationality was the best instrument to achieve progress, which also was defined in Western terms. The ideology was that what was good for European countries should be applied to the rest. This notion of progress, based on instrumental calculation, was rooted in the paradigms of heritage, development, and patrimony.

### **Conclusion**

The foregoing criticism of RP is not meant as a criticism of Jafar Jafari, who had brought extensive theoretical corpus tourism. It is directed at tourism scholars who have manipulated his concepts to impose a specific discourse, which today facilitated the world debt. To what extent RP influenced the pronouncements of the World Tourism Organization regarding to culture, heritage, sustainability, and patrimony are evident but not part of this review.

In this essay we have laid the foundation for a critical reading of Rational Platform scholarship, in which outcomes are paraded as scientific advances in the field. RP is bound up with modernization theory and goals of development which have created dependency of many impoverished nations that were encouraged to introduce tourism as a leading industry. Financial and business organizations delivered their experts to solicit governments to be educated as how to order” their financial accounts. Over the years the underdeveloped not only did not achieve substantial economic advance but also sank their industries because of high debt burdens. RP never conducted a critical review of failure of development, and the RP scholarship is still used to encourage tourism as a mechanism for progress, using the blaming the victim strategy for its failures. Pseudo-scholars inherited RP indirectly paved the conceptual was to adopt governmental policies that otherwise would have been rejected.

Last but not least, RP was constructed to provide a framework for managerial planning for destination maintenance, which is a valuable goal, but not sufficient for a scientific discipline. RP makes claims to the status of a scientific paradigm to gain legitimacy against other, classic disciplines. RP instills the need to improve destinations by accepting international loans as the only valid sources of enhanced tourism. If the plan does not work, exegetes of RP will have the correct answers: failures of development resulted from the cultural incompatibilities of non-Western societies. Since its goals are related to polling methodologies about the needs of tourists, their investigations are diversified as according to as many market segment ass can be found. To some extent, the flourishing of more segments and diversification of new forms of tourism (eco-tourism, heritage-tourism, patrimonial tourism, dark tourism, and

so on) is functional to a unique epistemology. This happens because RP studies are pieces of engineering more interested in keeping the tourist destinations profitable, than objective science. Since tourism is defined from the perspective of demand, which means tourists' desires, we have a lot of subtypes of tourism(s). The authoritative voice of science, RP proclaimed, accelerated the neo-liberal programs marketed to the Third World. The supposed indiscipline, a couple of years ago denounced by senior epistemologist John Tribe, at the bottom covers an even more pervasive problem.

#### References

Andriotis, K (2010). "Brits behaving badly: template analysis of newspaper content". *Int. Journal of tourism Anthropology*. Vol. 1 (1): 15-34

Andriotis K & Agiomirgianakis G. (2013) "Market escape through exchange: home swap as a form of non-commercial hospitality". *Current Issues in Tourism*. DOI:  
10.1080/13683500.2013.837868

Bauman, Z. (2011) *Consuming Life*. Oxford, Polity Press.

Botterill, D. (2001). "The epistemology of a set of tourism studies". *Leisure Studies*, 20(3), 199-214.

Boyer, M. (1997). "Tourism, a specific epistemology". *Loisir et Société*, 20(2), 455-477.

Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (1993). "Sustainable tourism: An evolving global approach". *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1(1), 1-5.

Britton, S. G. (1982). "The political economy of tourism in the Third World". *Annals of tourism research*, 9(3), 331-358.

Buell, F. (1998) *The National Cultural and the New Global System*. Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press.

Butler, R W (1999) "Sustainable tourism: a state of the art review". *Tourism Geographies*. Vol 1 (1): 7-25

Clayton, A., Mustelier, L. C., & Maximiliano, E. (2014). Understanding Perceptions and Attitudes to Risk in the Tourism Industry. *International Journal of Religious Tourism and Pilgrimage*, 2(1), 8.

Cohen, E, et al. (2005) Presentación 7-10 Julio ARAMBERRI. *Política y Sociedad*, vol. 42, (1), 3-6.

Crang, M. (1997). "Picturing practices: research through the tourist gaze". *Progress in Human Geography*, 21(3), 359-373.

Dachary, A. C., & Arnaiz Burne, S. M. (2006). "El estudio del turismo:¿ Un paradigma en formación?". *Estudios y perspectivas en turismo*, 15(2), 179-192.

De Kadt, E. J. (Ed.). (1979). *Tourism: passport to development? perspectives on the social and cultural effects of tourism in developing countries*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

De Kadt, E J (1992) "Making the Alternative sustainable: lessons from development for tourism". In *Tourism Alternatives: Potentials and problems in the development of tourism*. Ed. Valene Smith & William Aedington. International Academy for the Study of Tourism, Pp 47-76

Escobar, A. (2011). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. New Jersey, Princeton University Press.

Esteva, G. (2000). "Desarrollo". En Viola Andreu (Compilador). *Antropología del Desarrollo*. Barcelona, Editorial Paidós.

Fujikura, T. (2001). Discourses of awareness: notes for a criticism of development in Nepal. *Studies in Nepali History and Society*, 6(2), 271-313.

