DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/109830415X14483038034083
E-ISSN 1943-4146
www.cognizantcommunication.com

DIASPORAS DISENTANGLED: THE CULTIVATION OF AN OPEN/SPIRAL IMAGINATION IN TOURISM STUDIES

MILKA IVANOVA AND KEITH HOLLINSHEAD

Department of Marketing, Tourism and Hospitality, University of Bedfordshire, Luton, Bedfordshire, UK

This companion article by Ivanova and Hollinshead seeks to show how "the changing same of the diasporic imaginal" (after Leroi Jones, via Gilroy) often conceivably constitutes "a wicked problem" (after Brown, Harris, and Russell) that is often so complex in its characteristics that hard and fast definitions about it (and solutions for its problematics) are not easy to conjure up. Thus, in order to monitor how ethnic, cultural, and historic codes are switched and hybridized in and through the inconstant identifications of diasporic senses of inheritance and aspiration, this article endeavors to show how transdisciplinary lines of inspection may prove useful. Taken in tandem with the previous article by Hollinshead, the two dovetailed articles thereby comprise no tributary celebration of the purity of ethnic or national culture, but one that indeed demands a high degree of open interpretive imagination if such matters of ambivalence and ambiguity are to be gradually and meaningfully deciphered.

Key words: Transdisciplinarity; Open transdisciplinarity; Preformulated knowledge; Conjoint knowledge/coherent knowledge; Wicked problem; Ontological commitment; Imaginative inquiry; Critical tourism studies

Introduction

This article is the second of two companion articles on the subject of interpreting the complexities of diasporic identifications today vis-à-vis tourism/travel/Tourism Studies. In the first of the two companion articles (by Hollinshead), an attempt was made to account for the importance of diasporic identifications to our understanding of tourism and the social/cultural/political mobilities of things across the contemporary world. In the first article, diasporic phenomena were situated in various performative subject positions in our contemporary still-colonial (?)/postcolonial (?) moment, and the inherent difficulties involved in tracing the variform and often nonconformist or recusant character of diasporic ties and hailings (i.e., the claimed longings and felt belongings) were recognized. Thereafter, a number of "old imprints" and "new inscriptions" were acknowledged, which are useful in mapping and monitoring the who, what, where, when, why, which, and how of diasporic affiliation

Address correspondence to Dr. Milka Ivanova at her current address: Events, Tourism and Hospitality, Carnegie Faculty, Leeds Beckett University, Headingley Campus, Leeds LS6 3QS, UK. Tel: +44(0) 113-8123599, ext. 23599; E-mail: m.ivanova@leedsbeckett.ack.uk

across our throbbing contemporary universe (or rather, "multiverse"). To these ends, the often mercurial and transgressive forces of diasporic connectivity and diasporic disconnectivity to "the public" and "the counterpublic" realms of our present-day world were pointedly acknowledged.

In this second of the two companion articles, an effort will now be made to find new and improved ways of delving into the identificatory minefield of such performative diasporic identifications today. To this end, particular advocacy will be given to inspecting the serviceability and agency of transdisciplinary lines of inquiry in decently interpreting the diasporic ties and the diasporic counteraspirations of our time. In this light, this article seeks to distil:

- the general role or merit of transdisciplinary forms of cognition;
- the potential use of transdisciplinary trajectories of inquiry to fathom the kinds of association and affiliation and the sorts of resistances and reactivities that crop up with or within diasporic aspiration, where they thereby might compose notably difficult or perfidious—or "wicked"—issues to audit or substantiate; and, thereafter,
- a short end-up recap will be provided to summarize the potential fit of transdisciplinary lines of analysis in coming to terms with the often polymorphous nature and protean character of diaspora identifications, notably where the reflectivity and reflexivity of emergent forms of transdisciplinary inquiry are becoming more commonly "open," increasingly "critical," and helpfully "imaginative" in operational probity.

The Role of Transdisciplinary Approaches in Inspecting Problematics in/Around Diaspora

In the first these two companion articles, it was recognized—notably through an examination of the work of Gilroy in Table 1 of that article—that diaspora are not such neat and discrete phenomenon as is generally assumed. We have learned from Gilroy (1997) that diasporic positions are best seen not so much as, for instance, *highly specific situations of territorial dislocation where singular invocations of ethnic identity and/or cultural nationalism are clearly discernible*, but rather (perhaps) *as difficult-to-read states of in-between-ness where many sorts of cultural mutation and restless discontinuity/continuity transpire.* It is now opportune to inspect the worth of transdisciplinary approaches in gauging these rich and deep problematics.

