

How Can Tourism Studies Be Tourismology?

Katsumi YASUMURA

Introduction

I The Current State of Tourism Studies and Images of Tourismology

II The Epistemology of Tourismology

III The Methodology of Tourismology

Conclusion

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to examine how tourismology as a discipline can be established. For that purpose, assets of tourism studies for building tourismology are first reconsidered, and thereby scientific foundations of tourismology are philosophically investigated on the basis of the assets. The epistemology and methodology of tourismology are suggested in view of five concepts: practical validity, maxim, ethical neutrality, the constructive method, and the method of gradual approximation. Consequently, it is manifested that tourismology can be a practical science to resolve tourism related problems as well as to analyze tourism as a social phenomenon.

Keywords: tourismology, practical science, practical validity, maxim, constructive method, method of gradual approximation

Introduction

Every discipline challenges to resolve a variety of philosophical issues when it is faced with epistemological and methodological problems in each stage of its evolution. At that time, scholars of individual disciplines themselves should undertake the issues. The reason that Einstein indicates in the case of physics is as follows:

[W]hen experience forces us to seek a newer and more solid foundation, the physicist cannot simply surrender to the philosopher the critical contemplation of the theoretical foundations; for, he himself knows best, and feels more surely where the shoe pinches. (Einstein 1950: 59)

Thus, tourism studies also should explore their philosophical issues on their own responsibility. A fundamental issue in the present tourism studies concerns scientific foundations for the establishment of tourismology as a distinct discipline.

Several tourism scholars have already discussed philosophical issues for tourismology. Echtner and Jamal (1997), and Leiper (1981) notice the possibility and difficulties of tourismology as a distinct discipline. Tribe (1997) contradicts the possibility of tourismology, and mentions 'the

indiscipline of tourism.' Recently there was a severe argument between Leiper (2000) and Tribe (2000) over Tribe's contention (1997).

Most of the philosophical discussions in tourism studies have so far addressed only problems concerning the current state of them. Themes of the discussions tend to be whether their current state is advantages or obstacles for building tourismology. Finally, their philosophical considerations virtually result in a principal question: Can tourism studies be tourismology?

This paper will examine scientific foundations of tourismology according to Kantian principal question of philosophical consideration, which rests on the basic query: *not* 'whether one can recognize or not' *but* 'how one can recognize.' Then, we propound a principal question: How can tourism studies be a tourismology?

Thereupon, the consideration of the paper ultimately postulates the possibility that tourismology can be transformed from tourism studies. Instead, it may be appropriate to say that tourismology should be transformed from tourism studies. This view is due to the gravity of tourism as a social phenomenon.

Recently tourism is recognized as a social phenomenon with a variety of social-cultural impacts from the individual, through the societal, to the global level (Yasumura 1996a). Tourism itself is a profound and significant reality, but tourism studies are not yet sufficiently established as a discipline. Thus, the establishment of tourismology is widely requested all over the world, which will produce a body of rigid knowledge on tourism in order to manage the growth of 'better' tourism such as sustainable tourism.

To start with, we will investigate the current state of tourism studies, and will identify positive and negative assets of them as referring to the existent literature. On the basis of assets of tourism studies, then, the epistemology and methodology will be explored for the establishment of tourismology.

I The Current State of Tourism Studies and Images of Tourismology

Tourism studies have been formed since around the 1970s to analyze tourism and to manage tourism-related problems (Graburn and Jafari 1991). As tourism was recognized as a significant social phenomenon since the end of World War II, it has been approached by various disciplines. It can be said that the rapid expansion of tourism generated tourism studies.

Now literature in tourism studies is remarkably progressing in quality and quantity, but tourism studies are so called a get-together of numerous disciplines. Their academic results are not yet systematized as knowledge-constructs, which mean a 'body of knowledge' for scientific recognition or 'paradigms' in a definitive meaning: "universally recognized scientific achievements that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioner" (Kuhn 1970, viii). In order to obtain knowledge-constructs and to manage tourism scientifically, we should transform tourism studies to tourismology as a discipline. Towards the establishment of tourismology, philosophical foundations of tourism studies need be reconsidered and improved.

