TITLE: Generation Tourism: Towards a Common Identity
AUTHORS: Sebastian Filep[a], Michael Hughes[b], Mary Mostafanezhad[a], Fiona Wheeler[c]

a) Otago University, New Zealand
b) Curtin University, Western Australia
c) University of Strathclyde, UK

1. Introduction

An important change in membership of tourism academe is unfolding. The generation of founding scholars, who established the field of tourism largely from single-disciplinary perspectives, are retiring (Dann, 2009). These scholars have contributed to theoretical and methodological innovation in the tourism field over the last few decades (Ren, Pritchard & Morgan, 2010). A new generation of tourism scholars have reached academic maturity and are ready to develop their own sense of identity within an increasingly competitive environment. According to Mannheim's (1952) seminal theory, a generation is a group of individuals of similar age whose members have experienced a noteworthy historical event within a set period of time. Generation Tourism, characterised by new and emerging scholars with degrees in tourism and a multidisciplinary educational background has recently emerged (Pearce, Filep and Ross, 2011). It is typified by relatively young scholars, holding multidisciplinary, phenomenon-centred and often applied degrees in tourism with little or no knowledge of core disciplines which have shaped tourism studies. This cohort of researchers would typically include both tourism scholars who have a multidisciplinary background and who maintain this more generalist perspective (classic Generation Tourism); and, tourism scholars who might start with a multidisciplinary background but who then gravitate towards a particular foundation discipline (representatives of Generation Tourism who become more specialised in their focus of research). In contrast, tourism scholars who have studied a single discipline as a major focus of undergraduate education (effectively a three to four year concentration on a particular way of viewing the world) are not part of Generation Tourism (Pearce et al, 2011).

Generation Tourism membership is growing and individuals in this cohort have successfully inhabited the academic corridors of many universities. While tourism scholarship will perhaps always be connected to its parent disciplines such as economics, psychology, sociology, anthropology and geography it seems the new generation of scholars seeks to find its own, unique place within academia (Tribe, 2010). Due to a lack of specific discipline training, there is uncertainty as to how a multidisciplinary Generation Tourism can constructively contribute to theoretical and methodological development. As a result, it appears that Generation Tourism scholars within many university tourism departments are struggling with issues of identity.

The purpose of this article is to start new conversations around the identity of Generation Tourism and its future in academia. The paper offers suggestions for how Generation Tourism could constructively contribute to the theoretical and methodological development and further the evolution of tourism knowledge to help build its identity. The problem this article addresses relates to what Mosca (1939) and Pareto (1935) named the *circulation of elites*, how new generations of scholars and their views on knowledge creation achieve ascendancy in ways that move on from existing paradigms and earlier cohorts of scholars. This article is especially aimed at emerging tourism scholars who seek to make novel contributions to this fragmented field, but find it increasingly difficult to find grounding in what is described as a remarkably inter, multi and transdisciplinary area of

1

enquiry (Echtner & Jamal 1997; Jamal & Hollinshead 2001; Tribe 1997; Tribe 2006; Tribe 2010).

As part of the Generation Tourism's identity formation, there is a need for refinement of theories and methodological approaches in tourism studies (Echtner & Jamal, 1997; Ren et al., 2010; Tribe, 2006, 2010). While we do not seek recognition as an academic discipline, we suggest that the legitimacy of the field depends on adopting some discipline-like qualities. These qualities are necessary for facilitating effective teaching, learning and research in a coherent way amongst scholars within the field of study (Ben-David & Zloczower, 1962; Echtner & Jamal, 1997; Leiper, 2000). For example, Echtner and Jamal (1997) list five key dimensions necessary for the evolution of tourism studies:

1) Generation of theoretical body of knowledge;
2) Use of diverse methodological approaches;
3) Theory and methodology clearly explicated;
4) Interdisciplinary focus;
5) Holistic, integrated research.

Over the past few decades, the progress of tourism studies toward these theoretical and methodological ideals has been limited. As a historical example, Dann, Nash and Pearce (1988) conducted a meta-analysis of theoretical and methodological trends in tourism and noted that theory building in the field had limited success at that time. Jafari (1990) also noted that development of a doctoral degree in tourism is very difficult due to the fragmentation of knowledge and methods in the field. Witt, Brooke and Buckley (1991) later suggested that a single theoretical underpinning in tourism studies is unrealistic and that tourism research is theoretically variegated and sometimes conflicting. Pearce's more recent review similarly illustrated tourism as still being a field of "conceptual weakness and fuzziness, a spread of topics and a lack of focus, a predominance of one-off atheoretical case studies and difficulties with access to quality large-scale data sources" (2004, p. 58). This lack of cohesiveness and organisation can create difficulties in working towards acceptance and functionality of tourism as an area of study. Recent observation also notes that tourism is a field of study lacking a cohesive theoretical basis that is yet to fully mature (Racherla & Clark, 2010; Xiao, Li & Lin 2011; Ye, Li & Law 2013).

