Pergamon

Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 941–963, 2011
0160-7383/$ - see front matter © 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
Printed in Great Britain

www.elsevier.com/locate/atoures

doi:10.1016/j.annals.2011.01.004

HOPEFUL TOURISM
A New Transformative Perspective

Annette Pritchard, Nigel Morgan
University of Wales Institute, UK
Irena Ateljevic
University of Wageningen, The Netherlands

Abstract: This paper makes a philosophical and ontological contribution to tourism knowledge. It discusses emergent perspectives and paradigms, identifies major omissions in tourism knowledge and challenges its dominant assumptions, reviewing the imperatives for a regime change in the field. The paper argues that the new hopeful tourism perspective which combines co-transformative learning and action offers a distinctive approach to tourism study. It defines the characteristics of this values-led humanist perspective and presents a reflexive accounting of its evolution. It concludes with a three part agenda for tourism educators and researchers concerned to embrace co-transformative learning, which responds to the challenges of creating just and sustainable tourism worlds. **Keywords:** hopeful tourism, ontologies, paradigms, co-transformative learning, social justice, advocacy.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years the tourism research field has reached a state of maturity whereby it has advanced beyond its applied business research base to embrace reflexive and critical academic enquiry (Airey, 2008a, 2008b; Lew, Hall, & Williams, 2004; Tribe, 2004, 2006). This maturation has seen the emergence of a number of networks within the knowledge community, such as the sustainability and mobilities networks (Tribe, 2010). In addition, whilst the last four decades have seen much work engaged with critical theory (Nash, 2007) and with inequality, injustice and tourism (e.g., de Kadt, 1979; Hall & Brown, 2006; Harrison, 2001), the last half a dozen years have seen the emergence of a further network of 'critical' or 'hopeful' tourism scholars. This academy of hope has gained particular traction through publications and its conference series (see Atelejevic, Pritchard, & Morgan, 2007a,

Annette Pritchard's research focuses on: hopeful tourism; tourism and social justice; tourism's gendered visual rhetoric; destination reputation management (Welsh Centre for Tourism Research, the University of Wales Institute, Cardiff, Western Avenue, Cardiff, CF5 2YB, tel.: +44 (0)29 20205682, fax: +44 (0)29 20416930. Email <apritchard@uwic.ac.uk>). **Nigel Morgan**'s research interests are: destination reputation management; hopeful tourism; tourism, citizenship and social justice. **Irena Ateljevic**'s research interests are: human development potential; hopeful tourism; tourism epistemology; women empowerment.

in press; Ren, Pritchard, & Morgan, 2010; Richards, Pritchard, & Morgan, 2010; Sedgley, Pritchard, & Morgan, 2010). In this paper we define the values of hopeful tourism, making a contribution to the philosophy and ontology of tourism. More than simply defining it however, we present hopeful tourism as a new perspective which combines co-transformative learning and action to offer a distinctive approach to tourism knowledge production.

Our paper reviews the context which has nurtured this academy of hope and contends that, just as the dominant world system is at a crisis point environmentally, financially and politically, so the prevailing neoliberal view of tourism knowledge production (Ayikoru, Tribe, & Airey, 2009) also faces a potential 'regime change'. We suggest that an increasing number of responsible tourism intellectuals are concerned to pursue tourism knowledge which directly relates to the challenge of creating a more just and sustainable world (e.g., Cole & Morgan, 2010; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, 2008; Minnaert, Maitland, & Miller, 2006, 2009; Pernecky, 2010; Stephenson, 2006). To this end, our paper proffers hopeful tourism as a values-based, unfolding transformative perspective (imbued by principles of partnership, reciprocity and respect). It offers a 'reflexive accounting' (Seale, 1999) of the development of hopeful tourism, a pause for reflection which aspires to stimulate debate on the philosophical scope of tourism enquiry and the potential role of tourism scholars as change agents. We consider how hopeful tourism shapes every aspect of the research process from ontological and methodological decisions through to reporting and dissemination. We conclude by setting a three part agenda for tourism educators and researchers concerned with planetary justice and sustainability, namely to: disturb and critique hegemonic socio-political practices; prepare reflexive, ethical tourism professionals and academics; promote human dignity, human rights, and justice in tourism policy and practice.

THE HOPEFUL TOURISM PERSPECTIVE

Imperatives for Paradigm Shift

Today the tourism research field is characterized by tremendous growth and increasing fragmentation. There has been an explosion in the number of undergraduate and postgraduate tourism-related programmes, most of them located within business and management schools (Airey, 2008a). The number of travel and tourism-related journals has grown from a dozen in the 70s to around 150 related titles today, with 60% of all tourism journals having been established after 2000 (Atelejevic & Peeters, 2006). Yet despite this growth Goeldner (2005), reflecting on the role of journals in shaping tourism knowledge, argues that tourism researchers and journal editors have consistently failed to address the theory gap within tourism studies. He notes how researchers have so far favoured 'narrow empirical studies' at the expense of theory building or conceptual writing and comments it is

'incumbent on tourism researchers and journal editors to move this development along' (2005, p. 49).

Tribe's (2010) latest analysis of tourism knowledge suggests that the field's lack of theoretical development confirms its uncertain status and 'indiscipline'. Indeed, he elsewhere argues that tourism enquiry's philosophical foundations have 'remained stubbornly underdeveloped' in a world rooted in neo-liberal market ideologies and values where the tourism industry has become a 'runaway' phenomenon, ill-managed and barely controlled (Tribe, 2009, pp. 3–4). Our ability to momentarily step outside of this world, to question its dominant philosophies and to reflect on its meaning and purpose is, as Tribe suggests, itself a philosophical act. It is an act which goes to the heart of questions about truth, beauty and virtue and challenges academics to reflect on tourism's ontological foundations. This is something that tourism researchers have consistently shied away from and few have truly pushed the field's paradigmatic boundaries. And yet the continued conceptual development of tourism depends on the exploration of new paradigms and perspectives, because when we push ourselves away from dominant and taken-for-granted thinking we open up possibilities of seeing ourselves and our multiple worlds anew.

Certainly now seems to be an appropriate time to be reflecting on the possibilities of a regime change or paradigm shift as although it is a characteristic conceit of the modern era to assert that each generation is transformatory, ours are sharply transitional times which are calling into question many conventions and orthodoxies. Such conceptual reflection is particularly pertinent as never before in human history have so many cultures, belief systems, and new scientific discoveries emerged and interacted so quickly. This era is indeed exciting as our dominant ways of knowing the world (the metanarratives of science and religion) and existing governance, institutional, business and societal structures are increasingly stressed (Abdallah, Thompson, Michaelson, Marks, & Steur, 2009). New perspectives are emerging across disciplines and research fields as western consciousness seeks to grow beyond the confines of Newtonian and Cartesian thought—from relativity theory in physics and the findings of depth psychologists, to new approaches in anthropological and ecological studies and evolutionary biology (Judith, 2006; Rifkin, 2009).

Until relatively recently, Western thought was dominated by the principles of scientific method and rational research, which have privileged objective masculine forms of enquiry. Francis Bacon (1561–1626), one of the founders of modern science and the originator of the scientific method described its development as a 'masculine birth', the means by which Nature's 'holes and corners were to be entered and penetrated' (Sheldrake, 1991, pp. 43–44). Rene Descartes (1596–1650) in advocating the complete separation of matter and spirit, of the mind and body, viewed nature and the human body as a mechanical system subject to precise, logical, mathematical laws and principles. Isaac Newton's (1642–1727) *Principia* (1687) likewise demonstrated how the universe was a purely mechanical system, a consequence of which was '[t]hat which could not be seen or measured was given little, if

any importance' (Judith, 2006, p. 184). Today we are witnessing the deconstruction of this largely masculine practice of western thought—a movement which is stimulating a new awareness of 'reality' as a construction of human imagination.

