Pergamon

Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 43, pp. 601–623, 2013
0160-7383/$ - see front matter
Printed in Great Britain

www.elsevier.com/locate/atoures

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.06.007

REVIEW ARTICLE

FRAMING TOURISM GEOGRAPHY: NOTES FROM THE UNDERGROUND

C. Michael Hall
University of Canterbury, New Zealand
University of Oulu, Finland
Linnaeus University School of Business and Economics, Sweden
University of Johannesburg, South Africa

Abstract: Tourism geography is a significant contributor to the study of tourism, yet is generally perceived as marginal to geography. The review frames contemporary tourism geography by examining it in the context of geographical knowledge processes, changes to the environment within which it is situated, issues of marginality, and the ongoing significance of major binaries in geographic thought including physical/human geography and applied/theoretical geography. These frames are relevant to the wider domain of tourism studies as well. Although noting the dangers of invented disciplinary traditions and heritage as a result of the writing of reflective reviews and texts, the article argues that tourism geography has been a significant contributor to the bringing together and hybridity of geographic binaries, especially in the development of more critical applied geographies of environmental change. **Keywords:** applied geography, knowledge circulation, space, place, academic tradition, hybridities.

INTRODUCTION

Geography has long had a significant place in tourism research. Geographical research on tourism was well established by the 1930s (Hall & Page, 2006). Early research often focussed as much on recreation as it did tourism, with 'recreation' being used to describe short, domestic trips and tourism being used to describe longer, often international, travel, even if they were describing essentially the same activities (Hall, 2013a). It is indicative of changed travel patterns and the routinisation of travel and tourism, including the transformation of once 'exotic' destinations to the mundane, that the notion of recreation geography

C. Michael Hall (Department of Management, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. Email <michael.hall@canterbury.ac.nz>) has a PhD in geography from the University of Western Australia and honorary doctorates from Umea (Sweden) and Oulu (Finland) universities. He is former chair of the International Geographical Union Commission on Tourism Geography and is a member of Association of American Geographers, Canadian Association of Geographers, Institute of Australian Geographers and a Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society.

has declined relative to the geographical analysis of tourism. Although the concepts, frameworks and studies of recreation geography still constitute an important intellectual legacy (Hall & Page, 2006; Williams, 2009).

Tourism geography is the study of tourism within the concepts, frames, orientations, and venues of the discipline of geography and accompanying fields of geographical knowledge. The notion of tourism geographies describes the multiple, and sometimes contested, theoretical, philosophical and personal orientations of those who undertake tourism research from geographical perspectives.

The review presents contemporary tourism geographies within several interrelated frames that may serve to help explicate key issues and challenges. In doing so it not only refers to contemporary tourism geographic knowledge but also relates such knowledge to some of the major philosophical and institutional issues in geography, tourism studies and the academy. The review also provides an account of the production, circulation and reading of tourism geographic knowledge using themes of marginality, institutionalisation, disciplinarity and the implications of binary thinking.

REVIEWING TOURISM GEOGRAPHY

Although the academic foci of tourism geography is often summarised as space, place and environment, as in the subtitles of the *Tourism Geographies* journal (published by Taylor & Francis) or the Hall and Page (2006) text, its scope is broader and reflects the varieties of geographical knowledge. The academic domain of geography cannot easily be summarised in a brief, succinct statement as it spans the natural, biological, social and behavioural sciences as well as the humanities. There is as much contention and debate over what constitutes 'geography' as 'tourism'. Emphasis has changed over time and, appropriately for geography, over space as well. Geographical scholarship is not neatly demarcated. Geography ''is quintessentially an interdisciplinary tradition when its various 'parts' (physical and human, cultural and economic, etc.) are considered together'' (Agnew & Livingstone, 2011, p. 1).

Since 2005 there has been a burst of reflective reviews and collections on tourism geography. Several reasons can be given. Tourism geography is undergoing a significant generational change as those geographers who gained their doctorates in the 1970s or previous decades enter retirement (Hall & Page, 2009). Such a change is leading to 'stocktakes' of the field before cultural, disciplinary and personal memories fade (Gill, 2012; Hall & Page, 2009, 2010; Smith, 2010, 2011). The generation that is now entering retirement is not the first generation of tourism geographers but, given the expansion of tourism as an academic field, it is the first generation whose work has simultaneously existed in both geography and tourism studies. Their work is also significant because they were the first generation whose publications become internationalised as a result of information and communication

technology, and English becoming the dominant language of the international academy (Hall, 2013a).

An increase in interest in tourism from human geographers and a decade-long absence of a significant review in *Progress in Human Geography* (Crang, 1997) led to the commissioning of an influential series of reviews (Gibson, 2008, 2009, 2010). The growth in interest by human geographers in tourism has also been influenced by the 'cultural turn' (Aitchison, 2006; Barnett, 1998) and non-representational conditions and concerns (Butcher, 2012; Lorimer, 2008; Smith, Waterton, & Watson, 2012). This is also reflected in the extent to which issues of postcolonialism (Gibson, 2009; Hall & Tucker, 2004; Winter, 2007), performity (Coleman & Crang, 2002; Crouch, 2003; Hannam, 2006), embodiment (Duffy, 2012; Waitt, Markwell, & Gorman-Murray, 2008), and the mundane (Edensor, 2003, 2007; Molz, 2010; Sheller, 2007; Waitt & Duffy, 2010) have influenced tourism geographical research, as well as the renewed focus on mobility (Adey, 2010; Coles, Hall, & Duval, 2005; Cresswell, 2006, 2011, 2012; Edensor, 2004, 2007; Hall, 2005a, 2005b; Hannam, 2008; Sheller & Urry, 2006; Timothy & Coles, 2004; Williams & Hall, 2002). Nevertheless, the 'cultural turn' in geography and elsewhere in the social sciences represents only one dimension of contemporary tourism geographies (Coles & Hall, 2006).

Finally, there has been a clear change in publishing style with review papers given greater importance in tourism and geography related journals. This is perhaps related to the need for greater intellectual stocktaking at a time of rapidly expanding publication rates. The field has been served with multi-authored edited handbooks and companions on tourism geography (Lew, Hall, & Williams, 2004; Wilson, 2012), as well as other thematic volumes edited by geographers (Holden & Fennell, 2013; Page & Connell, 2012; Smith & Richards, 2013), which incorporate specialist reviews on tourism geography (Hall & Page, 2012; Nepal, 2009b).

This work does not aim to be a review of reviews, although that publication will undoubtedly eventually be written. It instead highlights that in a review of a field as catholic as tourism geography knowledge selection is inescapable, especially given the expansion of potential publishing outlets, with unavoidable sins of inclusion and exclusion. The history of geography, as well as the history(-ies) of the geographies of tourism is open to debate, criticism and revision. The reviewer's task is inevitably implicated in the creation of disciplinary heritage, and their own personal academic heritage (Smith, 2010). One selects from the available sources the material deemed relevant in light of the task set and the issues under investigation. Chroniclers of a discipline's 'evolution', 'development' or, in some cases, 'collapse', as Livingstone (1992, pp. 4–5) noted in his seminal history of geographic thought, ''never have access to all the facts anyway, and even those to which they do have access are selected to suit their own purposes. There is no history on a mortuary table. The 'facts' therefore do not simply 'speak for themselves'; the historian stage manages their performance on the contemporary scene''. Indeed, it is intellectually vital that tourism and tourism geographies engage in developing 'notes from the

underground', that is a history that delves below the reported surface. Barnes' (2010, p. 1) advice with respect to economic geography,

> Historical knowledge of our discipline enables us to realize that we are frequently ''slaves of some defunct'' economic geographer; that we cannot escape our geography and history, which seep into the very pores of the ideas that we profess; and that the full connotations of economic geographic ideas are sometimes purposively hidden, secret even, revealed only later by investigative historical scholarship.

Applies equally well to tourism and tourism geography.