Achieving the ideal of a common identity is also challenging owing to the tension among various academic tribes, territories and networks that make up tourism studies (Tribe, 2010). This is particularly evident between the social sciences and the business-oriented areas of tourism studies (Ren et al., 2010). As Pearce (2004) and Racherla and Clark (2010) suggest, the tension mainly comes from a lack of coordination (and perhaps respect) between disciplinary approaches in the field. Tribe (2010) asserts that tourism knowledge is divided into two distinct groups labelled T1 and T2. These refer to the distinct division between the social science of tourism (T1) and the business and management stream of tourism knowledge (T2). The two approaches tend to function as separate and distinct streams resulting in little assimilation of knowledge and methods. Scholars such as Racherla and Clark (2010), and Xiao et al. (2011), also note that while collaboration occurs in tourism research, it is clustered within areas of interest with little interaction between those groups. This lack of interaction may be the result of established tourism researchers having discipline-specific backgrounds (Ren et al., 2010). Indeed, the findings of Racherla and Clark (2010) show that the senior or most prominent researchers in tourism tend to have relatively restricted networks and, therefore, perhaps offer only a limited contribution to the evolution of cohesion in tourism studies. Racherla and Clark attribute this fragmentation to several possibilities including the fact that tourism studies is a relatively new and immature field of study and that the fragmentation is an outcome of different schools of thought still to be assimilated.

While this indiscipline of tourism (Echtner & Jamal 1997; Tribe 1997) still presents many challenges, we also believe that it equally presents opportunities for Generation Tourism to spearhead growing trends towards interdisciplinary research (Tribe 2010; Xiao et al., 2011). Indeed, rather than attempt to compartmentalise tourism into a distinct discipline per se, one of the main contributions of tourism to academia is precisely its indisciplinary nature. Yet, this indiscipline does not preclude tourism scholars from seeking out a collective identity.

To begin our conversation around the identity of Generation Tourism we outline five possible points of departure: 1) learning from historical developments in parent disciplines; 2) spearheading interdisciplinary scholarship; 3) working towards theoretical developments; 4) embracing mediating methodologies; and 5) forming tourism nodes and networks. Recognising these as starting points rather than final statements, we hope that this conversation will continue in other forums including publications, conference panels and through informal discussions. Our main argument that is woven throughout what follows is that tourism academia is at a critical juncture. It has become increasingly important that Generation Tourism begins to more clearly develop a focused identity for the sake of its position within academia and the generation's role in serving others: students, tourists, communities, business sectors, governments.

2. Learning from historical developments

Generation Tourism can learn from the historical development of academic disciplines to work towards a more organised and integrated identity (Kuhn, 1962). Oldnall (1995) and Leiper (2000) note that cohesive fields of study often develop from interdisciplinary origins using theory and knowledge drawn from so-called parent disciplines. Indeed, the field of tourism is not facing a unique situation in terms of its research, teaching and academic status. For example, the mid to late 19th century experienced the rapid development of new study areas in universities. Prior to this period, virtually all scholarly knowledge was contained within the fields of theology, philosophy, law and medicine (Ben-David & Zloczower, 1962; Schofer & Meyer, 2005). This expansion of study areas was at first tolerated and even welcomed by universities. Yet, by the end of the 19th century resistance to the introduction of *new sciences* set in. This was both in terms of acceptance as legitimate fields of study as well as the granting of discipline status, with more stringent requirements put in place. Engineering and the social sciences such as psychology experienced the most resistance. These areas consequently developed discipline-like characteristics in terms of organised knowledge, theory and methodologies using interdisciplinary sources, contributing to a coherent program of teaching and research. Significant resistance however continued from a political and organisational standpoint. The reasons for resistance to new areas of study related to traditionalism and inflexible organisational structures and thinking within universities (Ben-David & Zloczower, 1962). Yet over time, the discipline-like qualities of these new areas of study did eventually earn them recognition by universities as official disciplines (Schofer & Meyer, 2005). This type of debate is not a relic of history but an ongoing phenomenon (Powell, Malley, Muller-Wille, Calvert & Dupré, 2007; Soffer, 1982). For example, there have been recent arguments regarding the discipline status of systems engineering (Shenhar, 1994), nursing (Oldnall, 1995) and rural medical practice (Smith & Hays, 2004).

