

Graham M. S. DANN*

**KAD DISCIPLINA NIJE DISCIPLINA?
ISTRAŽIVANJA INTERDISCIPLINARNIH DRUŠTVENIH ZNANOSTI
KAO TEMELJA ZA RAZUMIJEVANJE TURIZMA**

**WHEN IS A DISCIPLINE NOT A DISCIPLINE? EXPLORATIONS
INTO THE INTERDISCIPLINARY SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC
BASIS OF TOURISM UNDERSTANDING**

SAŽETAK: Ovaj rad ponovno istražuje pitanje je li izučavanje turizma znanost, disciplina ili područje. Problem se analizira u sedam faza. Rad prvo istražuje pojam znanosti turizma jer, ako se može dokazati da je turizam metadisciplina, onda ga više ne treba promatrati kao disciplinu. Međutim, s obzirom da je dokazano da to nije tako, treba se usredotočiti na turizam kao disciplinu. Stoga se u sljedećem dijelu daje kratak pregled etimologije discipline. U trećem dijelu opisano je kako je pokrenuta rasprava o turizmu kao disciplini. Četvrto, nakon što smo istražili programe dva vodeća fakulteta društvenih znanosti i sadržaj jedne enciklopedije koja se bavi društvenim znanostima, mogli smo identificirati ključne discipline u društvenim znanostima i uvidjeti po čemu se razlikuju od područja koja nastaju preklapanjem više područja i od njihovih primjena. U petom dijelu rad istražuje problem "društvene znanosti turizma". Šesto, rad analizira ideje intradisciplinarnosti, multidisciplinarnosti, interdisciplinarnosti i postdisciplinarnosti, koja se nedavno pojavila. Tamo gdje je u stvaranje kumulativnog znanja o turizmu uključeno više disciplina društvenih znanosti, takav pluralistički pristup sagledavanju tog fenomena naziva se interdisciplinarnost.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: turizmologija, turizam kao disciplina, turizam kao područje, interdisciplinarnost

SUMMARY: This paper revisits the whole question of whether the study of tourism is a science, a discipline or a field. The argument is developed in seven stages. First, the notion of the science of tourism is explored, because, if tourism as a meta-discipline can be substantiated, then *a fortiori* it is no longer necessary to examine tourism as a discipline. However, as the former is demonstrably not the case, attention needs to focus on the latter. Accordingly, and second, the etymology of a discipline is briefly outlined. Third, there is the contextual advent of tourism as a discipline debate. Fourth, by inspecting the offerings of two leading faculties of social sciences, and an encyclopedia with a similar focus, it is possible to identify the core disciplines in the social sciences and to distinguish them from intersecting fields and applications. Fifth, the issue of "tourism social science" is investigated. Sixth, the ideas of intradisciplinarity, multidisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity and, more recently, postdisciplinarity are analysed. Where more than one social science discipline is involved in obtaining a cumulative knowledge of tourism, this pluralistic form of capturing the phenomenon is referred to as interdisciplinarity.

KEY WORDS: tourismology, tourism as a discipline, tourism as a field, interdisciplinarity

* Professor Emeritus Graham Dann, University of Tromsø, Arctic University of Norway, Alta Campus, Norway, e-mail: dann_graham@yahoo.co.uk

Disciplina definira ne samo o čemu razmišljati i kako o tomu razmišljati, već i što se nalazi izvan područja koje pokriva. Tvrđiti da je nešto disciplina znači reći ne samo što ona jest, već i što ona nije (Wallerstein 1999:1).

1. UVOD

Oko razumijevanja pojma „interdisciplinarnost” još uvijek ima puno terminoloških nejasnoća iz jednostavnog razloga što još uvijek ne postoji konsenzus oko pojma “disciplina” na kojoj se on zasniva. Kad je riječ o izučavanju turizma, taj je prijedor počeo raspravom oko pitanja predstavlja li turizam samostalnu disciplinu ili područje. Iako je prevladalo mišljenje da je riječ o području, u konačnici je predloženo da bi se mogla napraviti dodatna distinkcija između istraživanja poslovnih aspekata turizma i njegovih ne-poslovnih obilježja.

Međutim, u ovom radu naglašava se da je s teorijskog gledišta puno smislenije razlikovati akademski od neznanstvenog pristupa turizmu, ovisno o tome temelji li se na disciplinama društvenih znanosti ili ne. Tako su, na primjer, menadžment i marketing, koji se otprilike mogu opisati kao sistemski oblici praktičnog znanja povezani s turističkim aktivnostima, nesumnjivo neznanstvene discipline po sebi budući da je većina njihovih takozvanih “teorija” i “spoznaja” prije deskriptivna nego eksplanatorna. Stoga, žele li menadžment i marketing zadobiti poštovanje akademske zajednice, stručnjaci koji se njima bave mogu se osjetiti ponukanima da se u velikoj mjeri koriste elementima priznatih znanstvenih društvenih disciplina poput sociologije, koja sadrži notu uzročnosti. Na sličan način, na primjer, i antropologija, kao samostalna znanstvena disciplina, može pomoći u razumijevanju turizma ako se njezine teorije i metodologije izravno primijene na područje turizma, bilo samostalno ili zajedno s njegovim teorijama i metodo-

A discipline defines not only what to think about and how to think about, but also what is outside its purview. To say that a given subject is a discipline is to say not only what it is but what it is not (Wallerstein 1999:1).

1. INTRODUCTION

Much terminological confusion still exists in comprehending the notion of “interdisciplinarity” for the very reason that there is a surprising lack of consensus over the concept of “discipline” on which it is based. In relation to the study of tourism, this controversy originally came to fruition in the debate as to whether tourism constituted an autonomous discipline or a field. Even though the latter view prevailed, it was nevertheless suggested as a corollary that an additional distinction could usefully be made between investigating the business aspects and non-business features of tourism.

However, it is emphasised here that it makes greater theoretical sense to distinguish the academic from the non scholarly treatment of tourism which in turn is dependent on either its respective grounding on, or lack of disciplinary foundation in the social sciences. Thus, management and marketing, for example, which can be loosely described as systematic forms of practical knowledge that are connected with the operations of tourism, are arguably not social-scientific disciplines in their own right, since most of their so-called “theories” and “insights” are descriptive rather than explanatory in nature. Hence, if management and marketing are to achieve academic respect, their adherents may feel obliged to *borrow* heavily from established social scientific disciplines such as sociology that inject a note of causality into the proceedings. Similarly, anthropology, for instance, as an independent social science discipline, is capable of providing an understanding of tourism by the direct application

logijama. Menadžment i marketing, s druge strane, teško mogu postići taj cilj, a da pri tome ne posegnu za društvenim znanostima kako bi uzeli ono što im nedostaje u njihovom skućenom teorijskom repertoaru.

2. PORIJEKLO RASPRAVE O DISCIPLINI U KONCEPTU TURIZMOLOGIJE

Cijeloj kontroverzi oko toga je li turizam disciplina ili područje prethodila je rasprava je li ili nije turizam znanost ili bi li bi trebao biti znanost pod nazivom "turizmologija" (a ponegdje i "turologija"). U ovom je radu stoga potrebno, pa makar i ukratko, istražiti porijeklo ideje o "turizmu kao znanosti" prije nego se okrenemo problemu discipline. Jednostavan razlog takvom slijedu razmatranja jest taj, ako je turizam samostalna, nezavisna znanost, tada je *a fortiori* metadisciplina i stoga se na njega logično može gledati kao na set znanja koji u sebi sadrži raznovrsne podsetove discipline. Nakon što je utvrđeno da to nije tako, rad se usredotočuje na etimologiju discipline i na pojam reda koju ona implicira. Nakon toga, fokus se stavlja na pitanje je li turizam disciplina ili područje, što je tema rasprave koja se intenzivno vodila između dva istaknuta znanstvenika, pokojnog Neila Leipera i živućeg Johna Tribea. Međutim, čini se da niti jedan od te dvojice međusobno suprotstavljenih autora nije siguran kako bi discipline trebalo klasificirati ili, što je za našu sadašnju temu još važnije, koje discipline po sebi predstavljaju discipline društvenih znanosti. Potom se razmatra koje prave discipline društvenih znanosti mogu pružiti razumijevanje turizma. Ovo posljednje istražuje se u kontekstu društvene znanosti turizma, što je bila tema posebnog broja *Annals of Tourism Research* 1991. godine, a potom i konferencije kojom se slavila dvadeseta godišnjica njegova izlaska.¹ I na

of its own body of theory and methodology to the field of tourism, either singly or in tandem with one another. Management and marketing, by contrast, would find it difficult attain that goal without going first to the social sciences in order to obtain what they are lacking in their own flimsy theoretical repertoires.

2. THE ORIGIN OF THE DISCIPLINARY DEBATE IN THE CONCEPT OF TOURISMOLOGY

The whole controversy as to whether tourism is a discipline or field was pre-dated by a debate as to whether or not tourism was or should be a science known principally as "tourismology" (or occasionally as "turology"). This paper necessarily, though briefly, due to inevitable constraints of space, investigates the origins of this "tourism as science" stance before tackling the issue of discipline. The simple reason for this prioritising of agenda is that if tourism is an autonomous, independent science then *a fortiori* it is a meta-discipline and hence can logically be viewed as a knowledge-set containing various disciplinary subsets. After reaching a negative conclusion to that question, thereafter the account focuses on the etymology of discipline and the notion of order that it implies. Subsequently, attention focuses on whether tourism is a discipline or a field, an intellectual exchange that intensifies between the two key players of the late Neil Leiper and the very much alive John Tribe. Neither of these two adversarial commentators, however, appears to be certain as to how disciplines should be classified, or, more importantly for the current exercise, which disciplines are social scientific in nature. This matter is addressed before it is asked which genuine social scientific disciplines provide an understanding of tourism. This last consideration is investigated within the context of tourism social science, as a special issue of *Annals of Tourism Research* in 1991 and then as the theme of a 20th anniversary

¹ Potrebno je napomenuti i da se prije konferencije koja se održala 2011. godine u Surreyju održao sličan

kraju, u zadnjem se poglavlju analizira što se podrazumijeva pod multidisciplinarnošću, interdisciplinarnošću i postdisciplinarnošću te u kojoj mjeri razlike među njima mogu pomoći u istraživanju turizma.