Place, space, time and identity—none are now conceived as fixed but as mutable, represented, relative and constructed. If relativity and imagination have replaced stability and objectivity, then reality becomes contested and, as a result—together with an increasing awareness that the intellectual conventions of the west have no overarching place as the dominant wisdom tradition—there is a greater interest now than at any other time in what has previously been marginalized, oppressed and unrecognized (Pritchard, 2004). At the same time, the 'thoroughgoing reflexivity' of modernity has rendered most aspects of human activity and experience liable to continuous and rapid revision in the light of new learning. Such constant revisionism across every field of enquiry (from history to cosmology) has not only had the effect of abolishing the certainty of knowledge, but is '*existentially troubling* for ordinary individuals' (Giddens, 1991, p. 21, italics in original), who are less sure than ever of their own 'place' in the world. Indeed, it could be said that many people today feel 'immersed in technology, yet [are] hungry for the sacred [and] there is deep longing for a story that balances masculine and feminine, progress and sustainability, order and freedom, power and love' (Judith, 2006, p. 19).

Thus, a range of new perspectives are seeking to generate transformative models for human development in a world dominated by post-9/11 security and political challenges, economic and financial collapses and the threats posed by climatic change and resource depletion. For example, resilience theory provides a new framework for analyzing social—ecological systems in a world confronted by rapid change (Holling & Gunderson, 2002). Scholars in global change, resilience and sustainability studies are seeking conceptualizations and models which integrate the earth system, human development and sustainability based on a widely shared view that 'the challenge of sustainable development is the reconciliation of society's development goals with the planet's environmental limits over the long term' (Clark & Dickson, 2003, p. 8059). In the vanguard of these moves towards paradigmatic shift are the cultural creatives (Ray & Anderson, 2000). Said to account for approximately a quarter of Americans and a fifth of Europeans (Ghisi, 2008), they are today's 'creative marginals' who lead the transitions between civilizations and cultural shifts (McNeill & Arnold, 1989). These cultural creatives have been characterized as new progressives who value 'planetary rather than national interests, eco-sustainability rather than sentimental environmentalism, feminism rather than heroic models, personal growth rather than personal ambition…' (Ray, 2002, p. 21).

A number of new perspectives have also emerged in the social sciences, which attempt to provide understanding of our transitory times. Three of these—the dynamic feminine (Hill, 1992; Judith, 2006) transmodernity (Ghisi, 2006, 2008) and worldism (Agathangelou & Ling, 2009)—strongly connect with hopeful tourism. Guided by consensual

practices of cooperation, reciprocity, interdependence, activism and support, the paradigmatic shift promised by transmodernity and the dynamic feminine resonates with the ideas of leading feminists such as bell hooks (2000) and her work on the envisioning of love ethics and Gloria Steinem (1993) and her writing on the circularity paradigm (see Atelejevic, Pritchard, & Morgan, 2007b, pp. 4–5). Judith describes the dynamic feminine as a participatory movement, founded on civil rights and a unity of body and mind and the planet and culture. She characterizes it as 'a reclamation of the body, sexuality, freedom, passion, community and creativity' (2006, p. 211). For Hill (1992, p. 17) in 'its highest aspect, the dynamic feminine is the synthesizing creation of new possibilities and new combinations... Its attributes are participation and process.' Significantly it 'does not come from a place of knowing, so much as from an openness based on the realization of how we *don't know*' (Judith, 2006, p. 203, italics in original).

In rejecting patriarchal values of control and domination, both the dynamic feminine and transmodern paradigms offer collective empowering, egalitarian and respectful visions for women and men where civil rights are fundamental and the sacred and transcendental are reclaimed and re-evaluated. For Ghisi (2006, 2008) and Atelejevic (2009) transmodernity and its paradigm-shifting possibilities offer a new way of thinking, a new vision to move us beyond postmodern deconstructions of modernity 'from the edge of chaos into a new order of society' (Sardar, 2004, p. 2). It is a new global consciousness which recognizes our interdependencies, vulnerabilities and responsibilities to each other, to the natural world and to the planet (Rifkin, 2005), for 'life is an intricate living web—all of it sacred' (Judith, 2006, p. 206). The knowledge economy and the centrality of quality of life as a measure of societal progress are both fundamental tenets of transmodernity, which just like the dynamic feminine, offers the potential of an optimistic, hopeful vision of the future through redefining the relationship between human and material capital, between life and work, between the intuitive and the rational; between society, science and ethics.

Hopeful tourism strongly connects with the empowering and egalitarian values of the dynamic feminine and transmodernity; indeed its naming took inspiration from bell hooks' 2003 book *Teaching Community: A pedagogy of hope*, which offers insights into how to create critical education arenas that dismantle oppression across racial, ethnic, gender, class and nation lines and work towards socially just communities. It also resonates powerfully with Agathangelou and Ling's (2009, p.1) worldism perspective and its focus on 'the multiple relations, ways of being, and traditions of seeing and doing passed to us across generations. More than a postmodern sense of ''difference'', worldism registers the entwinement of multiple worlds: their contending structures, histories, memories, and political economies in the making of our contemporary world....' Just like Agathangelou and Ling's (2009) new perspective in international relations however, hopeful tourism does not idealize these multiple worlds, but rather politicizes them. We too acknowledge oppression and coercion as central features of power

politics, but this recognition propels us towards hopeful tourism even more as people have been subverting the hegemonic discourses for millennia.

The de-centring of the intellectual universe has also been encouraged by the fracturing of formerly stable divisions between subjects in the 'soft' sciences which has enabled social scientists to break the ties of powerful epistemological straightjackets (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a; Seale, 1998, pp. 183–190). In view of this epistemological fracturing Pritchard (2000, 2004, 2006) argues that tourism's variegated, complex and inherently interdisciplinary nature makes it particularly well placed to contribute to current social science epistemological and ontological debates. By engaging such arguments and by embracing pluralist, even transgressive learnings already animating other fields she suggests that tourism enquiry has the opportunity to create a more inclusive, more dynamic and more profound research base. It follows therefore that the tourism scholarly community needs more rigorous engagement with competing positivist, post-positivist/critical realist, constructionist and critical theorist claims about the nature of reality in order to bring balance to its own knowledge canon.

Ren et al. (2010) contend that rather than there being a single hegemonic centre of tourism research, tourism is enacted in multiple versions through various practices and performances across and within different knowledge communities. Within these communities, scholars align themselves with what Tribe (2010) has identified as two deep knowledge networks—business and social science—although he suggests that new networks such those based on hopeful tourism or sustainable tourism are emerging which may disturb this dominance. The knowledge networks of tourism management and tourism studies reflect Habermas's (1987) observations on knowledge constitution, so that the former is rooted in system world knowledge which foregrounds instrumental and technical knowledge and the latter emphasizes life world knowledge or the knowledge of the everyday world of lived experience. Both knowledge networks are supported by particular forms of knowledge enquiry so that life-world knowledge emphasizes interpretive, historical-hermeneutic science whilst system world knowledge privileges empirical scientific enquiry with its emphasis on large-scale objective studies. Thus, the tourism management community is rooted in neo-liberal philosophies and dominated by a drive for industry-oriented solutions which seek to enhance and reinforce the existing systems.