TAKING STOCK

The invention of and engagement with traditions is an important part of being a member of the academic community. This review follows Agnew and Livingstone (2011) in adopting a relatively broad definition of what constitutes tourism geography scholarship in the belief that there is a stream of related knowledge produced and situated in discrete examinable locations that circulate over space and time. It also agrees that increasingly frequent tides of theoretical, methodological and referential fashion washes both geography's and tourism geography's shores. This has meant that some authors have jumped from bandwagon to bandwagon or, in some cases, even jumped ship. Yet this is usually done without available comment on either the paradoxes between different public intellectual positions or the relationship between research and the mundane world outside of the academy.

There is no ''view from nowhere'' knowledge is always ''local, situated and embedded'' (Shapin, 1998, p. 6). The study of tourism geography is embedded in academic and scientific discourse and the institutions of which it is part (Butler, 2004; Coles, 2004; Hall 2013a; Wilson & Anton Clavé, 2014). As Johnston noted in his study of Anglo-American geography, despite 'ivory tower' accusations, academic life ''is not a closed system but rather is open to the influences and commands of the wider society which encompasses it'' (Johnston, 1991, p. 1). Recognition of how knowledge is produced and circulated is therefore fundamental to establishing its credibility, its beneficiaries and how it is read in different places.

Agnew and Livingstone (2011) identify several ways in which geography enters knowledge production and circulation, each of which reflect their relative relatedness to specific milieaux and places versus the circulation and spatial diffusion of knowledge. The involves the voicing of different forms of indigenous, gendered and localised knowledge and research practices (Hall, 2011a; Hoogendoorn & Visser, 2012; Lemelin, Wiersma, & Stewart, 2011; Scott, Miller, & Lloyd, 2006), while the role of coloniality affects the perception of the local knowledge of the colonised versus the knowledge of the coloniser (Connell, 2007; Hamnett & Hoogendoorn, 2012; Winter, 2009).

The phenomenological relationship between the geographical contexts of being somewhere and knowledge acquisition reflects a concern not just with where things matter but also how they matter. Place

matters with respect to senses and experiences of place for tourism (Hultman & Hall, 2012; Waitt & Duffy, 2010), while place as the setting for social rootedness is a major theme in research on multiple-dwelling (Hui, 2008; Müller, 2006, 2011; Paris, 2009) and authenticity (Knudsen & Waade, 2010).

The transfer of ideas from the local to the global and their relative influence occurs via the influence of sponsors. Examples include the diffusion of neoliberal notions of university education and research (Ayikoru, Tribe, & Airey, 2009; Hall, 2011b; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), and new practices of consumption, production and marketization (Duffy & Moore, 2010). The circulation of knowledge and its consumption is also part of 'the geography of reading' (Keighren, 2006). This is not just translation, but also the potential role of knowledge as an ideological resource (Livingstone, 2005). For example, the 'entrepreneurial university' (Deem, 2001) has become part of the rationale for applied geography (Bailly, Gibson, & Haynes, 2008), including tourism geography (Dornan & Truly, 2009).

Travelling Knowledge

At a time when there is much emphasis on knowledge management and transfer (Coles, Liasidou, & Shaw, 2008; Cooper, 2006; Shaw & Williams, 2009; Weidenfeld, Williams, & Butler 2010; Williams & Shaw, 2011) there is a need to understand how the knowledge of tourism geography travels and is made as it circulates. Four dominant approaches in considering knowledge production can be identified that inform thinking about tourism geographies: the market of ideas, conceptions of world geography, temporal periodicity, and the categorisation of knowledge (Agnew, 2007).

Knowledge may be regarded as a commodity like any other that competes and is exchanged in the 'marketplace of ideas'. Ideally, success is dependent on the truthfulness of the idea as it competes in the evolutionary competition of ideas in research institutes and universities as well as the users of such knowledge in the public and private sectors. Alternatively, it could be argued that the marketplace of ideas is not a level playing field and how knowledge becomes normalised or dominant—or marginal—has something to do with the proponent and where they are located (Agnew, 2007) as well as the receptors and sponsors of knowledge (Hall, 2014). This perspective is important for not only describing the geography of knowledge transfer and the mobility of tourism knowledge, but also the marginality of ideas, including perhaps tourism geography itself.

How world geography is conceived is significant because it influences perspectives on ease of movement, directional bias and the role of time. The questions of where and when ''brings together a wide range of potential ontological and epistemological effects'' under the rubric of spatial and temporal difference (Agnew & Livingstone, 2011, p. 7). Many theoretical positions contain within them specific grids of space and periods of time that can deeply trouble commonly-held spatial and

temporal designations, i.e. 'Asia' or 'modern', that influence knowledge formation and reproduction (Deprest, 2002; Hall, 2009a; Teo, 2009; Winter, 2009).

Space may be characterised in terms of progressive temporal periods. This is most closely associated with notions of developed and less developed countries and regions, but is also clearly tied in to intellectual ideas on tourism development processes (Butler, 2006; Hall & Lew, 2009). Finally, there is the contrast often drawn between space, the general and universal, and place, the local and specific. This has become significant for debates about nationalism, community and identity, cosmopolitanism, and globalisation in tourism. However, Cloke and Johnston (2005a) highlights the relationality of space and place and the deconstruction of concepts that are often presented as binary categories, including the categorisation of knowledge into ''socially created'' academic disciplines. ''In academic life, just as everywhere else, we simplify by creating categories—and then people identifying with those categories come into conflict'' (Cloke & Johnston, 2005b, p. 4).

Academic communities argue on both empirical and theoretical grounds and what constitutes evidence ''becomes a way of challenging the very meaningfulness of a particular concept from those affiliated to...some competing concept or theory'' (Agnew & Livingstone, 2011, p. 13). Claiming that tourism is atheoretical or poorly theorised (Franklin & Crang, 2001) becomes a way of challenging or demeaning the value of research not undertaken within a particular theoretical context (Hall, 2005b). In addition, criticisms may also be grounded in disputes over method, social-normative qualities and ethics—concerns over the way knowledge is 'made'.

THE MARGINAL POSITION OF TOURISM GEOGRAPHY

Discipline development, and the how, where and why of what is and is not studied ''is an investigation of the sociology of a community, of its debates, deliberations and decisions as well as its findings'' (Johnston, 1991, p. 11). Tourism geography receives very little recognition in the various editions of Johnston's work, a situation which is commonplace in many publications on the history of geographical thought. For example, the only mention of tourism by Peet (1998) is in relation to its perceived irrelevancy by Marxist geographers in the 1960s:

> There was a growing intolerance to the topical coverage of academic geography, a feeling that it was either an irrelevant gentlemanly pastime concerned with esoterica like tourism, wine regions, or barn types, or it was an equally irrelevant ''science'' using quantitative methods to analyze spatial trivia like shopping patterns or telephone calls, when geography should be a working interest in ghettos, poverty, global capitalism, and imperialism (Peet, 1998, p. 109).

Similarly, tourism receives only brief mentions in a number of significant texts such as Massey, Allen, and Sarre (1999) *Human Geography*

Today; Holt-Jensen (2009) *Geography: History and concepts*; Castree, Rogers, and Sherman (2005) *Questioning Geography;* Massey's (2005) *For Space*; Crang and Thrift (2000) *Thinking space*; Cloke and Johnston's (2005) *Spaces of Geographical Thought*; De Blij's (2005) *Why geography matters;* and was not essential to Agnew et al's (1996) *Human Geography: An Essential Anthology*. There are no tourism geographers who are *Key Thinkers on Space and Place* (Hubbard, Kitchin, & Valentine, 2004). If textbooks are regarded as terrains of struggle over power and control (Silverman, 1992), then tourism geography is excluded from the landscape. Little wonder the notion that tourism is peripheral to the study of geography pervades reviews of the geography of tourism (Butler, 2004; Gibson, 2008; Hall & Page, 2009; Ioannides, 2006). Yet, tourism geography is much better received in tourism studies than in geography, with tourism geographies being among the most highly cited tourism authors. For example, 15 of the 58 most cited tourism authors 1970–2007 had PhDs in geography including four of the ten most cited (McKercher, 2008). As Gibson (2008, p. 418)) notes, ''It still struggles to pervade publishing in 'global' [geography] journals, and yet, when eventually appearing elsewhere, tourism geography appears to be on the whole more cosmopolitan. To me this seems an important—even defining—contradiction of tourism in contemporary geography''.