Koliko je poznato, prva osoba koja je skovala termin *turizmologija* bio je srpski geograf Živadin Jovičić. On je 1972. godine objavio zbirku radova na tu temu i, prema Vukoniću (2009:205), iste godine napisao kontroverzni članak pod naslovom "Za bržim stvaranjem turizmologije kao posebne znanstvene discipline". Kasnije je 1980.

interdisciplinarni skup (the 5th World Conference for Graduate Research in Tourism, Leisure and Hospitality) u Muğli u Turskoj, od 21.-24. travnja 2011., kojega je sponzorirao časopis *Anatolia*, a organizirao Metin Kozak. Prema Zaferu Oteru (2011), na tom su se događanju vodile burne rasprave o tome je li turizam disciplina ili „neovisno znanstveno područje“, a neki od glavnih govornika bili su Richard Butler, Erik Cohen, Jafar Jafari i Egon Smeral. Kad su o tome izvijestile lokalne turske novine *Hürriyet Daily News* (26. travnja 2011.) i kad su o tome objavljeni postovi na TRINET-u, svjetskom internetskom forumu za istraživače u turizmu, potaknuto je još više rasprava. Svi zainteresirani mogu o njima više pročitati na TRINET-u, a osobito su zanimljiva razmišljanja Thomasa Iversona, Alana Lewa, Nielsa Nielsena, Zafera Otera, Toma Selwyna i Sagara Singha. Posebno su interesantni sljedeći kontroverzni dijelovi navedenog novinskog članka: „Turizam se brzo transformira iz poslovnog segmenta u znanstveno područje“, „Turistički sektor se pretvara iz područja primijenjenih istraživanja u zrelo znanstveno područje“, „Predstavnici akademske zajednice koji su govorili na konferenciji podcrtali su nedostatak jedinstvene teorijske baze turizma što ga je do sada sprječavalo da postane znanstvenom disciplinom“, „Rečeno je da istraživači u tom područja imaju koristi od teorijskih osnova poslovne administracije, a ponekad i drugih znanosti“, „Znanstvenici su rekli da je turizam akademska disciplina“, „U završnom izvješću navodi se da je turizam dio društvenih znanosti“, „Stručnjaci koji su sudjelovali na konferenciji dolaze iz raznih disciplina, uključujući turističko poslovanje, filozofiju znanosti, sociologiju, upravljanje povijesnu znanosti, marketing, statistiku, ekonometriju, javnu administraciju, financije i ekonomiju.“ Među ovako različitim mišljenjima ne samo da nije moguće postići konsenzus, već iz navedenoga nije ni jasno što točno jest disciplina u društvenim znanostima, a kamoli što jest znanost.

conference dedicated to the celebration of the same topic.¹ Finally there is a concluding analysis as to what is meant by intradisciplinarity, multidisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity and postdisciplinarity, and the extent to which these distinctions can lead the way forward in tourism research.

To the best of one's knowledge, the first person to have coined the term *tourizmologi-*

¹ It should also be noted that predating the Surrey 2011 conference there was a similar interdisciplinary gathering (the 5th World Conference for Graduate Research in Tourism, Leisure and Hospitality) held in Muğla, Turkey from April 21-24 2011 under the sponsorship of the journal *Anatolia* and the organisation of Metin Kozak. According to Zafer Oter (2011), in the actual event there was a great deal of divided discussion as to whether tourism was or was not a discipline or "an independent field of science" among the keynote speakers which included *inter alia* Richard Butler, Erik Cohen, Jafar Jafari and Egon Smeral. When the issue was reported in a local Turkish newspaper, *Hürriyet Daily News* (26 April 2011) and posted on TRINET, the worldwide electronic bulletin board for tourism researchers, this had the effect of generating even more debate. Those interested in following the various arguments can therefore consult TRINET, and in particular contributions from the likes of Thomas Iverson, Alan Lew, Niels Nielsen, Zafer Oter, Tom Selwyn and Sagar Singh. Of special relevance were the following controversial sentences from the newspaper account: 'Tourism is rapidly transforming from a business segment into a scientific field', 'The tourism sector was moving from being an applied study field to being a mature field of science', 'Academics speaking at the conference underlined the lack of unique theoretic foundations to tourism that had so far prevented it becoming a scientific discipline' 'They said that researchers of the field benefited from the theoretic underpinnings of business administration and sometimes other sciences', 'The scholars said tourism was an academic discipline', 'The final report said that tourism was part of social science', 'Experts participating at the conference came from a variety of disciplines, including tourism administration, philosophy of science, sociology, science history management, marketing, statistics, econometrics, public administration, finance and economy.' Here, not only is it difficult to achieve consensus among these varying points of view, but it is not obvious as to what exactly constitutes a social scientific discipline, let alone a science.

godine uslijedila i Jovičićeva knjiga *Osnovi turizmologije*. Ne samo da je u to vrijeme na Sveučilištu u Beogradu pod njegovim vodstvom postojao istoimeni odsjek koji se bavio studijem turizmologije, već je izlazio i časopis jednostavnog imena *Turizmologija*. Vukonić (2009:205) navodi da je Jovičić smatrao da se turizam može legitimno smatrati znanostima samo na određenom stupnju svojega razvoja (na razini i teorije i metode) i da se tako nešto smatra poželjnim. Međutim, većina znanstvenika u bivšoj Jugoslaviji suprotstavila se Jovičićevim razmišljanjima. U njihovoj se kritici implicitno odražavao i politički kontekst u kojemu su se te ideje artikulirale jer su njihovi stavovi trebali biti ideološki usklađeni sa stavovima komunističkih vlasti. Međutim, to nije pokolebalo Jovičića te je uskoro nastavio raspravu, ustrajući te godine u *Tourist Review* da će “neki možda nastaviti osporavati turizmologiju kao znanost, ali nema sumnje da će ona svoju punu potvrdu dobiti u bliskoj budućnosti” (1993:2). U tomu se mogao osloniti na korisnog saveznika Rogozinskog (1985) koji je tvrdio da će, ako se istraživanje turizma ne integrira (kao znanost) u svoje opće teorije, modele i koncepte, jednostavno doći do fragmentacije te discipline (Echtner i Jamal, 1997:869-870).

Nakon toga prošlo je nekih dvadeset godina prije nego se u Perpignanu u Francuskoj pojavio sljedeći značajan zagovornik turizmologije, Jean-Michel Hoerner. Iako je i prije pisao o brojnim temama vezanima uz turizam (npr. Hoerner, 1993, 1996, 1997a, 1997b, 2001, 2006, 2008a, 2008b, 2010), njegov najznačajniji doprinos je ponovno pokretanje teme turizmologije (Hoerner, 2000, 2002a, 2002b, 2005; Hoerner i Mamontoff, 2009; Hoerner i Sicart, 2003). U svojem prvom radu na tu temu Hoerner (2000) je u obliku manifesta pozvao na stvaranje znanosti turizma kao sredstva evaluacije, istraživanja i poučavanja u području koje su “pravi” znanstvenici prezirali (tragovi anglofonskih primjedbi o turizmu kao frivol-

ja [tourismology] was the Serbian geographer, Živadin Jovičić. In 1972 he published a collection of papers on this subject, and, according to Vukonić (2009:205), in the same year produced a controversial article under the heading “For the More Rapid Formation of Tourismology as a Separate Scientific Discipline”. Later in 1980 there followed a book from the same Jovičić entitled *Osnovi Turizmologije* [Essentials of Tourismology]. Not only was there at that time a corresponding department under his aegis dedicated to tourismology studies at the University of Belgrade but also a journal bearing the simple name of *Tourismology*. Vuonić (2009:205) notes that Jovičić maintained that it was only at a certain stage of its development that tourism could legitimately be regarded as a science, (both at the level of theory and method), and that such a situation was considered desirable. However, most scholars in the former Yugoslavia were opposed to Jovičić’s thinking. Implicit in their judgement was also the political context in which these ideas were articulated and whether or not they were deemed to be ideologically compatible with the prevailing Communist power base. Even so, the ever undaunted Jovičić soon returned to the fray, maintaining in the *Tourist Review* of that year that, ‘some will perhaps continue to dispute tourismology as a science, but there is no doubt that it will find its full assertion in the near future’ (1993:2). In this respect he was able to rely on a useful ally in the person of Rogozinski (1985) who maintained that unless tourism research was integrated (as a science) in its general theories, models and concepts, it would simply be subject to single discipline fragmentation (Echtner and Jamal 1997:869-870).

Thereafter, some twenty years went by until the appearance in Perpignan, France, of the next significant advocate of tourismology, Jean-Michel Hoerner. Although he had written on numerous tourism topics (e.g., Hoerner 1993, 1996, 1997a, 1997b, 2001, 2006, 2008a, 2008b, 2010), his major contribution lay in the resurrected theme of tourismology

nom predmetu?). Samo dvije godine kasnije, Hoerner (2002a) piše traktat o turizmologiji kao novoj znanosti turizma koja je u stanju analizirati sve aspekte putovanja i usluga, humanističkoj sintetičkoj znanosti orijentiranoj ka zapošljavanju u toj industriji. Turizam je tako kao znanost u nastajanju bio na prijelomnoj točki, spreman suočiti se ne samo s temama poput udaljenosti, trajanja i troška putovanja, već i onima poput individualiziranih putovanja i društva hipertrofiranih slavlja i njihovih kontradiktornih posljedica. Hoerner (2002b) je stoga tu novu znanost povezo s načinima definiranja turizma te istražio njegova epistemološka obilježja (Hoerner, 2005). U svojem zajedničkom radu Hoerner i Sicart (2003) su se također pozabavili problemom definiranja turizma te istražili materijale na linkovima Svjetske turističke organizacije (World Tourism Organisation, WTO) u engleskom prijevodu, poput pojmova udaljenosti, trajanja boravka, upravljanja putovanjem, turističke industrije i razlike između putnika (*travellers*) i turista (*tourists*) u engleskom jeziku. Na kraju su se Hoerner i Mamontoff (2009) vratili temi znanosti turizma i pokušali uspostaviti njezine nove obrise. Nastojali su objasniti probleme poput povezanosti turizma i kapitalizma, uloge srednje klase, važnosti globalnih financija u razvoju ugostiteljstva te kolonijalnog odnosa između turista sa sjevera i naroda na jugu koje posjećuju. Usto su, iako su u svojim promišljanjima ponekad bili nelogični, zagovarali sociološka i psihološka istraživanja tema poput razvoja turističkih praksi i njihovog utjecaja na logiku potrošnje, ponašanja grupa u skladu s njihovim društvenim teritorijima te održivosti i rizika mobilnosti turista. Zanimljivo je da su osjetili da im za njihov pothvat trebaju dvije discipline društvenih znanosti, što je svakako predstavljalo indikaciju da znanost turizma u tom trenutku nije mogla samostalno ispuniti taj zadatak.

