



Centre for Ethnicity & Racism Studies

TOURIST RISK RESEARCH AND ETHNOCENTRISM

Dr Maximiliano Korstanje

May 2015

Abstract

Though risk perception theory has advanced a lot over the last decades, its preferred methodologies much of them closed-led questionnaires or intrusive instruments obscures the derived conclusions. This text aims not only to explore the problems and limitation of risk perception theory to understand the difference between fear, anxiety, panic and risk, but also the tourist-safety. The adoption of risk research, post 9/11 was based on quantitative methods alone. This creates a serious conceptual myopia to understand the connection of risk and late-capitalism. Our attempt to fulfill this gap is shown in this essay-review

Key words: Risk, Fears, Tourism, Disasters, Epistemology

Introduction

Every culture has developed ways to adapt to its environment. One method is the construction of feared object which serves as a mechanism to adjust social perceptions of danger. Elements which instill fear vary from one society to another (Korstanje, 2011). In recent years policy makers in the tourism and hospitality industry have acknowledged problems with mass media in maintaining

images of tourist destinations. Through an ever changing world, where humankind seems to be subject to a state of instability, the tourism industry is affected by a kind of risk inflation. Though many sociologists have observed that risks are inextricably intertwined with postmodernism (Giddens, 1991; Beck, 2006; Luhmann, 2006; Castel, 1997; 2006; Becker, 2011), the fact is that the term was widely adopted by tourism fields after the September 11, 2001 (9/11) attacks to World Trade Center and Pentagon (Floyd & Pennington Gray, 2004; Dolnicar, 2005; Mansfeld & Pizam, 2006; Boniface & Cooper, 2009; Ertuna & Ertuna, 2009). The attacks caused serious financial losses to tourism even years after the event. In part, this has been because terrorists employed mobile technologies, which are the pride of West, against the symbolic epicenter of world. At bottom, the message was that nobody will feel safe anywhere anymore (Zizek, 2009; Howie, 2012; Korstanje, 2013).

Although the concept of risk has served scholarship on the safety of tourist destinations, there remains much to say about the conceptual problems of risk. The present essay aims to explore not only the roots of risk in capitalist societies and attendant methodological limitations, but also to differentiate among fear, risk, and safety. We argue that an all encompassing model is needed to understand tourism risks and needs for protection required by the industry. It is unfortunate that the current specialized literature on risk perception theory (in tourism fields) is far from reaching an understanding of the problem, but by the demonization of non-western cultures. To put this in bluntly, risk perception leads to the configuration of an “ethnocentric” discourse that makes from “security” the touchstone to mark the difference between civilized and uncivilized world.

The Meaning of Risk.

Sometimes, we hear concepts as risk, fear and angst in the academic discourse. However, less attention is given to their meanings. The lack of clear definition in

the concepts scholars use in their respective researches, not only obscures the derived findings, but leads to wrong results.

The specialized literature suggests that *fear* can be defined as a basic emotion, which protects the survival of an organism. Not just human beings, but all animals experience fear of external threatening stimuli. Alerted by fear, the organism has three possible reactions: paralysis, attack, or withdrawal (Fraisse, 1973; Panksepp, 1982; Levenson, Ekman & Friesen, 1990; Strongman, 1996). Nonetheless, the concepts of behavioral psychology have not embraced by other social sciences. Anthropology has developed its own sense of what fear means. Although, recognizing a strong neurobiological basis that reduces or enhances the fear, ethnologists evaluate the social factors by which some fears are overvalorized while others rejected (Malinowski, 1967). Therefore, culture plays a vital role not only conferring a specific meaning to objects, but also to fears. Mary Douglas, a pioneer scholar interested in exploring the connection of fear, evil, and risk, argued that psychological fear represents an attempt to react when faced with a hostile situation. To some extent, the preservation of culture is at stake in contexts of uncertainty or instability. When socialized, fear unites a society (Douglas, 1992). In subsequent studies, Douglas developed a new thesis arguing that risk, danger, and sin are intertwined social constructs. Sin and risk give further legitimacy to the status quo, which would otherwise discredit privileged groups if they did not give solutions to lay people. Risk and sin both provide rationalizations for how the world works. The potentiality of threat provides legitimization for social solidarity and status hierarchies (Douglas, 2007).

Philosophically, the self experiences anxiety-angst when faced with a decision. Existentialism defined anxiety as a result of freedom or uncertainty. The self opts for a way out of choosing. While fear corresponds with a specific object or stimulus, anxiety has an abstract nature produced by the presence of nothingness (Heidegger, 1997, Kierkegaard, 2003). This begs a more than interesting question, what is risk?