The General Value of Transdisciplinary Approaches

Transdisciplinary approaches are being considered as useful and productive means of examining diasporic matters because they tend to be

Table 1
The Philosophical Commitments of the Open and Critical Transdisciplinary Researcher

The commitment to provisory knowledge

The open and critical transdisciplinary inquirer accepts that (given the consequences of the complexity of the world and our inability to include everything in our system of inquiry) gained knowledge is inevitably:

- **partial**: we cannot ever know everything there is to know about the world;
- **plural**: we find ourselves living and thinking within historically situated cultures, which govern the purposes, the values, and the interests that shape the nature and processes of our inquiry and thereby influence the kind of "knowledge" that is generated, thereby resulting in the potential for a multiplicity of ways of seeing/interpreting/"knowing" things;
- **provisional**: as a consequence of the partiality and plurality of our ways of knowing, all knowledge is incomplete and fallible, and ought thereby remain "open to revision and improvement."

The ontological commitment

The open and critical transdisciplinary inquirer works within a view about the nature of the world that is:

- **open**: where the nature of the world is believed to exist as an unfolding dynamic and a heterogeneous complexity, which stands in stark contrast to a closed systems view of the world;
- **realist**: where the world is seen to exist independently of what I may think about it, thus providing one of the standards against which the reliability of knowledge may be assessed;
- **amplified**: where an expanded view of what counts as "real" is adopted—inclusive of both physical and cultural things as a legitimate focus of inquiry. This facilitates transdisciplinary inquiry of and into the relations between human cultures and their environments.

Source: Adapted from Russell (2010, pp. 39, 48).

more fruitful than other "disciplinary spectrum" approaches in handling complex social, cultural, and multiperspectival matters. While no comprehensive account of the history and meaning of *transdisciplinary* has ever been produced, and while no absolute or universally accepted definition of the term has ever been generated, a number of broad principles have been generally accepted to distinguish transdisciplinary lines of analysis, which render it utilitarian for the ambivalences and the ambiguities of investigation into diaspora. A number of these principles initially (drawn from a literature review carried out by Lawrence, 2010) will now be briefly distilled vis-à-vis the protean characteristics of diasporic self-making, as given in Table 1 of the previous article.

First, transdisciplinary approaches tend to resist (relatively speaking) the fragmentation of knowledge (Somerville & Rapport 2000), and are relatively responsive when the identifications significations, on aspirations involved are drawn from heterogenous rather than homogenous entities, which is thus advantageous, for instance, when diasporic outlooks on self and society are inclined to be *difficult to read* and *imaginative* in their conceptualization, where it is not easy to know up front which sorts of knowledge regimes and disciplinary domains will be directly suited to the involved critique as was stated in the companion article by Hollinshead.

Second, transdisciplinary approaches tend to be relatively flexible and therefore useful when a particular arena of knowledge construction is hybrid in form with strong nonlinear and reflexive characteristics that often render it poor in the fit with singular within-discipline traditional lines of critique (Balsiger, 2004). This is advantageous, for instance, when diasporic outlooks on self and society are inclined to be *antinational* (i.e., against the normal grain) and *gelling* (i.e., adhesive in fresh or previously unencountered ways*)*—again, as signified in the companion article.

Third, transdisciplinary approaches tend to be relatively pliant where as-yet-uncertain "local" contextual orientations have to be uncovered and where setting specific or milieu specific have to be fathomed (Thompson Klein, 2004). This is advantageous, for instance, when diasporic outlooks on self and society are inclined to lack fixity and otherwise to be *negotiated* or *emergent* in ways that have not been distinctly predictable before along known trajectories—as per the companion article.

Fourth, transdisciplinary approaches tend to be relatively accommodating when the target understandings are intersubjective and result from some form of practical or survivalist forms of reasoning that a group, community, or mix or organization had been forced or driven into (Deprés, Brais, & Avellan, 2004). This is advantageous, for instance, when diasporic outlooks on self and society are inclined to be *corrective* towards established ways of behaving or even transgressive towards previously normalized thought lines/naturalized action lines—as posited in the companion article.

Fifth, transdisciplinary approaches tend to be relatively tractable when the phenomenon in question requires a close and prolonged period of inspection from a range of different vantage points, notably where those subsequent angles or areas of sustained inspection may not be relatively knowable up front (Horlick-Jones & Sime, 2004). This is advantageous, for instance, when diasporic outlooks on self and society are inclined to be *transcultural* (i.e., osmotic towards a number of different cultural inheritances on "locations") and *promissory* other than culturally stable and/or cosmologically steadfast—as the companion article by Hollinshead suggested.

In order to understand what can conceivably be gained from adopting transdisciplinary lines of inquiry, it is helpful to consider how *transdisciplinary* modes of investigation differ from *interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary* ones. In some senses, there are no significant differences between the three modes, and some observers deem them to be "complementary" rather than "mutually exclusive" lines of inspection (Lawrence, 2010, p. 21). But to some other commentators—and in certain important regards—*transdisciplinary* lines of critique are rather distinct from interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary ones. To Somerville and Rapport (2000), the term "interdisciplinarity" ought to be reserved for those forms of research where a number of scientific disciplines are brought together, while the term "transdisciplinarity" ought to be reserved for those processes where scientific lines of scrutiny are conjoined with professional and/or nonacademic understandings.