Some tourism scholars properly describe the current state of tourism studies, though they have each different conception about tourismology (Echtner and Jamal 1997; Gunn 1994; Leiper

1981; Tribe 1997). According to them, the current state of tourism studies can be summarized in the following main three conditions.

Condition 1. The knowledge field of tourism studies is created through different disciplines, and moreover is approached by not only scholars but also tourism related business persons and academic-industrial complexes. Therefore, the knowledge of tourism studies is provided from various contexts, and then its form of the knowledge production is characteristics of 'mode 2' (Gibbons et al. 1994).

Condition 2. Tourism studies have been formed in the face of the great significance of tourism. The purpose of them is to resolve actual problems on tourism, while it is to analyze tourism phenomena. Thus, tourism studies can be seen as a 'practical science,' i.e., a problem-solving oriented type of discipline rather than a 'theoretical science,' i.e., a 'theory-constructing oriented type of discipline' (Yasumura 2000).

Condition 3. Most tourism scholars suggest that tourism studies should adopt interdisciplinary approach as its own methodology. However, techniques of interdisciplinary approach are not yet completely established in tourism studies. Most knowledge on tourism studies has been individually offered by various disciplines. Such methodology in tourism studies is regarded as 'multidisciplinary approach' (Przeclawski 1993).

These three conditions throw light on 'assets' which tourismology takes over from tourism studies. Positive assets of tourism studies will be advantages to utilize for the establishment of tourismology, while negative ones will be obstacles.

The three conditions are closely interconnected in the scientific structure of tourism studies, and they can be seen as positive assets as well as negative ones. Tourismology can take over the new knowledge production, 'mode 2' from Condition 1, and thereby it can be a new form of discipline in the new age, i.e., a practical science from Condition 1 and 2.

However, foundations of a practical science are not established so far, and even the real image of it cannot be fully described. Therefore, epistemological issues seem to be derived from Condition 1 and 2. Epistemological foundations should be elucidated for building tourismology as a practical science, which concerns a problem: How are its own theory and practice adequately realized on the basis of 'mode 2' for knowledge-production?

Condition 3 is a negative asset. The methodological problem of tourismology will be derived from this condition. The problem arises from the situation that tourism studies have no methodology with which a large volume of knowledge through various disciplines can be systematically organized. The application of interdisciplinary approach is often indicated as an appropriate method of tourismology, but the realization of its application to tourismology is questionable for some reasons, as mentioned below in detail. Tourismology should develop an alternative methodology for the formulation of its own knowledge-constructs from the view of the 'mode 2' in Condition 2.

The three conditions of tourism studies furthermore throw images of tourismology into a relief. The images can be integrated into two points as follows:

Image 1. Tourismology is a practical science. It produces its own knowledge-constructs on

tourism, and offers practical knowledge as various directives for the growth of 'better' tourism.

Image 2. Tourismology is a discipline constituted of the existent disciplines, and it synthesizes its knowledge-constructs by means of its own theories and methodology.

Referring to the assets of tourism studies and the images of tourismology, we shall consider epistemological and methodological issues of tourismology respectively hereinafter.

II The Epistemology of Tourismology

Tourismology as a Practical Science

Tourismology can be seen as a 'practical science' as mentioned above. The main purpose of tourismology therefore is to resolve actual problems related to tourism as well as to analyze the tourism reality objectively. In a direct expression, the final goal of tourismology is to furnish practical directives for the growth of 'better' tourism. Thus, in the epistemological consideration on tourismology, we shall inquire, to some extent, into scientific foundations of a 'practical science,' which is a new type of science.

Disciplines are roughly classified into two types: a theory-constructing oriented type and a problem-solving oriented type. These two terms, a 'theory-constructing oriented type' and a 'problem-solving oriented type' of discipline may be transposed the other concise ones, viz., a 'theoretical' and 'practical' science respectively.

On the one hand, theoretical sciences are traditional disciplines whose main purpose is to construct theories for scientific recognition, explanation and prediction, and those which produce theoretical knowledge on the field of objects concerned (Cassirer 1910). The examples in natural sciences are physics, chemistry, biology, etc., and those in social sciences are economics and psychology. Knowledge production in this type of sciences is characterized by 'mode 1' (Gibbons et al. 1994: 1-3).