Any question of marginality and peripherality requires the response of peripheral in relation to what? Gibson (2008) used the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) (Now Web of Science) to analyse tourism within geography journals and found that very little work was conducted in the 1960s and 1970s. 'Growth occurred in the late 1980s and particularly into the 1990s, as human geography itself diversified. About 40 articles have been published annually in the last decade, across the selected geography journals (not including the specialist *Tourism Geographies*), and their breadth and diversity is striking' (Gibson, 2008, p. 409). Gibson's (2008) analysis suggested an equivalent of about one paper per ISI geography journal each year. A slightly higher rate was found by Hall (2013a) in an analysis conducted of tourism articles in selected leading geographical journals 1998–2009 with *Geografiska Annaler, Series B: Human Geography* and *Geographical Research* (formerly *Australian Geographical Studies*) having the largest number of papers. Nevertheless, as Gibson (2008, p. 409) noted, ''many researchers featuring in the SSCI bibliography would probably not consider themselves tourism geographers or may not even list tourism as a specialist research interest''.

A citation analysis of the title/abstract/keywords of publications in the Scopus database to 2010 conducted by Hall (2013a) provides coverage of articles on the geography of tourism published in tourism and cognate journals. The most cited paper is Britton (1991), while the top 25 citations also includes a book (Hall & Page, 2006). All were written in English. The five journals with the most cited papers were *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space*, *Progress in Human Geography*, *Leisure Studies*, *Tourism Geographies*, and *Annals of Tourism Research*. However, citation analysis is dependent both on the search categories that are used and on what is actually included in the database. For example,

what is arguably the most cited paper in tourism geography, Butler's (1980) tourism area life-cycle, was not included (Hall, 2013a).

On The Margin of The Margin

The market of ideas in tourism geography is clearly affected by ''the uneven geographies of international journal publishing spaces'' (Paasi, 2005, p. 769) that are shaped by different national and institutional research agendas as well as language. The 25 most cited papers in Scopus under 'tourism and geography/ies' were mainly from authors with institutional affiliations in the UK, New Zealand, Canada and the USA (Hall, 2013a). Even given the inclusion of more non-English journals in Scopus, authors based at institutions in primarily English speaking countries accounted for 57.6% of institutions contributing two or more papers of all publications listed in Scopus under tourism AND geography/ies up to the end of 2010. The leading countries ($\geqslant$5%) being the UK (21.8%), USA (14.1%), China (10.3%), Australia (7.2%), Canada (6.5%), New Zealand (6.5%) and France (5%) (Hall, 2013a). However, when the total number of Scopus listed publications is categorised according to language of publication an even higher proportion (68%) are in English (French being the next most used, 8.1%), reflecting concerns not only about the peripheralisation of non-English publications (and hence ideas) in the 'international' discourse of tourism geography (Wilson & Anton Clavé, 2014), but also the emerging linguistic and institutional monopolisation of international publishing spaces (Paasi, 2005).

The above reveals not only the unreality of level playing fields in the knowledge market but also the extent to which the local and specific affects the geography of reading. It also indicates a problem for some linguistically defined bodies of tourism geography knowledge at a time when there are demands from policy-makers and university administrations to figure in international subject and university rankings (Mohrman, Ma, & Baker, 2008). No matter how important local and national knowledge is within a specific spatial context, unless it is conveyed in English it has little chance to enter the global marketplace and be reproduced and recirculated. Somewhat ironically, given the desire to give voice to local and indigenous perspectives, unless that voice can be spoken in English it is likely not to be heard. It is notable that, in returning to Hall's (2013a) analysis, while China accounts for over 10% of all tourism geography publications in Scopus only a little over a quarter of these are actually in Chinese, reflecting the efforts of Chinese institutions to compete internationally (Bao & Ma, 2010). Although the hegemony of the centre in the knowledge production process has long been acknowledged (Canagarajah, 1996), the English language has become part of the 'ideological complex' that produces and maintains the increasing hegemony of the English speaking academy (Tietze & Dick, 2013).

Further analysis of tourism geography indicates that not only ideas circulate but so to tourism geographers. Of the 59 most cited (>five

publications) authors in Hall and Page (2006) and Wilson (2012) 22 of them had multiple institutional affiliations in different countries, with several having visiting positions in non-English speaking countries simultaneously with their permanent position. Such movement reflects both the well-recognised transfer of tourism geographers from geography departments to business schools (Gill, 2012; Hall & Page, 2009; Smith, 2010; Smith, 2011), and the interest of some institutions in non-English speaking countries in embedding the academic and linguistic capacities of Anglophone academics in their own knowledge production and promotion. The creation of such transnational networks is ''less intense and durable than local networks'' (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 86) but is intensely attractive for institutions and departments seeking to increase their international profile. Of course, individual mobility and linkages reflect academic interests, career development, and personal lifestyle reasons as well as, in some cases, financial incentives. Whatever the reasons for the circulation and stickiness of ideas and academics, they will have undoubted affects on the institutional and disciplinary characteristics of tourism geography.

THE INSTITUTIONALISATION AND DISCIPLINARITY OF TOURISM GEOGRAPHY

There is relatively little overt discussion from academics within the tourism geography community and the wider tourism studies field as to the reasons why certain topics are studied and approaches developed (Coles & Hall, 2006; Coles, Hall, & Duval, 2006; Hall, 2004; Smith, 2010; Smith, 2011; Tribe, 2009). Reflections on academic debates are often presented as part of a rational discourse in which the role of interests, ideologies and institutions are minimised or not noted at all, and in which the positionality of disciplinary gatekeepers are ignored (Hall, 2010a). This may be because of fears of professional repercussions, especially from gatekeepers such as journal editors, or the receipt of negative manuscript and publication reviews. Rational accounts of disciplinary growth stands in stark contrast to the discussions that occur 'backstage' at conferences, on emails and in general conversation between colleagues with respect to who and what is being published and research, where, how and why. You are not told who drank with who, who slept with who, and who is pissed off with who – and why. It is also not how science really works (Feyerabend, 2010). ''Social context, metaphysical assumptions, professional aspirations, or ideological allegiances rarely feature in the textbook histories of the growth of geographical knowledge'' (Livingstone, 1992, p. 2).

The contents of an area of study at any one time and location reflect ''the response of the individuals involved to external circumstances and influences, within the context of their intellectual socialization'' (Johnston, 1983a, p. 4). Hall and Page (2006) (see also Jamal & Everett, 2004; Stewart, Draper, & Johnston, 2005) used Grano's (1981) model of geography's external influences and internal change to examine tourism geography. The tourism geography community, with

its associated conferences and meetings, journal(s) and organisations, is an 'institutionalizing social group' (Grano, 1981, p. 26), in which individuals are socialised and networked (Che, 2010) in the context of the structures within which it operates, including the circulation of social and scientific ideas and changes to university and research environments.

Changes in The Field

Given the perceived and empirical marginality of tourism geography to geography an obvious question is why *should* tourism be a significant sub-field of geography? The implications, for place, space, landscape, and environment as well as other themes are significant (Nepal, 2009a). But it is also significant with respect to its exceptionalism—the growth in international tourism mobility and its implications—as well as its mundanity, the fact that it is now such a part of the everyday, at least in consumer societies and destinations.

In policy terms, changes in global mobility patterns and place competition has lead to changes in private sector demands for labour, research funding; and education. The geography of tourism and those who engage in it are embedded and relationally involved in such global processes, even if not always willingly (Smith, 2010). There is an international labour market for tourism geographers, not necessarily including geography departments, as well as an increasingly international set of educational institutions and services. Teaching and research in tourism geography has become highly globalised—as evidenced by internationalisation of journals, books, courses, Internet communities, scholarly meetings, research projects and consultancies. Institutional demands to be international only further strengthen the dominance of English as the current language of globalisation and reinforcement of cultural and structural power and the prestige of certain Anglophone publications and publishers (Paasi, 2005)—what are otherwise hegemonic academic practices (Kitchin, 2005; Meriläinen, Tienari, Thomas, & Davies, 2008; Tietze & Dick, 2013). Such practices may also potentially worsen gender and minority group representation and impose different ethical practices (Dyer & Demerrit, 2009; Hall, 2011a).