Bruce, Lyall, Tait, and Williams (2004) suggest that "multidisciplinary" research is that form of inquiry

where a number of disciplines come together to look at an issue, but do so from self-contained outlooks, "interdisciplinary" research is that where a number of disciplines are integrated in some unifying fashion to look at "it." In contrast, for "transdisciplinary" research to be bona fide (to Bruce et al.), when those disciplines (and those professional/nonacademic bodies) are brought together the line of inspection is decidedly not arranged around a set of given disciplinary trajectories or a priori subjects, but is schemed up contextually around a number of emergent or salient domains of interest that arise within the contexts being explored, and there is a strong effort to cross (i.e., to "trans") the borders of established avenues of inquiry "there and then." Where these emergent angles of inspection and the involved domains of inquiry are particularly flexible and where multiple constructions of knowledge are countenanced within and between multiple worldviews, open forms of transdisciplinarity (viz., *open transdisciplinarity)* is said to have emerged (Lawrence, 2010).

It is important to realize that as a principle, multidisciplinary lines of inspection are generally felt to remain "still disciplinary but loosely collective" in style, interdisciplinary ones are generally felt to be "mixed" ones, while transdisciplinary ones are seen to be "fused" endeavors. Thus, to Ramadier (2004), while both multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary inspections tend to project different types of *unified* but still *preformulated* knowledges, transdisciplinary inspections tend to generate (when successful!) *conjoint* or *coherent* forms of knowledge that stretch beyond the unity of held worldviews to some form of "transcendence" beyond them. For the sincere transdisciplinarian researcher, therefore, the sovereignty of start-up disciplines is not a sanctified matter, and he/she is often fired up by the opportunity of working not only "with" but "deep inside" other professional, lay, and nonacademic diagnoses to be able to generate a fresh form of collective awareness and collaborative insight. Thus, while the *multidisciplinarian* might be a specialist researcher who has joined others but effectively remains within his/her own discipline, and while the *interdisciplinarian* is a team researcher who brings his/her trusted conceptualizations to bear on the mutually agreed "subject," the *transdisciplinary* researcher is one who is more committed to the dynamic cross-fertilization of a diversity of contributory approaches as enlarged visions of that original subject are sought, and as newly synergized and enriched vantage points are developed. In all of these efforts, the genuine transdisciplinary researcher may be said to be one that is conscious of the perfidities of disciplinary expertise, is welcoming towards "tacit" or "lived world" forms of knowledge, and is fast-ready to engage in the coalecive deconstruction of assumed (i.e., preassumed) understandings.

Thus transdisciplinarity is the effort to generate understanding that crisscrosses disciplines, goes between, beyond and outside of disciplines, thereby traversing the possibilities of understanding from many or all disciplines (Hollinshead & Ivanova, 2013) "and points toward our potential to think in terms of frameworks, concepts, techniques, and vocabulary that we have not yet imagined" (Buckler, 2004, p. 2).

In this light, thereby the transdisciplinary researcher tends to be a knowledge-searcher or knowledge-constructor who recognizes that knowledge generation is itself embedded in social contexts, and that inquiry cannot fall back on facts and logic that exist in isolation from the historically and culturally produced values that exist within a found setting or that actually generate the research act (Russell, 2010, p. 39). Please refer to Table 1 here for an explanation of the main philosophical obligations of *the open critical transdisciplinarian*—in terms of his/her "ontological commitments" according to Russell (2010). Space limitations (within this article) prevent the coverage of the matching epistemological and ethical commitments that routinely apply to the open and critical transdisciplinary researcher—they may be viewed in Russell (2010). (For novitiate researchers in the social sciences, matters of ontology tend to address those matters of being and becoming that routinely belong to or characterize a specific population or held cosmology, while matters of epistemology tend to address those matters of knowing and justification that are routinely deployed by a specific group/people, or are supported within a specific institution or cosmological order.)

The Specific Merit in Deploying Transdisciplinary Approaches: Diasporic Issues as "Wicked Problems"

In recent social science classification, "wicked problems" are not seen to be those matters or

activities that are morally unsound or ethically unacceptable—as one might first suspect—rather they are concerns that have been found to be highly difficult to deal with via current means of problem solving. Wicked problems are thereby issues with which existing methodological or disciplinary approaches have had little success, and for which there are many involved and resistant or seemingly intractable factors. Indeed, while elements of the examined situation (i.e., of "the problem") might appear to be solvable via established or traditional pathways to understanding, that wicked problem is often one characterized by paradox: for instance, in terms of diaspora, the displaced population hails from country X but does not support the government, the religion, or the cultural practices now in power or in vogue "there" in nation X. In this light, established lines of attack at the problem have often tended to focus on singular and narrow definitions of the said issue, where in fact the problem is a wicked one because that scenario has many involved community groups, and is overseen or witnessed by many different sanctioning or grandstanding bodies. Thus, wicked problems tend to be issues that readily afford multiple worldviews and they are inclined to generate multiple (and often conflicting, inconsistent, or seemingly self-contradictory) ways of constructing knowledge.