Važno je napomenuti da danas postoji veliki broj akademskih institucija koje se bave

(Hoerner, 2000, 2002a, 2002b, 2005; Hoerner and Mamontoff 2009; Hoerner and Sicart 2003). In his first paper on the topic, Hoerner (2000) constructed a manifesto-like plea for the creation of a tourism science as a means of evaluating, research and training in a domain that had come to be despised by “real” scientists (shades of Anglophone comments about tourism being considered a frivolous subject?) Just two years later, Hoerner (2002a) was writing a treatise of tourismology as a new tourism science capable of analysing all aspects of travel and service, a human science of synthesis oriented to employment in that industry. Tourism was thus at the crossroads of a science waiting to be born and ready to embrace not just the distance, duration and cost of trips, but also to incorporate the voyage of the “me” and the hyper-festive society, along with their contradictory consequences. Hoerner (2002b) subsequently tied in this new science with the definitional aspects of tourism and examined its epistemological features (Hoerner, 2005). In a co-authored paper, Hoerner and Sicart (2003) once more went back to the connection with definitions, on this occasion examining the links provided by the World Tourism Organisation (WTO) in English translation, including those relating to distance, length of stay, management of travel, the tourist industry and the familiar English speaking distinction between travellers and tourists. Finally Hoerner and Mamontoff (2009) returned to the science of tourism and tried to establish new contours. Here they attempted to understand such issues as the associations between tourism and capitalism, the role of the middle class, the importance of global finance in the development of hospitality, and the colonial relationships between tourists of the north and visited peoples of the south. They additionally, though on reflection somewhat illogically, argued for sociological and psychological research into such topics as the evolution of touristic practices and their impacts on the logic of consumption, performance of groups according to their social territories, and the viability and risks of touristic

poučavanjem turizmologije, poput centara u Francuskoj, Libanonu, Turskoj i Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama (<http://www.tourismology.org>). Uz već spomenuto Sveučilište u Beogradu, postoje i Katedra za turizmologiju na Ekonomskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Kragujevcu te Institut za geografiju, turizmologiju i hotelski menadžment na Prirodno-matematičkom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Novom Sadu. Usto, kad je riječ o pojedincima, tu su Tran Duc Thanh, koji je znanost turizma 1998. uveo na College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Sveučilišta u Hanoiju, Vijetnam, a autor je i knjige o turizmu koja je već doživjela svoje peto izdanje (2009); S. R. Erdavletov, koji predaje osnove znanosti turizma (turizmologije) na Al-Farabi Kazakh National University u Republici Kazahstan (<http://www.kaznu.kz/en/755>); A. Pykharev na South Kazakhstan State University, kao i Daniel Fuchs na Silpakom University International College, u Bangkoku, Tajland (<http://www.danielgfuchs.com>). Tu su i A. Benami i O. Demiroglu koji objavljuju radove iz područja turizmologije koja je, kako kažu, prethodila doprinosima Svjetske turističke organizacije na tom području (<http://www.tourismology.org>), kao i De Costa i Grunewald (2008). Postoji i World Association for Hospitality and Tourism Education and Training (AMFORHT) koja je 1969. osnovana u Nici. Kako se navodi na njihovoj stranici (<http://www.amforht.com>), „turizam je ekonomski div, ali politički patuljak“. Razlog tomu je što turizam nije prepoznat niti kao sveučilišna disciplina, a trebao bi biti priznat kao znanost. Nakon što je skovan, termin turizmologija brzo se proširio diljem svijeta. AMFORHT bi stoga trebao svoj sljedeći skup posvetiti turizmologiji. Na kraju, tu je i Katedra za turizmologiju na East China Normal University u Šangaju, što bi moglo odgovarati Katedri za istraživanje turizma. Bihu Wu (2010:177) o tomu piše:

U Šangaju se dogodilo nešto što ja zovem "turizmologijom" (termin koji sam

mobilities. Interestingly they felt the need for two social science disciplines to help them in their endeavours, surely an indication that the science of tourism could not at this juncture carry out this task on its own.

It is worth noting that there are currently a number of academic institutions which are committed to the teaching of tourismology, including centres in France, the Lebanon, Turkey and the United States (<http://www.tourismology.org>). Furthermore, and apart from the previously mentioned University of Belgrade, there is a Department of Tourismology in the faculty of Economics at the University of Kragujevac, and an Institute of Geography, Tourismology and Hotel Management in the Faculty of Science at the University of Novi Sad. Additionally, and at the individual level, there is Tran Duc Thanh who introduced tourism science in 1998 to the College of Social Sciences and Humanities at the University of Hanoi, Vietnam, and who now has a book on the subject that is in its fifth edition (2009), S. R. Erdavletov who teaches the basics of tourism science (tourismology) at Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Republic of Kazakhstan (<http://www.kaznu.kz/en/755>), as well as A. Pykharev at South Kazakhstan State University, and a similar offering at Silpakom University International College in Bangkok, Thailand from Daniel Fuchs (<http://www.danielgfuchs.com>). A. Benami and O. Demiroglu also have published in the area of tourismology which they say predates contributions from WTO (<http://www.tourismology.org>), as more recently have De Costa and Grunewald (2008). There is also the World Association for Hospitality and Tourism Education and Training (AMFORHT) which was created in Nice in 1969. According to its website (<http://www.amforht.com>) 'tourism is an economic giant but political dwarf'. The reason why this situation is so is arguably because tourism is not recognised as a university discipline, whereas it should be acknowledged as a science. Once touris-

ja stvorio, a koji se odnosi na izučavanje turizma). U turizmologiji ima prostora za multidisciplinarna znanja, filozofiju i metodologiju iz područja poput geografije, antropologije, sociologije i poslovnog upravljanja. Sve ono što je uzela od roditeljskih ili seestrinskih studijskih programa turizmologija spaja u povezanu cjelinu. Turizmologija se konačno preobrazila u zrelu disciplinu koja utječe i na način života i na akademsku misao... U ovome trenutku nalazim se na raskršću: jesam li geograf koji provodi istraživanja u turizmu ili turiznolog koji provodi geografska istraživanja? Još uvijek nisam došao do odgovora.

U ovome odlomku Bihu Wu tvdi da je skovao pojam "turizmologija", što je u proturječnosti s prethodnim odlomcima u kojima je podrobno opisano porijeklo toga pojma. Bihu Wu ili nije svjestan onoga što se događalo u prošlosti ili toga jest svjestan, ali odlučuje previdjeti prethodna razmatranja te teme. Međutim, moguće je i nešto još gore, a to je da dobro ne razumije taj pojam. Naime, on nikad nije predstavljao kaleidoskop teorija preuzetih iz raznih drugih disciplina društvenih znanosti u svrhu stvaranja metadiscipline jer bi prema samoj definiciji ta nova autonomna znanost trebala biti neovisna od tih disciplina i doprinijeti znanju samostalno, na svoj jedinstveni način. Ovaj nas zaključak vodi ka sljedećem poglavlju u kojemu se pojašnjava ključna razlika između discipline i područja.

mology was coined it soon spread round the world. AMFORHT should therefore now take the lead and focus its next forum on tourismology. Finally there is a Department of Tourismology at the East China Normal University, Shanghai which seems to be interchangeable with the Department of Tourism Studies. Here the following statements are uttered by Bihu Wu (2010:177):

What Shanghai has undergone is something I call "tourismology" (a term I have created to refer to tourism studies). Tourismology has and continues to make room for multidisciplinary knowledge, philosophies and methodologies from such fields as geography, anthropology, sociology, and business management. Tourismology amalgamates what it has imported from parent or sister programs and melds them into an integrated mixture. Finally tourismology has morphed into a mature discipline that influences both ways of life and academic thought...I am now at a crossroads: am I a geographer who carries out tourism research or a tourismologist carrying out geographic research? I am still debating the answer.

In this passage, the claim is made by Bihu Wu that he is the creator of the term "tourismology", a view contradicted by the previous paragraphs detailing the origins of the expression. Here Bihu Wu is either unaware of what has gone on before or else he is so conscious but chooses to overlook previous insights on the topic. Possibly worse, however, is his misunderstanding of the concept since it was never intended to be a kaleidoscope of theories taken from various social science disciplines in order to create a meta-discipline, because by very definition that new autonomous science should be independent of these disciplines and have its own unique contribution to make. It is this conclusion that leads to the following section in which a crucial distinction is made between a discipline and a field.

3. DISCIPLINA: ETIMOLOGIJA I ZNAČENJE

Prema <http://www.etymonline.com>, engleska riječ *discipline* [disciplina] potječe iz 13. stoljeća i dolazi od francuske riječi *descepline* koja u najširem smislu ima konotacije fizičkog kažnjavanja, poučavanja, patnje i, u ekstremnim slučajevima, mučenja. Vezana je i uz latinske riječi *disciplina*, čije je uže značenje poduka, poučavanje, učenje i znanje, i *discipulus* [učenik] ili onaj kojega se ispravlja ili povremeno kažnjava kad narušava red koji se veže uz takvo poučavanje. Kasnije, pri kraju 14. stoljeća, disciplinu se počelo poistovjećivati s granom poučavanja ili obrazovanja te se rabila čak i za vojnu obuku (u 15. stoljeću) ili za dobro vladanje koje je bilo rezultat takve obuke. Koncept discipline kao grane ili kategorije znanja implicirao je uz nju vezanu ideju samodiscipline i povremenog samobičevanja koje se u nekim vjerskim redovima nazivalo disciplinom (<http://en.wiktionary.org>). Međutim, disciplina je dobila aktivniju dimenziju kad se počeo rabiti uz nju vezan latinski glagol *discere* (učiti, čuti, saznati) jer je tada iz njezga izvedena riječ *disciple* značila “onaj tko je prigrlio znanja koja mu je prenio netko drugi i nastavlja ih širiti”, čak u toj mjeri da je postao “aktivni sljedbenik nekog pokreta ili filozofije” (<http://www.english.usab.edu>). *Disciplina* i *disciple* povezani su tako upravo zato što je disciplina znanje koje vođa prenosi na svoje sljedbenike, što implicira poduku, metodologiju i motivaciju (<http://www.differencebetween.net>). Međutim, ona je i dalje sadržavala i potrebu za redom. I doista, racionalno društvo zahtijevalo je red, autoritet koji postavlja pravila i kažnjava one koji ih krše; a uređene discipline također su trebale pravila jer su funkcionirale unutar uređenog društva (<http://www.differencebetween.net>).