Institutional dimensions of research quality are extremely important for the assessment of tourism geographical research as they set the 'rules of the game' within which research is conducted and published. National reviews define what constitute 'good' research by prescribing the analytical means, who does the analysis, what is included in the analysis, how tourism is regarded as a body and subject of knowledge and what the implications of the analysis will be (Coles, 2009; Hall, 2011b; Visser, 2009). The transfer and institutionalisation of research quality assessment processes, including journal rankings, has significant implications for local and global discourses of tourism geography knowledge and their circulation, especially given that the same article published in one journal can be ranked differently in terms of

'research quality' than if it was published in another. In non-Anglophone countries the preference for immutable mobiles in assessment regimes has pushed social scientists to publish in specialized, invariably Anglophone journals, resulting in attenuation in the relevance of local knowledge production (Paasi, 2005; Stöckelová, 2012).

What is still missing in the geographies of tourism knowledge production and circulation is an analysis of the intellectual and spatial mobilities of doctoral students post graduation and the extent to which graduates from non-English speaking countries return to their home countries and, even if they do, the extent to which they have been acculturated within the Anglophone academy (Tribe, 2010). Globalisation has changed the 'rules of the game' in higher education. However, the global circulation of knowledge is uneven. In some national jurisdictions, rewards may even be provided for various forms of 'local' research, such as indigenous studies. Yet, the primary focus of most university administrations is on publishing in international, meaning English language, journals. Nevertheless, other related debates and issues exist.

The Applied vs Theoretical Tourism Geography Binary

Tourism geography is long perceived as being primarily a field of applied geography (Lew, Hall, & Timothy, 2011; Martin & James, 1993; Meyer-Arendt & Lew 2003). The tensions between 'applied' and 'theoretical' studies in geography are also reflected in tourism geographies (Britton, 1983, 1991; Gill, 2012). Much of the tourism geographer's interest in applied geography is part of a desire to be 'relevant' and engage with broader public, community and business issues, including, for example, accessibility (Tóth & Lóránt, 2010), event management (Page & Connell, 2012), planning (Silberman & Rees, 2010), spatial analysis (Chhetri, Corcoran, & Hall, 2008; McKercher, Chan, & Lam, 2008; Peeters & Landré, 2011; Shoval & Isaacson, 2007), environmental behaviours (Barr, Gilg, & Shaw, 2011), social marketing and behavioural interventions (Hall, 2014), and weather information (Scott & Lemieux, 2010). Connecting with government, NGOs and business may also stimulate demand for graduates (Dornan & Truly, 2009). In the contemporary higher education environment those disciplines that demonstrate their intrinsic value may potentially be at less at risk from closure or amalgamation, with applied geography being 'essential' for the entrepreneurial university (Bailly et al., 2008).

Debate over applied geography, the use of geographic frameworks, methods and tools ''to address a specific issue that requires taking a space-place perspective in the human and/or physical environmental context of a particular situational setting, and doing that mostly through a formal client-consultant relationship'' (Stimson & Haynes, 2012, p. 4), has been ongoing since the 1970s. Critiqued first by Marxists and more recently by poststructuralists and social theorists the debate over applied geography focuses on the issues of relevance and value in geography, including tourism geography (Staeheli & Mitchell,

2005). In applied geography, theory provides the framework for asking questions, managing the problem, and deriving solutions (Pacione, 2004; Stimson & Haynes, 2012). As Livingstone (1992, p. 3) commented, ''Too often the practical outworkings of theory are overlooked''. Much applied spatial analysis appears to be criticised because it is grounded in a different set of scientific theory, usually in a quantitative and empirical vein, than those who criticise it (Hall, 2012). Wyly (2009) emphasises that the alignment between positivist epistemology, quantitative methodology, and conservative political ideology was contingent and contextual. Post-positivists committed to progressive politics have also suggested ways in which the critical-quantitative binary can be at least partially eclipsed and emphasise that spatial and quantitative analysis and critical geographies are not mutually exclusive (Kwan & Schwanen, 2009; Schwanen & Kwan, 2009). Hall (2013b) is more provocative suggesting that in ''focussing on the qualitative as being critical there is a danger that the potential critical powers of quantitative research . . . are undermined or, just as significantly, lead to accusations that those who advocate the qualitative without appreciating the quantitative do so only because they cannot do or understand statistics or mathematical modelling''.

Pacione's (1999) influential response to criticisms of applied geography highlights issues of knowledge management, circulation and reading as well as the contingency of knowledge. Pacione suggests that applied geography makes

> explicit the view that some kinds of research are more useful than others. This is not the same as saying that some geographical research is better than other work—all knowledge is useful—but some kinds of research and knowledge are more useful than others in terms of their ability to interpret and offer solutions to problems in contemporary physical and human environments (Pacione, 1999, p. 2).

Much of the criticism of applied geography is grounded in epistemological difference and issues of relevance. The influence of post-structuralist social theory is suggested to have led to the downgrading or loss of some geographical skills from geography departments, and their transfer elsewhere (Stimson & Haynes, 2012), with consequent difficulty in effective public policy engagement. Although the use of qualitative methods to provide informants with a voice to be heard, and increased awareness of researcher positionality and the politics of knowledge production is potentially improving contributions to policy-making (Hall, 2011a).

The 'applied vs theory' debate is germane to broader debates in tourism research and the social sciences (Tribe, 2009). It also reflects the emergence of concepts, i.e. creative class, experience economy, service-dominant logic, co-creation, destination competitiveness, and 'isms' or 'turns' that are sometimes uncritically adopted (Bianchi, 2009; Hall, 2010a), as part of the discourses of tourism geography. Many 'turns' have antecedents within geography that are unacknowledged (Hall & Page, 2009). It is not clear if this is a product of a loss of collective and individual memory, a failure to teach the history of

a discipline, the relatively poor availability of pre-1990 geography books in libraries or on Google Scholar, or just deliberate ignorance. But it does highlight the embeddedness of tourism geography in academic fashion cycles, 'which plays out through a particular industrial actor-network of academic knowledge production, circulation and reception' (Gibson & Klocker, 2004, p. 425); within which ''Dedicated followers of fashion hurry to buy the new…book, an act of discernment and discrimination that starkly reveals the truism that identity is constructed in and through the consumption of commodities'' (Barnett, 1998, p. 388).

The Physical vs Human Geography Binary

Perceptions of tourism geography are affected more by the intellectual debates of human geography than physical geography (Hall, 2013a). Nevertheless, a long-standing theme in geography (Johnston, 1983b), and in tourism geography (Hall & Page, 2006), is the relationship between physical and human geography. ''Frequently physical and human geography are separated out from one another as if they had completely different historical trajectories. Yet, over a fairly long period of time, it is their very co-existence that is one of the things that has helped to constitute the field at large'' (Agnew & Livingstone, 2011, p. 1).

A core reason for the sometime unease between physical and human geographers is their different methods, reasons and foci (Valentine, French, & Clifford, 2010). The physical/human binary with the quantitative scientific methods of physical geography at one extreme and the qualitative, poststructuralist, humanistic methods of human geography at the other revisits many elements of the applied/theoretical binary. Gregory (1978, p. 75) influentially suggested that the integration of human and physical geography was an ontological problem, in that even though they are connected by social practices, ''there is nothing in this which requires them to be connected through a formal system of common properties and universal constructs''.

Ontological differences raise fundamental questions about how the environment can actually be understood, the ethical relationships between humans and the environment, as well as criticism of instrumental science (Demeritt, 2006). Despite often little ontological common ground, there is a substantial history of multi-method and interdisciplinary approaches in tourism geography, including environmental perception (Kaltenborn, Qvenild, & Nellemann, 2011), natural hazards research (Mulligan, Ahmed, Shaw, Mercer, & Nadarajah, 2012), tourism impacts (Hall & Lew, 2009; Peeters, Szimba, & Duijnisveld, 2007; Wall & Mathieson, 2006), and resource management (Plummer & Fennell, 2009; Sæþórsdóttir & Ólafsson, 2010). Tourism geographers have made substantial contributions to sustainable tourism research (Bramwell, 2011; Bramwell & Lane, 2013; Hall, 2011c; Hall & Gössling, 2013; Holden & Fennell, 2013; Saarinen, 2006; Weaver 2006), including in developing regions (Rogerson & Visser, 2011; Saarinen,

Rogerson, & Manwa, 2011). However, its most substantial contemporary contribution is arguably in the complex areas of global environmental change (Gössling & Hall, 2006a) and climate change (Gössling, 2011; Scott, Peeters, & Gössling, 2010; Steiger, 2012) that necessitate integrated physical and human geographic approaches (Demeritt, 2009).