Moreover, the complex and multidimensional nature of wicked problems makes it highly unlikely that the many interests involved would be easily willing to work together without an open ended and collective framework that imaginatively includes such multiple ways of constructing knowledge: a wicked problem in itself (V. A. Brown, Deane, Harris, & Russell, 2010). For instance, in terms of diaspora, a cooperation between the displaced population from country X, the destination country Y, the origin country X (plus all the countries between country X and country Y) might be needed when multiple barriers to earnest dialogue make such cooperation immensely difficult.

Table 2 is provided to give an indication of the common characteristics of "wicked problems" (as originally listed by Rittel & Webber, 1973). Each of eight key cardinal characteristics (as synthesized by V. A. Brown, 2010a, from those initial thoughtlines of Rittel & Webber) are now illustrated here in terms of the difficulties occasioned by the need to deal with a dislocated and deterritorialized (but supposedly "intact") diasporic population. The eight lead proclivities of *wicked problems* are:

- **the evasion of clear definition**: diasporic populations are rarely intact, unified, and homogenous;
- **the suspected multicausality**: the reasons for dislocations and deteritorializations are numerous and contextual to diasporic populations, they are complex, multilayered, and emergent;
- **the feared subsequent spiral of unforeseen consequences**: diasporic populations can have subversive and transgressive connectivities and disconnectivities to their adopted countries;
- **the sheer unfixity and mobility of the issue at hand**: diasporic populations are often restless, making and remaking identifies caught in the influx between new and old countries;
- **the expected necessity of and for different/multiple/partial solutions**: the heterogenic (the term here is used in its generic meaning of "composed of dissimilar parts") nature of diasporas necessitates equally heterogenic solutions;
- **the social/cultural/political complexity of the matter being examined**: diasporic populations live in states of hybridity caught between the realities of their new countries and the memories, links, and milieus of their "homelands";
- **the multiplicity of different organizational mandates and differing institutional responsibilities that surround the subject or arena in question**: different institutions and originations across many different sectors have interests, deal with, operate on behalf of disaporic populations;
- **the envisaged likelihood that found remedies will be fiercely opposed or completely ignored by significant players or populations**: diasporic populations do not have singular identity, problems, and needs that can be easily addressed to common satisfaction.

Researchers in the nation of residence, researchers in the nation of origin, and even researchers within the diasporic community itself may have all have significant difficulties reading the unstable identifications and the fast new mobilities involved. To Pant (2009), such knowledge divides or such conceptual misrepresentations can occur for a myriad number of reasons. Ontologically,

Table 2
The Wicked Problem of Cultural and Communal Belonging in Times of Dislocation and Deterritorialization

Key Characteristics of Wicked Problems, According to Brown	Common Place Diasporic Issues as Wicked Problems
Wicked problems **evade clear definition**. They have multiple interpretations from multiple interests, with no one version verifiable as right or wrong.	In some senses the examined diasporic population may exhibit strong loyalties to a territory of origin, strong affinities with a new nation of residence, yet, also strong aspirations towards a new future seemingly unconnected with either such identifications.
Wicked problems are **multicasual with many interdependencies**, thereby involving trade-offs between conflicting goals.	A found diasporic population may have members who are loyal to a nation of origin but *not* to the government in power there, and coterminously these members may be happy to live elsewhere (in a difference country) but *not* be happy with the government in power there too!
Attempts to address wicked problems often lead to **unforeseen consequences** elsewhere, creating a continuing spiral of change.	The government of a country where a particular diasporic population have settled may try to solve "the problem" caused by their presence or anomie there by working with leaders from diasporic people who are *not* acceptable to many of the individuals from it, which gives rise to fresh/accelerating conflict within that diasporic population within that new locale.
Wicked problems are often **not stable**. Problem solvers are forced to focus on a moving target.	When seeking to represent "their diasporic community" as a distinct and proud people in exile (through tourism, for instance), the established leaders of that diasporic population work with longstanding symbols and cherished icons that the younger or later-exiled members of that diasporic population do *not* recognize/identify with.
Wicked problems can have **no single solution**. Since there is no definitive stable problem, there can be no definitive resolution.	When attempting to deal with a diasporic population newly found in its midst, the government of a territory seeks to deal with "the problem" in economic terms, yet the diasporic population may itself be much more concerned about (for instance) spiritual or educational concerns which that government is *not* so sensitive to.
Wicked problems are **socially complex**. Their social complexity baffles many management approaches.	The leaders of a diasporic population "abroad" may endeavor to solve the seeming problem of "their" listless youth (i.e., their own youngsters) in terms of inherited cultural warrants that have been associated with that ethnic group or that destabilized community for many centuries, but where that "listless youth" may have been influenced heavily by many new (entirely different) motives that have come to them through osmosis—i.e., through recent process of globalization—and that do not closely tally with those received cultural warrants from yesteryear.
Wicked problems rarely sit conveniently within any one person, discipline, or organization, making it **difficult to position responsibility.**	The diasporic community within a new nation-of-residence is assumed to be "one distinct population" by the government or media of that recipient nation, but actually consists of several contesting factions who do not agree about esteemed inheritances, and who are *also* contending with the leaders of that same diasporic community who are now resident in yet another (neighboring) country! A potpourri of articulate (but contrapose) champions of culture-hood thereby emerges within that spreadeagled diaspora.
Resolution of wicked problems necessarily involves changes in personal and social behavior, **changes that may be strongly resisted or encouraged**, according to circumstances.	The leaders of a diasporic population (abroad) may wish to impose strict religious, ethnic, or elitist versions of history/heritage/cultural practice upon "their" diasporic people, many of whom have actually fled their old ancestral country to escape those restrictive "overnormalized" practices.