Achieving recognition of academic discipline status is arguably not essential for the creation of a cohesive and systematic approach to academic research and teaching in tourism. Adopting some discipline-like qualities however, is necessary for creating a cohesive identity (Echtner & Jamal, 1997; Leiper, 2000). Therefore, the generation could further develop

interdisciplinary scholarship, embrace theories applicable to tourism as an interdisciplinary field and build tourism research methods that will benefit our students, our research and Generation Tourism's position within academia.

3. Spearheading interdisciplinary scholarship

Given the historicity of tourism academia, the strength of the field is in its ability to facilitate research that spans business as well as the physical and social sciences. Tourism scholars have the advantage of a more holistic approach to their objects of study. Thus, they are uniquely positioned to spearhead interdisciplinary scholarship through a focus on multiple disciplinary perspectives. We suggest it is time to move beyond debates over a unified theory of tourism and instead embrace an identity of multiple and overlapping interdisciplinary theories (Cohen, 1988).

As tourism students learn early on, arguably three of the most contested concepts in the field are tourism, tourists and host community. Tourism scholarship is often premised on a conceptual model where scholars might examine different aspects of the tourist experience including motivations and perceptions, yet these concepts presuppose a certain uniformity. The definitions of the concepts are however unavoidably linked to context. Thus, it is the object of our study, tourism, that perhaps prevents anything but a multi-disciplinary perspective as tourism is a socially constructed category that involves myriad institutions and thus disciplinary perspectives.

Tourism scholars are well known for anthropomorphising tourism through implied statements of tourism's impacts on local economies, culture and social organisation. That is, tourism does not cause poverty, just as it does not make people rich. Tourism may be the effect of the decisions that people make regarding local development policies and business strategies that benefit and marginalise people differently (Castañeda 2012). For example, it would be inaccurate at best to say that clothing companies cause poverty. Rather, it is the unfair trade policies, inhumane production practices in free trade zone factories and the unequal distribution of wealth that causes poverty. What the stories of tourism impacts highlight are the implications of the broader global capitalist, and increasingly neoliberal political economic system. To argue that correlation equals causation is analytically incorrect and a core problem in the field (ibid). As a result of this kind of analysis, tourism scholars have a long tradition of working within an environment which has only served to undermine their efforts at advancing tourism theory more generally. Generation Tourism will therefore benefit from its multidisciplinary perspective to move toward more critical interdisciplinary explanations of the impacts of tourism (Castañeda 2012; Jafari 2005; Jamal & Hollinshead 2001; Pernecky 2012; Provinzano 2005; Ren, et al. 2010) which could gradually lead to post-disciplinary outlooks, or a direction beyond disciplines (Coles, Hall & Duval, 2006) as will be argued in the following section.

4. Working towards theoretical developments

Systematic theory building is an essential requirement for developing a cohesive identity as well as to overcome the fragmented nature of tourism academia. Theory building includes both inductive and deductive approaches that tend to occur as a cycle over time. Deductive theory building begins with a theory and related hypotheses followed by

information gathering to test the specific hypotheses. Inductive theory building is based on gathering information, which is then analysed and a hypothesis proposed (Bernard 2011). Gathering information to test hypotheses can lead to new propositions which are subsequently tested. The cycle can commence with information gathering leading to a hypothesis or with the proposition of hypotheses to be tested. In this way, a cohesive body of knowledge can be built over time based on consecutive generations of study (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007).

More than twenty years ago, Dann et al. (1988) claimed that the lack of theoretical progress in tourism appears to be partly the result of a failure to build on knowledge created by previous generations. Drawing from Rosnow (1981), Dann et al. suggested: "one might argue that all of this is in the nature of scientific inquiry, but at least one factor behind the chaos is the repeated failure by each cohort of researchers to build effectively and systematically on previous generations" (1988, p. 23). In other words, there was a disconnection between the inductive and deductive parts of the tourism theory building cycle. This disconnection may be partly a result of the poorly integrated collection of distinct knowledge and methods making up the field; the poor integration of knowledge remains a contemporary concern in the field (Tribe, 2010). Thus, in addition to building on the work of previous generations, Generation Tourism could identify and deal with strategies for connecting seemingly disparate areas of tourism knowledge as part of the contemporary theory building challenge. Few discussions have tried to integrate the varied worlds of tourism knowledge (T1 and T2 and other perspectives) and develop ideas for the evolution of tourism studies as a whole (Echtner & Jamal, 1997). The ability to systematically draw on theory from a range of disciplines may require both understanding of and respect for the various parent disciplines. It also might require an ability to effectively engage with a range of researchers from various disciplinary backgrounds. Harbouring discipline bias and, or lacking the motivation to build multidisciplinary research networks would arguably only work to stymie the evolution of tourism as a field of study. This inherent bias is seen in the way theory building criteria have been applied in tourism research. Some tourism scholars commonly use Blalock's (1967) three elements of theory building. This approach includes: specification of assumptions; specification of relationships among factors or variables; and articulation of propositions to integrate or predict outcomes. As previously shown by Dann et al. (1988) and through Pearce's (2004) analysis of theoretical developments in tourism, Blalock's elements have been widely accepted as useful for theory building in the field of tourism studies. Yet there are other ways of building theories (Dubin, 1969; Silverman, 1973) and, as implied by Echtner and Jamal (1997), many tourism scholars may prefer to work in alternative frameworks.