Geographers have long drawn attention to the institutional and social relations involved in producing scientific knowledge and have challenged the construction of environmental problems, such as climate change, within narrow technical and reductionist approaches that promote some kinds of knowledge at the expense of others (Demeritt 2001, 2006). Gössling and Hall (2006b, 2006c) noted that even though there has been a call for greater social science information to be brought into climate change assessment, these have primarily been neo-classical economic contributions that have significant problems in the formal modelling of tourist adaptation to climate change (Scott, Gössling, & Hall, 2012). In response, integrative 'postdisciplinary' (Coles et al., 2005, 2006), 'transdisciplinary' (Wainwright, 2010) and transition management approaches (Gössling, Hall, Ekström, Brudvik Engeset, & Aall, 2012) have been proposed to open the 'black boxes' that are often taken for granted in global change research to develop more sustainable trajectories.

Although often extensively using quantitative methods, a number of tourism geographers argue that climate change, as well as broader environmental issues, should be defined not just as an environmental issue but as a political-economic problem (Duffy & Moore, 2010; Gössling, Hall, Peeters, & Scott, 2010; Hall, 2011c), including the roles of economic and tourist growth, and seeking to encourage more sustainable forms of tourism consumption (Dubois, Ceron, Peeters, & Gössling, 2011; Gössling, Scott, Hall, Ceron & Dubois, 2012; Hall 2009b; Scott, 2011; Gössling, Peeters, Hall, Ceron, Dubois, Lehmann, & Scott, 2012). Indeed, Peeters and Landré (2011) call for a new quantitative and spatially-based but politically informed theoretical approach to tourism geography to be able to effectively respond to the challenges of tourism related climate change.

CONCLUSION

There is value in asking what tourism geographers do. The relatively open disciplinary boundaries of geography are reflected in tourism geography. The sub-discipline mirrors the concerns of geography, especially human geography, as well as tourism studies. ''Just as geography forms the foundation of our identity, so our association with the discipline of geography adds to our processes of self-identification'' (Cloke & Johnston, 2005, p. 2). Nevertheless, there are good grounds for feeling uneasy and self-conscious about the invention of heritage and traditions via disciplinary reviews, whether they be in textbooks, journals or research monographs (Aay, 1981; Smith, 2010), especially when their writing requires not just a re-evaluation of the academic arena but also,

as it should (Hall, 2004), a re-evaluation of self (Hall, 2010b). Heritage and tradition are essential for engaging in common dialogues, thinking critically and creatively, preparing future generations of students, and grounding disciplinary commitments in a time of rapidly changing institutional settings (Agnew & Livingstone, 2011; Mohrman et al., 2008). The invention of tradition, heritage and categories of belonging are clearly as important for academic identities as they are for the wider community (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983).

It is essential for scholars to understand the traditions of their academic fields and disciplines hopefully by crossing the different categorisations that comprise the discipline. If the binary or slightly more nuanced categorisations, e.g. physical and human; ''or qualitative and quantitative, or economic and cultural, or...were brought together the cross-fertilisation would bring massive benefits'' (Cloke & Johnston, 2005, p. 5). Therefore the issue is to ensure that vital conversations continue between pasts, presents and futures without becoming exclusionary or repressive regimes. However, this is sometimes difficult to achieve given the need for both open academic space for the circulation, production and reading of tourism geography, and encouragement to visit it. Given the expansion of the domains of geography and tourism, it is now extremely 'easy' to attend conferences and sessions that match personal interests or publish in specialised journals (of a high enough ranking) without being fundamentally challenged or invigorated by intellectual others. While the disciplinary boundedness of research quality exercises only further reinforces the closure of spaces between traditions.

Despite concerns over peripherality and the geography of knowledge this paper reinforces Gibson's (2008, p. 407) observation, ''Although not taken seriously by some, and still considered marginal by many, tourism constitutes an important point of intersection within geography, and its capacity to gel critical, integrative and imperative research appears to be increasingly realized''. In tourism geography, like geography (Cloke & Johnston, 2005; DeLyser & Sui, 2012; Sui & DeLyser 2012), there are clear signs that the qualitative/quantitative and human/physical divides are being bridged where interest exists, especially in critical applied geographies of sustainable consumption and environmental change, that necessitate methodological synergy, ontological holism, pluralism and radical open-mindedness in epistemology, and new balanced specialist-synthesis approaches. Such crossings and new research hybridities have long been part of the great emancipatory traditions of geography (Harvey, 2000a, 2000b). It will remain to be seen whether at the end of the next decade they have been made, or whether or not as geographers we will have further abandoned our natural world. A

REFERENCES

Aay, H. (1981). Textbook chronicles: Disciplinary history and the growth of geographic knowledge. In B. Blouet (Ed.), *The origins of academic geography in the United States* (pp. 291–301). Hamden: Archon Books.

Adey, P. (2010). *Mobility*. London: Routledge.

Agnew, J. (2007). Know-where: Geographies of knowledge of world politics. *International Political Sociology, 1*, 138–148.
Agnew, J., & Livingstone, D. N. (2011). Introduction. In J. Agnew & D. Livingstone (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of geographical knowledge* (pp. 1–18). London: Sage.
Agnew, J., Livingstone, D. N., & Rogers, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Human geography: An essential anthology*. Malden: Blackwell.
Aitchison, C. (2006). The critical and the cultural: Explaining the divergent paths of leisure studies and tourism studies. *Leisure Studies, 25*, 417–422.
Ayikoru, M., Tribe, J., & Airey, D. (2009). Reading tourism education: Neoliberalism unveiled. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*, 191–221.
Bailly, A., Gibson, L. J., & Haynes, K. E. (Eds.). (2008). *Applied geography for the entrepreneurial university*. Paris: Economica.
Bao, J., & Ma, L. J. C. (2010). Tourism geography in China, 1978–2008: Whence, what and whither?. *Progress in Human Geography, 35*, 3–20.
Barnes, T. J. (2010). Notes from the underground: Why the history of economic geography matters: The case of central place theory. *Economic Geography, 88*, 1–26.
Barnett, C. (1998). The cultural turn: Fashion or progress in human geography?. *Antipode, 30*, 379–394.
Barr, S., Gilg, A., & Shaw, G. (2011). 'Helping people make better choices': Exploring the behaviour change agenda for environmental sustainability. *Applied Geography, 31*(2), 712–720.
Bianchi, R. (2009). The 'critical turn' in tourism studies: A radical critique. *Tourism Geographies, 11*, 484–504.
Bramwell, B. (2011). Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: A political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 19*, 459–477.
Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2013). Getting from here to there: Systems change, behavioural change and sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 21*, 1–4.
Britton, S. (1983). Book review: Pearce, D.G. 1981: Tourist development. Topics in applied geography. *Progress in Human Geography, 7*, 618–621.
Britton, S. (1991). Tourism, capital, and place: Towards a critical geography of tourism. *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space, 9*, 451–478.
Butcher, S. (2012). Embodied cognitive geographies. *Progress in Human Geography, 36*, 90–110.
Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution, implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer, 24*, 5–12.
Butler, R. W. (2004). Geographical research on tourism, recreation and leisure: Origins, eras and directions. *Tourism Geographies, 6*, 143–162.
Butler, R. W. (Ed.). (2006). *The tourism area life cycle (2 vols.)*. Clevedon: Channel View.
Canagarajah, A. S. (1996). ''Nondiscursive'' requirements in academic publishing, material resources of periphery scholars, and the politics of knowledge production. *Written Communication, 13*, 435–472.
Castree, N., Rogers, A., & Sherman, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Questioning geography: Fundamental debates: Essays on a contested discipline*. Malden: Blackwell.
Che, D. (2010). Publishing tourism geography research. *Tourism Geographies, 12*, 324–328.
Chhetri, P., Corcoran, R., & Hall, C. M. (2008). Modelling the patterns and drivers of tourism related employment for South East Queensland, Australia – A spatial econometric approach. *Tourism Recreation Research, 33*(2), 25–38.
Cloke, P. J., & Johnston, R. (Eds.). (2005a). *Spaces of geographical thought: Deconstructing human geography's binaries*. London: Sage.
Cloke, P. J., & Johnston, R. (2005b). Deconstructing human geography's binaries. In P. J. Cloke & R. Johnston (Eds.), *Spaces of geographical thought: Deconstructing human geography's binaries* (pp. 1–20). London: Sage.
Coleman, S., & Crang, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Tourism: Between place and performance*. Oxford: Bergahn Books.
Coles, T. (2004). Tourism and leisure: Reading geographies, producing knowledges. *Tourism Geographies, 6*, 135–142.