Source: Brown's (2010a, pp. 62/63) eight key characteristics, comprising a reduced synthesis of the work of Rittel and Webber (1973).

they may have a sociocultural origin (e.g., arising from unaligned North/South interpretations, resulting from ideological or political standpoints, stemming from socioeconomic conditions, issuing from racial/cultural differences, or otherwise being ethical in character). Epistemologically, they may have origins in terms of the decision-making processes that are used where there is a lack of fit between individualistic and communal/collective worldviews, or between (say) Western specialized institutional knowledge and non-Western holistic/spiritual reasoning. And all these potential misreadings or mal-interpretations of different or emergent populations may be compounded by overspecialized forms of academic inspection based on: differences in ways of objective/subjective framing;

differences in research practice/scholarly tradition; differences in disciplinary division or institutional classification; differences in empirical/interpretive style; and differences in governing theoretical design/interpretive practice (see V. A. Brown, 2008, following Kuhn, 1970).

Since many of these difficulties of specialization can be major, a rising tide of transdisciplinary researchers had arisen over the last several decades who wish to pursue more open and critical lines of inquiry in their efforts to construct and design research investigations that are sensitive to the many and contested worldview constructions that typically crop up over such scenarios. Such *open and critical transdisciplinary researchers* tend to reject the view that inquiry ought to be the preserve of singular and higher informed specialists in *safe academic space* where that scientific expertise seemingly resides, and they are inclined to want to develop admissive forms of inquiry that involve the asking of a litany of particular questions emanating from different starting points, which inspect supposed paradoxes from a range of viewpoints and which are pointedly reflexively transparent and operationally flexible about the stances adopted in terms of ethics, ontology, and epistemology (V. A. Brown, 2010a, p. 64). Such *open and critical transdisciplinary researchers* also tend to call for research spaces where "local," "communal," "situational," and "nonscientific"/"nonacademic" collaborative and "community auspiced" forms of knowing are explored (Moses & Knutsen, 2007).

Discussion: The Conduct of Open Critical, Imaginitive, Transdisciplinary Inquiry Vis-à-Vis Diaspora

In order to meaningfully and productively engage in inspecting a found wicked problem, V. A. Brown (2010b) suggests that the research team must seek synergy in its efforts by:

- accepting that multiple worldviews may indeed exist/indeed exist across the scenarios in question;
- recognizing that different sources of evidence will probably be needed to faithfully and substantially capture the different constructions of knowledge that are involved/pertinent/manifest in the examined settings;
- acknowledging that considerable interpretive effort will probably be revised to produce "a collective learning spiral" of synthesized interpretations from these multiple worldviews;
- condoning the fact that there are no singular ways in which the or any particular open critical inquiry can be moved towards transformative action of or for the examined problem.

Since the findings for "wicked problems" must often and inevitably be reported as being partial, uncertain, and open ended, the fit of the solution finding must unavoidably always be regarded as being contextual, dynamic, and still in process. With these considerations in mind, Table 3 offers a critique of 11 avenues of open, critical, transdisciplinary inquiry, which have been synthesized by V. A. Brown (2010b). Each of the 11 transdisciplinary approaches covered are accompanied by germane questions set within the arena of diaspora problematics. The 11 listed commonplace beachheads or ripe contexts for the strategic application of open/critical forms of transdisciplinary trajectories are:

- via social research theory;
- in situated research;
- through authentic research;
- via action research;
- through problem-based research;
- via pattern language research;
- in discovery research;
- through case-based research;
- under appreciative inquiry;
- via systems thinking; and,
- per collective social learning.

So Table 3 suggests that there is an infinity of new forms or research or styles of investigation that can be harnessed by the open/critical transdisciplinary team to pry into the affiliations, aspirations, and appropriations of diasporic populations. While an attempt has been made in Table 3 to situate Brown's thinking in terms of the issues and practices of interest to the diasporic settings and standpoints being explored in this special issue of *Tourism, Culture & Communication*, sadly no room is available for the 11 research scenarios to be pointedly illustrated in tourism/travel settings ipso facto.