Theoretical sciences mentioned here include "human sciences" or "the humanities" such as sociology, anthropology, geography, etc. Human sciences have so far no exact theory and generally refer to interpretation-deciding oriented type of disciplines. Then, human sciences are certainly regarded as another type of discipline in contrast with theoretical social sciences such as economics and psychology. However, a final goal of human sciences is the objective recognition of their own objects by means of "generalized models or perspectives," i.e., "theories" in a broad sense (Weber 1949, chap. II). Therefore, human sciences can be seen as a type of disciplines in theoretical sciences in this paper.

On the other hand, practical sciences mean relatively new disciplines whose final goal is to present practical directives for resolution of actual problems, and those which produce practical knowledge as well as theoretical knowledge on the field of objects concerned. This type of disciplines seems to have been formulated with the development of interdisciplinary approach (Yasumura 2000: 101-102). Examples of them are space science, life science, political science, information science, etc. Knowledge production in these sciences is characteristic of 'mode 2' (Gibbons et al. 1994: 3-16). Tourismology will also be this type of discipline.

The common scientific nature of both sciences concerns the 'confidence' of academic results

as a final goal produced by them. The 'confidence' means the degree in which results of sciences should be evaluated with identical judgment among every members of each scientific community. Therefore, the existence of practical sciences as a relatively new type of discipline depends on the achievement of the confidence paralleled to that of theoretical sciences.

However, there is a conclusive difference in the property of the confidence between theoretical and practical sciences. All theoretical knowledge in theoretical sciences can be logically consistent; all practical knowledge in practical sciences is inevitably beset with the problem of 'value judgment,' even though it is derived from knowledge-constructs as a set of theoretical knowledge.

Scientific philosophy has so far investigated only the confidence of theoretical sciences. The confidence of theoretical sciences is regarded as the 'objectivity' and 'universality' provided by their theories (Cassirer 1942). Yet the confidence of practical sciences have scarcely been elucidated epistemologically. Therefore, the epistemological consideration on how practical sciences can secure the confidence is an indispensable issue for the establishment of tourismology.

The Epistemology of Practical Sciences

Let us examine epistemological issues of practical sciences, particularly the problems of the confidence, compared with those of theoretical sciences, from the two points of view: a 'framework' of scientific operations and a 'ground' for the confidence of the framework.

The former point concerns a 'framework' of scientific operations in practical sciences. While the operation of theoretical sciences concentrates on the phenomenal process, that of the practical science directs its attention to the practical process. Then, the framework of the practical science addresses the 'means-end' relation of a practice, i.e., the 'practical relation'; that of a theoretical science focuses on the 'cause-effect' relation of a phenomenon, i.e., the 'causal relation' or 'causality.'

The logical structures of the practical and causal relation are formally isomorphic. Both the relations are based on the logic of the general causality. However, the practical relation is logically subsumed into the causal relation, for a rational choice of means to end in a practice presupposes the existence of the cause-effect relations.

Therefore, there is a difference in epistemological levels between the practical and causal relation. Obviously, the practical relation is a process in the real world; the causal relation is a process in the artificial time-space world on thought (Cassirer 1910: 115-130). The practical relation operates in the real world on the basis of analyses of the causal relation. The causal relation of a phenomenon is logically constructed under the condition of a perfect vacuum, i.e. the artificial world where the given conditions are constant, while the practical relation is always implemented under the condition of change and contingency of the real world. When a person practice achieving his/her 'end', he/she selects, modifies, and complements 'theories' according to situations of the real world.

Then, the latter point concerns a 'ground' of the confidence of the framework in practical sciences. The confidence of practical sciences means that they certifies the means-end relation of

practice; that of theoretical sciences is denoted as the 'scientific truth' in the cause-effect relation. Scientific truth implies 'objectivity' and 'universality' of recognition, and it is embodied in a 'theory,' which can be seen as a ground of the certification of the causal relation (Cassirer 1942, 1953).

Scientific truth of a theory is composed of the necessary (universal) and empirical (objective) truth; the former can be obtained by the mathematical representation of a theory, and the latter can be acquired through the empirical construction of a theory by experiments (Cassirer 1942). Therefore, the role of theory is the realization of the scientific truth as the confidence of the causal relation.