Vezom između znanja i moći (reda) bavi se i Foucault u svojem djelu *Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la Prison (Nadzor i kazna: Rođenje zatvora)* (1975) koje je na engleski

3. DISCIPLINE: ETYMOLOGY AND MEANING

According to <http://www.etymonline.com>, the English word *discipline* derived from the 13th century Old French *descepline*, with its broad connotations of physical punishment, teaching, suffering and, in extreme cases, martyrdom. It was also associated with the Latin *disciplina* and its more restrictive meaning of given instruction, teaching, learning and knowledge, as well as *discipulus* [disciple], one who was corrected or occasionally punished, when deviating from the notion of order connected with such instruction. Subsequently (late 14th century) a discipline became identified with a branch of instruction or education, even coinciding with military training (15th century) or the orderly conduct resulting from that training. Implied in the concept of discipline as a branch or a category of knowledge was the corresponding idea of self-discipline and the occasional self-inflicted flagellation by a whip known as a discipline among some religious orders (<http://en.wiktionary.org>). However, discipline assumed a more active dimension when the associated Latin verb *discere* (to learn, to hear, to get to know) was introduced because then the derived *disciple* was one who embraced and assisted in spreading the teachings of another even to the point where s(he) became “an active adherent of a movement or philosophy” (<http://www.english.usab.edu>). Discipline and disciple were thus linked precisely because a discipline was the knowledge imparted by a leader to his followers, thereby implying training, methodology and motivation (<http://www.differencebetween.net>). Nevertheless, the need for order persisted. Indeed, rational society required order, the authority to make rules and punish infractions; and ordered disciplines also needed rules because they operated within an ordered society (<http://www.differencebetween.net>).

The connection between knowledge and power (order) was also treated by Foucault

prevedeno (1977) kao *Disciplina i kazna: Rođenje zatvora*. Zanimljivo je da je francuska riječ *surveiller* (nadzirati, nadgledati, paziti na, gledati, imati na oku) (Boïelle i Payen-Payne, 1905:535) prevedena kao disciplina, čime je izgubila nešto od svoje etimološke točnosti. Međutim, i koncept nadgledanja zatvorenika temeljio se na Benthamovom panoptikumu u kojemu su čuvari iz središnjeg tornja mogli nadzirati ponašanje zatvorenika. Jesu li ih čuvari *de facto* neprestano nadzirali ili ne bilo je manje važno od toga da su zatvorenici bili uvjereni da ih čuvari neprestano špijuniraju. Odatle su se rodile francuska riječ *le regard* (pogled) i engleska riječ *gaze* koju je pokojni veliki John Urry (1990) tako uspješno transponirao u izučavanje turizma. Kasnije je i autor ova rada iz toga izveo koncept turizma kao jezika društvene kontrole te ga i istraživao (Dann, 1996).

Ako povežemo ta različita razmišljanja, disciplinu možemo opisati kao autonomnu granu znanja koja ima vlastiti dogovoreni set pravila pomoću kojih njezini sljedbenici (*disciples*) mogu komunicirati uz nju vezane teorije i metode iz prošlosti i sadašnjosti na takav način da se to akumulirano znanje može prenijeti u budućnost. Ako dođe do devijacije od tako ustrojenog viđenja stvarnosti, njihovi će ih kolege (drugi *disciples*) sankcionirati, a najstroži oblik sankcije je isključivanje iz zajednice okupljene oko te discipline (tj. ekskomunikacija). Očigledno, govoriti o turizmu, kako to čine zagovornici turizmologije, kao o znanosti ili disciplini po sebi dok je ona tek područje, znači pretjerivati kako s obzirom na znanja koja čine njegove temelje tako i s obzirom na njegovu važnost.

in his (1975) *Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la Prison* which was translated into English (1977) as *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Interestingly the French *surveiller* (to superintend, inspect, look after, watch, have an eye upon) (Boïelle and Payen-Payne 1905:535) was translated as discipline, thereby arguably losing some of its etymological resonance. After all, the concept of overseeing prisoners was based on Bentham's panopticon whereby wardens could monitor from a central tower the behaviour of inmates. Whether or not these custodians were on *de facto* constant watch was less important than the *belief* that the prisoners held that they were being continuously spied upon by these guardians of behaviour. Hence the notion of *le regard* was born and with it the corresponding English notion of *gaze* that the late and great John Urry (1990) so successfully transposed to tourist studies. Subsequently, the idea of tourism as a language of social control was explored by the current author as a derived concept (Dann 1996).

Thus, taking these various strands of thought together, a discipline may be described as an autonomous branch of knowledge with its own agreed body of rules whereby adherents (*disciples*), by following these commands, can communicate related theories and methods from the past and present so that such cumulative knowledge may extend into the future. Should they deviate from this ordered vision of reality, sanctions will ensue from their peers (fellow *disciples*), the most acute form of which is exclusion from that disciplinary community (i.e., excommunication). Evidently, to speak of tourism as a science or discipline in its own right when it is only a field, as do the proponents of tourismology, is to exaggerate both its knowledge base and importance.

4. TURIZAM KAO DISCIPLINA ILI PODRUČJE

Turizam kao disciplina

Znanstvenici koji se bave turizmom mogu se podijeliti u dvije šire grupe ovisno o tome smatraju li turizam disciplinom ili područjem. Disciplinom ga smatraju osobe poput pokojnog Neila Leipera, Charlesa Goeldnera (1988) i, u novije vrijeme, Sagara Singha, kao i prethodno navedeni pojedinci koji smatraju da je turizam znanost, bilo da je pri tome nazivaju turizmologijom ili ne, pri čemu je on stoga implicitno i disciplina. U anglofonskom svijetu tu je temu uveo Leiper (1979) ustvrdivši da nam je potrebna prihvatljiva definicija turizma. Nakon što je proučio ograničenja ekonomskih i tehničkih definicija, kao i manjkavosti tri primjera naizgled holističkih definicija (Gunn, 1972; Hunziker i Krapf, 1942; Jafari, 1977), predložio je svoju holističku definiciju koja je uključivala "turiste, zemljopisne komponente, industrijsku komponentu i razne interakcije sa širom okolinom" (Leiper, 1979:395) te je bila kompatibilna s tehničkim definicijama. Ta novoskovana definicija turizma glasila je:

Sustav koji obuhvaća proizvoljno putovanje i privremeni boravak osoba van njihovog uobičajenog prebivališta jednu ili više noći, osim putovanja čija je primarna svrha zarada na točakama koje obuhvaća taj put. Elementi tog sustava su turisti, turistički emitivne regije, tranzitni putevi, receptivna područja (destinacije) i pružatelji usluga u turizmu. Tih je pet elemenata međusobno prostorno i funkcionalno povezano. Kako ima osobine otvorenog sustava, organizacija ovih pet elemenata djeluje unutar širih okolina: fizičkih, kulturnih, društvenih, ekonomskih, političkih i tehnoloških, s kojima je u interakciji (Leiper, 1979:403-404).

4. TOURISM AS A DISCIPLINE OR A FIELD

Tourism as a Discipline

Tourism scholars can be divided into two broad factions depending on whether or not they classify tourism as a discipline or a field. The former position is adopted by such persons as the late Neil Leiper, Charles Goeldner (1988) and more recently Sagar Singh, as well as those previously discussed individuals who argue that tourism is a science, with or without bearing the name of tourismology, and hence by implication is also a discipline. In the Anglophone world, Leiper (1979) introduced the topic by arguing for the need for an acceptable definition of tourism. After examining the limitations of economic and technical definitions, as well as shortfalls in three examples of seemingly holistic definitions (Gunn 1972; Hunziker and Krapf 1942; Jafari 1977), he proposed a holistic definition of his own which involved "tourists, geographical components, an industrial component, and various interactions with broader environments" (Leiper 1979:395) and which was compatible with technical definitions. This new compound definition of tourism was said to be:

The system involving the discretionary travel and temporary stay of persons away from their usual place of residence for one or more nights, excepting tours made for the primary purpose of earning remuneration from points en route. The elements of the system are tourists, generating regions, transit routes, destination regions and a tourist industry. These five elements are arranged in spatial and functional connections. Having the characteristics of an open system, the organization of five elements operates within broader environments: physical, cultural, social, economic, political, technological with which it interacts (Leiper 1979:403-404).

U vezi s time Leiper (1993:548) smatra da nije sam turizam u tolikoj mjeri sustav koliko postoji karakteristično ponašanje turista zahvaljujući kojemu su nastali turistički sustavi. Prihvatanje sistemskog pristupa omogućilo je da ljudi iz raznih disciplina mogu koristiti isti model. Hipoteze je tako moguće sustavno artikulirati i testirati. Na primjer, može se postaviti hipoteza da su turisti motiviraniji sociokulturnim čimbenicima u turistički emitivnim područjima koja posjećuju nego čimbenicima okoline u turističkim destinacijama.

Treba napomenuti da Leiperova argumentacija počiva na premisi da bi bilo neophodno usvojiti sistemski ili funkcionalistički pristup kako bi se turizam shvatio kao disciplina, slično kao što to čini Talcott Parsons u svojoj viziji sociologije kao *grand theory*. Stoga se Leiperu može prigovoriti da, isto kao što je Parsons otkrio *kako* funkcionira društvo, umjesto da daje objašnjenja o tome *zašto* ono funkcionira na određene načine, i u njegovom shvaćanju turizma kao discipline nedostaje neophodan teorijski kauzalitet koji je inherentan pojmu discipline. Međutim, koliko je poznato, ni jedan od Leiperovih kritičara nije protiv njega upotrijebio takav argument.