Generation Tourism's potential contribution to theoretical development and multi-paradigmatic perspectives on theory building could be further explored and debated. In the management field, for example, Gioia and Pitre (1990) proposed a multi-paradigm view on theory building. Acknowledging an exclusively correct perspective cannot exist (Bochner, 1985), Gioia and Pitre simply suggested that researchers "consider the set of theories relevant to a given topic from some viewpoint beyond that of an individual paradigm" (1990, p. 595). Although this idea was proposed more than two decades ago, few tourism scholars seem to have adopted such multi-paradigm perspectives in their research. The process of considering a set of theories or concepts relevant to a given tourism topic from multiple viewpoints and proposing interrelationships among those theories or concepts is part of relationship building (Gioia & Pitre, 1990).

Examples of relationship building in tourism studies include: recent work on actor network theory (Ren et al., 2010); past work on tourism typologies as suggested by Dann et al. (1988); papers which discuss the proposed discipline of tourismology (Comic, 1989;

Leiper, 1981, 2000) or works on tourism education values (e.g. Sheldon, 2008). The work on typologies, for instance, recognises that the tourist is a polymorphous consumer (e.g. Wickens, 2005). This literature shows that an understanding of the tourist experience requires relationship building, as evidenced by the construction of typologies. A typology in this context is essentially about how diverse images of tourists can be brought to a common ground and explained through overall tourist types, such as the drifter type and explorer type (Cohen, 1988).

Similarly, actor network theory describes how a "multiplicity of things, categories and rationales often conceived as divided are related as they are stitched together across divisions and distinctions" (Ren et al., 2010, p. 5). A detailed discussion of this literature is outside the scope of the paper. The examples of relationship building in the tourism literature however collectively demonstrate the important point that connections between units of tourism education, different groups of tourists or between other tourism variables are always bound by a common principle. The works bring together different elements of tourism into explanatory frameworks, typologies, networks or, in the case of tourismology, core values, ideals and themes that are deemed to represent tourism academia (Comic, 1989; Dann et al., 1988). Hence, further identification and development of the relationship building literature by Generation Tourism could address the issue raised some time ago by Dann et al. (1988) that tourism scholars need to build more effectively and systematically on previous generations and move away from dualism in tourism research (Pritchard & Morgan, 2007).

One of Generation Tourism's strengths is that it does not claim loyalty to a particular theoretical tradition. This ideally means it can engage in relationship building with greater ease than its predecessors. Consequently, Generation Tourism is well positioned to engage in theoretical developments in the field without implicit disciplinary biases. Arguably, scholars with a parent discipline might have an implicit bias in the way they solve tourism problems. Tribe's (2010) identification of the T1 and T2 streams of tourism studies affords a useful illustration. Research by Xiao et al (2011) also demonstrates distinct approaches to tourism research between discipline areas. While many in the social sciences may prefer a particular set of theories or methods, a different set may be preferred by those in business and economics. Both economists and social scientists may be appropriately addressing that given problem, but perhaps with an implicit disciplinary bias. As implied above, this bias may translate to the way theory building is viewed in tourism studies and further complicate the quest for theoretical development.

Our proposed relationship building theoretical initiatives are akin to a post-disciplinary outlook for tourism studies, that is a direction "which is more problem-focused, based on more flexible modes of knowledge production, plurality, synthesis and synergy (Coles et al., 2006, p.293) ". As Coles et al. (2006) and Visnovsky and Bianchi (2005) suggested, the post-disciplinary outlook does not mean that disciplines are irrelevant, but that it may no longer be possible to solve complex issues related to tourism from any single discipline due to implicit disciplinary biases. While a detailed discussion of prospects for the development of post-disciplinary scholarship of Generation Tourism is beyond the scope of the paper, we note this linkage for future discussions. In addition to the continued work towards the theoretical development however, Generation Tourism could further shape its identity by adopting mediating methodologies.