For Habermas, the dialectic tensions between system and life-world knowledge need to be balanced by critical or emancipatory knowledge which foregrounds issues of justice and domination, resistance, praxis, intervention and, above all, emancipation. There has always been a stream of work in tourism enquiry, which has engaged with critical theory (Botterill, 2003; Nash, 2007) and this was strongly in evidence in the last decade (e.g., Bianchi, 2006; Chambers, 2007; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006). In fact, it could be argued that such work has been gathering momentum and is reflected in the 'proliferation of new journals that are orientated towards theoretical and critical works in

methodological issues in tourism studies' (Jamal & Hollinshead, 2000, p. 66). Critical research is transformative; it is a political act which is values-led and regards moral and ethical obligations as intrinsic to its enquiry. This is an enquiry which rejects 'the positivist dichotomy between fact and value, theory and politics... [it] interrogates the ''is'' in terms of the ''ought,'' seeking to grasp the emancipatory possibilities of the current society as something that can and should be realized in the future' (Best & Kellner, 1997, p. 223).

Whilst there are a number of knowledge communities in tourism research, it is difficult to underestimate the influence of scientific rationalism through positivism in shaping how and what we know of tourism (Xiao & Smith, 2006, 2007). However, tourism's overall lack of theoretical engagement has compounded a situation whereby 'many orthodox tourism researchers follow the largely discredited positivist correspondence of truth theory ... one that is almost entirely rejected by the social sciences' (Botterill, 2007, pp. 124–125). As a consequence, tourism enquiry has remained on the margins of many of the philosophical debates which have energized the social sciences. In addition, critical reflections on the market economy are rare in business schools (where most tourism academics are located), whose researchers continually eschew social, political and ethical critique in favour of technical, problem-solving research (Dunne & Harney, 2008). In such an environment, it is not surprising that tourism enquiry promotes particular values of 'performativity, consumerism and profitability' over all others' (Tribe, 2009, p. 4).

An Accounting of the Academy of Hope

Hopeful tourism has achieved a degree of success in enrolling people, ideas and inscriptions as an emergent perspective (Tribe, 2010). In this section of the paper we map its development and highlight how the personal, the public and the academic have shaped the creation of this academy of hope (Ren et al., 2010). This reflexive accounting of the hopeful tourism perspective and its network partly responds to Mair and Reid's (2007, p. 519) challenge to tourism researchers to 'provoke a broader debate about the nature of social research and the role that we, as researchers, can and should play in affecting social change.' Further than this, however, we argue that hopeful tourism is a new perspective in tourism enquiry which offers an alternative values-led approach to tourism knowledge production.

Hopeful tourism's distinctive advocacy of radical critiques of tourism practice, the advocacy of human dignity and rights and just societies in tourism policy arenas and positioned scholarship are not something that is entirely novel, rather they mark an evolution of thinking (e.g., Ateljevic, Harris, Wilson, & Collins, 2005; Morgan & Pritchard, 1998; Pritchard & Morgan, 2000; Westwood, Morgan, & Pritchard, 2006). The hopeful tourism network can trace its origins to 2004, since when it has generated the Critical Tourism Studies conference series (2005, 2007, 2009, 2011) and several publications (e.g., Atelejevic et al., 2007a,

in press; Pritchard, Morgan, Ateljevic, & Harris, 2007a). The project encapsulates 'a commitment to tourism enquiry which is pro-social justice and equality and anti-oppression: it is an academy of hope' (Atelejevic et al., 2007b, p. 3) founded in an inclusive environment and encompassing a range of interpretative, critical and emancipatory approaches.

Interestingly, Mair and Reid (2007) note how critical theory exhibits a strong gender dimension and analysis of those participating in the Critical Tourism Studies conferences reveals that almost three-quarters are women (Ren et al., 2010). Work elsewhere demonstrates how the knowledge production process is socially constructed and subject to intellectual imperialism (Alatas, 2000; Bishop, 2005). In tourism its learned societies and editorial boards are largely influenced by masculinist, western research traditions (Pritchard & Morgan, 2007; Swain, 2004) where 'the very act of naming has been until now the prerogative of males' (Crotty, 1998, pp. 181–183), shaping how tourism research should be performed, created and disseminated. It seems academics marginalized by tourism's unarticulated masculinist research traditions and networks (Phillimore & Goodson, 2004) have gravitated towards the hopeful tourism project.

It is in the areas of tourism gender studies and methodologies that hopeful tourism has made its most significant contributions to date. As Pritchard, Morgan, Ateljevic and Harris note (2007b, p. 5) 'a field's engagement with gender-oriented research can be a measure of its ontological and epistemological maturity. Whilst it is too early to talk about the existence of a substantive body of feminist tourism research, and despite the often hostile contemporary environment for such scholarship, such work is gathering pace at both a doctoral and post-doctoral level.' Indeed, there is a:

> re-energized focus on gender emanating from the critical turn now shaking up tourism's various academies ... [it is] a dynamic project for tourism studies, continuing a challenge to us all to think within and outside of our own bodies, be they corporeal and/or institutional, about the critical importance of gender equity in our daily world (Swain, 2007, p. xi).

Hopeful tourism is also seeking to disturb and shake up tourism's hegemonic methodological foundations and its network provides a nurturing environment to reduce the isolation experienced by interpretive and critical researchers in a field where objectivity, generalisation and distance are the norm (Ateljevic et al., 2005). If hopeful tourism is to grow beyond the confines of certain topic areas however, it must properly engage with philosophical debates in tourism, aspire to bridge the field's theory gap (Goeldner, 2005) and play its part in Denzin and Lincoln's 'critical conversations about democracy, race, gender, class, nation states, globalization, freedom and community' (2005b, p. 3). In particular, the hopeful tourism perspective must rise to the challenge posed by researchers who contend that:

> The epistemological, ontological and methodological underpinnings of critical research remain under-theorised and under-explored.

> This . . . has resulted in a lack of theoretical cogency and coherency in much of what is labelled as 'critical' tourism research (Chambers, 2007, p. 105).

The Tenets of Hopeful Tourism

This section of the paper defines the hopeful tourism perspective and explains its aspiration to make a difference to tourism enquiry and practice. The following pages outline it as a values-led humanist approach based on partnership, reciprocity and ethics, which aims for co-created learning and which recognises the power of sacred and indigenous knowledge and passionate scholarship. This in turn impacts on its enquiry aim, methodologies, action, researcher position and voice and the relationship between the 'researcher' and the 'participants'. Thus, this section unpacks how hopeful tourism shapes what and how we research, not simply in terms of methodological choices but at the level of philosophical awareness and applied critical literacy (Hollinshead, 2004). It is important to begin, however, with questions of ontology—the study of being and the nature of reality, since as Hollinshead continues, 'researchers in tourism studies . . . must be very careful about the ways they go about investigating . . . the very ontological matters of being, becoming and meaning' (2004, p. 67).

Critical tourism scholars have been criticised for engaging epistemological and methodological concerns at the expense of ontological debate and for preferring relativist rather than realist conceptions (Botterill, 2007; Chambers, 2007). Both Chambers and Botterill contend that without expressly confronting such issues, hopeful tourism scholars find themselves in the untenable position of challenging oppression from a relativist intellectual stance, which would deny emancipatory transformation as it refutes universal truth. Thus, Botterill (2007) argues that there is a mind-independent external reality and it can be known. To deny this, he suggests is to engage in Harraway's 'god trick', so that whereas rational tourism researchers claim to see everything but remain themselves unseen and removed, relativist tourism research 'involves its own ''god-trick'': it is a way of being nowhere while claiming to be everywhere equally, involving a denial of responsibility and critical enquiry' (Harraway cited in Botterill, 2007, p. 127).