Coles, T. (2009). Tourism studies and the governance of higher education in the United Kingdom. *Tourism Geographies, 11*, 23–42.
Coles, T. E., & Hall, C. M. (2006). Editorial: The geography of tourism is dead. Long live geographies of tourism and mobility. *Current Issues in Tourism, 9*, 289–292.
Coles, T., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. (2005). Mobilizing tourism: A post disciplinary critique. *Tourism Recreation Research, 30*(1), 31–41.
Coles, T., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. (2006). Tourism and post-disciplinary enquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism, 9*, 293–319.
Coles, T., Liasidou, S., & Shaw, G. (2008). Tourism and new economic geography: Issues and challenges in moving from advocacy to adoption. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 25*(3–4), 312–324.
Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory*. Cambridge: Polity.
Cooper, C. (2006). Knowledge management and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 33*, 47–64.
Crang, M. (1997). Picturing practices: Research through the tourist gaze. *Progress in Human Geography, 21*, 359–373.
Crang, M., & Thrift, N. (Eds.). (2000). *Thinking space*. London: Routledge.
Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the move: Mobility in the modern Western world*. New York: Routledge.
Cresswell, T. (2011). Mobilities I: Catching up. *Progress in Human Geography, 35*, 550–558.
Cresswell, T. (2012). Mobilities II: Still. *Progress in Human Geography, 36*, 645–653.
Crouch, D. (2003). Spacing, performing and becoming: Tangles in the mundane. *Environment and Planning A, 35*, 1945–1960.
De Blij, H. J. (2005). *Why geography matters: Three challenges facing America: Climate change, the rise of China, and global terrorism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still important?. *Comparative Education, 37*, 7–20.
DeLyser, D., & Sui, D. (2012). Crossing the qualitative-quantitative divide II: Inventive approaches to big data, mobile methods, and rhythmanalysis. *Progress in Human Geography*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0309132512444063.
Demeritt, D. (2001). The construction of global warming and the politics of science. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 91*, 307–337.
Demeritt, D. (2006). Science studies, climate change and the prospects for constructivist critique. *Economy and Society, 35*, 453–479.
Demeritt, D. (2009). Geography and the promise of integrative environmental research. *Geoforum, 40*, 127–129.
Deprest, F. (2002). L'invention géographique de la Méditerranée: éléments de reflexion. *L'Espace Géographique, 31*, 73–92.
Dornan, D., & Truly, D. (2009). Tourism geography education: Opportunities, obstacles and the production of tourism geographers. *Tourism Geographies, 11*, 73–94.
Dubois, G., Ceron, J., Peeters, P., & Gössling, S. (2011). The future tourism mobility of the world population: Emission growth versus climate policy. *Transportation Research A, 45*, 1031–1042.
Duffy, M. (2012). The requirement of having a body. *Geographical Research*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-5871.2012.00770.x.
Duffy, R., & Moore, L. (2010). Neoliberalising nature? Elephant-back tourism in Thailand and Botswana. *Antipode, 42*, 742–766.
Dyer, S., & Demeritt, D. (2009). Un-ethical review? Why it is wrong to apply the medical model of research governance to human geography. *Progress in Human Geography, 33*, 46–64.
Edensor, T. (2003). Defamiliarizing the mundane roadscape. *Space and Culture, 6*, 151–168.
Edensor, T. (2004). Automobility and national identity representation, geography and driving practice. *Theory, Culture & Society, 21*(4–5), 101–120.
Edensor, T. (2007). Mundane mobilities, performances and spaces of tourism. *Social & Cultural Geography, 8*, 199–215.
Feyerabend, P. (2010). *Against method* (4th ed.). London: Verso.

Franklin, A., & Crang, M. (2001). The trouble with tourism and travel theory?. *Tourist Studies, 1*, 5–22.
Gibson, C. (2008). Locating geographies of tourism. *Progress in Human Geography, 32*, 407–422.
Gibson, C. (2009). Geographies of tourism: Critical research on capitalism and local livelihoods''. *Progress in Human Geography, 33*, 527–534.
Gibson, C. (2010). Geographies of tourism: (Un)ethical encounters. *Progress in Human Geography, 34*, 521–527.
Gibson, C., & Klocker, N. (2004). Academic publishing as 'creative' industry, and recent discourse of 'creative economies': Some critical reflections. *Area, 36*, 423–434.
Gill, A. (2012). Travelling down the road to postdisciplinarity? Reflections of a tourism geographer. *Canadian Geographer, 56*, 3–17.
Gössling, S. (2011). *Carbon management in tourism: Mitigating the impacts on climate change*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Gössling, S., & Hall, C. M. (Eds.). (2006a). *Tourism and global environmental change: Ecological, economic, social and political interrelationships*. London: Routledge.
Gössling, S., & Hall, C. M. (2006b). Uncertainties in predicting tourist flows under scenarios of climate change. *Climatic Change, 79*, 163–173.
Gössling, S., & Hall, C. M. (2006c). Uncertainties in predicting travel flows: Common ground and research needs. A reply to Tol et al. *Climatic Change, 79*, 181–183.
Gössling, S., Hall, C. M., Ekström, F., Brudvik Engeset, A., & Aall, C. (2012). Transition management: A tool for implementing sustainable tourism scenarios?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 20*, 899–916.
Gössling, S., Hall, C. M., Peeters, P., & Scott, D. (2010). The future of tourism: A climate change mitigation perspective. *Tourism Recreation Research, 35*, 119–130.
Gössling, S., Peeters, P., Hall, C. M., Ceron, J., Dubois, G., Lehmann, L. V., & Scott, D. (2012). Tourism and water use: Supply, demand, and security. An international review. *Tourism Management, 33*, 1–15.
Gössling, S., Scott, D., Hall, C. M., Ceron, J., & Dubois, G. (2012). Consumer behaviour and demand response of tourists to climate change. *Annals of Tourism Research, 39*, 36–58.
Grano, O. (1981). External influence and internal change in the development of geography. In D. Stoddart (Ed.), *Geography, ideology and social concern* (pp. 17–36). Oxford: Blackwell.
Gregory, D. (1978). *Ideology, science and human geography*. New York: St. Martins.
Hall, C. M. (2004). Reflexivity and tourism research: Situating myself and/with others. In J. Phillimore & L. Goodson (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies* (pp. 137–155). London: Routledge.
Hall, C. M. (2005a). Reconsidering the geography of tourism and contemporary mobility. *Geographical Research, 43*, 125–139.
Hall, C. M. (2005b). *Tourism: Rethinking the social science of mobility*. Harlow: Prentice-Hall.
Hall, C. M. (2009a). 'A long and still-unfinished story': Constructing and defining Asian regionalisms. In T. Winter, P. Teo, & T. C. Chang (Eds.), *Asia on tour: Exploring the rise of Asian tourism* (pp. 21–33). Abingdon: Routledge.
Hall, C. M. (2009b). Degrowing tourism: Décroissance, sustainable consumption and steady-state tourism'. *Anatolia, 20*, 46–61.
Hall, C. M. (2010a). Academic capitalism, academic responsibility and tourism academics: Or, the silence of the lambs?. *Tourism Recreation Research, 35*, 298–301.
Hall, C. M. (2010b). In *The life and opinions of C. Michael Hall, gent: A shandy or full beer?*. In S. Smith (Ed.). *The discovery of tourism* (Volume the first, pp. 51–68). Bingley: Emerald Publishing.
Hall, C. M. (Ed.). (2011a). *Fieldwork in tourism: Methods, issues and reflections*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Hall, C. M. (2011b). Publish and perish? Bibliometric analysis, journal ranking and the assessment of research quality in tourism. *Tourism Management, 32*, 16–27.