5. Embracing mediating methodologies

Methodologies play a core role in academic identities (e.g. anthropology and ethnographic methods). As such, it is important that Generation Tourism embraces a core set

of methodologies that are unique or specifically applied to tourism research. The theoretical relationship building process in tourism can be justified through mediating methodological philosophies such as critical realism (Hindess, 1996) and pragmatism (Powell, 2001). The term critical realism was coined by American philosopher Roy Wood Sellars. In an attempt to mediate between direct realism and idealism he stated that objects of perception are neither solely objects nor simply ideas (Drake et al., 1920). That is, no one theory can claim privilege as the right form of knowledge or approach to problem solving (Richardson, 2000). In a practical sense, this means a problem can be studied and, or solved through both positivist and relativist perspectives (Groff, 2004). Each approach provides partial illumination of the evidence and serves simply as one of many possible lenses through which tourism can be viewed and interpreted (Janesick, 2003)**.**

Applying these different approaches may also afford a type of triangulation leading to a more accurate representation of the problem and, or a better solution. This view relates to the critical approach to social science, as derived from the works of Marx, Kant, Hegel and Weber, and can be defined as "a critical process of inquiry that goes beyond surface illusions to uncover real structures in the material world" (Neuman, 2003, p. 81). Critical realism recognises and helps portray the messy, uncertain and fluid nature of reality where people and phenomena coexist in relations of force that are the basis of human existence (Hindess, 1996).

Critical realism suits the diverse field of tourism studies and the need for integration of different approaches to knowledge. It is a philosophy that could enable Generation Tourism to engage in relationship building as it allows researchers to solve problems from different perspectives and connect seemingly opposing views, thereby bridging the positivist and relativist divide. Although greater attention to critical realism in tourism studies has been advocated by some tourism scholars (Botterill, 2007; Gill, 2004) it does not appear to have been widely adopted.

Pragmatism contrasts with the dominant positivist and anti-positivist views of scientific discovery (Pansiri, 2005; Powell, 2001). Pragmatism is a philosophy (Aune, 1970) that emerged from discussions among predominantly American theorists (such as William James, Charles Sanders Peirce, Chauncey Wright and Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes) and is based on the reflections of Kantean/Fichte/Dilthy philosophical thought (Laughlin, 1995). According to Rorty, pragmatism is: "the claim that the function of inquiry is to relieve and benefit the condition of man - to make us happier by enabling us to cope more successfully with the physical environment and with each other" (1991, p. 27). Pragmatism, like critical realism, rejects the two extremes espoused by positivism and interpretivism. It argues that no theory in a social science world of tourism can satisfy the demands of objectivity, falsifiablity and experiment. It also rejects the view held by strict anti-positivists that virtually any theory would satisfy them. It rejects the quest for the ultimate truth or reality, but argues that the mandate of science is to facilitate problem solving as is the case with practical judgements. The objective is to gain an understanding in order to deal effectively with the problems (Pansiri, 2005; Powell, 2001).

Critical realism and pragmatism closely resemble the basic principle of relationship building necessary for the evolution of tourism knowledge. The basic premise of pragmatism, like critical realism, is that any research method has disadvantages and the choice of each individual method limits the conclusions that can be drawn (Scandura & Williams, 2000). They are based on the principle that dualities often considered diverse can be meshed together across methodological and theoretical divisions and traditions in tourism (Ren et al., 2010). Understanding these limitations and how various approaches may complement each other could contribute to the development of greater respect and integration between methodological approaches in tourism.

Hence, Generation Tourism is uniquely positioned to develop strong skills in mixed research methods. This development may involve championing triangulation and crystalisation. Triangulation is based on the assumption that there is a truth that can be defined based on establishing an intersection of various reference points (Janesick, 2003). Triangulation may involve answering the same research question using both qualitative and quantitative methods. Each method would uncover different aspects of the same research question. A related concept, specific to qualitative research, is crystalisation (Richardson, 2000). Like triangulation, crystalisation assumes multiple research methods can more effectively address a specific research problem than a single method. Unlike triangulation, however, crystalisation assumes that there can be no single truth or meaning. Instead there are many perspectives through which to view the world. A researcher cannot know something objectively but only through how they subjectively experience it. This is based on the notion that individual people will perceive a given circumstance or problem differently as meanings are determined partly by personal experience (Richardson, 2000). Thus, in research practice, crystalisation may involve addressing a research question through in depth interviews and written narratives. This task could provide a series of informative qualitative insights that lead researchers to develop new theoretical relationships and question old ones. This is an intuitive and insightful task which, as called for by Pearce (2004), may lead to more appropriate theoretical propositions and resembles the relationship building process. In adopting these approaches, representatives of Generation Tourism could become experts in triangulation, crystalisation, pragmatism or critical realism in a similar way that tourism scholars with expertise in anthropology have championed qualitative ethnographic methods.