Following the observations of K. Tierney, risks should be defined as any probability of damage resulting from an event where the integrities of victims are at stake. In recent decades, sociologists have treated risk as a social construction. Within sociology, two contrasting waves have historically discussed the nature of risk (Tierney, 1994). One group explored the probability of harm, focusing on the effects of unseen risk for social systems. Another paid attention to the perception of citizens and the paradoxes this generates (Duclos, 1987). The specialized literature in risk management took the pragmatic perspective that bad evaluations of risk may lead to bad decisions. In this sense, efforts to mitigate risks open new ones (Oliver-Smith, 2002).

Zygmunt Bauman (2011) explained that risks are social constructions to try to control the future. In the Middle Ages, happiness was thought to be restricted to few people, who can attain it only through suffering and expiation. The American Revolution introduced a radical change in the way that happiness was conceived, as suggested by Thomas Jefferson's claim in the Declaration of Independence (1776) that the pursuit of happiness is a self evident truth of the human condition. This assertion of a global right to happiness broadened its possibilities, but linked the possibility of happiness to freedom and choices. Risk, then, came to regulate the uncertainty of the future, but also conferred on the subject the liability for failure to be happy. Ulrich Beck has argued that modernity opened new global risks, which were alien to the medieval world view. Chernobyl in the Ukraine was the symbolic of the role played by technology in fabricating new risks. In Beck's view, technology had helped enhance security, but today it generates new and dire risks that threaten human existence. In Beck's "risk society" the old modes of production, which fabricated commodities, have turned into methods that produce risks (Beck, 2006; 2011). Parallel to Beck, Anthony Giddens acknowledged globalization as a project based on two key factors. The first is that money has come to serve as a mechanism of connecting presence with absences, or needs with their satisfaction throughout the world. The second element is a network of experts, who not only evaluate potential risks

but also devise ways for mitigating risks. Starting from the premise that experts monopolize the trust of lay people, for Giddens, risk is what society creates to sustain its efficient functioning (Giddens, 1991; 1999). In opposition to Giddens's argument, Niklas Luhmann has criticized the thesis of risk society because of the increasing alarmism it spreads in public consciousness. Certainly, Luhmann adds, risks always are rooted into a previous profits or benefit, whereby the subject should decide. It corresponds with the principle of contingency.

Unfortunately Beck did not contemplate the distinction between risk and threat. While risk signifies a previous decision by the self, threat refers to something external to the self. A terrorist attack, an airplane accident, or a natural disaster are threats, since the victims have no way to reverse the situation. The passengers in an airplane crash have no way of avoiding the harm. In contrast, for the air travel company owner, who opted to reduce costs, the accidents are a risk. Generally, those who make the decision are generators of risks. They are not the same as those who face the risks (Luhmann, 2006). J. Richardson (2010) says that threats which jeopardize society are introduced in the social system by means of knowledge. Risk, in these terms, would be the efforts to intellectualize the future by offsetting costs and benefits. The final decision made on the possibility to face or avoid the damage is given by the degree of contingency, with respect to the problem to be solved (Richardson, 2010). This seems to be the reason why technology designed to mitigate risks under some conditions of uncertainty, generates new risks. A discussion of this nature, coined in the core of social sciences, has not been duly evaluated in tourism fields. In the next section, some of the more relevant studies in tourism risk are scrutinized.

Tourist Risk

The theory of risk perception has more than forty years of empirical research behind it. Nonetheless, it has been adopted by tourism industry only after the attacks of 9/11 (Dolnicar, 2005a; 2005b; Kuto & Groves, 2004; Paraskevas &

Arendell, 2007; Bhattacharai, Conway and Shrestha, 2005; Boniface & Cooper, 2009; Yuan, 2005; Floyd, Gibson, Pennington-Gray & Thapa, 2003; Goldblatt & Hu, 2005). Why is risk important for tourism industry?

S. Dolnicar (2005a) argued that the intangibility of tourist products generates a high degree of uncertainty in consumers. He said that the tourist industry needs a model that helps policy makers to delineate and define types of risks so that mitigations can be deployed. Following this argument, A. Fuchs and G. Reichel (2010) classify risks depending on the human intervention: there are risks which are fabricated by human beings, while others like disasters followed natural reasons. In recent decades, the world has witnessed disasters and crises which have affected tourism. J. C. Henderson (2008) evaluated the importance of risk management plans to mitigate potential risk for the industry. If risks are controlled, the disaster can be prevented. The perception of risk, far from being pathological, is conducive to recreate a precautionary principle so that the society can avoid the catastrophe. The theory of risk applied in the context of leisure and tourism can be classified in four main categories: a) social bonds, b) nationality and cultural differences, c) residency, d) personality.