Chambers and Botterill both suggest that critical realism offers tourism scholars a resolution to this ontological question. Yet perhaps the fundamental issue here is not the perceived dissonance between realism and constructivism, rather it is the divide between realism and idealism. Critical realism arguably relies on the premise that there is a 'real' truth which we can only imperfectly and probabilistically know (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005b). Yet is the 'probabilistic' nature of critical realism's reading of social reality that dissimilar from constructivism's view that there are useful interpretations of reality that stand against interpretations that appear to have no useful purpose (Crotty, 1998)? As Crotty (1998, p. 63) continues, '[t]o say that meaningful reality is socially constructed is not to say that it is not real' but it is to say that different people construct diverse meanings and realities. In recognizing

that the 'social sciences are normative disciplines, always already embedded in issues of value, ideology, power, desire, sexism, racism, domination, repression and control' (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005b, p. 13) we come to realize that social scientific knowledge is less clear-cut, less defined, more fragmented and less cumulative than natural scientific knowledge (Outhwaite, 1998).

Hopeful tourism presents an unfolding vision for tourism research, one which is committed to co-transformative learning, social justice and the universality of human rights. It is bound by five key principles, the first being that society is characterized by objective structures of power that encompass states, governments, classes and sets of ideologies and relations that privilege the few at the expense of the many. The second principle recognizes human agency in the making of multiple worlds through multi- and trans-subjectivities. The third principle is that language is central to meaning, whilst the fourth holds that consensus is discursively formed and significantly, that emancipation is possible through research critiques which address issues of ideology and power. Finally, knowledge is guided by social interests so that 'truth' is regarded as a matter of social location and knowledge is seen to be a product of specific social, cultural and historical contexts (Mannheim, 1993). This is not to say that all knowledge is relative (and therefore dependent on the researcher's theoretical perspective) but that all knowledge is partially true so that when 'people define situations in particular ways, their definitions have real consequences for the development of that situation' (Scott, 1998, p. 111).

Within this ontological framework, we now unpack the detail of the hopeful tourism perspective. Table 1 summarises its 13 key tenets, starting with ontology and epistemology and including methodology, aim, action, control and researcher positioning and credibility. The origins of the word hope are obscure and it is a complex concept, yet as bell hooks reminds us, '[d]efinitions are vital starting points for the imagination. What we cannot imagine cannot come into being' (2000, p. 14). Ernest Bloch (1885–1977) in *Principle of Hope* (1986) demonstrates how hope can be discerned, not only in the utopian writings of philosophers such as Marx and Hegel, but also in art, popular culture and in the establishment of hopeful utopias, such as those of the Welsh industrialist and humanitarian Robert Owen (1771–1858). The last thing to be released from Pandora's jar, hope plays a major role in most faiths and religions and when used in a Christian religious context, it has connotations of spiritual truth and (together with faith and love) is one of the three theological virtues, a spiritual gift of God.

In today's world there is limited engagement with hope yet all social justice movements have strongly emphasized a love and hope ethic. Hopeful tourism does not and cannot present a polished template to create social justice—that would be absurd. But we do proffer hopeful tourism as an unfolding vision, a perspective, a way of knowing the world and a set of methods, that we hope will prompt syncretic growth and co-transformative learning. To appropriate the words of Judith (2006, p. 14), tourism enquiry needs 'a story of hope . . . the kind of hope that employs all of our efforts in creating a mature vision of

Table 1. The Tenets of Hopeful Tourism Enquiry

Ontology	Participative reality is shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic and gender values and underpinned by power structures
Epistemology	Transactional, subjectivist, value-mediated and co-created knowledge
Nature of Knowledge	Structural/historical insights, critical subjectivity, living knowledge, co-transformative learnings
Values and Ethics	Value-led scholarship; ethics and respect for human dignity and multiple worlds intrinsic
Methodology	Emancipatory, action-oriented, participant-driven, reflective, dialectical, pluralist, multi-dimensional
Inquiry Aim	Critical understanding, co-transformation
Action	To transform our way of seeing, being, doing and relating in tourism worlds; emancipation and transformation of self and others are hoped for, a less unequal, more sustainable world is a goal
Control	Shared between inquirer and co-knowledge generators
Researcher Position	Transformative advocate
Voice	Self-reflexive, passionate, positioned
Research Training	Qualitative and quantitative, learns through active engagement, foregrounds the emotional dynamics of research relations
Research Credibility	Trustworthiness, resonance, participative storying; the extent to which it makes possible new and meaningful interpretations of the social and political phenomena it investigates
Research Dissemination	Challenges traditional research reporting and encourages participant involvement

what's possible'. Rather than being underpinned by a passive, unrealistic hope which is more akin to dreams and longings, hopeful tourism is an active hope which visualizes an idea and formulates a plan to accomplish its ends. It looks forward to change with confidence; it is about moving towards something rather than moving away from something else, it is a collective vision of what is possible, an organizing principle for transformation.

Even to speak of hope and love as academics however makes us vulnerable, as this is associated with weakness, irrationality and emotion—particularly in an academy conditioned to principles of distance, objectivity and rationality. Yet this engages directly with the nature of hopeful tourism knowledge, researcher position, voice, training and control (Table 1). Work in other disciplines and research fields such as geography, has pointed to the marginalization of emotion in the research canon, despite the fact that human lived experience is constructed through emotion. This marginalization ' . . . has been part of a gender politics of research in which detachment, objectivity and rationality have been valued, and implicitly masculinised, while engagement, subjectivity, passion and desire have been devalued and frequently feminized' (Anderson & Smith, 2001, p. 7). For example, geography—just like orthodox tourism enquiry—has had a tendency to 'deny, avoid, suppress or downplay its emotional entanglements' (Bondi,

Davidson, & Smith, 2005, p. 1). This suppression of the emotional in tourism enquiry has produced a relatively sterile scholarship which marginalizes and excludes many of the complex emotional and passionate geographies from the knowledge worlds created in the field: worlds of pain-pleasure, fear-comfort, hate-love and despair-hope.

Feminist thought reminds us that when we 'neglect how our research and social life are mediated by feeling and emotions [we] . . . exclude a key set of relations through which lives are lived, societies made, and knowledge produced' (Kwan, 2007, p. 24). To confront these omissions, hopeful tourism scholars have adopted the position of transformative advocate, with a self-reflexive, passionate, positioned voice, foregrounding the emotional dynamics of research relations (Sedgley et al., 2010). At the same time, hopeful tourism has at its heart the transformation of relationships between the researcher and the researched—no longer subjects or even participants in projects, but wherever possible, collaborators in tourism storying (e.g., Dunkley, 2007; Richards et al., 2010; Sedgley, Pritchard, & Morgan, 2007). In turn, this places significant demands on the researcher as it centralizes the emotional, spiritual and ethical responsibilities its researchers have to their co-creators of tourism knowledge. This transformation also creates alternative discourses of research credibility, beginning with the ontological matters of being, becoming and meaning and foregrounding trustworthiness, participatory consciousness and resonance. In essence, hopeful tourism scholars ask to be judged on the extent to which they make possible new and meaningful interpretations of the social and political phenomena they investigate.