Finally, the mobility of tourism scholars and their research is notable. Tourism researchers have a history of conducting research among mobile populations. The methods used to conduct these mobile ethnographies, surveys and observations are a quality that is perhaps most refined in tourism research. Generation Tourism may benefit by identifying with this mobile methodology as something that is unique to the field (Büscher, Urry & Witchger, 2010; Fincham, McGuinness & Murray 2001). Lastly, there is an opportunity for a tigher research collaboration among the members of the various groups, organisations, alliances and associations to furher shape the identity of the generation.

6. Forming tourism nodes and networks

Generation Tourism members are currently part of diverse doctoral, early career research or new and emerging networks but there is seemingly little communication and research collaboration among these diverse groups. The development of tourism as a more cohesive field of study partially relies on researchers forming functional, integrated, virtual and, or face-to-face communities to develop a more cohesive identity (Racherla & Clark, 2010). An international community of Generation Tourism scholars could engage in theory building workshops and methodological discussions via social media channels. This awareness of and fluency of technology use is well suited to Generation Tourism that has grown up with the Internet and instant global communication. Academic social media discussions are already beginning to be developed on sites such as LinkedIn, Facebook and Academia.edu. These kinds of networks could allow for a horizontal integration of generational scholarship, where emerging academics could collaborate and learn from each other through social media initiatives. The core principle of discussions at these networks would ideally be openness to various methodological styles in tourism and theoretical foundations which have shaped the field. This openness requires overcoming barriers such as that between Tribe's (2010) T1 and T2 aggregations of study and moving away from the

fuzziness and lack of cohesion observed by Pearce (2004). It also means overcoming the bias shown by many discipline-specific teachers and mentors while drawing on the various discipline-based theories and methodologies on which previous generations of tourism scholars are founded. To work toward this state of cohesion, Generation Tourism needs to have a core membership base, engage in learning projects, organise events and have strong leadership. The stated aim would be to evolve tourism studies towards an integrated and holistic field of study as envisioned in the past by Echtner and Jamal (1997) amongst others. The relationship building component forms a central aspect of this community. The notion of events and learning projects influencing the formative years of a generation could be examined empirically in the future. Through such organised initiatives, Generation Tourism could play an important role in contributing to the evolution of tourism academia and identity formation. Many tourism networks already exist where the topic of theory building can be debated. Nevertheless, new events and connectivity-related forums may benefit Generation Tourism scholars (Benckendorff, 2009). The more experienced senior scholars are generally from discipline-based generations of tourism research, perpetuating the segregation of tourism studies into its various methodological and theoretical divisions (Racherla & Clark, 2010).

7. Conclusions

In an effort to start new conversations around the possibilities for Generation Tourism to build a more focused identity, this paper has outlined five potential points of departure. These departure points are: learning from historical developments in parent disciplines, spearheading interdisciplinary scholarship, working towards theoretical developments, embracing mediating methodologies and forming tourism nodes and networks. In the future, it is feasible for tourism studies to develop discipline-like qualities as a conceptually diverse academic field (Biglan, 1973; Tribe, 2010) but also a more conceptually linked academic field in which scholars with tourism-focused educational backgrounds drive knowledge creation. Table 1 summarises our argument that the momentum for the development of tourism studies toward a more cohesive, integrated field is already here. The challenge of Generation Tourism is to build on and increase this momentum. The division of the table into the past (Dann et al., 1988; Jafari, 1990; Pearce, 2004; Racherla & Clark, 2010; Tribe, 1997, 2010; Witt et al., 1991), the present era (Pearce, 2004; Pritchard & Morgan, 2007; Ren et al., 2010) and the proposed future (Pearce et al., 2011) is grounded in the works discussed in this paper that analyse evolutionary trends in tourism studies. The aim of the table is to demonstrate that Generation Tourism scholars are equipped to deal with the complex issue of developing tourism knowledge across a diverse field of study.

* please insert Table 1 about here

A vision for the tourism scholarship of the future is proposed. Table 1 describes how relationship building initiatives might lead to changes in the academic field status, shaping the identity of the new scholars. Greater adoption of critical realism, pragmatism and similar mixed methodological philosophies will encourage greater acceptance and awareness of methodological traditions that have influenced tourism research. This could result in a more coherent and effective system of knowledge building as part of a functional inductive-deductive theory building cycle. We have however identified one core limitation of Table 1 in that it does not acknowledge those emerging tourism scholars who may continue to drive

the evolution of tourism studies but who are not representatives of Generation Tourism in a strict sense. There are two notable cohorts of such emerging non-Generation Tourism academics: emerging tourism scholars who will continue to have a single foundation discipline; and non-tourism emerging academics with various disciplinary backgrounds (including new disciplines such as Marketing) who periodically contribute to the theoretical development in the tourism field. An exploration of the relationships between representatives of these two groups of emerging scholars and Generation Tourism scholars and the mutual commitment to contribute to the evolution of the field are worthy of future considerations.