Scholars who assert that risk perception is limited or enhanced by the trust travellers have were very popular in the first decade of the twenty-first century. They proposed that those travelers who were accompanied by relatives or friends perceive less risk than other groups. The sentiments of vulnerability are awakened when the travelers go beyond the security of home would be controlled by the social trust associated with accompanying companions (Roehl & Fesenmaier, 1992; Yuan, 2005; Castaño, 2006; Park & Reisinger, 2010). A. Reichel, G. Fuchs, and N. Uriely (2007) found that those who prioritized the political instability as the main threat at time of vacationing, travelers in company of others are more likely to suffer physical wounds than single travelers.

For other scholars, nationality was the significant variable that explains the variation of risk perception. H. Sackett and D. Botterill (2006) collected evidence that British and Americans perceive more risk than other nationalities. This happens because of the Anglo-American alliance in the Iraq and Afghanistan invasions. These findings were previously inferred by P. Dominguez, E. Burgette and A. Bernard (2003). To these researchers, nationality plays a vital role in risk perception depending on the geopolitical policies of their respective countries. C. Ertuna and Z. I. Ertuna (2009) validate the idea that there is a connection between risk perception and national or religious affiliation. The mass media disseminate news about terrorism and political instability worldwide. Those nationalities directly involved in international disputes would develop more sensibility to risk than others. For example, while British holiday-makers perceived less risk from natural disasters after the tsunami in Sri Lanka, other nationals, such as Germans and Italians, confessed to experience more concerns. The psychological impacts deepened on the number of victims portrayed by the media.

The place of residency seems to be another variable that explains why risk evolves over time. M. Floyd, et al. explain that inhabitants of New York City showed higher anxieties after 9/11. This trauma persisted for approximately one year, and was more persistent in those nearer to ground zero. After the attacks, Americans closed their collective perception, and tended to think that going beyond the country was a dangerous and risky venture. J. Y. Wong and C. Yeh (2009) focused on the decision at time of selecting the holiday destination. The level of reliable knowledge and not residency would be the variable that determines whether a destination is avoided. Though risk tends to be rooted in a territory, the sense of danger is broadly associated with more complex trends. The 9/11 attacks represented the onset of a new way of imagining urban life in great cities. What scares people is not proximity to ground zero, but living in urban spaces. Terrorism is presented by establishment media as not occurring in rural areas (Woods et al, 2005; Yuan, 2005). Psychologically, we tend to compare the context of risk to be replicated in related environments.

A final viewpoint considered here, emphasizes psychological character or personality as the main factor for analysis. Originally, the pioneer in these types of investigation was Stanley Plog who argued that there is a relation between personality and perception of the environment. Though he was strongly criticized in how he formed the model, it paved the ways for the upsurge of much applied investigation. A. Lepp and H. Gibson (2008) wrote that tourist travel is subject to two contrasting sentiments: the quest for novelty and the need for safety. To some extent, the cultural incompatibility between tourist originating and receiving countries may reduce the travelers' feelings of safety. Their degree of adaptation to new landscapes is partially determined by their personalities. While some tourists are sensation seekers, others are risk averse. M. Kozak, J. Crotts and R. Law found the following:

- a) Risk attracts some travelers who change their original destination to seek it.
- b) Those personalities based on higher degree of tolerance to change do not need to alter their plans in context of adversity.
- c) News of disasters or catastrophe not only affect the place of occurrence, but also neighboring countries.
- d) Risks are not restricted to specific locales, but extend too much wider regions.
- e) While travellers coming from industrial societies are concerned about terrorism, travelers from underdeveloped nations fear virus outbreaks.
- f) Personality variations explain why some travellers perceive more risk than others.

Y. Reisinger and F. Mavondo (2005) and Yun and McLaurin (2006) present a scale based on 22 categories to measure the safety of tourist destinations. The specialized literature fails to explain the correlation of personality and risk perception, because the evidence is not conclusive. A remaining question concerns the role of culture as a template for determining which aspects of life are salient in terms of travel safety.