Table 2. Comparing Rational and Hopeful Tourism Enquiry

Rational Tourism Enquiry	Hopeful Tourism Enquiry
Systematic	Creative
Western/Anglocentric traditions	Multiple worlds
Mind-over-body	Mind-body-spirit integration
Masculinist	Partnership
Either/or	Both/and
Hierarchical	Participatory
Detached science	Co-transformative learning
Validity, reliability, objectivity	Trustworthiness, resonance, participative storying
Technically trained	Technically trained *but* reflexive and emotionally competent
Value-free	Values-led
Ethics are extrinsic	Ethics are intrinsic
Instrumental and performance-led	Empowering
Self/Other	I/we
Growth and expansion	Mindful sustainability
Reductionist	Holism
Neoliberal competition	Syncretic co-creation
Linear	Circularity, spiral discourse
Dominant perspective	Emerging perspective
Explanatory knowledge	Co-transformative learning

Table 2 demonstrates how hopeful tourism differs from rational tourism enquiry. Hopeful tourism strives for co-created, co-transformative learning, impacting the self and others. In contrast to the scientific rational approach it is values-led rather than value-free, it embraces the oneness and integration of mind, body and spirit found in non-western wisdom traditions (e.g., Bishop, 2005; Fox, 2006; Tuhiwai Smith, 2005) and is empowering and participant-driven. It seeks to disrupt the hegemony of the field's intellectually detached western research traditions and emphasizes multiple relations, ways of being, and traditions of seeing and doing. Crucially hopeful tourism offers an alternative to the dominant way of understanding and being in the tourism world not by discarding or dismissing it but by engaging it to demonstrate that it offers but one perspective. In this we agree with Agathangelou and Ling (2009, p. 10) that 'we need a world-rich paradigm ... that accounts for all who make our worlds ... not a hierarchical and violent positioning of one over others.' Hopeful tourism envisions a tourism industry that values syncretic, mindful growth not mindless development (Morgan, Pritchard, & Pride, 2011, p.10) and an academy that embodies the connections of multiple worlds to speak truth to power not to excuse it.

As a perspective guided by ethics, values and responsibility, hopeful tourism has an activist edge. In this it builds on the philosophic tenets of Aristotle, for as Tribe notes (2002, p. 315), '[i]n the Aristotelian paradigm, the good life concerned truth, responsibility for actions and right actions.' For Aristotle (384 BC–322 BC), philosophy and action were inextricably linked as he taught that intellect itself 'moves nothing but only the intellect which aims at an end and is practical' (Aristotle, in Tribe, 2002, p. 316). In the hopeful tourism perspective, action and practice are inextricably entwined as to speak of hope and love is a philosophical undertaking which offers 'a hopeful joyous vision of love's transformative power' (hooks, 2000, p. xxix). Love implies action, accountability and responsibility; it was defined by Morgan Scott Peck (1978, p. 81) as 'the will to extend one's self for the purpose of nurturing one's own or another's spiritual growth.' Embracing a hope and love ethic as a hopeful tourism scholar means utilizing all the dimensions of these two concepts—care, commitment, trust, responsibility, respect, knowledge and a vision of human possibilities—in all one's research undertakings. Hopeful tourism is closely entwined with what Tribe (2002, p. 322) has termed ''the idea of knowing-in-ethical-tourism-action... Here reflection and action are integrated and where people act for the good of tourism societies. This is a move towards tourism stewardship ... and a fuller responsibility to the contexts within which tourism is practiced.''

Co-transformative Learning and Action

Hopeful tourism scholars do not aim to disengage from tourism's hegemonic ontology or its socio-political practices, rather they seek to disrupt them by demonstrating the existence of grander, more

thoughtful possibilities drawn from a wider range of human experiences than the reductive, abstracted self-other binary. Reading the world through hopeful lenses, we can access the relationships that bind and separate selves and others, and glimpse a world 'more humanistic ... more holistic ... more relevant to the lives of disenfranchised populations' (Hollinshead, 2004, p. 78). This is a philosophical and political act, which offers the possibility of co-transformation in and through enquiry, learning and action. Our discussion over the nature of tourism knowledge is by no means esoteric as it takes us to the heart of effecting change outside and inside academia, requiring us to reflect on what we systematically privilege in tourism enquiry and practice and what we repeatedly deny and occlude.

Agathangelou and Ling (2009), writing about worldism, talk of 'the neoliberal imperium', an overarching hegemonic project which draws on and legitimizes neocolonial strategies of power based on race, gender, sexuality and class to exploit the many in order to sustain the few. They regard the imperium hegemony as more than a collusion between the state and civil society to preserve elite interests—they see it as a systematic erasing of all other ways of seeing, being, doing and relating in the world. Hopeful tourism seeks to play its part in countering such erasures and Table 3 identifies an agenda for developing syncretic understandings of our multiple tourism worlds. To be read vertically, the table identifies key issues of ontology which hegemonic tourism knowledge occludes (ways of knowing) and organizes neglected research topics under Habermas' three dialectic knowledge worlds (life, system and emancipatory). Each topic has been the subject of more or (more often) less tourism enquiry but all of them and cognate areas have been under-served by the tourism academy. If we are to

Table 3. An Agenda for Hopeful Tourism

Neglected Ways of Knowing	Under-served Life Worlds	Under-served System Worlds	Under-served Emancipatory Worlds
Mind-body-spirit holism	Gendered experiences & sexuality	Government	Public good
Indigenous & sacred learnings	Racial & ethnic minority experiences	Corporate worlds	Quality of life & fulfilment
Eastern philosophies	Indigenous peoples	Socio-economic elites	Peace & social justice
Multiple worlds	Class	Work & labour	Harmony & balance
Co-created knowledge	Disability & illness	Human rights	Integration
Philosophies	Children & young people	Social politics	Aesthetics & beauty
Emotion and embodiment	Older people	International systems	Mindful development
Values & ethics	Intergenerational encounters	Less economically developed countries	Tourism as co-transformation

build tourism knowledge which is more relevant to just and sustainable human and planetary development, we must question such hegemonic views of what are 'legitimate' and 'appropriate' ontologies and research topics.

Although an emergent perspective, hopeful tourism is already beginning to transform enquiry, education and practice. For example, scholars are engaging with disability and citizenship (Richards et al., 2010; Small & Darcy, 2010), older people and advocacy (Sedgley et al., 2010), justice and peace (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2010; Noy, in press; Pernecky, 2010), human rights (Cole & Eriksson, 2010), education and knowledge production (Caton, in press; Leopold, in press; Ren et al., 2010), inequality (Cole & Morgan, 2010) and destination reputation stewardship (Morgan et al., 2011). These and other scholars (more and less) associated with the academy of hope are confronting 'the opportunities and obligations inherent in intervening to foster change' (Mair, in press) and whilst some only embrace aspects of the hopeful tourism perspective, others hold close its tenets (Table 1). Table 4 illustrates how the perspective can shape research (from ontological- through to methods-level decisions) *and* produce specific, attainable transformative acts. In the example given here (condensed from Sedgley et al., 2010), hopeful tourism frames biographical research of tourism in later life and counters hegemonic objectivist, value-free, instrumental and performance-led market analyses.

Whilst hopeful tourism aims for co-transformation in and through enquiry and practice, it is important to recognise that it plays a role in the classroom and that learning and education are also transformative acts (e.g., hooks, 2003; McLaren, Macrine, & Hill, 2010). Hopeful tourism seeks to engage democratic and emancipatory learning agendas, transforming the traditional hierarchical character of much pedagogic practice (Brookfield, 1995) and valuing multiple worlds and knowledge experiences in the classroom (Biggs & Tang, 2007). An increasing number of voices have criticised many western higher education institutions' failures to address social conscience, ethics, sustainability and concern for the world's disenfranchised populations in their curricula (Corbyn, 2008). This is particularly true in business schools, where much tourism scholarship and education occurs; thus Dunne and Harney's (2008) study of 2,300 leading research papers concludes that management academics have failed to engage with fundamental questions concerning wealth distribution, the environment, workers' rights, equality issues and business ethics, which could help provide answers to the very real and pressing problems our world faces.