Hall, C. M. (2011c). Policy learning and policy failure in sustainable tourism governance: From first-and second-order to third-order change?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 19*, 649–671.
Hall, C. M. (2012). Spatial analysis: A critical tool for tourism geographies. In J. Wilson (Ed.), *The routledge handbook of tourism geographies* (pp. 163–173). London: Routledge.
Hall, C. M. (2013a). Development(s) in the geographies of tourism: Knowledge(s), actions and cultures. In J. Wilson & S. Anton Clavé (Eds.), *Geographies of tourism: European research perspectives*. London: Emerald.
Hall, C. M. (2013b). Book review. Understanding tourism: A critical introduction. *Annals of Tourism Research, 41*, 244–246.
Hall, C. M. (2014). *Tourism and social marketing*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Hall, C. M., & Gössling, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Sustainable culinary systems: Local foods, innovation, and tourism & hospitality*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Hall, C. M., & Lew, A. (2009). *Understanding and managing tourism impacts: An integrated approach*. London: Routledge.
Hall, C. M., & Page, S. J. (2006). *The geography of tourism and recreation* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
Hall, C. M., & Page, S. J. (2009). Progress in tourism management: From the geography of tourism to geographies of tourism – A review. *Tourism Management, 30*, 3–16.
Hall, C. M., & Page, S. J. (2010). The contribution of Neil Leiper to tourism studies. *Current Issues in Tourism, 13*, 299–309.
Hall, C. M., & Page, S. J. (2012). Geography and the study of events. In S. Page & J. Connell (Eds.), *A handbook of events* (pp. 148–164). Abingdon: Routledge.
Hall, C. M., & Tucker, H. (Eds.). (2004). *Tourism and postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.
Hamnett, D., & Hoogendoorn, G. (2012). Geographies of the discipline: Experiences of young human geographers researching South Africa. Reflections on the politics and practices of knowledge production beyond the Anglo-American core: An introductory note. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography, 33*, 283–286.
Hannam, K. (2006). Tourism and development III: Performances, performities and mobilities. *Progress in Development Studies, 6*, 243–249.
Hannam, K. (2008). Tourist geographies, tourist studies and the turn towards mobilities. *Geography Compass, 2*, 127–139.
Harvey, D. (2000a). Cosmopolitanism and the banality of geographical evils. *Public Culture, 12*, 529–564.
Harvey, D. (2000b). *Spaces of hope*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Hobsbawm, E., & Ranger, T. (Eds.). (1983). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Holden, A., & Fennell, D. (Eds.). (2013). *The Routledge handbook of tourism and the environment*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Holt-Jensen, A. (2009). *Geography: History and concepts*. London: Sage.
Hoogendoorn, G., & Visser, G. (2012). Stumbling over researcher positionality and political-temporal contingency in South African second-home tourism research. *Critical Arts, 26*, 254–271.
Hubbard, P., Kitchin, R., & Valentine, G. (Eds.). (2004). *Key thinkers on space and place*. London: Sage.
Hui, A. (2008). Many homes for tourism re-considering spatializations of home and away in tourism mobilities. *Tourist Studies, 8*, 291–311.
Hultman, J., & Hall, C. M. (2012). Tourism place-making: Governance of locality in Sweden. *Annals of Tourism Research, 39*, 547–570.
Ioannides, D. (2006). Commentary: The economic geography of the tourist industry: Ten years of progress in research and an agenda for the future. *Tourism Geographies, 8*, 76–86.
Jamal, T. B., & Everett, J. (2004). Resisting rationalisation in the natural and academic life-world: Critical tourism research or hermeneutic charity?. *Current Issues in Tourism, 7*, 1–19.
Johnston, R. J. (1983a). On geography and the history of geography. *History of Geography Newsletter, 3*, 1–7.

Johnston, R. J. (1983b). Resource analysis, resource management and the integration of human and physical geography. *Progress in Physical Geography, 7*, 127–146.
Johnston, R. J. (1991). *Geography and Geographers: Anglo-American human geography since 1945* (4th ed). London: Edward Arnold.
Kaltenborn, B. P., Qvenild, M., & Nellemann, C. (2011). Local governance of national parks: The perception of tourism operators in Dovre-Sunndalsfjella National Park, Norway. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift–Norwegian Journal of Geography, 65*, 83–92.
Keighren, I. M. (2006). Bringing geography to the book: Charting the reception of influences of geographic environment. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 31*, 525–540.
Kitchin, R. (2005). Commentary: Disrupting and destabilizing Anglo-American and English-language hegemony in geography 1. *Social & Cultural Geography, 6*, 1–15.
Knudsen, B., & Waade, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Re-investing authenticity: tourism, place and emotions*. Bristol: Channel View.
Kwan, M., & Schwanen, T. (2009). Quantitative revolution 2: The critical (re)turn. *The Professional Geographer, 61*, 283–291.
Lemelin, H., Wiersma, E., & Stewart, E. (2011). Integrating researchers and indigenous communities: Reflections from Northern Canada. In C. M. Hall (Ed.), *Fieldwork in tourism: Methods, issues and reflections* (pp. 289–307). Abingdon: Routledge.
Lew, A. A., Hall, C. M., & Timothy, D. J. (2011). *World regional geography: Human mobilities, tourism destinations, sustainable environments*. Phoenix: Kendall Hunt.
Lew, A., Hall, C. M., & Williams, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Companion to tourism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.
Livingstone, D. N. (1992). *The geographical tradition: Episodes in the history of a contested enterprise*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Livingstone, D. N. (2005). Science, text and space: thoughts on the geography of reading. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 30*, 391–401.
Lorimer, H. (2008). Cultural geography: non-representational conditions and concerns. *Progress in Human Geography, 32*, 551–559.
Martin, G. J., & James, P. E. (1993). *All possible worlds: a history of geographical ideas* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. London: Sage.
Massey, D., Allen, J., & Sarre, P. (1999). *Human geography today*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
McKercher, B. (2008). A citation analysis of tourism scholars. *Tourism Management, 29*, 1226–1232.
McKercher, B., Chan, A., & Lam, C. (2008). The impact of distance on international tourist movements. *Journal of Travel Research, 47*, 208–224.
Meriläinen, S., Tienari, J., Thomas, R., & Davies, A. (2008). Hegemonic academic practices: Experiences of publishing from the periphery. *Organization, 15*, 584–597.
Meyer-Arendt, K. J., & Lew, A. A. (2003). Recreation, tourism, and sport. In G. Gaile & C. Willmott (Eds.), *Geography in America at the dawn of the 21st century* (pp. 524–540). New York: Oxford University Press.
Mohrman, K., Ma, W., & Baker, D. (2008). The research university in transition: The emerging global model. *Higher Education Policy, 21*, 5–27.
Molz, J. G. (2010). Performing global geographies: Time, space, place and pace in narratives of round-the-world travel. *Tourism Geographies, 12*(3), 329–348.
Müller, D. K. (2006). The attractiveness of second home areas in Sweden: A quantitative analysis. *Current Issues in Tourism, 9*, 335–350.
Müller, D. K. (2011). Second homes in rural areas: Reflections on a troubled history. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift-Norwegian Journal of Geography, 65*(3), 137–143.