Although research in tourism and risk has advanced in recent years, many of the stereotypes and limitations among tourism scholars were first laid down by the pioneer research conducted by W. Roehl and D. Fesenmeier (1992). Drawing a sample of 258 participants, they found that perception of risk varied with the purpose for travel. Based on an answer-rate of 64 percent, this study concluded that demographic variables of travelers such as age, gender, and family structure correlated directly with risk perception. Social bonds played an important role in explaining why some travelers opt for some destinations while they exclude others. Although Fesenmaier and Roehl's work illuminated whole of the subsequent research in risk fields, their focus was based on a business plan to protect tourist destinations, instead of expanding the current understanding of the issue. The first problem lies in the way they defined risk. Mathematicians evaluate the evolution of risks using complex software which studies the decision making process of participants. However, risk-related research in tourism is based on open or closed-ended questionnaires written to refute or validate hypotheses. Later, these questions are correlated by following complex algorithms to make stable queues or segments, which can be examined to discover tourist perceptions. The goal of these researchers is to give some preview on the tendencies of the tourism market and its segments. The participants' views and attitudes are subject to substantial reductions. Quantitative research emphasizes data from standardized questionnaires and closed-ended questions. This means that what Roehl & Fesenmaier obtain is the declaration of participants, who sometimes are not familiar with the reasons for their own behavior. Participants may simply lie to impress the researcher. W. Roehl and D. Fesenmaier initiated a new way of investigation, but also introduced techniques of engineering in the production of knowledge. Their assumptions, models, and methods were replicated by followers who, eager for legitimacy and greater status, appeared to make "science." In so doing, they used the experimental model, but fundamentally, their goals were not scientific. Risk studies wanted to promote sales, delving into the psychology of those who have capital to spend—the tourists. Besides, it is contradictory to apply probabilistic models to analyze non-probabilistic methods, such as open-ended questionnaires.

Tourism researchers interested in risk tried to draw larger samples of tourists while excluding other agents who participate actively in the tourist system such as professionals or staff. The researchers concentrated on understanding economic demand by travelers and visitors. Questionnaires were oriented to the consumer. Some other researchers targeted hotel operators using the Delphi or focus group methods. The over valorization of tourists as the axis of industry not only was replicated in risk related issues, but also paved the way to an ethnocentric discourse.

Conceptual Problems of Risk studies

There are no scientific reasons for arguing that risk is strictly linked to probability, nor for seeing risk with a strictly quantitative paradigm. Tourism risk studies mainly have aimed at exploring the connection between risk perception and tourism consumption. Their goals are given by the needs of indentifying, controlling, and mitigating some dysfunctional or inefficient factors which jeopardize the tourist industry. A wide range of potential threats ranges from natural disasters to terrorism (Yuan, 2005; Park & Reisinger, 2010; Niyaz, 2010). What is noteworthy is that travels and tourist destinations are not the same. Sometimes, risk investigation treats tourist destinations as the all-encompassing unit of analysis. These views lead us to trivialize travel as a psychological process which begins and ends irrespective of the date we purchase the ticket.

For example, researchers following terrorism issues do not focus on the biographies of terrorists, but on the perceptions of travelers. The demand, not the offering, is important for these scholars. Their formulated goals lead to basic contradictions. First and foremost, they fail to recognize that perception is the result of social context. We cannot obtain answers to questions without connecting what people say and do. Some misunderstanding is based on the discrepancy by statements and psychological arousal. We may accept some risks without being concerned about them. For example, most people do not hesitate

to leave their homes for fear of being struck by lightning, although that risk is far greater than the risk from terrorist attacks. Secondly, less attention was given to the role played by ideology which confers specific reasons for fear. For example, K. Wolff, S. Larsen and R. Doran (2013) and K. Wolff and S. Larsen (2013) have been documented a contradiction in the way people construct risk. Despite two attacks against civilians in Norway, interviewees feel this country is safer than others. The attraction of New York as a symbolic centre of civilization made other attacks fall into oblivion.

Other methodological problems with these empirical studies are related to the criterion of sampling. Some samples are not balanced in proportion to the number of participants (Roehl and Fesenmaier, 1992; Sacket and Botterill, 2006), or the criterion of justification is weak (Plog, 1972; 1991; Dominguez, Burguette and Bernard, 2003; Wong and Yeh, 2009). In other studies, questionnaires are ethnocentric ignoring a division between industrial and rural minds or world views (Kuto and Groves, 2004) or replicating values associated with nationalism or chauvinism (Yun and McLaurin, 2006), while other studies are determined by conditioned answers because questionnaires are written in English or conducted in the pre-embarkation sections of transportation facilities (Wong and Yeh, 2009). If I interview tourists who are about to travel, their sentiments will be different were I do the same at home. Since the context conditions responses, they should be compared in diverse environments. Another clear error in these studies is the way the question is formulated. Sentences such as, “I feel fear to travel abroad,” do not reveal any risk, but reveal the prejudice of researchers who consider the world an unsafe place.

On another hand, such studies make no clear distinction between risk seekers and risk avoiders. Many of these studies merely assume risk is dysfunctional for international tourism demand. W. Aschauer (2010) criticized the risk paradigm for being oriented to businesses, marketing, and profits, as they confuse safety with risk. Indeed, some tourists elect extreme sports and seek elevated risks to gain status and prestige. Their psychological structure gives meaning to the

risk while their perception plays a neutral role. Both categories work in diverse spheres of human minds. Negative evaluation of some destinations is not explained by the risk itself, but by how it is communicated (Aschauer, 2010). Safety, and not risk, should be prioritized as a fertile ground of investigation in tourism fields.