Sagar Singh (u postupku izdavanja) primjer je mlađeg znanstvenika koji problemu pristupa iz azijske antropološke perspektive koja nadopunjuje Leiperova razmišljanja. Singh tvrdi da antropolozi (poput njega), turisti, vodiči i domaćini predstavljaju *flâneurs* koji kumulativno pridonose tomu da izučavanje turizma postane disciplina. Nadalje, smatra da je izučavanje turizma u toj mjeri samostalna disciplina da je došlo u fazu istraživanja koja po mnogočemu nalikuju suvremenoj antropologiji koja je istovremeno i znanost i umjetnost. Potom, izučavanje turizma jest disciplina jer ima svoje definicije i pravila te predstavlja neovisnu granu znanja koja počiva na jasno definiranim konceptima. "Ono je [također] disciplina koja pokušava razumijeti ljudsku mobilnost i njezine

Subsequently and by corollary, Leiper (1993:548) argued that it was not so much that tourism itself was a system but more that there was a distinctive behaviour of tourists which gave rise to tourism systems. By adopting a systems approach it meant that people from different disciplines could employ the same model. Hypotheses could thus be articulated and tested in systematic terms. For example, and as hypothetically stated, tourists could be said to be motivated more by socio-cultural factors in traveller generating regions than by environmental factors in tourist destination regions.

It should be noted that Leiper's case rested on the premise that for tourism to be a discipline it was necessary to adopt a systems or functionalist approach, in a similar fashion to Talcott Parsons's vision of sociology as grand theory. Consequently it could be objected that just as Parsons revealed *how* society operated, rather than providing explanations as to *why* it functioned in specific ways, so too Leiper's notion of tourism as a discipline lacked the necessary theoretical causality inherent in the notion of a discipline. Yet, to the best of one's knowledge, none of Leiper's critics employed this argument against him.

Sagar Singh (in progress) is an instance of a younger scholar at work, this time from an Asian anthropological perspective which complements the thinking of Leiper. Singh argues that anthropologists (like himself), tourists, guides and hosts are all *flâneurs* who cumulatively contribute to making tourism studies a discipline. He further maintains that tourism studies is an autonomous discipline to the extent that it has arrived at that stage of research which parallels advances in anthropology as both a science and an art in more ways than one. Moreover, tourism studies is a discipline because it has its own definitions and codes of conduct, and is an independent branch of knowledge centred on defined concepts. 'It is [also] a discipline that attempts to understand human mobility and its ramifications (at all times and in all societies and

posljedice (u svim razdobljima i svim društvima i kulturama) kao dio civilizacijskog procesa koji uključuje akulturaciju kao sredstvo razvoja globalnog društva s globalnom kulturom” (Singh, u postupku izdavanja: 18). Izučavanje turizma se stoga može smatrati disciplinom koja ima poddiscipline kao što su sociologija turizma i ekonomika turizma.

Turizam kao područje

John Tribe je 1997. objavio važan i mnogo puta citiran rad pod naslovom “Ne-disciplina turizma” u kojemu daje pregled epistemologije turizma i iz nje izvodi novi model. U tom članku s filozofskog stanovišta razlikuje “znati o” (činjenično znanje) i “znati kako” (proceduralno znanje)². Ta dva oblika znanja odražavaju razliku između akademskih obilježja turizma nevezanih uz poslovanje i onih koja se odnose na upravljanje poslovanjem (Buck 1978), te razliku između proučavanja turizma i turizma kao fenomenološkog predmeta tog proučavanja. U vezi s navedenim, Tribe (2004), oslanjajući se na Hirsta (1974), tvrdi da je turizam prije područje negoli disciplina jer, kako nema samosvojne spoznaje (npr. o motivaciji turista), koristi koncepte koje je preuzeo iz drugih disciplina, a oni nisu povezani u isti logički strukturirani okvir kao što je to slučaj kod tih disciplina te tvrdnje vezane uz njih nije moguće testirati rabeći kriterije koji su

cultures) as part of a civilization process that includes acculturation as a means of developing a global society with a global culture’ (Singh, in progress:18). Tourism studies thus may be considered as a discipline having such sub-disciplines as the sociology of tourism and the economics of tourism.

Tourism as a Field

Back in 1997, John Tribe published an important and much cited paper, entitled “The Indiscipline of Tourism” in which he provided an overview of the epistemology of tourism along with a corresponding new model. In this article he made a philosophical distinction between knowing *that* (propositional knowledge) and knowing *how* (procedural knowledge)² which reflected the respective differential between academic non-business and managerial business features of tourism (Buck 1978), between the study of tourism and tourism as a phenomenological object of that study. In relation to the former, Tribe (2004), basing himself on Hirst (1974), argued that tourism was a field rather than a discipline since, not having unique insights (e.g., on tourist motivation), it employed concepts that had been taken from other disciplines, because these concepts were not linked in the same logically structured framework as these disciplines, and because statements surrounding these concepts were not testable using criteria peculiar to tourism

² Tribe (2004) je ustanovio da postoje dva oblika proizvodnje znanja. Prvi se odnosi na kognitivno znanje koje se generira iz jedne ili više disciplina (pri čemu je prvo samo jedna disciplina, a drugo se odnosi na multidisciplinarnost ili interdisciplinarnost), dok je drugi oblik ekstradisciplinarnost jer je to primijenjeno znanje izvedeno iz „vlastitih posebnih teorijskih struktura, metoda istraživanja i praksi koje se možda nužno ne nalaze na uobičajenoj mapi disciplina“ (Tribe 2004:51; cf. Coles, Hall i Duval 2006:299). Ova posljednja rečenica je osobito sporna jer, ako znanje dolazi iz područja koja su izvan ovih disciplina, može li ga se onda legitimno opisati teorijskim?

² Tribe (2004) subsequently identified two modes of knowledge production. Mode 1 referred to cognitive knowledge generated from one or more disciplines (the former single, the latter multi- or interdisciplinarity), while mode 2 was extradisciplinary in that it was applied knowledge derived from ‘its own distinct theoretical structures, research methods and modes of practice which may not be locatable on the prevailing disciplinary map.’ (Tribe 2004:51; cf. Coles, Hall and Duval 2006:299). It is this last sentence which is highly debatable, because if knowledge comes from outside disciplines then can it legitimately be described as theoretical?

specifični za sami turizam (osobito kriterij ireducibilnosti). Nadalje, Tribe smatra da turizam ne zadovoljava kriterije da bude disciplina, poput zasebne samoodržive zajednice, homogene mreže sredstava komunikacije (časopisa, konferencija), duge akademske tradicije ili koherentnog seta vrijednosti i vjerovanja. S druge strane, Leiperova tvrdnja da turizam jest disciplina, koju temelji na sistemskom pristupu, vezana je uz njegovo poimanje turologije koja je, međutim, bila daleko od “objedinjujuće teorije turizma”, što možda objašnjava činjenicu da nije bila prihvaćena u narednih šesnaest godina. Još je važnije da su discipline bile koherentne i da su imale set osnovnih koncepata, stečeno znanje i metodologiju pomoću kojih su rasvjetljavale jedno područje vanjskoga svijeta. S druge strane, područja su išla u obrnutome smjeru: kretala su od pojedinih fenomena ili praksi i potom posezala za različitim disciplinama kako bi ih istražila i objasnila.

Rasprava se intenzivira

Nakon što je Tribe (1997) objavio svoj utjecajan članak, prošle su tri godine prije nego što mu se Leiper odlučio izravno suprotstaviti u odjeljku za komentare i kritike časopisa *Annals of Tourism Research* koji se, zanimljivo, najviše uključio u te rasprave. U njemu je Leiper otvoreno izrazio svoje neslaganje s Tribeovim mišljenjem da bi turizam kao samostalna složena disciplina nužno doveo do stvaranja “male izolirane enklave” (Leiper, 2000a:805) te da bi to utjecalo na istraživanja i publiciranje. Zbog toga je Leiper predložio da Tribe detaljnije prouči što govore urednici časopisa o turizmu i da obrati pažnju na to da se sve veći broj katedri za turizam bavi turizmom kao zasebnom disciplinom. Nadalje, Leiper smatra da Tribe nikad nije točno definirao što misli pod pojmom discipline, već je radije popisivao njezina obilježja, a njezine evolucijske faze nije uspio razlikovati od njezinog prvotnog oblika. Zaista, s porastom broja turističkih

itself (especially the criterion of irreducibility). Furthermore, Tribe maintained, tourism did not have the disciplinary requirements of a unique self-sustaining community, a homogeneous network of communications (journals, conferences), a lengthy academic tradition or a coherent set of values and beliefs. As for Leiper’s advocacy of tourism as a discipline based on a systems approach, that ideology was associated with his notion of turology which was hardly a “unifying theory of tourism” and possibly explained why the idea had not been accepted over the intervening sixteen years. More significantly though, disciplines had coherence, with an initial tool kit of concepts, acquired knowledge and methodology which illuminated a particular area of the external world. Fields by contrast acted in the reverse direction; they started with specific phenomena and practices and then drew on various disciplines to investigate and explain them.

The Debate Intensifies

From the appearance of Tribe’s (1997) seminal article, three years went by before Leiper decided to confront Tribe directly via the commentary and rejoinder section of *Annals of Tourism Research*, that journal which interestingly appeared to be the most involved in these ongoing discussions. Here Leiper openly disagreed with Tribe that having tourism as a single complex discipline would necessarily lead to the formation of a “little enclave from invasion” (Leiper 2000a:805), or that it would adversely affect research and publications. For this reason Leiper suggested that Tribe look more closely at what editors of tourism journals were saying as well as the growing numbers of departments of tourism that were treating the topic as a separate discipline. Furthermore, Leiper maintained that Tribe never defined exactly what he meant by a discipline, preferring instead to list its characteristics, and that he additionally failed to distinguish its evo-

putovanja, turizam kao disciplina će se vjerojatno širiti, a ne smanjivati.