This failure has continued despite the emergence of critical management studies which stress critique, promote ethical business practices and emphasize critically-based teaching and learning practices (Fulop, 2000). At the same time however, the teaching of tourism is maturing in universities and critical enquiry is beginning to impact on the field's teaching (Airey, 2008b; Stergious, Airey, & Riley, 2008). Such scholarship encourages researchers to reflect on their role in promoting education as personal transformation (Molesworth, Nixon, & Scullion, 2009) and to centralize student agency, empowerment and active

Table 4. An Exemplar of Co-Transformative Enquiry: Tourism and Ageing Research

Ontology	Humanistic co-created scholarship, which invites older people to represent themselves, so that it becomes empowering and transformative knowledge; recognizes the influence of overarching historical, economic and social power structures.
Epistemology	Subjectivist and co-created; moves away from reality-oriented enquiry predicated on external 'truth', towards understandings that we live in a world of socially constructed realities.
Nature of Knowledge	Conscious-raising, empowering, collaborative, emancipatory and transformative.
Values and Ethics	Value-led scholarship, ethics and respect for human dignity and multiple worlds intrinsic.
Methodology	Emancipatory, action-oriented, biographical or life story research; personalized accounts of tourism experiences in later life that embody emotion, agency and individuality.
Inquiry Aim	Achieve holistic understandings of tourism in later life; understand ageing from the inside, aiming not for certainty but to challenge assumptions and to hear and respect a multitude of voices.
Action	Champion a transformation in the nature, norms and values that characterize tourism's research approaches to older people; call for a new approach that actively engages older people in the research process, so that we hear their voices and recognize their perspectives.
Control	Participatory research that matters to older people themselves and which involves them in setting the research agenda and collecting and analyzing research material; partners bound by mutual reciprocity and emotional commitment.
Researcher Position	Advocacy scholarship that promotes the social inclusion, human dignity and human rights of older people; committed to transformative research which engages people, seeks to ameliorate their lives and attempts to involve them as partners in exploring their lived realities and opportunities to promote change.
Voice	Self-reflexive co-learner; positioned; passionate scholarship.
Research Training	Qualitative and quantitative, learns through active engagement, foregrounds the emotional dynamics of research relations.
Research Credibility	Trustworthiness, resonance, participative storying and the extent to which it makes possible new and meaningful interpretations of the social and political phenomena it investigates.
Research Dissemination	Challenges traditional research reporting and encourages participant involvement often through experimental writing and research dissemination techniques such as reflexive accounts, fiction and poetry and performance pieces including dramatic readings and plays.

Condensed from Sedgley et al. (2010).

participation (Angus, Cook, Evans, et al., 2001; Hyman, 2000). For instance, projects such the Tourism Education Futures Initiative are concerned to build leadership capacity in the industry through education.

Recognizing the pressing need for the transformation of the tourism curriculum, the Tourism Education Futures Initiative is committed to building a values-based curriculum which can effectively create responsible leaders. Significantly such curricula would be imbued by a respect for diversity, experiential learning, creativity, emotional intelligence, good citizenship and openness (Sheldon, Fesenmaier, & Tribe, 2009).

CONCLUSION

In defining the tenets of the hopeful tourism perspective, this paper has sought to contribute to tourism's philosophical and ontological development. Such development is essential if we are to deepen our understandings of how we know the multiple worlds of tourism. As a field of academic enquiry tourism is exhibiting tremendous growth yet remains resistant to sustained philosophical entanglements and is fixated with market-focused and narrowly-defined empirical studies. Yet there have been calls for more philosophical engagement and reflexivity in the academy (see Tribe, 2009), calls which now assume greater urgency in the climate of crisis pervading the dominant world system. In our contemporary moment, the sole pursuit of instrumental tourism knowledge becomes less justifiable and we contend that hopeful tourism offers the academy an opportunity to participate in the creation of a more just and sustainable world. Over two thousand years ago Socrates (circa 469 BC–399 BC) advocated a society of critical thinkers and education which would enable people to develop a deeper, more coherent worldview. Yet arguably when the need for critical societies has never been greater, when the goal of creating reasonable and just societies has never been more pressing, when we should all 'value the importance of living an examined life', we continue to pursue narrow, vested interests. Above all, 'we think our thinking is fine' (Elder, 2010, pp. 39–40).

Our reflexive accounting of hopeful tourism demonstrates its success as a network. Only time will reveal how it will evolve as a perspective and whether more researchers will want to declare themselves as hopeful scholars. We have suggested an agenda which optimistically will resonate with researchers engaged in critical and interpretive practice *and* in the wider tourism academy. Tourism worlds are worlds of ugliness-beauty, pain-pleasure, toil-relaxation, poverty-luxury; fear-comfort, hate-love, sacredness-profanity, and despair-hope. Hopeful tourism requires an emotional exploration of *all* these worlds, of fear, ills, ugliness and exploitation as well as love and hope since emancipation cannot proceed without a deeper understanding of the conditions that make it necessary. Certainly, hopeful tourism does not pretend to be a finished product or a route map to social justice, to suggest as much would not only be extremely arrogant but would run counter to its ideals of open-ended engagement.

It does however represent an unfolding vision, a perspective, a way of knowing and a set of methods that aims for co-transformative learning

and syncretic growth. Issues of gender, race, and sexuality, class and (dis)ability provide substantive and analytical centrality in hopeful tourism and are crucial to how it understands the ways in which social relations structure institutions of power and our multiple, entwined tourism worlds. In highlighting key research omissions within the tourism knowledge canon, we have mapped a terrain for further knowledge-based critiques of social and institutional settings. Such critiques of these institutions could open up transformative possibilities across tourism's life, system and emancipatory worlds, possibilities which depend on co-created learning and the nurturing of reflexive and ethical practitioners.

Such an undertaking presents huge challenges. Our age is one which renounces love, hope and the transcendental. It is governed by the mundane; it is a time of lovelessness, of 'us' and 'them', of profit and loss, when we cut ourselves off from what makes us human, from our essence. It is a world which nullifies mutually sustaining, nurturing relationships and shuns beauty. Yet, our world does not merely ignore such relationships, it rails against them and so to even talk about them makes us vulnerable. For many these are not legitimate areas of enquiry for scholars and certainly not for tourism scholars who work in the Western scientific, rational tradition which has eschewed beauty and love. And yet surely to contemplate such things is the purpose of intellectuals? Of all people do not we have a duty to explore such issues? Much too often we turn away from philosophical issues. If hopeful tourism is to move from the margins to the centre of the field, hope, love and beauty must be integrated into the lexicon of tourism scholarship. Only then can we produce and sustain reciprocal relationships between ourselves, our students, our co-generators of knowledge and our world.

Beauty may be lost in a world where it is de rigour to mock it and reveal life as dirty and mundane (Scruton, 2009) but it is central to the tourist experience. Anyone who has held a loved one's hand, contemplated a fine sculpture, touched the cool stone of an ancient building, gazed upon a dazzling azure sea, listened in rapture to the call of seabirds or relished the taste of succulent food has experienced beauty; it is what many travel to experience. Tourism provides those privileged to travel with the luxury of time and escape. Time for individuals and families to reconnect and break away from everyday pressurized routines crammed with paid and unpaid duties. What we can experience and study in tourism—the transcendental, the sacred and the beautiful—those remarkable encounters which nourish our everyday and spiritual lives is what has been lost elsewhere in our contemporary world. Thus, through tourism it is possible to re-discover contemplative life, but only if we have the philosophical ambition and intellectual courage to do so. If we can fold hope, love, the sacred and the transcendental into tourism learning, then we can develop a broader philosophical understanding of how we know our multiple, entwined worlds. In this, maybe hopeful tourism enquiry has something unique to offer. A

REFERENCES

Abdallah, S., Thompson, S., Michaelson, J., Marks, N., & Steur, N. (2009). *The happy planet index 2.0*. London: New Economics Foundation.