Methodologically, if we conduct investigation prioritizing quantitative techniques, the outcome will not explain the behaviour. We will see only correlations between two or more variables. To understand what is happening in the field, we need to introduce qualitative methods to complement the quantitative one (Slovic, 1987; Korstanje, 2009; Zinn, 2010). Quite aside from the size of the sample, the correlation of both variables does not entail explanations of why that correlation occurs. That is, there is no causal connection, no accounting for the mechanisms producing the correlations. For example, considerable evidence suggests that women perceive more risk than men. Following a quantitative reading, one might infer the gender is a variable of risk perception but this exhibits an ecological fallacy. Males are socialized and educated to repress their emotions. Though they feel fear, they avoid voicing or otherwise exhibiting fearful emotions. On the contrary, females are socialized to communicate fear and other emotions (Becker, 2011). P. Manning (1989) recognizes the importance of understanding that social practice is embedded in a structure whereby discourse is articulated. Understanding how the narratives of safety are orchestrated, overvalorized or silenced, researchers can get a more profound idea of the object of study. This is the reason why questionnaires and interviews alone are not useful in understanding social issues.

C. Waterton and B. Wynne (2001) conducted an investigation in towns such as Sellafield (UK), which are next to nuclear plants. Under some conditions, inhabitants at risk of dangerous exposure intellectualize their situation, repressing their fear and displacing it or negating it with sentiments such as pride and stoicism to rationalize their persistence in a dangerous place. This reveals that risk may confer strong attachments of identity where real dangers become a

criterion of status and social distinction. Unless the qualitative view is introduced in risk perception research, biased diagnoses may lead scholars to inaccurate or partial explanations.

Last but not least, one of the main problems of this perspective on risk and tourism relates to the ethnocentric discourse it disseminates. Racism expressions activated against Muslims are known by specialists as Islamo-phobia. The problem lies in the produced knowledge about Islam, or the distortions certain object may have. Islamophobia today encompasses a lot of aspects enrooted in the code of West, which ranges from the fear for Otherness, to an exaggerated cultural reaction to 9/11(Sayyid, 2014).

In this context, risk perception opens the doors for long-simmering hostilities against Muslim World. At time the other non-white is considered as dangerous, West declares its supremacy over other cultures. As Graham Fuller puts it, what would happen in Muslim World never existed?.

The hostilities between East and West was not activated by 9/11; even as Fuller adds, if Islam never would take room in Middle East, this ancient hatred would flourished in another civilization, as Byzantines. Islam is not the problem, but by the configuration done by West. The struggle between Rome and Constantinople was given in terms of politics, not religion. In the same way, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam have historically coexisted without problems. The Anti-Rome sentiments developed by Eastern Roman Empire were based on the hostilities and the lack of tolerance of any political structure or culture which opposed to the terms of Rome. In this conjuncture, Fuller says,

“Islam, as a new geopolitical force, inherited not only much of the anti-Rome views that grew over time within Byzantine Empire itself. While Byzantium drew its deepest identity from the belief that it was perpetuating the true tradition of the Roman Empire, it increasingly came to view the Western Church as a geopolitical rival whose

power was ultimately as threatening to Byzantine power and identity as Islam itself" (Fuller, 2012: 68).

Fuller's contribution are useful to remind that one of the main successes ideological discourse against Muslim World consists in stressing "the problem of terrorism" as a cultural pathology enrooted in Middle East. Instead of exploring the real roots of terrorism, as an inherent part of capitalism (Korstanje, Skoll & Timmermann 2014), some scholars present the problem as a "Clash of Civilizations" (Huntington, 1993), or an impossibility of some underdeveloped nations to alleviate poverty and resentment against West, or antinomian religious incompatibles. Of course, because the world is a dangerous place, where anti-democratic movements may cement the upsurge of terrorist cells, we need to monitor, detect and mitigate the risks. This is the context, where unfortunately risk perception theory applied in tourism, appeared and evolved. Nowadays, risk has placed the role played by development theory over last two decades. Policy makers do believe those poor countries where poverty and resentment prevail may cause serious problems to West in a later day because they are a fertile ground to the multiplication of terrorist cells, produced by political instability. In this vein, tourism would be an effective instrument not only to pacify the region but enhancing the beaten economies. Undoubtedly, terrorism may be a big problem for all nations and communities, but worse is the asymmetries (or hierarchies) posed by the risk perception. Raoul Bianchi and Markus Stephenson argue convincingly that the ideological discourse of empires entails making citizens believe not only that tourism gives a world without boundaries, but also a political stability for all nations. At time marketing of tourism focused on the risk perception, (globalized fear), a new type of double-oriented mobility may be imposed. This means that when some global citizens are legally authorized to visit any secure region in the world, the whole are immobilized. How risk and ethnocentrism are interlinked?.