Gasper, D. (1996). Culture and development ethics: Needs, women's rights, and Western theories. *Development and change*, 27(4), 627-661.

Germann Molz J (2014) *Travel Connection: tourism. Technology and togetherness in a mobile World*. New York, Routledge

Graburn, N. H., & Jafari, J. (1991). Introduction: Tourism social science. *Annals of tourism research*, 18(1), 1-11.

Guzmán, L. F. J. (1986). *Teoría Turística: un enfoque integral del hecho social*. Bogotá, Universidad Externado de Colombia.

Hall, C. M. (2005). *Tourism: Rethinking the social science of mobility*. Upper Saddle River, Pearson Education.

Jafari, J., (2001). The scientification of tourism. In *Hosts and guests revisited: Tourism issues of the 21st century*, Smith, V. L., & Brent, M, editors. New York, Cognizant Communications, pp. 28-41.

Jafari, J., & Aaser, D. (1988). Tourism as the subject of doctoral dissertations. *Annals of tourism Research*, 15(3), 407-429.

Jamal, T., Smith, B., & Watson, E. (2008). Ranking, rating and scoring of tourism journals: Interdisciplinary challenges and innovations. *Tourism Management*, 29(1), 66-78.

Kaspar, J. (1987). Constructing a scientific discipline. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(2), 274-275.

Kiely, R (1999) The Last refuge of the noble savage?, a critical assessment of post development theory. *The European Journal of Development Research*. Vol 11 (1): 30-55.

Korstanje, M. (2010) *Formas Elementales de la Hospitalidad (Elementary forms of hospitality)*. *RBTUR: Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*. Vol 4 (2): 86-111

Korstanje, M. E. (2011). "Un estudio crítico sobre el patrimonio turístico: capitalismo vs (des) protección". *Revista Hospitalidade*, (2), 3-37.

Korstanje, M. (2012). Reconsidering cultural tourism: an anthropologist's perspective. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 7(2), 179-184.

Korstanje, M. E. (2013). *Turismus Systemae: epistemología del viaje onírico*. *IJSSTH*, 1(4), 24-35.

Leiper, N. (1981). Towards a cohesive curriculum tourism: The case for a distinct discipline. *Annals of tourism Research*, 8(1), 69-84.

Mauss, M. (1950 [2002]). *The Gift*. Translated by W. D. Halls. London: Routledge.

McKercher, B. (2005). A case for ranking tourism journals. *Tourism Management*, 26(5), 649-651.

Mansfeld, Y. & Pizam, A. (2006). *Tourism, Security and Safety: from theory to practice*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Meethan, K. (2001). *Tourism in global society* (p. 130). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Monterrubio Cordero, J C. (2011) *Turismo y Cambio socio cultural: una perspectiva conceptual*. México, Plaza y Valdés.

Muñoz de Escalona, F. (1992). Turismo y desarrollo. *Estudios turísticos*, (115), 23-44.

Muñoz de Escalona, F. (2004). *Autopsia del Turismo: El vencimiento de la distancia*. Editado por eumed· net.

Rist, G. (2002). *The history of development: from western origins to global faith*. London, Zed Books.

Ritchie, J. R. B., & Crouch, G. I. (2003). *The competitive destination [electronic resource]: a sustainable tourism perspective*. Oxford, Cabi.

Robinson, W. I. (2008). *Latin America and Global Capitalism: A Critical Globalization Perspective*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rostow, W. W. (1960). *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ryan, C. (2005). The ranking and rating of academics and journals in tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 26(5), 657-662.

Santana-Talavera, A. (2006) *Antropología y Turismo. ¿nuevas hordas, viejas culturas?*. Barcelona, Ariel.

Sahlins, M. (1962) *Stone Age Economics*. London, Routledge.

Scheyvens, R. (2010). *Tourism and poverty*. Oxford, Taylor & Francis US.

Scheyvens, R., & Momsen, J. H. (2008). Tourism and poverty reduction: issues for small island states. *Tourism Geographies*, 10(1), 22-41.

Schlüter, R. (2003). *El turismo en Argentina: Del balneario al campo*. Buenos Aires, CIET

Smith, V. L. (Ed.). (1989). *Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism*. Univ of Pennsylvania Press.

Tarlow, P. E. (2000). Creating safe and secure communities in economically challenging times. *Tourism Economics*, 6(2), 139-149.

Thirkettle, A. & Korstanje, M. (2013) "Creating a new Epistemology for tourism and Hospitality Disciplines". *International Journal of Qualitative Research in Services*. Volume 1, (1): 16-33.

Tribe, J. (1997). "The indiscipline of tourism". *Annals of tourism research*, 24(3), 638-657.

Tribe, J. (2004). 3 Knowing about tourism. *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*, 14, 46.

Tribe, J. (2006). The truth about tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 360-381.

Urry, J. (2001, November). Globalising the tourist gaze. In Cityscapes conference.

Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Oxford, Polity Press.

Weiner, A. B. (1992). *Inalienable possessions: The paradox of keeping-while-giving*. California, Univ of California Press.

Zhao, W., & Ritchie, J. R. (2007). "An investigation of academic leadership in tourism research: 1985–2004". *Tourism Management*, 28(2), 476-490.