Table 3

Strategies for the Conduct of Open, Critical, Transdisiplinary Inquiry: Candidate Approaches for Collective Research Into Diaspora

Social research theory turns a searchlight onto the research process itself. Bandura (1997) emphasizes the importance of observing and modeling the behaviors, attitudes, and emotional reactions of the self and others during the research process. Social research theory explains human behavior in terms of *continuous reciprocal interaction between intellectual, behavioral, and environmental influence*s. It holds that changes in mass human behavior can be identified from observing new behaviors in some. Social theory considers the ways in which the collective (the society) gives the individual the authority to act.
Inquiry into diaspora:
How does the diasporic population act differently in the new cultural and natural environment of the new territory it finds itself in?
How does the diasporic population act differently from the old cultural and natural environment of territory of origin?

Situated research (J. Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989) is a strategy in which the research is *contextual (*i.e., *embedded in its social and physical environment)*. In contrast with many other applied research activities, which often involve knowledge out of its context, situated research proposes that knowledge be considered in the settings and applications that would normally involve that knowledge. The more the inquiry is anchored in a context that is meaningful to the research participants, the more they will be motivated to act collectively to resolve their issues.
Inquiry into diaspora:
Can the diasporic population attend to their cherished religious/spiritual practices in the new urban (or rural) milieu in which they find themselves, within the new nation they have moved to?
Can the diasporic population easily maintain links to their cherished religious/spiritual practices in their territory of origin?

Authentic research is an extension of situated research in which researchers explore and construct concepts and relationships that involve *real-world problems and projects*. In authentic research, Herrington (2006) proposes that the inquiry reflects the way in which the knowledge will be used in real life. The research team is given across to multiple perspectives on social events and collaborates with the researched in the construction of the knowledge emerging from the research.
Inquiry into diaspora:
Is the diasporic population represented politically in their new domain: do its people have reasonable/meaningful access to the representational system there?
Is the diasporic population represented politically in their old domain: do its people have reasonable/meaningful access to the representation system there?

Action research (Bonwell & Eison, 1991) is a term applied to several paradigms and practices inspired by *critical social theory*. The researcher's role switches from an external observer to an active participant in and critic of the issue under investigation. Research questions are set by the community undertaking the action, often with the advice of the researchers. Action research practice can take the form of case studies, critical inquiry, action learning, participatory research, and collaborative action research. Distinctive elements of action research are the need to ensure clarity about the roles of researcher and researched, and to establish trust and mutual respect among all inquiry participants.
Inquiry into diaspora:
How is the diasporic population affected by the mechanics of "power" where they now reside: do they consider that they are strongly suppressed/subjugated/silenced in any substantial ways?
How is the diasporic population affected by the mechanics of "power" where they used to reside: do they consider that they are strongly suppressed/subjugated/silenced in any substantial ways?

Problem-based research (Savery & Duffy, 1995) addresses *challenging, open-ended, and usually complex problem*s, rather than following standardized research approaches. In problem-based research, there is an iterative process of assessing what is known about the problem, identifying what needs to be known, and collaborating on testing hypotheses developed in the light of the data that have been collected. Investigations into the interconnectedness and complexity of real-world problems encourage learning among the participants.
Inquiry into diaspora:
Do the diasporic people who have moved or migrated to different nations A+B+C suffer from the same governing biases or acts of discrimination from the original/mainstream inhabitants of those countries, and if so, can anything be done to alleviate those difficulties on a macroregional or international scale?
Do the diasporic people easily maintain links to their country of origin and if not, can anything be done to alleviate those difficulties on a macroregional or international scale?

Pattern language research is an approach developed for community-based urban design by Alexander (2003). Its application has extended to computer–human interaction (Kelly, 1963) and transformational social change (Brown, 2008; Schuler, 2008). The approach considers that *the recurring patterns of a complex issue* give a better representation of the issue than a linear inquiry. A pattern is made up of an issue, the social context of the issue, the core problem to be resolved, the forces impacting upon the problems, a solution, and examples of the solution in practice. According to Alexander, a good pattern can be recognized because it has life and a strong center.
Inquiry into diaspora:
Is the found tension that exists between the established leaders of a diasporic population and the later arriving people within it actually increasing in force, and if so, which particular issues are exacerbating those generational or en groupe gulfs, and are they the same issues that troubled the felt coherencies of diasporic population in previous centuries?
Are there tensions that exist between the diasporic population D in country A and dispaoric population D in country B, and are those tensions exacerbating by generational issues/issues from the territory of their origin/issues form their destination country?

(*continued*)

Table 3 (Continued)

Discovery research is founded upon the work of psychologists Piaget (1952), Bruner (1990), and Papert (1992), and is based on the idea that *exploring an issue for its own sake without predetermined answers* produces information that makes the solution more valid and viable. Team-based discovery research involves jointly interacting with the research environment, exploring and manipulating events, and examining controversies. This is not just fishing, but directed inquiry. Examples are the control of severe acute respiratory syndrome and predictions of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
Inquiry into diaspora:
Why indeed are people from a particular nation continuing to flee from it to several other countries in not only considerable but accelerating numbers?
Are there strong movements to return to the country of the diaspora's origin?