Thus, the 'confidence' and a 'ground' of its causal relation are designated as 'scientific truth' and 'theory' respectively in theoretical sciences. However, philosophical meanings on the 'confidence' and a 'ground' of the practical relation have not been adequately considered in practical sciences themselves as well as in scientific philosophy. Since we have no even the terms signifying the 'confidence' and a 'ground' of practical relation, we will designate them as the 'practical validity' and 'maxim' respectively.

"Practical Validity" and "Maxim" of Tourismology

Here, let us examine two concepts of 'practical validity' and 'maxim' minutely, together with epistemological issues of tourismology.

Practical knowledge as a result of practical sciences is based on the practical relation. Since the practical relation of practical knowledge is, as indicated above, always involved with the problem of evaluations in the real world, the confidence of practical knowledge is also inevitably determined by value-judgments. Practical knowledge, therefore, cannot obtain the scientific truth of theoretical knowledge.

Nevertheless, practical sciences must achieve any confidence that fulfills the same function as the scientific truth of theoretical science, if they exist as a type of sciences. The confidence in practical sciences can be seen not as the 'absolute truth' but as the 'consensus' among members of scientific community. Such confidence is designated as the term of 'practical validity,' as mentioned above.

The judgment on the 'practical validity' of practical relations requires a ground that manifests how practical knowledge is valid and effective in practice. Such ground is designated as the term of 'maxim,' as mentioned above as well. Therefore, the function of 'maxim' means a criterion that members of scientific community can reach a 'consensus' on the validity of knowledge. This function of 'maxim' in practical sciences is paralleled with that of 'theory' in theoretical sciences.

However, 'maxim' also has no scientific truth of 'theory.' 'Maxim' is a tentative plan for discussion on advisability of practical knowledge. Such plan cannot be certified rigidly but can be understood intersubjectively. When a maxim is certified as a ground of the means-end relation among practitioners of scientific community, it can be regarded to obtain the validity of practical knowledge.

If tourismology attempts to be a practical science, it should search for how to obtain the

validity of practical knowledge. Whenever every tourismologist offers their practical directives on tourism and tourism development, they should reveal maxims as a ground of their directives (e.g., Yasumura 1996b). Tourism practical knowledge as the final goal of tourismology can obtain the practical validity, when maxims are judged to be appropriate among scholars and business persons of tourismological community.

However, it must be noted that practical knowledge of tourismology is guided by knowledge-constructs derived from disciplines as theoretical sciences. Though the only aspect of a practical science in tourismology was so far emphasized in this paper, tourismology has to analyze tourism related phenomena rigidly. Tourism practical knowledge is always guided by tourism knowledge-constructs. Therefore, tourism theoretical knowledge is first formulated through analyses of tourism reality by theoretical sciences, and its theoretical knowledge is then applied to tourism practical knowledge.

The Problem of Ethical Neutrality in Tourismology

The practical knowledge such as directives and manifestations for the growth of tourism is naturally derived from theoretical knowledge on the reality of tourism. Here, another epistemological problem of tourismology will be surfaced. It is the problem of 'ethical neutrality (Wert Freiheit),' which means scholar's attitude to his / her investigation. Tourismologists should reconfirm philosophical meanings of the ethical neutrality in view of the relation between theoretical and practical investigations.

The problem of ethical neutrality proceeds from value-judgments in social sciences. Investigations of all social sciences are always relevant to value-judgments, for all objects of social sciences are directly and indirectly connected with human conducts. Thus, "[the] problems of social sciences are selected by the value-relevance of the phenomena treated" (Weber 1917: 21). Tourismology as a practical science is also inevitably determined by the problem of value-judgment.

Nevertheless, tourismology presents practical directives based on the scientific foundations such as the 'practical validity' and 'maxim.' According to Weber's indication, types of directives that tourismology and any other social sciences can offer are as follows:

As soon as one seeks to derive concrete directives from practical political (particularly economic and social-political) evaluations, (1) the indispensable means, and (2) the inevitable repercussions, and (3) the thus conditioned competition of numerous possible evaluations in their practical consequences, are all that an empirical discipline can demonstrate with the means at its disposal. (Weber 1949: 18)

As can be seen in this quotation, these three types of directives, i.e., means, repercussions, and evaluations in consequences, should be offered on the basis of the corroboration with theoretical knowledge.