What makes Generation Tourism's story unique however is the opportunity to employ inter and multidisciplinary, phenomenon-centred educational and often 'atheoretical' background to its advantage. Without a disciplinary affiliation the generation could engage effectively in creative relationship building theoretical activities and question current assumptions in tourism studies. The questioning and re-examination of theoretical relationships is an insightful process which could lead to more rigorous theoretical developments in the field (Pearce 2004). Generation Tourism could therefore play an active role in embellishing current theoretical and methodological approaches in tourism academia while developing its identity and while building on the strong foundations of its predecessors.

8. References

Aune, B. (1970). *Rationalism, empiricism, and pragmatism: An introduction*. New York, NY: Random House.

Ben-David, J. & Zloczower, A. (1962). Universities and academic systems in modern societies. *European Journal of Sociology*, 3, 45-84.

Benckendorff, P. (2009). Themes and trends in Australian and New Zealand tourism research: A social network analysis of citations in two leading journals (1994-2007). *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management,* 16, 1-15.

Bernard, H.R. (2011). *Research Methods in Anthropology* (5th edn), Maryland, USA: AltaMira Press.

Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(3), 195-203.

Blalock, H. (1967). *Theory construction: From verbal to mathematical formulations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bochner, A. (1985). Perspectives on inquiry: Representation, conversation, and reflection. In M. L. Knapp & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (pp. 27-58). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Botterill, D. (2007). A realist critique of the situated voice in tourism studies. In A. Ateljevic & N. Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies – Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 119-129). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Büscher, M. , Urry,J. & Witchger,K. (Eds.) (2010).*Mobile Methods.* London: Routledge.

Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(3), 371-386.

Castañeda, Q. (2012).The Neoliberal Imperative of Tourism: Rights and Legitimization in the Unwto Global Code of Ethics For Tourism. *Practicing Anthropology* 34(3), 47-51.

Coles, T., Hall, M. C., & Duval, D. T. (2006). Tourism and post-disciplinary enquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(4–5), 293–319.

Comic, D. (1989). Tourism as a subject of philosophical reflection. *Revue de Tourisme*, 2, 6-13.

Dann, G. (2009). How international is the International Academy for the Study of Tourism? *Tourism Analysis*, 14(1), 3-13.

Dann, G., Nash, D., & Pearce, P. (1988). Methodology in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 15(1), 1-28.

Drake, D., Pratt, J. B., Rogers, A. K., Santayana, G., Sellars, R. W., Strong, C. A., et al. (1920). *Essays in critical realism*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Dubin, R. (1969). *Theory building*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Echtner, C. & Jamal, T. (1997). The disciplinary dilemma of tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 24(4), 868-883.

Eisenhardt, K. & Graebner, M. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25-32.

Fincham, B., McGuinness, M. & Murray, L. (Eds.) (2001).*Mobile Methodologies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gill, A. M. (2004). Tourism communities and growth management. In A. A. Lew, C. M. Hall & A. M. Williams (Eds.), *A companion to tourism* (pp. 569-583). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Gioia, D. A. & Pitre, E. (1990). Multiparadigm perspectives in theory building. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 584-602.

Groff, R. (2004). *Critical realism, post-positivism and the possibility of knowledge*. London, UK: Routledge.

Hindess, B. (1996). *Discourses of power: From Hobbes to Foucault*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Jafari, J. (1990). Research and scholarship: The basis of tourism education. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 1(1), 33-41.

Jafari, J. (2005). Bridging out, nesting afield: powering a new platform. *Journal of Tourism Studies,* 16(2),1-5.

Jamal, T., and Hollinshead, K. (2001). Tourism and the forbidden zone: the underserved power of qualitative inquiry. *Tourism Management,* 22(1),63-82.

Janesick, V. (2003). The choreography of qualitative research design. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (2nd edn) (pp. 46-79). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Laughlin, R. (1995). Methodological themes: Empirical research in accounting: Alternative approaches and a case for 'middle-range' thinking. Ac*counting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 8(1), 63-87.

Leiper, N. (1981). Towards a cohesive curriculum in tourism. The case for a distinct discipline. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 3(1), 69-84.

Leiper, N. (2000). An emerging discipline. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 805-809.

Mannell, R. C. & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1987). Psychological nature of leisure and tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(3), 314-331.

Mannheim, K. (1952). The Problem of Generations. In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.), *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge by Karl Mannheim.* New York, NY: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mosca, G. (1939). *The ruling class (Elimenti Di Scienza Politica)*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social research methods*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Oldnall, A. (1995). Nursing as an emerging academic discipline. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 21(3), 605-612.

Pansiri, J. (2005). Pragmatism: A methodological approach to researching strategic alliances in tourism. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development*, 2(3), 191-206.