Case-based research focuses on one particular example of a topic or theme deemed worthy of inquiry. The theme may be abstract (race, gender, equality, finance, power relationships) or concrete (genetics, energy, water, incomes, crime rates). Any complex case study will need to address *the competing perspectives of the full range of interest groups* and so will involve identifying multiple constructions of knowledge and the conflicts of interests between them.
Inquiry into diaspora:
Should the diasporic population living in another territory be permitted to indulge openly/publically in cherished spiritual pursuits or religious funerary practices that the original/mainstream people of that area or country currently regard as "noisome"/"abhorrent"/"offensive"?
Does the diasporic population contribute to the abandonment of cherished religious/spiritual/cultural practices in their country of origin?

Appreciative inquiry seeks to achieve *the fullest possible sharing of academic resources, management opportunities, community activism, and individual leadership in positive change*. The distinction from collective thinking lies in its focus on within-organization change. While appreciative inquiry also enlarges the scope of both researchers and researched, and treats the two as partners in the enterprise, its origins in the fields of organizational management can limit its application in the wider agenda of social environmental change.
Inquiry into diaspora:
Is it possible for cultural/scientific/intellectual leaders of a particular diasporic population "P" today in territory "T" to be permitted to join or make use of the resources of powerful institution "I" that was actually established centuries ago by founders "F" who worked principally or in part to subdue/suppress/silence scientific/intellectual leaders of a particular diasporic population "P" and hence the cultural activities exhibited by (or thought to be exhibited by) it?
Are there strong/weak links between the scientific/intellectual leaders of a particular diasporic population "P" and the scientific/intellectual leaders of a particular diasporic population "P" in their country of origin "O"?

Systems thinking is inevitable in transdisciplinary inquiry, whether so titled or simply taken for granted. *A system is essentially a connected set of units that influence each other.* Inquiries formally identified as a systems approach range across many "positionalities" from the objective > the subjective > the involved > the engaged > the reciprocal > the mutual. Hard systems follow fixed rules with the parts distinct from one another. Evidence on "the system" is gathered by observation and measurement. Soft systems rely upon connections and units, which may be qualitative as well as quantitative, and the processes involved may be dynamic and unpredictable. Under systems thinking for soft systems, emphasis is placed on the gaining of evidence (i.e., interpretations) of the key relationships involved.
Inquiry into diaspora:
Ought the government of originating (and distant) country "O" be involved in the funding of involved/expensive/time-consumptive solution "S" by neighboring countries "N" + "E" + "I" to which the people of diaspora "D" have fled over recent centuries, and (if so) ought those reciprocal or reflexive payments be made on a combined (across the nations and across the issues aggregate) basis, on a country by country (disaggregated and geographic) basis, or otherwise on an proportionate (disaggregated and issue-by-issue) basis, and is this decision a matter for intergovernmental relations or rather a macroconcern that ought to be resolved by the United Nations?
What sort of influence do diaspora "D" have on their country of origin "O" and does the diaspora "D" contribute to solutions to problems in country "O"?

Collective social learning seeks to bring together the interest groups involved in a wicked problem, and to achieve synergies of and about the involved spiral(s) of knowledge involved or embedded "there." Participants are asked to answer questions on *their IDEALS* (what should be), *the FACTS* (what is), *their IDEAS* (what could be), and *their recommended ACTIONS* (what can be), with respect to the study focus, from their own perspective. The results [or *findings* [sic!.]] from any of the four stages will not be one right answer, the lowest common denominator, or a majority vote, but a synergy. The aim is for the strength of the diversity to produce collaborative, innovative ideas. Each social learning cycle is actually a step in a spiral since (here) human knowledge is held to be cumulative.
Inquiry into diaspora:
To what degree are the iconic or representational symbols cherished by diasporic population "D" within the new territory "T" (to which they have migrated) still disliked or still detested—on the back of the long run of history—by the indigenous or mainstream people ("I"/"M") of that territory: is it possible for the indigenous/mainstream population to grow to use limited, or even full, use of those important-to-"D" psychic emblems or projections, today?
To what degree are the iconic or representational symbols cherished by diasporic population "D" still cherished in country of origin "O"?

Source: These 11 potential strategies are reduced from Brown (2010b, pp. 107–110); the 11 diasporic applications are added.

But the recent rise in popularity of Critical Tourism Studies within the parental field of Tourism Studies [as evidenced by the staging—in Opatija, Croatia—of the sixth "C.T.S. (Critical Tourism Studies) International Conference] implies that something of a critical mass of C.T.S. thinkers is now alive within the domain. The open critical transdiciplinary researcher, especially one that is interested in the intersections of tourism and diaspora, may also want to examine the recent article by Wilson and Hollinshead (2015) that provides an overview of soft science approaches that meet the outlined philosophical obligations. They not only provide a critical and creative inspection of state of the art qualitative-cum-hermeneutic (the term is used in its more generic meaning) approaches, but discuss the difficult/uncertain "interpretive headwinds" that blow in problematic fashion around and of the often new/emergent approaches.