Then, meanings of 'ethical neutrality' in tourismology are noticed from the viewpoint of the relation practical and theoretical investigation. 'Ethical neutrality' indicated by Weber (1917) concerns a rule that social scientists should abide in their investigations attendant on value-judgments. Weber's indication does not mean that social science should exclude value-judgments.

An emphatic point of ethical neutrality is as follows:

[The] investigator and teacher should keep unconditionally separate the establishment of empirical facts (including the 'value-oriented' conduct of the empirical individual whom he is investigating) and his own practical evaluations, i.e., his evaluation of these facts as satisfactory or unsatisfactory (including among these facts evaluations made by the empirical persons who are the objects of investigation). These two things are logically different and to deal with them as though they were the same represents a confusion of entirely heterogeneous problems. (Weber 1917[1949]: 11)

It is as the clear distinction between theoretical recognition and practical evaluation that the fatal meaning of ethical neutrality can be seen.

Tourismology whose knowledge production is characterized by mode 2 is particularly imposed on an issue of ethical neutrality. Tourism knowledge is produced from various contexts such as academic and business communities. There are sometimes conflicts between scholars and businesspersons over images of 'better' tourism, means of tourism development and so on. Then, both scholars and businesspersons as tourismologists should abide ethical neutrality on their investigation, and then must dialogue with each other to conclude the validity of their practical knowledge.

Thus, the problem of ethical neutrality is of great importance in the epistemology of tourismology. Tourismology itself is a practical science; accordingly tourismologists should make a clear distinction between theoretical facts and practical directives.

III The Methodology of Tourismology

Interdisciplinary Approach and the Methodology of Tourismology

Now that we examine epistemological foundations of tourismology, the next step is to explore the methodology of tourismology in view of the consideration on its epistemology. A practical science is generally constituted of various disciplines. Since resolutions of actual problems in practical sciences require a variety of knowledge and theories, they are approached by collaborations of the different disciplines. Therefore, the methodology of practical sciences depends on how disciplines concerned collaborate to resolve the common problems.

Most practical sciences attempt to apply the method of interdisciplinary approach, and some of them can reap their own results from this approach. Tourism studies also regard interdisciplinary approach as an ideal method, and attempt the application of it (Dann et al. 1988; Prezeclawski 1993). Yet interdisciplinary approach cannot be functioned at all in the present tourism studies.

If practical sciences expertly adopt to interdisciplinary approach, they have to set up two necessary conditions for the introduction of it (Yasumura 2000: 102-104). The one is that there is a unified perspective among all collaborators participating in the approach; the other is that collaborators can utilize mathematics as their common language to communicate their own disciplinary theories with one another.

As for tourismology, there seems to be no possibility of the application of interdisciplinary

approach. Tourismology cannot choose but take over multidisciplinary approach from tourism studies. For it cannot attempt to employ mathematics in the construction of its theories. Specifically, disciplines that are particularly involved with tourismology, e.g., sociology, geography and anthropology, cannot or decline to adopt mathematics in their thinking processes. None of their disciplines have their own exact theories.

Nevertheless, tourismology should have its own theories as its own perspectives, and it should investigate an alternative methodology instead of interdisciplinary approach. The alternative methodology of tourismology will be explored at the different level in the application of interdisciplinary approach.

Then, the methodology of tourismology should start from the following question: How can the existent results by tourism studies and new ones by multidisciplinary approach be integrated into knowledge-constructs? In other words, how can tourismology systematically and logically synthesize a large volume of knowledge on tourism into knowledge-constructs? This question may be seen as mere abandonment and replacement of the application of interdisciplinary approach. However, tourismology already owned a positive legacy of tourism studies: a large volume of knowledge on tourism. Such legacy can be utilized effectively in an alternative methodology based of the idea of 'mode 2.' Therefore, the methodology in tourismology concerns a method for the formation of knowledge-constructs on tourism through the synthesis of results derived from multidisciplinary approach.