Tribe (2000) je odgovorio da se Leiper u svojem komentaru nije mogao pozvati na spoznaje turizma kao discipline iz jednostavnog razloga što turizam nije disciplina. Stoga je svoj komentar trebao temeljiti na nekoj drugoj nepristranoj disciplini poput filozofije ili, preciznije, na njezinoj poddisciplini epistemologiji. Da je koristio tu strategiju, Leiper se ne bi trebao oslanjati na svoju prilično ograničenu definiciju discipline kao sistematično organiziranog korpusa znanja kojemu je svrha poučavanje, učenje i istraživanje. Ustvari, smatra Tribe, Leiper se toliko usredotočio na kurikulum da disciplinu kao oblik proizvodnje znanja nije uspio odvojiti od znanja pakiranog za konzumaciju. Tribe potom ističe da ni Leiperovo oslanjanje na slabašne argumente drugih autoriteta nije uvjerljivo jer osobe koje citira nisu inzistirale na tome da je turizam disciplina (npr. Echtner i Jamal, 1997; Cooper et al., 1998). Nadalje, ako je Leiper htio potkrijepiti tu i svoje ostale ideje, trebao je to učiniti u kontekstu novog članka umjesto pisanja mišljenja u odjeljku za komentare i kritike koji ne podliježu postupku recenzije.

Iz svega navedenog čini se da, bilo da je turizam disciplina ili ne, a navedeni argumenti uglavnom podržavaju stanovište da on to nije, ostaje otvoreno pitanje koje su to discipline koje pridonose boljem izučavanju turizma.

5. KLASIFIKACIJA DISCIPLINA

Discipline kao autonomne grane znanja općenito se klasificiraju prema tome u koju od četiriju širih metagrupa pripadaju: prirodne znanosti, društvene znanosti, umjetnost ili humanističke znanosti. Ponekad je teško odrediti treba li pojedina disciplina, kao na primjer povijest ili geografija (vidi Hall i Page, 2008), biti kategorizirana kao društvena ili humanistička znanost. Postoje čak

lutionary phases from its initial emergence. Indeed, with tourist arrivals continuing to increase, tourism as a discipline was more likely to expand than decline.

For his part, Tribe (2000) responded that Leiper was unable to ground his commentary by utilising the insights of a discipline of tourism for the simple reason that tourism was not a discipline. Hence his commentary should have been based on an impartial external discipline such as philosophy, and more specifically the sub-discipline of epistemology. If that strategy had been followed then Leiper would not have had to rely on his rather limited definition of a discipline as a body of knowledge organised systematically for purposes of teaching, learning and research. In fact, argued Tribe, so concerned was Leiper with the curriculum that he could not disentangle a discipline as a form of knowledge production from packaged knowledge for consumption. Tribe continued by pointing out that Leiper's reliance on a weak argument from authority also did not bear much scrutiny because those persons that he quoted, if anything, were quite lukewarm about tourism being a discipline (e.g., Echtner and Jamal (1997) and Cooper et al. (1998)). Moreover, if Leiper wished to substantiate this and his foregoing points, he should have made them in the context of a refereed article rather than avoiding the peer review process by publishing his opinions within the un-refereed framework of a rejoinders and commentary department.

Thus it would appear that whether or not tourism is a discipline, and generally the argument would tend to support the view that it is not, the question remains as to the identity of the disciplines that contribute towards understanding in the field of tourism studies.

5. THE CLASSIFICATION OF DISCIPLINES

Disciplines as autonomous branches of knowledge are generally classified as belonging to one of four larger meta-groups: natu-

i neke potpodjele tih disciplina (npr. fizička geografija kao poddisciplina), što je inače više svojstveno prirodnim znanostima. Međutim, konačan čin *de facto* klasifikacije manje je važan od toga da trebamo priznati da je neka područja teško, a ponekad i nemoguće klasificirati. Uzmimo za primjer znanost o menadžmentu. Kako bi se trebala klasificirati? Kao prirodnu znanost, društvenu znanost, kao dio humanističkih znanosti ili ni u jednu od navedenih skupina? Što je s marketingom? Kako njega kategorizirati? Odgovor je, čini se, da je to na ovaj način nemoguće iz jednostavnog razloga što on nije autonomna disciplina. Ako svoje teorije i metode uzima iz drugih disciplina, onda se njega kao takvog ne može opisati kao neovisnu disciplinu. Samo zato što on posuđuje teorije iz sociologije i psihologije, koje su obje društvene znanstvene discipline, a usprkos mišljenju Graburna i Jafarija (1991), ne znači da i on sam može biti definiran kao društvena znanost. Bilo bi ga puno točnije nazvati parazitskom društvenom znanost.

Koje su discipline društveno znanstvene po sebi?

Iz svega navedenog trebalo bi biti jasno da u proučavanju turizma treba načelno posegnuti za društvenim znanostima, iako, naravno, neka znanja dolaze iz prirodnih znanosti (npr. čimbenici poput transporta), a neka iz umjetnosti (npr. slike u spiljama) i humanističkih znanosti (npr. povijest *Grand Toura*). Međutim, nije odmah očigledno koje su to discipline po sebi discipline društvenih znanosti. Na primjer, School of Social Sciences of the University of Manchester (UK) (<http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk>) navodi popis disciplina među kojima su ekonomija, politika, filozofija, socijalna antropologija, sociologija i socijalna statistika. Psihologija se ne nalazi na tom popisu, a usto je možda jedino sporno što se na popisu našla i socijalna statistika, koja je nesumnjivo na njega uvrštena zbog svoje važnosti za

ral sciences, social sciences, arts or humanities. Sometimes it is difficult to determine whether a given discipline, such as history or geography (see Hall and Page 2008), for example, should be categorised as belonging to the social sciences or humanities. There are even some divisions of these disciplines (e.g., physical geography as a sub-discipline) which are more germane to the natural sciences. However, the eventual act of *de facto* classification is less significant than admitting the difficulty or impossibility of classification of a given subject area. Take management studies, for example, how should that be classified: as a natural science, a social science, as forming part of the arts or humanities, or none of the above? What about marketing? How should that be categorised? The answer, it would seem, is that it cannot be classified within this framework for the simple reason that it is not an autonomous discipline. If its theories and methods are taken from other disciplines then it itself cannot be described as an independent discipline. Just because it borrows its theories from sociology or psychology, both of which are social scientific disciplines, the opinion of Graburn and Jafari (1991) notwithstanding, does not mean that it can also be described as a social science. A parasitical social science might be a more accurate nomenclature.

Which Disciplines are Social Scientific in Nature?

From what has been stated earlier, it should be evident that an understanding of tourism is to be derived principally from the social sciences, even though some insights of course are drawn from the natural sciences (e.g., factors such as transportation) arts (e.g., cave paintings) and humanities (e.g., the history of the Grand Tour). However, it is not immediately obvious as to which disciplines are social scientific in nature. For example, the School of Social Sciences of the University of Manchester (UK) (

sociologiju u Velikoj Britaniji gdje su provedena opsežna istraživanja (npr. Rowntree) društvenih fenomena poput siromaštva. S druge strane, The London School of Economics and Political Science (<http://www2.lse.ac.uk>) u svojim studijskim programima ima daleko širi pristup te uključuje i grane znanja poput računovodstva, aktuaristike, znanosti upravljanja, društvene politike, prava i kriminalistike, uz standardne društvene znanosti poput socijalne antropologije, ekonomije i sociologije. Ni tu se nigdje ne spominje psihologija.

Od literature na tu temu možda je najznačajnije djelo *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (*Međunarodna enciklopedija društvenih i bihevioralnih znanosti*) (Smelser i Baltes, 2002). Taj *magnum opus* od 26 tomova s nekih 122.400 natuknica koje su napisali vodeći znanstvenici, a čija cijena iznosi strahovito visokih 6.970,00 funti, kao discipline tih znanosti navodi: antropologiju, demografiju, ekonomiju, obrazovanje, povijest, lingvistiku, filozofiju, političke znanosti, kliničku i primijenjenu psihologiju, kognitivnu psihologiju, kognitivnu znanost, razvojnu psihologiju, socijalnu psihologiju, psihologiju ličnosti, motivacijsku psihologiju i sociologiju. U njoj je barem psihologija više nego adekvatno priznata, nesumnjivo zbog toga što su bihevioralne znanosti dio područja kojim se enciklopedija bavi. Međutim, od veće je važnosti to što je napravljena razlika između disciplina društvenih znanosti i nečega što je nazvano “ukrštajućim područjima”. Ona obuhvaćaju evolucijske znanosti, genetiku, ponašanje i društvo, bihevioralnu neuroznanost, kognitivnu neuroznanost, psihijatriju, zdravstvo, rodne studije, studije religija, oblike izražavanja, znanost o okolišu/ekologiju, ekonomske i tehničke znanosti, regionalne komparativne politike i međunarodne studije. Napravljena je i distinkcija između disciplina, područja i primjena. Ovo posljednje uključuje organizacijske studije, studij menadžmenta, medijske studije, ko-

manchester.ac.uk) lists the disciplines of economics, politics, philosophy, social anthropology, sociology and social statistics among its various offerings. Although there is an absence of a psychological component, the only other questionable element is social statistics, no doubt included because of its connection with the origins of sociology in Britain and its associated large scale surveys (e.g., Rowntree) into such social problems as poverty. The London School of Economics and Political Science (<http://www2.lse.ac.uk>), on the other hand, adopts a much broader approach among its degree courses by including such branches of knowledge as accounting, actuarial science, management sciences, social policy, law and criminology, in addition to such standard social science disciplines as social anthropology, economics and sociology. Again there is no mention of psychology.

Turning to the underpinning literature, perhaps the most widely recognised standard text on the topic is the *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Smelser and Baltes 2002). This 26 volume *magnum opus* with some 122,400 entries by leading scholars, and an eye-watering price tag of £6,970, lists among its constituent disciplines: anthropology, demography, economics, education, history, linguistics, philosophy, political science, clinical and applied psychology, cognitive psychology, cognitive science, developmental psychology, social psychology, personality psychology, motivational psychology and sociology. Here at least psychology is more than adequately acknowledged, no doubt because of the inclusion of behavioural sciences in the encyclopaedia's remit. Of greater importance, however, is the distinction made between social science disciplines and what it terms “intersecting fields”. The latter comprise: evolutionary sciences, genetics, behaviour and society, behavioural neuroscience, cognitive neuroscience, psychiatry, health, gender studies, religious studies, expressive forms, environmental sciences/ecological sciences, economic and technical studies, area studies and international stud-

mercijalne primjene, urbane studije, urbani-
stičko planiranje, javnu politiku i suvremene
kulturalne teme.