Agathangelou, A. M., & Ling, L. H. M. (2009). *Transforming world politics: From empire to multiple worlds*. Oxford: Routledge.

Airey, D. (2008a). In search of a mature subject?. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education, 7*(2), 101–103.

Airey, D. (2008b). Tourism education: Life begins at 40. *Téoros, Printemps, 2008*, 27–32.

Alatas, S. H. (2000). Intellectual imperialism: Definition, traits and problems. *South Asia Journal of Social Science, 28*(1), 23–45.

Anderson, K., & Smith, S. J. (2001). Editorial: Emotional geographies. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 26*, 7–10.

Angus, T., Cook, I., Evans, J., et al. (2001). A manifesto for cyborg pedagogy. *International Research in Geographic and Environmental Education, 1*(2), 195–201.

Atelejevic, I. (2009). Transmodernity: Remaking our (tourism) World?. In J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical issues in tourism* (pp. 278–300). Bristol: Channel View.

Atelejevic, I., & Peeters, I. L. (2006). *Mapping the history and development of tourism studies*. Wageningen: University of Wageningen Working Paper, University of Wageningen.

Atelejevic, I., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (Eds.). (2007a). *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Atelejevic, I., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2007b). Editors' introduction: Promoting an academy of hope in tourism enquiry. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard, & Morgan (Eds.). *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 1–11). Oxford: Elsevier.

Atelejevic, I., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (Eds.). (in press). *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope*. London: Routledge.

Ateljevic, I., Harris, C., Wilson, E., & Collins, L. (2005). Getting 'entangled': Reflexivity and the 'critical turn' in tourism studies. *Tourism Recreation Research, 30*(2), 9–21.

Ayikoru, M., Tribe, J., & Airey, D. (2009). Reading tourism education: Neoliberalism unveiled. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(2), 191–221.

Best, S., & Kellner, D. (1997). *The postmodern turn*. New York: Guildford Publishing.

Bianchi, R. (2006). Tourism and the globalization of fear: Analyzing the politics of risk and (in)security in global travel. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 7*(1), 64–74.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (3rd ed.). Berkshire, UK: McGraw Hill/The Society for Research into Higher Education.

Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing ourselves from neocolonial domination in research: A Kaupapa Maori approach to creating knowledge. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 109–139). London: Sage.

Bondi, L., Davidson, J., & Smith, S. (2005). Introduction – Geography's emotional turn. In L. Bondi, J. Davidson, & S. Smith (Eds.), *Emotional geographies* (pp. 1–18). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Botterill, D. (2003). An autoethnographic narrative on tourism research epistemologies. *Society and Leisure, 26*(1), 97–110.

Botterill, D. (2007). A realist critique of the situated voice in tourism studies. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard, & Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 121–131). Oxford: Elsevier.

Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossy-Bass.

Caton, K. (in press). Thinking inside the box: Understanding discursive production and consumption in tourism. In I. Atelejevic, A. Pritchard, Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope*. London: Routledge.

Chambers, D. (2007). Interrogating the 'critical' in critical approaches to tourism research. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard, & N. Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 105–120). Oxford: Elsevier.

Clark, W. C., & Dickson, N. M. (2003). Sustainability science: The emerging research program. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 100*(14), 8059–8061.
Cole, S., & Morgan, N. (Eds.). (2010). *Tourism and inequality: Problems and prospects*. Oxford: Cabi.
Cole, S., & Eriksson, J. (2010). Tourism and human rights. In S. Cole & N. Morgan (Eds.), *Tourism and inequality: Problems and prospects* (pp. 107–125). Oxford: Cabi.
Corbyn, Z. (2008). Did poor teaching lead to crash? *Times Higher Education*, 25 September, p. 5.
Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage.
de Kadt, E. (1979). *Tourism: Passport to development?*. Oxford: Open University Press.
Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005a). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1–32). London: Sage.
Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005b). Part II: Paradigms and perspectives in contention. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 183–190). London: Sage.
Dunkley, R.A. (2007). *Collected tales of thanatourism experience*, unpublished University of Wales Institute, Cardiff PhD.
Dunne, S., & Harney, S. (2008). Speaking out: The responsibilities of management intellectuals: A survey. *Organization, 15*(2), 271–282.
Elder, L. (2010). Reason to live, *The Times Higher Education* 18–24 February, pp. 39–41.
Fox, K. (2006). Leisure and indigenous peoples. *Leisure Studies, 25*(4), 403–411.
Fulop, L. (2000). Practicing what you preach: Critical management studies and its teaching. *Organization, 9*(3), 428–436.
Ghisi, L. M. (2006). Transmodernity and transmodern tourism: A keynote presented at the 15th. *Nordic symposium in tourism and hospitality research: Visions of modern transmodern tourism*, Savonlinna, Finland, 19–22 October.
Ghisi, L. M. (2008). *The knowledge society: A breakthrough towards genuine sustainability*. India: Stone Hill Foundation.
Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Polity Press: Cambridge.
Goeldner, C. R. (2005). Reflections on the historic role of journals in shaping tourism knowledge. *The Journal of Tourism Studies, 16*(2), 44–51.
Habermas, J. (1987). *Theory of communicative action, Vol 2: Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
Hall, D., & Brown, F. (2006). *Tourism and welfare: Ethics, responsibility and sustainable well-being*. Wallingford: CABI.
Harrison, D. (2001). Introduction. In D. Harrison (Ed.), *Tourism in the less developed world: Issues and cases* (pp. 1–22). CABI: Oxford.
Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an ''industry'': The forgotten power of tourism as a social force. *Tourism Management, 27*, 1192–1208.
Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2008). Justice tourism: A pathway to alternative globalisation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 16*, 345–364.
Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2010). Justifying tourism: Justice through tourism. In S. Cole & N. Morgan (Eds.), *Tourism and inequality: Problems and prospects* (pp. 195–212). Oxford: Cabi.
Hill, G. (1992). *Masculine and feminine: The natural flow of opposites on the psyche*. Boston: Shambala.
Hollinshead, K. (2004). A primer in ontological craft. In J. Phillimore & L. Goodson (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies* (pp. 63–82). London: Routledge.
hooks, B. (2000). *All about love: New visions*. New York: Harper Collins.
hooks, B. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge.
Holling, C. S., & Gunderson, L. (Eds.). (2002). *Panarchy: Understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
Hyman, R. (2000). Research pedagogy and instrumental geography. *Antipode, 23*, 292–307.