Pareto, V. (1935). *The mind and society: A treatise on general sociology* (Vol. 1-4). New York: Dover.

Pearce, P. (2004). Theoretical innovation in Asia Pacific tourism research. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research,* 9(1), 57-70.

Pearce, P., Filep, S., & Ross, G. (2011). *Tourists, tourism and the good life*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pearce, P. L. (2005). *Tourist behaviour: Themes and conceptual schemes*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.

Pernecky, T. (2012). Constructionism: Critical Pointers for Tourism Studies. *Annals of Tourism Research* 39(2),1116-1137.

Powell, T. C. (2001). Competitive advantage: Logical and philosophical considerations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(9), 875-888.

Powell, A., O Malley, M. A., Muller-Wille, S., Calvert, J., & Dupré, J. (2007). Disciplinary baptisms: a comparison of the naming stories of genetics, molecular biology, genomics, and systems biology. *History and philosophy of the life sciences*, 29(1), 5.

Pritchard, A. & Morgan, N. (2007). Decentering tourism's intellectual universe or traversing the dialogue between change and tradition. In I. Ateljevic, N. Morgan & A. Pritchard (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 11-28). Harlow, UK: Elsevier.

Provinzano, J. (2005). Tourism Studies Come of Age. *Reviews in Anthropology*, 34, 49-62.

Racherla, P. & Clark, H. (2010). A social network perspective of tourism research collaborations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(4), 1012-1034.

Ren, C., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2010). Constructing tourism research: A Critical Inquiry. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(4), 885-904.

Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd edn) (pp. 923-948). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rorty, R. (1991*). Objectivity, relativism, and truth: Philosophical papers* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosnow, R. (1981). *Paradigms in transition: The methodology of social inquiry*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Scandura, T. A. & Williams, E. A. (2000). Research methodology in management: Current practices, trends, and implications for the future. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1248-1264.

Schofer, E., & Meyer, J. W. (2005). The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century. *American sociological review*, 70(6), 898-920.

Sheldon, P. (2008). *Summary: Towards a framework for values-based tourism curricula*. Paper presented at TEFI II Summit.

Shenhar, A. (1994). Systems engineering management: A framework for the development of a multidisciplinary discipline. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 24(2), 327-332.

Silverman, D. (1973). Methodology and meaning. In P. Filmer, M. Phillipson, D. Silverman & D. Walsh (Eds.), *New directions in sociological theory* (pp. 183-200). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Smith, J. & Hays, R. (2004). Is rural medicine a separate discipline? *Australian Journal of Rural Health*, 12, 67-72.

Soffer, R. N. (1982). Why do disciplines fail? The strange case of British sociology. *The English Historical Review*, 97(385), 767-802.Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

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

Tribe, J. (2010). Tribes, territories and networks in the tourism academy. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 37(1), 7-33.

Visnovsky, E. and Bianchi, G. (2005). *Editorial. Human Affairs 15/2005*. On WWW at http://www.humanaffairs.sk/editorial.htm.Accessed 18.07.2013.

Wickens, E. (2005). Cultural heritage tourism: Being, not looking. In M. Novelli (Ed.), *Niche tourism: Contemporary issues and cases* (pp. 111-119). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Witt, S., Brooke, M., & Buckley, P. (1991). *The management of international tourism.* London, UK: Unwin Hyman.

Xiao, H., Li, M., & Lin, E. (2011). Diffusion patterns and knowledge networks: an inductive analysis of intellectual connections in multidisciplinary tourism studies. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing,* 28(4), 405-422.

Ye, Q., Li, T., & Law, R. (2013). A coauthorship analysis of tourism and hospitality research collaboration. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research,* 37(1), 51-76.

9. Acknowledgements

Dominant Scholarship	Academic Field Status	Body of knowledge	Methodology	Networks
PAST Founding, discipline specific tourism scholars	Fractured based on disciplinary lenses and inter-discipline bias	Fragmented, divided, conflicting	Ad hoc, uncoordinated	Multiple disjointed, discrete, exclusive nodes and networks
PRESENT Founding scholars and Generation Tourism	Potential for integration and interpretation	Learning: potential to build on existing knowledge, connect disparate parts systematically, theory building	Learning: potential to raise awareness and acceptance of multiple methods	Potential for network building based on connectivity, events, leadership, development of artefacts
FUTURE Generation Tourism scholarship	Cohesive and interconnected with inter-discipline respect	Theoretical body of holistic knowledge developed and clearly explicated	Awareness, acceptance and use of diverse integrated methods	Integrated nodes and networks

Table 1: Tourism knowledge creation - evolutionary steps

Keywords: Generation Tourism; identity; discipline status; theoretical development.