Spojimo li ta tri izvora i izuzmemo li dis-
cipline koje se pojavljuju samo jednom, do-
bit ćemo osnovni popis disciplina u društve-
nim znanostima koji se sastoji od: (socijalne)
antropologije, ekonomije, povijesti, filozofi-
je, političkih znanosti i sociologije.

6. DRUŠTVENA ZNANOST TURIZMA: KOJE DISCIPLINE DRUŠTVENIH ZNANOSTI PRUŽAJU RAZUMIJEVANJE TURIZMA?

Kad je riječ o turizmu, poznati vodeći
časopis u tom području, *Annals of Tourism
Research*, u svojim “uputstvima za autore”
navodi sljedeće:

Annals of Tourism Research je časopis iz područja društvenih znanosti koji se bavi turizmom iz akademske perspektive. Iako nastoji ostvariti ravnotežu između teorije i njezine primjene, časopis je prije svega namijenjen razvoju teorijskih konstrukata i novih pristupa koji pridonose razumijevanju turizma. Njegova je namjera pozivati i poticati autore iz različitih disciplina, služiti kao forum kroz kojega oni mogu surađivati i tako širiti granice znanja obogaćujući literaturu iz područja društvene znanosti turizma. Kako bi pridonio razvoju teorijski integriranog i metodološki obogaćenog multidisciplinarnog korpusa znanja o turizmu, časopis objavljuje rukopise koji se bave raznim aspektima tog fenomena. Prihvaćamo radove o, između ostaloga, antropogijskim, poslovnim, ekonomskim, obrazovnim, okolišnim, geografskim, povijesnim, političkim, psihološkim, filozofskim, religijskim i sociološkim aspektima turizma (uključujući konceptualne eseje, analize slučaja i radove koji su više orijentirani prema industriji). Isključivo deskrip-

ies. A further distinction is made between dis-
ciplines, fields and applications. The last men-
tioned include organizational studies, man-
agement studies, media studies, commercial
applications, urban studies, urban planning,
public policy and modern cultural concerns.

Taking these three sources together and
omitting disciplines which appear only once,
the basic listing of social scientific disci-
plines is thus made up of: (social) anthropol-
ogy, economics, history, philosophy, politi-
cal science, and sociology.

6. TOURISM SOCIAL SCIENCE: WHICH SOCIAL SCIENCE DISCIPLINES PROVIDE AN UNDERSTANDING OF TOURISM?

When one comes to tourism, the widely
recognised leading journal in the field, *Annals
of Tourism Research*, in its “guide for contrib-
utors” includes the following statement:

Annals of Tourism Research is a social sciences journal focusing upon academic perspectives on tourism. While striving for a balance of theory and application, Annals is ultimately dedicated to developing theoretical constructs and new approaches which further an understanding of tourism. Its strategies are to invite and encourage offerings from various disciplines; to serve as a forum through which these may interact; and thus to expand the frontiers of knowledge by contributing to the literature on tourism social science. To perform its role in the development of a theoretically integrated and methodologically enriched multidisciplinary body of knowledge on tourism, Annals publishes manuscripts dealing with various aspects of this phenomenon. Papers on anthropological, business, economic, educational, environmental, geographic, historical, political, psychological, philosophical, religious, sociological, inter alia, aspects

ktivni rukopisi, koji ne doprinose razvoju znanja, neće se smatrati prikladnima za objavljivanje.

Stoga ne samo da razumijevanje turizma proizlazi isključivo iz društvenih znanosti, što je dovoljno da zasluži naziv “društvene znanosti turizma”, već tomu pridonose i mnoge od gore navedenih disciplina društvenih znanosti. Međutim, kad se pomnije prouči popis tih disciplina, može se ustanoviti da samo neke od njih pripadaju prethodno ustanovljenoj jezgri disciplina društvenih znanosti (antropologija, ekonomija, povijest, političke znanosti, filozofija, sociologija). Druge (npr. poslovanje, obrazovanje, geografija, psihologija, religija) predstavljaju ili područja njihova ukrštanja ili njihove primjene.

Stoga kad je časopis *Annals* 1991. odlučio objaviti poseban broj posvećen društvenoj znanosti turizma, bilo je za očekivati da će se pomutnja koja je tome prethodila nastaviti. Tako je, osim nekoliko radova iz ključnih disciplina društvenih znanosti, bilo i onih iz rubnih disciplina društvenih znanosti (geografija, psihologija) ili iz onih koje nedvojbeno uopće ne predstavljaju discipline društvenih znanosti (ekologija, slobodno vrijeme/rekreacija, marketing, menadžment). Pa ipak, ti su radovi prihvaćeni uz objašnjenje da su istraživanja turizma kojima se bave “uvelike pod utjecajem teorija i metoda društvenih znanosti” (Graburn i Jafari, 1991:8).

Nakon nekih devetnaest godina najavljena je konferencija koju su sponzorirali Sveučilište u Surreyu i *Annals of Tourism Research* kako bi proslavili dvadesetu godišnjicu posebnog broja tog časopisa posvećenog društvenoj znanosti turizma (<http://ocs.som.surrey.ac.uk>). Konferencija je održana 2011. i nazvana je “Najnovija dostignuća u društvenoj znanosti turizma”, a inicirao ju je gore spomenuti John Tribe koji je neposredno prije toga preuzeo mjesto glavnog urednika časopisa *Annals* od svojeg dugogodišnjeg prethodnika Jafara Jafarija. Kako je najavljeno, “glavni cilj konferencije [bio] je ponovno razmatranje te teme radovima koji se bave naj-

of tourism (including conceptual essays, case studies and industry-oriented expositions) may be submitted. Purely descriptive manuscripts which do not contribute to the development of knowledge are not considered suitable.

Thus, not only does an understanding of tourism derive exclusively from the social sciences, sufficient to merit the designation “tourism social science”, but many of several designated social science disciplines contribute to this cause. However, when the listing of these disciplines is examined, one finds that only some correspond with the previously identified core social science disciplines (anthropology, economics, history, political science, philosophy, sociology). Others (e.g., business, education, geography, psychology, religion) are either intersecting fields or applications.

Consequently, when *Annals* decided to publish a special issue dedicated to tourism social science in 1991, it was to be expected that the foregoing confusion would persist. Thus, apart from several contributions to the core social science disciplines, there were others either from peripheral social science disciplines (geography, psychology) or from those that were arguably not social science disciplines at all (ecology, leisure/recreation, marketing management). Yet inclusion of the latter was justified on the grounds that their research on tourism was “greatly influenced by social science theories or methods” (Graburn and Jafari 1991:8).

Some nineteen years later there appeared an announcement of a conference sponsored by the University of Surrey and *Annals of Tourism Research* to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of a special issue of that journal dedicated to tourism social science (<http://ocs.som.surrey.ac.uk>). This 2011 conference was entitled “Advancing the Social Science of Tourism” and was under the inspiration of the aforementioned John Tribe who had recently taken over the position of Editor-in-Chief of *Annals* from the long-serving Jafar Jafari. According to the announcement, “the main aim of this conference [was] to

novijim dostignućima u društvenoj znanosti turizma". Radovi su trebali imati teorijsko uporište u jednoj ili više ključnih društvenih znanosti, uključujući antropologiju, komunikacije, kulturalne studije, demografiju, studij razvoja, ekonomiju, obrazovanje, geografiju, povijest, lingvistiku, studij menadžmenta, filozofiju, političke znanosti, psihologiju i sociologiju. Međutim, ako se ovaj popis pomnije pogleda, može se vidjeti da samo njih šest predstavlja glavne discipline društvenih znanosti (prema onome što je prethodno ustanovljeno). Zbog toga se terminološka zbrka nastavila ne samo u posebnom broju iz 1991., već i na konferenciji koja ga je slavila. Pošto je nova situacija bila gora od prethodne, razumljivo je da je taj skup teško mogao predstaviti najnovija dostignuća.

Ono što se smatralo najnovijim dostignućima u radovima koji su se trebali baviti suvremenim temama i primjenama društvene znanosti turizma obuhvaćalo je sljedeće predložene teme:

- "Istraživanja u okviru određenih društvenih znanosti
- Interdisciplinarna dostignuća
- Transdisciplinarnost
- Promjene paradigme znanja
- Složenost i kaos u znanju o turizmu
- Inovativne primjene društvene znanosti turizma u praksi
- Upravljanje znanjem i prenošenje znanja u društvenim znanostima
- Najnovija dostignuća u društvenim znanostima i turizmu
- Suprotstavljene paradigme (npr. mobilnost, nomadologija)
- Metodička dostignuća u društvenoj znanosti turizma
- Ograničenja i izazovi društvene znanosti turizma
- Dobrodošli su i radovi koji nude kritički pregled razvoja turizma i budućih agendi u bilo kojoj od ključnih disciplina u društvenim znanostima."
- "Specific social science informed research
- Interdisciplinary advances
- Transdisciplinarity
- Paradigm shifts in knowledge
- Complexity and chaos in tourism knowledge
- Innovative applications of tourism social science to practice
- Social science knowledge management and transfer
- Advances in social science and tourism
- Competing paradigms (e.g., mobilities, nomadology)
- Methodological advances in tourism social science
- The limits and challenges for tourism social science
- Papers that offer a critical review of progress and future agendas for tourism in any of the core social science disciplines are also welcome".

Bez namjere da zaključke donosimo naprečac, čini se da, ako konferencija nije u potpunosti razumjela što jest društvena znanost turizma, a kamoli od kojih se disciplina sastoji, teško je mogla adekvatno razlikovati napredak od nazadovanja. Nije jasno ni na koji su način međusobno povezani oni koji su pisali u posebnom broju *Annals* i oni koji su došli nakon njih. Još je ozbiljnija implicitna i pogrešna pretpostavka da društvena znanost turizma i uz nju vezane teorije svoje porijeklo vuku iz engleskog govornog područja (Dann i Liebman Parrinello, 2009). Ukoliko se taj mit ne dekonstruira, cijela struktura događaja iz 1991. i 2011. nedvojbeno počiva na nizu krivih premisa.