Jamal, T., & Hollinshead, K. (2000). Tourism and the forbidden zone: The underserved power of qualitative research. *Tourism Management, 22*, 63–82.
Judith, A. (2006). *Waking the global heart: Humanity's rite of passage from the love of power to the power of love*. Santa Rosa, CA: Elite Books.
Kwan, M-P. (2007). Affecting geospatial technologies: Towards a feminist politics of emotion. *The Professional Geographer, 59*(1), 22–34.
Leopold, T. (in press). Critical thinking in the tourism curriculum. In I. Atelejevic, A. Pritchard, & Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope*. London: Routledge.
Lew, A. A., Hall, C. M., & Williams, A. M. (2004). *A companion to tourism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
McLaren, P., Macrine, S., & Hill, D. (Eds.). (2010). *Revolutionizing pedagogy: Educating for social justice within and beyond global neo-liberalism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Mair, H. (in press). The challenge of critical approaches to rural tourism studies and practice. In I. Atelejevic, A. Pritchard, & Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope*. London: Routledge.
Mair, H., & Reid, D. G. (2007). Leisure research and social change: A millennial state of the art, Leisure/Loisir. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Leisure Studies, 31*(2), 417–426.
Mannheim, K. (1993). Competition as a cultural phenomenon. In K. Wolff (Ed.), *From Karl Mannheim*. London: Transaction Books.
McNeill, W. H., & Arnold, J. (1989). *Toynbee: A life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Minnaert, L., Maitland, R., & Miller, G. (2006). Social tourism and its ethical foundations. *Tourism Culture & Communication, 7*(1), 7–17.
Minnaert, L., Maitland, R., & Miller, G. (2009). Tourism and social policy: The value of social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(2), 316–334.
Molesworth, M., Nixon, E., & Scullion, R. (2009). Having, being and higher education: the marketization of the university and the transformation of the student into consumer. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*(3), 277–287.
Morgan, N., & Pritchard, A. (1998). *Tourism promotion and power: Creating images, creating identities*. Chichester & New York: John Wiley & Sons.
Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., & Pride, R. (2011). Tourism places, brands and reputation management. In N. Morgan, A. Pritchard, & R. Pride (Eds.), *Destination brands: Managing place reputation* (3rd ed., pp. 3–19). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
Nash, D. (2007). *The study of tourism: Anthropological and sociological beginnings*. Oxford: Elsevier.
Noy, C. (in press). The political ends of tourism: Voices and narratives of Silwan/the City of David in Jerusalem. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard, & Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope*. London: Routledge.
Outhwaite, W. (1998). Naturalisms and antinaturalisms. In T. May & M. Williams (Eds.), *Knowing the social world* (pp. 22–36). Buckingham: Open University Press.
Peck, M. S. (1978). *The road less traveled: A new psychology of love, traditional values and spiritual growth*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
Pernecky, T. (2010). The being of tourism. *The Journal of Tourism and Peace Research, 1*(1), 1–15.
Phillimore, J., & Goodson, L. (Eds.). (2004). *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*. London: Routledge.
Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., Ateljevic, I., & Harris, C. (Eds.). (2007a). *Tourism & gender: Embodiment*. CABI, Oxford: Sensuality and Experience.
Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., Ateljevic, I., & Harris, C. (2007b). Editors' Introduction: tourism, gender, embodiment and experience. In A. Pritchard, N. Morgan, I. Ateljevic, & C. Harris (Eds.), *Tourism & gender: Embodiment* (pp. 1–12). CABI, Oxford: Sensuality and Experience.
Pritchard, A. (2000). *Tourism representation, space and the power perspective*, unpublished Manchester Metropolitan University Ph.D. thesis.

Pritchard, A. (2004). Gender and sexuality in tourism research. In A. Lew, C. M. Hall, & A. Williams (Eds.), *A tourism companion* (pp. 316–326). Oxford: Blackwell.
Pritchard, A. (2006). Guest editorial: Leisure voices: Getting engaged in dialogues, entanglements and conversations. *Leisure Studies, 25*(4), 373–377.
Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2000). Privileging the male gaze, gendered tourism landscapes. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*(3), 884–905.
Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2007). De-centring tourism's intellectual universe or traversing the dialogue between change and tradition. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard, & N. Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 11–28). Oxford: Elsevier.
Ray, P.H. (2002) The new political compass, online at <http://www.culturalcreatives.org/Library/docs/NewPoliticalCompassV73.pdf/> Accessed 02.03.10.
Ray, P. H., & Anderson, S. R. (2000). *Cultural creatives: How 50 million people are changing the world*. New York: Harmony Books.
Ren, C., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2010). Constructing tourism research: A critical enquiry. *The Annals of Tourism Research, 37*(4), 885–904.
Richards, V., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2010). (Re)Envisioning tourism and visual impairment. *The Annals of Tourism Research, 37*(4), 1097–1116.
Rifkin, J. (2005). *The European dream: How Europe's vision of the future is quietly eclipsing the american dream*. New York: Penguin Group.
Rifkin, J. (2009). *The empathetic civilization: The race to global consciousness in a world in crisis*. New York: Tarcher/Penguin.
Sardar, Z. (2004) Islam and the west in a transmodern world. Article on Contemporary Issues 18/08/2004. Online at. <http://www.islamonline.net/english/Contemporary/2002/05/article20.shtml/> Accessed 15.04.07.
Scott, J. (1998). Relationism, cubism, and reality: Beyond relativism. In T. May & M. Williams (Eds.), *Knowing the social world* (pp. 103–119). Buckingham: Open University Press.
Scruton, R. (2009). *Beauty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Seale, C. (1998). Introduction. In C. Seale (Ed.), *Researching society and culture* (pp. 1–5). London: Sage.
Seale, C. (1999). *The quality of qualitative research*. London: Sage.
Sedgley, D., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2010). Tourism and ageing: A transformative research agenda. *The Annals of Tourism Research*, <http://dx.doi.org/>; doi:10.1016/j.annals.2010.09.002.
Sedgley, D., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2007). Insights into older women's leisure: Voices from urban South Wales. *World Leisure Journal, 49*(3), 129–141.
Sheldon, P., Fesenmaier, D. R., & Tribe, J. (2009). The tourism education futures initiative. *e-Review of Tourism Research (eRTR), 7*(3), 39–44.
Sheldrake, R. (1991). *The rebirth of nature: The greening of science and gods*. New York: Bantam.
Small, J., & Darcy, S. (2010). Tourism, disability and mobility. In S. Cole & N. Morgan (Eds.), *Tourism and inequality: Problems and prospects* (pp. 1–21). Oxford: Cabi.
Steinem, G. (1993). *Revolution from within*. USA: Gloria Steinem.
Stephenson, M. (2006). Travel and the 'freedom of movement': Racialised encounters and experiences amongst ethnic minority tourists in the EU. *Mobilities, 1*(2), 285–306.
Stergious, D., Airey, D., & Riley, M. (2008). Making sense of tourism teaching. *Annals of Tourism Research, 35*(3), 631–649.
Swain, M. (2004). (Dis)embodied experience and power dynamics in tourism research. In J. Phillimore & L. Goodson (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies* (pp. 102–118). London: Routledge.
Swain, M. (2007). Foreword. In A. Pritchard, N. Morgan, I. Ateljevic, & C. Harris (Eds.), *Tourism and gender: Embodiment, sensuality and experience* (pp. xi). Oxford: CABI.
Tribe, J. (2002). Education for ethical tourism action. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 10*(4), 309–324.

Tribe, J. (2004). Knowing about tourism: Epistemological issues. In J. Phillimore & L. Goodson (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies* (pp. 46–62). London: Routledge.
Tribe, J. (2006). The truth about tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 33*(2), 360–381.
Tribe, J. (2009). Philosophical issues in tourism. In J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical issues in tourism* (pp. 3–25). Bristol: Channel View.
Tribe, J. (2010). Tribes, territories and networks in the tourism academy. *Annals of Tourism Research, 37*(1), 7–33.
Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2005). On tricky ground: Researching the native in the age of uncertainty. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 85–109). London: Sage.
Westwood, S., Morgan, N., & Pritchard, A. (2006). Situation, participation and reflexivity in tourism research: Furthering interpretative approaches to tourism enquiry. *Tourism Recreation Research, 31*(2), 33–44.
Xiao, H., & Smith, S. (2006). The making of tourism research: insights from a social sciences journal. *Annals of Tourism Research, 33*(2), 490–507.
Xiao, H., & Smith, S. (2007). The use of tourism knowledge: Research propositions. *Annals of Tourism Research, 34*(2), 310–331.

4 March 2010. Final version 10 January 2011. Accepted 12 January 2011. Refereed anonymously. ***Coordinating Editor: Pauline Joy Sheldon***