The Method of Construction and Gradual Approximation for Theories on Tourism

We shall now outline a method for the formulation of knowledge-constructs on tourism. The core of the methodology in tourismology is the systematic arrangement of a numerous volume of knowledge produced by multidisciplinary approach. This arrangement of the knowledge is implemented by innate theories of tourismology. Tourismological theories are a type of 'perspective' from which different knowledge with different epistemological and methodological backgrounds is systematically integrated into knowledge-constructs. This perspective can be so called a 'meta theory.'

Tourismological theories as a meta theory can be achieved by the 'constructive method.' This method in exact sciences is minutely elucidated by Cassirer (1910). Furthermore, Lewin (1951) and Yasumura (1988) attempted to apply the method to social psychology and sociology respectively according to Cassirer's suggestion. "The essence of the constructive method is the representation of an individual case with the help of a few 'elements of construction' "(Lewin 1951: 61).

The nature of the constructive method can be clearly grasped in an example of mathematics, which has first developed it. "To consider qualitatively different geometrical entities (such as circle, square, parabola) as the product of a certain combination of certain 'elements of construction' (such as points and movements) has since the time of the Greeks been the secret of this method" (Lewin 1951: 32).

However, tourismology has few theoretical concepts as 'elements of construction' except ones such as 'carrying capacity' and 'authenticity.' So, theoretical concepts in tourismology will be first

created for the constructive method, and tourismological theories will then be built with the constructive concepts.

The synthesized process of knowledge-constructs by means of the constructive method can be summarized as follows: spheres of knowledge (knowledge-constructs) are gradually synthesized by fewer theories, and finally the overall sphere of knowledge (a knowledge-construct) is subsumed into one theory. The fewer the number of theories becomes, the wider extent of knowledge-constructs derived from theories responsively expands. Ultimately, the whole of the tourism world is integrated into a knowledge-construct by a unified theory.

This process may be parallel to the progress of physical knowledge-constructs described by Planck (1909) as the 'unified image of the physical world (die Einheit des physikalische Weltbildes).' 'Images of the physical world' means a set of physical phenomena explained by physical knowledge-constructs.

According to his indication, individual physical phenomena were explained by their each law or theory in the early stage of physics. Then, physical phenomena such as light, magnetism, sound, and heat can be scientifically recognized through each law of optics, magnetics, acoustics, thermodynamics, respectively. Afterwards, optics and magnetics are synthesized to a theory of the science of electricity; Acoustics and thermodynamic are done to dynamics. Furthermore, all of them are integrated into Newton's dynamics, which covers most of the whole physical world.

After the publication of his article, the physical knowledge-construct led by Newton's dynamics was expanded by Einstein's 'theory of relativity' and the 'quantum theory,' which cover the overall sphere of the physical world together. Now contemporary physics are undertaking to build a unified theory for a physical knowledge-construct (Hawking and Penrose 2000).

We shall call the process of the progress of theories and knowledge-constructs in physics and tourismology as the 'method of gradual approximation,' to borrow Lewin's (1951: 21) term on psychological methodology. Tourism knowledge-constructs will be accumulated, as a large volume of individual knowledge on tourism produced by multidisciplinary approach are gradually integrated through tourismological theories.

When tourismology builds theories to formulate its own knowledge-constructs, then it can be regarded as a distinct discipline both in name and in reality. Now, denominations of branches in tourism studies depend on those of each discipline: e.g., a 'sociology of tourism,' a 'geography of tourism,' an 'anthropology of tourism.' These denominations, as Isamu Maeda indicates (Japan Institute of Tourism Research 1997: 69), will be probably replaced in tourismology like these: 'social tourismology,' 'geographic tourismology,' 'anthropological tourismology.'

Conclusion

Consequently, this paper manifested the following three points: 1) Tourismology can be a distinct discipline as a practical science; 2) The issue of the epistemology in tourismology is concerned with the development of foundations for a practical science as well as a theoretical science; 3) The issue of the methodology in tourismology is to discuss how a large volume of knowledge created by multidisciplinary approach can be integrated into a knowledge-construct.

Furthermore, philosophical and methodological foundations of tourismology were discussed for establishing it, although not sufficient. Tourism knowledge-constructs will be built by means of the constructive method and the method of gradual approximation. Yet, not until tourismology itself is established, will validity of the foundations discussed here be confirmed.