So there is research meat here for the increasing numbers of C.T.S. investigators to think into and act upon. Undoubtedly, there is much latent "wicked fun" that may be explored as the wicked diasporic issues that litter Tourism Studies are there to be inspected in their manifold guises. But dear C.T.S. researchers, do not try this open/critical transdisciplinary research at home, unless you have (first) a number of other ontologically committed researchers from other fields and demesnes to get "cross" with, and (second) copious stocks of imagination to spirally rely upon with them.

References

Alexander, C. (2003). *The nature of order*. Berkeley, CA: Centre for Environmental Structure.

Balsiger, P. (2004). Supradisciplinary research practices: History, objectives, and rationale. *Futures*, *36*(4), 407–421,

Bandura, S. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.

Bonwell, C. C., & Eison, J. A. (1991). *Active learning*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Melbourne, Australia.

Brown, J., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, *18*(1), 32–42.

Brown, V. A. (2008). *Leonardo's vision: A guide to collective thinking and action*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Brown, V. A. (2010a). Collective inquiry and its wicked problems. In V. A. Brown, J. A. Harris, & J. Y. Russell (Eds.), *Tackling wicked problems: Through the transdisciplinary imagination* (pp. 61–83). London: Earthscan.

Brown, V. A. (2010b). Conducting an imaginative transdisciplinary inquiry. In V. A. Brown, J. A. Harris, & J. Y. Russell (Eds.), *Tackling wicked problems: Through the transdisciplinary imagination* (pp. 103–114). London: Earthscan.

Brown, V. A., Deane, P. M., Harris, J. A., & Russell, J. Y. (2010). Towards a just and sustainable future. In V. A. Brown, J. A. Harris, & J. Y. Russell (Eds.), *Tackling wicked problems: Through the transdisciplinary imagination* (pp. 3–15). London: Earthscan.

Bruce, A., Lyall, C., Tait, J., & Williams, R. (2004). Interdisciplinary integration in Europe: The case of the fifth framework programme. *Futures*, *36*(4), 457–470.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Buckler, J. A. (2004). *Towards a new model of general education at Harvard college*. Retrieved from http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic733185.files/Buckler.pdf

Deprés, C., Brais, A., & Avellan, G. (2004). Inclusive participation in collaborative urban planning. *IAPS*, 18, 264.

Gilroy, P. (1997). Diapora and the detours of identity. In K. Woodward (Ed.), *Identity and difference* (pp. 299–346). London: Sage.

Herrington, J. (2006). *Authentic e-learning in higher education.* World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education, Chesapeake, VA.

Hollinshead, K., & Ivanova, M. (2013). The multilogical imagination: Tourism studies and the imperative for postdisciplinary knowing. In: G. Richards & M. Smith (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of cultural tourism* (pp. 53–62). London: Routlegde.

Horlick-Jones, T., & Sime, J. D. (2004). Living on the border: Knowledge, risk, and transdisciplinarity. *Futures*, *36*(4), 441–456.

Kelly, G. A. (1963). *Theory of personality*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lawrence, R. J. (2010). Beyond disciplinary confinement to imaginative transdisciplinarity. In V. A. Brown, J. A. Harris, & J. Y. Russell (Eds.), *Tackling wicked problems: Through the transdisciplinary imagination* (pp. 16–30). London: Earthscan.

Moses, J. W., & Knutsen, T. L. (2007). *Ways of knowing: Competing methodologies in social and political research.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pant, L. P. (2009). *Learning networks for bridging knowledge divides in international development* (IKM Working Paper). Bonn, Germany: European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes.

Papert, S. (1992). Epistemological pluralism and revaluation of the concrete. *Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, *11*(1), 20–35.

Piaget, J. (1952). *The origin of intelligence in children.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Ramadier, T. (2004). Transdisciplinarity and its challenges: The case of urban studies. *Futures*, *36*(4), 423–439.

Rittel, H., & Webber, M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, *4*, 155–169.

Russell, J. Y. (2010). A philosophical framework for an open and critical transdisciplinary inquiry. In V. A. Brown, J. A. Harris, & J. Y. Russell (Eds.). *Tackling wicked problems: Through the transdisciplinary imagination* (pp. 31–60). London: Earthscan.

Savery, J. R., & Duffy, T. M. (1995). Problem based learning. *Educational Technology*, *35*(5), 31–37.

Schuler, D. (2008). *Liberating voices: A pattern language for civic communication.* Boston: MIT Press.

Somerville, M. A., & Rapport, D. J. (2000). *Transdisciplinarity: Recreating integrated knowledge.* Middlesex, UK: House of Anansi Press.

Thompson Klein, J. (2004). Prospects for transdisciplinarity. *Futures*, *36*(4), 515–526.

Wilson, E., & Hollinshead, K. (2015). Qualitative tourism research: Opportunities in the emergent sciences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *54*, 30–47.