Mulligan, M., Ahmed, I., Shaw, J., Mercer, D., & Nadarajah, Y. (2012). Lessons for long-term social recovery following the 2004 tsunami: Community, livelihoods, tourism and housing. *Environmental Hazards, 11*, 38–51.
Nepal, S. K. (2009a). Traditions and trends: A review of geographical scholarship in tourism. *Tourism Geographies, 11*, 2–22.
Nepal, S. K. (2009b). Tourism geographies: A review of trends, challenges and opportunities. In T. Jamal & M. Robinson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies* (pp. 130–145). London: Sage.
Paasi, A. (2005). Globalisation, academic capitalism and the uneven geographies of international journal publishing spaces. *Environment and Planning A, 37*, 769–789.
Pacione, M. (1999). Applied geography: in the pursuit of useful knowledge. *Applied geography, 19*, 1–12.
Pacione, M. (2004). Principles and practice. In A. Bailly & L. J. Gibson (Eds.), *Applied geography: A world perspective* (pp. 23–46). Paris: Economica.
Page, S. J., & Connell, J. (Eds.). (2012). *A handbook of events*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Paris, C. (2009). Re-positioning second homes within housing studies: household investment, gentrification, multiple residence, mobility and hyper-consumption. *Housing, Theory and Society, 26*, 292–310.
Peet, R. (1998). *Modern geographical thought*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Peeters, P., & Landré, M. (2011). The emerging global tourism geography—An environmental sustainability perspective. *Sustainability, 4*(1), 42–71.
Peeters, P., Szimba, E., & Duijnisveld, M. (2007). Major environmental impacts of European tourist transport. *Journal of Transport Geography, 15*, 83–93.
Plummer, R., & Fennell, D. A. (2009). Managing protected areas for sustainable tourism: Prospects for adaptive co-management. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 17*, 149–168.
Rogerson, C. M., & Visser, G. (2011). African tourism geographies: Existing paths and new directions. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie, 102*, 251–259.
Saarinen, J. (2006). Traditions of sustainability in tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research, 33*, 1121–1140.
Saarinen, J., Rogerson, C., & Manwa, H. (2011). Tourism and millennium development goals: Tourism for global development?. *Current Issues in Tourism, 14*, 201–203.
Sæþórsdóttir, A. D., & Ólafsson, R. (2010). Nature tourism assessment in the Icelandic master plan for geothermal and hydropower development. Part I: Rapid evaluation of nature tourism resources. *Journal of Heritage Tourism, 5*, 311–331.
Schwanen, T., & Kwan, M. (2009). ''Doing'' critical geographies with numbers. *The Professional Geographer, 61*, 459–464.
Scott, D. (2011). Why sustainable tourism must address climate change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 19*, 17–34.
Scott, D., Gössling, S., & Hall, C. M. (2012). *Tourism and climate change: Impacts, adaptation and mitigation*. London: Routledge.
Scott, D., & Lemieux, C. (2010). Weather and climate information for tourism. *Procedia Environmental Sciences, 1*, 146–183.
Scott, S., Miller, F., & Lloyd, K. (2006). Doing fieldwork in development geography: Research culture and research spaces in Vietnam. *Geographical Research, 44*, 28–40.
Scott, D., Peeters, P., & Gössling, S. (2010). Can tourism deliver on its aspirational greenhouse gas emission reduction targets?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 18*, 393–408.
Shapin, S. (1998). Placing the view from nowhere: historical and sociological problems in the location of science. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 23*, 5–12.
Shaw, G., & Williams, A. (2009). Knowledge transfer and management in tourism organisations: An emerging research agenda. *Tourism Management, 30*, 325–335.
Sheller, M. (2007). Bodies, cybercars and the mundane incorporation of automated mobilities. *Social & Cultural Geography, 8*, 175–197.

Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A, 38*, 207–226.
Shoval, N., & Isaacson, M. (2007). Tracking tourists in the digital age. *Annals of Tourism Research, 34*, 141–159.
Silberman, J. A., & Rees, P. W. (2010). Reinventing mountain settlements: A GIS model for identifying possible ski towns in the US Rocky Mountains. *Applied Geography, 30*, 36–49.
Silverman, N. (1992). Reading between the lines: textbooks as terrains of struggle over power and control. *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural. Studies, 14*, 203–213.
Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state and higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Smith, S. (Ed.). (2010). *The discovery of tourism*. Emerald: Bingley.
Smith, S. L. (2011). Becoming a tourism scholar. *Tourism Geographies, 13*, 480–494.
Smith, M., & Richards, G. (Eds.). (2013). *The Routledge handbook of cultural tourism*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Smith, L., Waterton, E., & Watson, S. (Eds.). (2012). *The cultural moment in tourism*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Staeheli, L. A., & Mitchell, D. (2005). The complex politics of relevance in geography. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 12*, 327–336.
Steiger, R. (2012). Scenarios for skiing tourism in Austria: Integrating demographics with an analysis of climate change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 20*, 867–882.
Stewart, E. J., Draper, D., & Johnston, M. E. (2005). A review of tourism research in the polar regions. *Arctic, 58*, 383–394.
Stimson, R., & Haynes, K. E. (2012). Applied geography: relevance and approaches. In R. Stimson & K. E. Haynes (Eds.), *Studies in applied geography and spatial analysis: Addressing real world issues* (pp. 1–16). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
Stöckelová, T. (2012). Immutable mobiles derailed: STS, geopolitics, and research assessment. *Science, Technology & Human Values, 37*, 286–311.
Sui, D., & DeLyser, D. (2012). Crossing the qualitative-quantitative chasm I. *Progress in Human Geography, 36*, 111–124.
Teo, P. (2009). Knowledge order in Asia. In T. Winter, P. Teo, & T. C. Chang (Eds.), *Asia on tour: Exploring the rise of Asian tourism* (pp. 34–51). Abingdon: Routledge.
Tietze, S., & Dick, P. (2013). The victorious English language. Hegemonic practices in the management academy. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 22*, 122–134.
Timothy, D. J., & Coles, T. (Eds.). (2004). *Tourism, diasporas and space: Travels to promised lands*. London: Routledge.
Tóth, G., & Lóránt, D. (2010). Tourism and accessibility: An integrated approach. *Applied Geography, 30*, 666–677.
Tribe, J. (Ed.). (2009). *Philosophical issues in tourism*. Bristol: Channel View.
Tribe, J. (2010). Tribes, territories and networks in the tourism academy. *Annals of Tourism Research, 37*, 7–33.
Valentine, G., French, S., & Clifford, N. (Eds.). (2010). *Key methods in geography*. London: Sage.
Visser, G. (2009). Tourism geographies and the South African National Research Foundation's Researcher Rating System: International connections and local disjunctures. *Tourism geographies, 11*, 43–72.
Wainwright, J. (2010). Climate change, capitalism, and the challenge of transdisciplinarity. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 100*, 983–991.
Waitt, G., & Duffy, M. (2010). Listening and tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research, 37*, 457–477.
Waitt, G., Markwell, K., & Gorman-Murray, A. (2008). Challenging heteronormativity in tourism studies: Locating progress. *Progress in Human Geography, 32*, 781–800.
Wall, G., & Mathieson, A. (2006). *Tourism: Change, impacts and opportunities*. Harlow: Pearson.

Weaver, D. (2006). *Sustainable tourism: Theory and practice*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
Weidenfeld, A., Williams, A. M., & Butler, R. W. (2010). Knowledge transfer and innovation among attractions. *Annals of Tourism Research, 37*, 604–626.
Williams, S. (2009). *Tourism geography: A new synthesis* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
Williams, A. M., & Hall, C. M. (2002). Tourism, migration, circulation and mobility: The contingencies of time and place. In C. M. Hall & A. M. Williams (Eds.), *Tourism and migration: New relationships between production and consumption* (pp. 1–52). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Williams, A. M., & Shaw, G. (2011). Internationalization and innovation in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 38*(1), 27–51.
Wilson, J. (Ed.). (2012). *The Routledge handbook of tourism geographies*. London: Routledge.
Wilson, J., & Anton Clavé, S. (Eds.). (2014). *Geographies of tourism: European research perspectives*. London: Emerald.
Winter, T. (2007). *Post-conflict heritage, postcolonial tourism: Culture, politics and development at Angkor*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Winter, T. (2009). Asian tourism and the retreat of Anglo-Western centrism in tourism theory. *Current Issues in Tourism, 12*, 21–31.
Wyly, E. (2009). Strategic positivism. *The Professional Geographer, 61*, 310–322.