The first point to discuss relates to the theory of Ulrich Beck. Although he is well-esteemed by the developments in the Risk Society, some of the results are

not correctly formulated. There is unobserved dialectics between risk perception and the economic system. Not only Beck did not realize the peoples of working age perceive further risks than retirees (which marks a direct correlation between economic factors and risk), but it is very difficult to think the risk undermines the current status and hierarchy of society. Although the concept of “reflexibility” applies on the produced knowledge, there still remains clear asymmetries between those classes which may buy better insurances respecting to others relegated to suffer the negative effects of risks. This happens simply because postmodern societies are structured according to the capacity to mitigate risks, (instead of capital as modern ones). The current climate of inflation of risk, which is daily covered by journalism and media, has two different purposes. First and foremost, it flaunts the technological supremacy of elite over the whole society. Secondly, as Zygmunt Bauman puts it, it marks the boundaries of privilege and disaster. In fact, thousand years back, walls and cities protected to their citizens from the external threats. The devotion posed on the walls, entailed the preservation of certain rights. The enemy was always a stranger, regulated by the combination of violence and legality. Nowadays, rather, the liquid modernity has diminished the social trust necessary to cohabit with the other. Today, the enemy not only resides in the city, but also enlarged the psychological distance among citizens. The development of a “liquid surveillance” remains how far the undesired guest should keep away, but what is most important, it presents those who can manipulate these types of technologies as the supreme group (privilege race) of society (Bauman & Lyon, 2013).

Conclusion

As discussed in the present essay review, whenever risk perception is circumscribed within a specific geographical point, as is the case with many of these studies, outcomes tend to demonize civilians living there. If we consider the Middle East a dangerous place, psychologically we will avoid any direct contact with Muslims. This creates geographies of two types: secure and insecure. At a first glance, the former attract more investment and tourism than the latter. Nonetheless, both are inextricably intertwined. Those destinations previously

considered unsafe not only direct tourist flows towards particular points, but valorize the product (Lash & Urry, 1994). From an ideological discourse, the theory of risk perception seems to be associated with geopolitical interests, reinforcing the dependency between centre and periphery. Recently, M. Korstanje and D. H. Olsen (2011) and M. Korstanje and P. Tarlow (2012) explored the qualitative archetype of risk and danger in the American cinema industry. Scholars agreed that not only did 9/11 create a new paradigm to understand horror movies, but also supported an ideological discourse where American tourists feel superior to other nationalities. The events of 9/11 created a hierarchy of tourists where their value is determined by their nationalities. Effects of 9/11 blurred the memories of other events. It became a mythical date so that the forces of order—the United States, Britain, and their allies, which not coincidentally were the colonial powers—launched their crusade against evil. Terrorism, in this view, became represented as the main threat for the West in this century. Tourists who are victims of attacks, and terrorists share the same cultural values in many respects. Both trust in physical displacement as an instrument of status. Moving to other spaces to rest or knowing diverse landscapes is a pattern terrorists know well in order to plan their attacks. They have been widely educated in Western universities. Because the World Trade Centre and mobile communication industry is a value for West, they have become targets of international terrorism. If Mohammed Ata, one of the leading perpetrators of 9/11, would not know of the importance of civil aviation for the Western public as a source of pride, he would never have opted to direct an airplane against a commercial tower.

References

Aschauer, W. (2010). “Perception of tourists at risky destinations. A model of psychological influence factors”. *Tourism Review*. Vol. 65 (2): 4-20.

Bauman, Z. (2011) *La Sociedad Sitiada. (The society under siege)*. Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Bauman, Z., & Lyon, D. (2013). *Liquid surveillance: A conversation*. New York, John Wiley & Sons.

Bhattarai, K., Conway, D & N. Shrestha. (2005). “Tourism, terrorism and turmoil in Nepal”. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (3): 669-688.

Beck, U. (2006). *La Sociedad del Riesgo: hacia una nueva modernidad*. Buenos Aires: Paidos.

Beck, U. (2011). “Convivir con el Riesgo Global”. En La Humanidad Amenazada: gobernar los riesgos globales. D. Innerarity y Solana, J (Editores). Madrid: Paidos, pp. 21-32.

Becker, P. (2011). “Whose Risks? Gender and the Ranking of Hazards”. *Disaster Prevention and Management*. Vol. 20 (4): 423-433.

Boniface, B. & Cooper, C. (2009). *World-wide destinations: the geography of travel and tourism*. New York: Elsevier.

Castaño, J. M. (2005). *Psicología Social de los Viajes y el Turismo*. Madrid: Thomson Ed.

Dolnicar, S. (2005a). “Fear Segment in tourism”. *CD Proceedings of the 14 International Research Conference of the Council for Australian University and Hospitality Education*. CAUTHE. 1-5 Febrero de 2005, Australia.