All that we present here is a maxim for the establishment of tourismology: "*primum edere denide philophare* (first, do your best, and thereby, philosophize)", as Przeclawski (1993: 18) suggests. Tourismology will be established as a practical science, premised on dialogues among members of the tourismological community. 'Dialogue' is indispensable for establishing tourismology. The meaning of this 'dialogue' is as follows:

Dialogue provides for better mutual knowledge and understanding, for the possibility of coexistence and cooperation agreement as to the basic principles of individual points of view. Knowledge and understanding are the preconditions of the dialogue. The discussion can be productive when the participants in it not only know their own views but also are aware of the views of the other side. A general conclusion is that although we start from different points, in practice we still share a great number of common values. It may turn out that there is a wide sphere where cooperation in the implementation of common values is possible. (Przeclawski 1993: 18)

Scholars and businesspersons who undertake the establishment of tourismology should congregate and dialogue one another. From then on, the gate to build tourismology will be opened.

References

- Cassirer, E. (1953) *Substance and Function* (Swabey, W. C. & M.C. Swabey, Trans.), New York: Dover (Original work published 1910).
- Cassirer, E. (1942) "Galileo: A New Science and a New Spirit," *American Scholar* 12: 5-19.
- Dann, G., D. Nash & D. Pearce (1988) "Methodology in Tourism Research," *Annals of Tourism Research* 15: 1-28.
- Einstein, A. (1950) *Out of My Later Years*, Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Echtner, C. M. & T. B. Jamal (1997) "The Disciplinary Dilemma of Tourism Studies," *Annals of Tourism Research* 24: 868-883.
- Gibbons, M., C. Limoges, H. Nowotny, S. Schwartzman, P. Scott & M. Trow (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*, London: SAGE.
- Graburn, N. H. H. & J. Jafari (1991) "Introduction: Tourism Social Science," *Annals of Tourism Research* 18: 1-11.
- Gunn, C. A. (1994) "A Perspective on the Purpose and Nature of Tourism Research Methods," in Ritchie, J. R. B. & C. R. Goeldner (eds.) *Travel, Tourism, and Hospitality Research* (pp. 3-12), New York: Wiley.
- Hawking, S. W. and R. Penrose (2000) *The Nature of Space and Time*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Japan Institute of Tourism Research (1997) "A Report on Symposium: The Important Problems of Tourism in Our Time and the Role of Tourism Research," *The Tourism Studies Quarterly* 9: 62-78. (in Japanese)
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Leiper, N. (1981) "Towards a Cohesive Curriculum in Tourism: The Case for a Distinct Discipline," *Annals of*

Tourism Research 8: 69-84.

Leiper, N. (2000) "An Emerging Discipline," *Annals of Tourism Research* 27: 805-809.

Lewin, K. (1951) *Field Theory in Social Science*, New York: Harper.

Planck, M. (1909) "Die Einheit des physikalische Weltbildes," *Physikalische Zeitschrift* 10: 62-75.

Prezeclawski, K. (1993) "Tourism as the Subject of Interdisciplinary Research," in Pearce, D. G. & Butler R. W. (eds.) *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges* (pp. 9-19), London: Routledge,.

Tribe, J. (1997) "The Indiscipline of Tourism," *Annals of Tourism Research* 24: 638-657.

Tribe, J. (2000) "Indisciplined and the Unsubstantiated," *Annals of Tourism Research* 27: 809-813.

Weber, M. (1949) *The Methodology of the Social Science* (Shils, E. A. & H. A. Finch, Trans.) New York: Free Press.

Yasumura, K. (1988) "Weber's Sociology and the Exact Sciences: The Common Characteristics of Both Epistemologies," *The Annals of the Japan Association for Philosophy of Science* 7: 131-146.

Yasumura, K. (1996a) "Issues of a Sociology of Tourism," *Japanese Sociological Review* 47: 366-377. (in Japanese)

Yasumura, K. (1996b) "Ethnic Tourism and the Problem of Social Inequalities in Mass Tourism," *Bulletin of Hokkai-Gakuen Kitami University* 36: 109-124.

Yasumura, K. (2000) "A Preliminary Note on the Construction of Tourismology: Postmodern and the Theory of Sciences." *Bulletin of Hokkai-Gakuen Kitami University* 44: 99-110. (in Japanese)