Dolnicar, S. (2005b). “Understanding barriers to leisure travel, tourists fears as marketing basis”. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11 (3): 197-208.

Domínguez, P, Burguette, E and Bernard, A. (2003). “Efectos del 11 de Septiembre en la hotelería Mexicana: reflexión sobre la mono-dependencia turística”. *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, 12 (3-4): 335-348.

Douglas, M. (1992). *Risk and Blame*. New York: Routledge

Douglas, M. (2007). *Pureza y Peligro: un análisis de los conceptos de contaminación y tabú*. Buenos Aires, Nueva Visión.

Duclos, D. (1987). “Le Risque: une construction sociale?”. En J. Fabiani, y J Thyes. *La Societeé Vulnerable*. Paris, Ecole Normale Superieure, pp. 91-92.

Floyd, M. Gibson, H. Pennington-Gray, L and Thapa, B. (2003). “The Effects of risk perception on intention to travel in the aftermath of September 11, 2001”. In *Safety and Security in Tourism: relationships, Management and Marketing*, (Eds)

Hall, M. Timothy, D. y Duval, T. New York: Haworth Hospitality Press.

Ertuna, C. and Ertuna, Z. I. (2009). “The Sensitivity of German and British tourists to new shocks”. *Tourism Review*. Vol. 64 (3): 19-27.

Floyd, M. and L. Pennington-Gray. (2004). “Profiling risk: perception of tourist”. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31 (4): 1051-1054.

Fraisse, P. (1973). “Las Emociones”. In *Motivación, Emoción y Personalidad*. P. Fraisse y J. Piaget (compiladores). Buenos Aires: Editorial Paidos. Pp. 106-187.

Fuchs, G. and Reichel, A. (2010). “Health Tourists Visiting a Highly Volatile Destination”. *Anatolia, an international Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*. Vol. 21 (2): 205-226.

Fuller, G. (2012) *A World Without Islam*, New York, Back Bay Books.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Giddens, A. (1999). *Consecuencias de la Modernidad*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

Goldblatt, J. y C. Hu. (2005). “Tourism, terrorism, and the new world for event leaders”. *E-review of tourism Research*, 3 (6): 139-144.

Gygax, M (2007) “El Intercambio de dones en el mundo griego: reciprocidad, imprecisión, equivalencia y desequilibrio”. *Gerión*, 25 (1): 111-26

Heidegger, M. (1997). *El Ser y el Tiempo*. Santiago: Editorial Universitaria

Henderson, J. C. (2008). “Managing crises: UK civil aviation, BAA airports and the August 2006 terrorist threat”. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*. Vol. 8 (2): 125-136.

Howie, L. (2012). *Witnesses to terror: understanding the meanings and consequences of terrorism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Huntington, S. P. (1993). The clash of civilizations?. *Foreign affairs*, 22-49.

Kierkegaard, S. (2003). *Temor y Temblor*. Buenos Aires: Losada.

Korstanje, M. (2009). “Re-visiting the risk perception theory in the contexts of travels”. *ERTR: e-review of Tourism Research*. Vol. 7 (4): 68-81

Korstanje M (2010) “Elemental Forms of Hospitality”. RBtur, Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo, 4 (2): 86-111

Korstanje, M. E. (2011). “Why risk why now? Conceptual problems around the risk perception in tourism industry”. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em turismo*, 5(1): 4-22.

Korstanje, M. (2013) “Pre-emption and terrorism. When the future governs”. *Cultura*, 10(1), 167-184.

Korstanje, M. E. (2014). Exegesis and myths as methodologies of research in tourism. *Anatolia*, 25(2), 299-301.

Korstanje, M., & Busby, G. (2010). Understanding the Bible as the roots of physical displacement: the origin of tourism. *E-Review of Tourism Research*, 8(3), 95-111.

Korstanje, M. E., & Olsen, D. H. (2011). The discourse of risk in horror movies post 9/11: hospitality and hostility in perspective. *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*, 1(3), 304-317.

Korstanje, M. E., & Tarlow, P. (2012). Being lost: tourism, risk and vulnerability in the post-'9/11'entertainment industry. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 10(1), 22-33.

Korstanje, M. Skoll G & Timmermann F. (2014) Terrorism, Tourism and Worker Unions: The disciplinary boundaries of fear. *International Journal of Religious Tourism and Pilgrimage*, 2(1): 1-12

Kozak, M, Crotts, J. and Law, R. (2007). "The Impact of the perception of risk on international Travellers". *International Journal of Tourism Research*. Vol. 9 (4): 233-242.

Kuto, B. and J. Groves. (2004). "The Effects of terrorism: evaluating Kenya's tourism crisis". Pero ¿como definir un acto "terrorista?". *E-review of tourism Research*, 2 (4): 88-95..

Lash, S., and Urry, J. (1994). *Economies of signs and space* (Vol. 26). London: Sage.

Levenson, R. W.; Ekman, P. and Friesen, W.W. (1990). “Voluntary facial expression generates emotions-specific nervous system activity”. *Psychophysiology*, vol. 27: 363-384.

Lepp, A. and Gibson, H. (2008). “Sensation Seeking and Tourism: tourist role, perception of risk and Destination Choice”. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 29: 740-750.

Luhmann, N. (2006). *Sociología del Riesgo*. México City: Universidad Iberoamericana.

Manning, P. K (1989). “Semiotics and Social Theory”. In *Action and Structure: research methods and social theory*. London: Sage, pp. 80-98.

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

Malinowski, B. (1967). *Una Teoría de la cultura*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana.

Niyaz, A. (2010). “Terrorism and extremism: a threat to Maldives tourism industry”. *Unisci. Discussion Papers*. No. 24. Octubre.

Oliver-Smith, A. (2002). “Theorizing disasters, nature, power and culture?”. In Hoffman, S. and Oliver-Smith, A. (Eds.), *Catastrophe and culture: the anthropology of disasters*. Oxford: School of American Research James Currey, pp. 23-47.

Panksepp, J. (1982). “Toward a General psychobiological theory of Emotions”. *The Behavioural and Brain Sciences*. Vol. 5 (407-467).

Park, K. and Reisinger, Y. (2010). “Differences in the perceived influence of natural disasters and travel risk on international travels”. *Tourism Geographies*. Vol. 12 (1): 1-24.

Plog, S. (1973). “Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity.” *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 13 (3): 13-16.

Plog, S. (1991). *Leisure travel; making it a growth market. Again!*. Nueva York: Wiley and Sons.

Reichel, A. Fuchs, G. and Uriely, N (2007). “Perceived risk and the non-institutionalized tourist role: the case of Israeli student ex backpackers”. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 46: 217-226.

Reisinger, Y. and F. Mavondo. (2005). “Travel anxiety and intention to travel internationally: implication of travel risk perception”. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43 (3): 212-245.

Richardson, J. (2010). "The certainty of uncertainty: risk management revisited". *Foresight*. Vol. 12 (4): 47-64.

Roehl, W. and Fesenmaier, D. (1992). "Risk perceptions and pleasure travel: an exploratory analysis". *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 30 (4): 17-29.

Sackett, H. and Botterill, D. (2006). "Perception of international travel risk: an exploratory study of the influence of proximity to terrorist attack". *E-review of tourism Research*. Vol. 4 (2): 44-49

Sayyid, S. (2014) "A Measure of Islamophobia", 2 (1): 10-25

Slovic, P. (1987). "Perception of Risks". *Science, new series*. Vol. 236 (4799): 285-285.

Strongman, K. T. (1996). *The Psychology of Emotions: theories of emotions in perspective*. Chichester, Willey and Sons.

Tierney, K. (1994). "Sociology's Unique Contributions to the Study of Risk". *Disaster Research Center*, Preliminary Paper, 204.

Waterton, C and Wynne, B. (2001). "Can focus groups assess community views?". In *Developing Focus Group. Politics theory and practices*. (Eds.) R. Barbour & J. Kitzinger). London: Sage. Pp. 127-143

Wolff, K., Larsen, S., and Doran, R. (2013). How dangerous is Norway? Risk perceptions before and after Utoya. *CAUTHE 2013: Tourism and Global Change: On the Edge of Something Big*, 941.

Wolff, K., and Larsen, S. (2013). Can terrorism make us feel safer? Risk perceptions and worries before and after the July 22nd attacks. *Annals of Tourism Research*. In press

Wong, J. Y. and Yeh, C. (2009). "Tourist Hesitation in Destination decision making". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36 (1): 6-23

Woods, J. et al. (2008). "Terrorism Risk Perception and Proximity to Primary Terrorist Targets: how close is too close?" *Research in Human Ecology*. Vol. 15 (1): 63-70.

Yuan, M. (2005). "After September 11: determining its Impacts on Rural Canadians travel to U.S". *E-review of tourism Research*, 3 (5): 103-108.

Yun, D. & MacLaurin, T. (2006). Development and validation of an attitudinal travel Safety scale. *Canada Chapter TTRA Conference*, Montebello, QC.

Zinn, J. O. (2010). "Biography, risk and uncertainty – is there common ground for biographical research and risk research". *FQS, Forum, Qualitative Social Research*. Vol. 11 (1). Paper 15. Disponible en <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1512>. Extraido el 01 de Febrero de 2011.

Zizek, S. (2009) *Violence*. Buenos Aires: Paidos.