7. INTRADISCIPLINARNOST, MULTIDISCIPLINARNOST, INTERDISCIPLINARNOST I POSTDISCIPLINARNOST

Do sada smo eksplicitno ili implicitno utvrdili da niti jedna disciplina samostalno svojim znanjima ne pokriva izučavanje turizma³. Tako, primjerice, Dann i Cohen u vezi sociologije navode sljedeće:

³ Na sličan način Coles, et al. (2006) navode: „pojedine discipline, ovakve kako sada izgledaju, rijetko su u stanju samostalno proizvesti kontrastirajuće i višestruke perspektive koje su toliko potrebne za razumijevanje života društva (2006:295); pišu o „fetišizaciji granica disciplina“ (2006:295); potom tvrde da „neki pripadnici raznih disciplina u društvenim znanostima smatraju da imaju stečena (institucionalna, pa stoga i financijska) prava da njihove discipline budu percipirane kao discipline koje posjeduju autoritet za istraživanja u turizmu“ (2006:296); zatim da su „discipline, kao kamene temeljci, prijeporni konstrukti“ (2006:300), da „discipline nisu uspjele držati korak s promjenama u društvu“ (2006:300) te da „mnoga etiketiranja u disciplinama ne predstavljaju mnogo više od prikladnog sredstva poticanja birokratizacije društvenih znanosti“ (2006:300); zatim navode: „uz puno disciplina veže se inherentan imperijalizam i ograničenost“ (2006: 300); „po definiciji discipline trebaju biti uređene“ (2006:301); „umjesto da prihvate

Without attempting to pre-judge the issue, it would therefore appear that if the conference was not fully aware as to what constituted tourism social science, let alone of its component disciplines, it would hardly be in a position to adequately distinguish progress from regress. It is also difficult to see how there was to be any link up between those who contributed to the special issue of *Annals* and those who came afterwards. More serious, however, was the implicit and erroneous underpinning supposition that tourism social science and its affiliated theories originated in the English speaking world (Dann and Liebman Parrinello 2009). Unless that myth were exploded, then arguably whole structure of the 1991 and 2011 events seemed to be based on a series of false premises.

7. INTRADISCIPLINARITY, MULTIDISCIPLINARITY, INTERDISCIPLINARITY AND POSTDISCIPLINARITY

Up to this point it has either been stated explicitly or by implication that the study of tourism is not captured by the insights of any one social science discipline³. As Dann

³ In a similar vein Coles, et al. (2006) point out that ‘single disciplines in their current constitution are rarely capable alone of delivering the contrasting and multiple perspectives that are so necessary to unravelling social life’ (2006:295), “the fetishisation of disciplinary boundaries” (2006:295), ‘certain members of the various social science disciplines have vested (institutional and thus financial) interests in their disciplines being perceived as the authoritative discipline of investigation for tourism’ (2006:296), ‘disciplines, as foundation stones, are contentious constructs’ (2006:300), ‘disciplines have failed to keep up with changes in society’ (2006:300) ‘many disciplinary labels are little more than convenient devices to aid in the bureaucratisation of the social sciences’ (2006:300), ‘the inherent imperialism and parochialism associated with much disciplinary activity’ (2006: 300), ‘by definition disciplines have to be policed’ (2006:301), ‘rather than recognise that they may

da mogu imati drugačiji pogled na neki problem, povezan s drugim pristupima tom problemu, oni [znanstvenici] nastoje obraniti svoj intelektualni teritorij" (2006:301); „znanstvenici pokazuju tendenciju da se ograniče na područje svojih disciplina što često ukazuje na neznanje o onome što se nalazi izvan njihovih područja“ (2006:301); „teško je identificirati neku akademsku disciplinu koja bi se po sebi mogla nazvati „izučavanjem turizma“ (2006:302). Iz tih razloga Coles et al, zazivaju postdisciplinarnu perspektive koje bi „omogućile da ideje i njihova međusobna povezanost vode ka logičnim zaključcima, a ne ka nekakvim izmišljenim krajnjim točkama koje određuju artificijelne granice disciplina“ (2006:303). To „demoniranje akademskih pregrada“ i „ostavljanje po strani akademskih kanona“ koje postdisciplinarnost zahtijeva rezultira „novom još više interdisciplinarnom analizom“ (2006:308). Takav cilj postiže se kroz (zajedničke) interese, kompetencije, pogled na svijet... i način razmišljanja“ (2006:305).

Ovakvim postdisciplinarnim stanovištem kakvog su zauzeli Cole et al. poslije se bavila konferencija pod nazivom „Dobrodošli susreti: Istraživanje turizma u postdisciplinarnoj eri“ koju je organizirao William Feighery, a održana je u Neuchatelu u Švicarskoj od 19.-22. lipnja 2013. Međutim, usprkos velikoj podršci postdisciplinarnoj poziciji, ona se nedvojbeno nije u potpunosti suočila s dihotomijom disciplinarnosti i postdisciplinarnosti jer su ih neki sudionici željeli obje zadržati usprkos nelogičnosti takve dihotomne situacije. Drugim riječima, željeli su istovremeno zadržati oba, međusobno kontradiktorna pristupa. Tu je i drugo pitanje, koje nije bilo postavljeno pa stoga na njega nije nađen ni odgovor, a to je što će se dogoditi nakon što postdisciplinarnost dođe svome kraju, pitanje s kojim se isto tako mogu suočiti zagovornici postturizma i postmodernizma. Stoga se rasprava na tu temu mogla nastaviti, što se i dogodilo na konferenciji koja se nastavila na ovu prvu, a to je bila ona u Kopenhagenu, od 22.-24. lipnja 2015. kojom su supredsjedali Ana Maria Munar, Tomas Pernecky i William Feighery. Nazvana je „Drugom konferencijom o postdisciplinarnosti u turizmu: sloboda, umjetnost, moć“. U posljednjem pozivu za prijavljivanje radova (www.postdisciplinary.net) stajalo je: „Postdisciplinarnost nadilazi granice razmišljanja u okvirima disciplina i otvara mogućnost da se propituju ustanovljeni fenomeni – u turizmu i u drugim područjima – koje se uzimaju zdravo za gotovo“. Potom se u ponešto patronizirajućem tonu nastavlja: „Ne tvrdi se da je disciplinarnost nužno loša, već se pokazuje da silos disciplina ograničava našu sposobnost da razumijemo svijet jer ne obu-

have an alternative interrelated angle to a subject, they [scholars] may act to defend their intellectual turf“ (2006:301), ‘the tendency for scholars to restrict themselves to the boundaries of their own disciplines is also reflective of a common ignorance of what lies beyond their own’ (2006:301), ‘it is problematic to identify an academic discipline in its own right called “tourism studies”’ (2006:302). For those reasons Coles et al call for post-disciplinary perspectives that ‘allow ideas and connections to be pursued to their logical conclusion not to some contrived end point determined by artificial disciplinary boundaries’ (2006:303). This “dismantling of academic partitions” and “setting aside of disciplinary canons” which postdisciplinarity enjoins, results in “new *more* interdisciplinary analysis” (2006:308). Such an outcome is achieved through “(shared) interests, competencies, worldview...and outlook” (2006:305).

This postdisciplinary stance adopted by Coles et al. was subsequently themed into a conference entitled “Welcoming Encounters: Tourism Research in a Postdisciplinary Era” organised by William Feighery and held in Neuchatel, Switzerland, 19-22 June 2013. However, in spite of overwhelming support for the postdisciplinary position, it arguably did not fully face up to the dichotomy of disciplinarity and postdisciplinarity which some of the adherents wished to retain simultaneously in spite of the illogicality of such a dichotomous situation, i.e., of holding two contradictory viewpoints at the same time. There was also an un-posed and hence unanswered question as to what exactly happens after postdisciplinarity has run its course, the same issue confronting the advocates of post-tourism and post-modernity. There was thus room for more debate on the topic and this took place in a follow up conference held in Copenhagen, 22-24 June 2015 that was co-chaired by Ana Maria Munar, Tomas Pernecky and William Feighery. It was entitled “2nd Tourism Postdisciplinary Conference: Freedom, Art, Power. In its final call for papers (www.postdisciplinary.net) the invitation stated: ‘Postdisciplinarity surpasses the boundaries of disciplinary thinking and opens up the possibility to question the established phenomena—touristic or otherwise—we take for granted’. Then rather patronisingly the discourse continued, ‘It does not claim that disciplinarity is essentially wrong, but it shows that disciplinary silos limit our capacity to make sense of the world and aims to make the subject of study less embedded in that system of thought. Postdisciplinarity is an epistemological endeavour that speaks of knowledge production and the ways in which the world of physical and

'Ne postoji samo jedna sociologija turizma, kao što ne postoji niti samo jedna sociologija obrazovanja ili obitelji. Umjesto toga, bilo je nekoliko pokušaja da se razni aspekti turizma razumiju kroz sociologiju, pri čemu se polazilo od više teorijskih perspektiva' (1991:157)...

čime je kumulativno stvoren kaleidoskop znanja. Štoviše, kao što ne postoji samo jedna sociološka perspektiva koja može pružiti potpuno razumijevanje turizma, tako i sama sociologija 'pruža tek djelomičnu interpretaciju složenog fenomena turizma. Kako bismo dobili cjelovitiju sliku, neophodno je sociološke uvide kombinirati s onima iz drugih disciplina društvenih znanosti' (Dann i Cohen, 1991:167). Prvi citat odnosi se na intradisciplinarnost; drugi na multidisciplinarnost. Unutar pojedine discipline moguće je naći niz raznovrsnih perspektiva ili škola od kojih svaka ima idiosinkratične paradigme koje se smatraju prikladnima za primjenu u određenim područjima. Tako je, na primjer, jedna od mnogobrojnih perspektiva sociologije kao discipline i simbolički interakcionizam. Taj se pristup često primjenjuje u području pregovaranja prema ulogama. I turizam je područje koje se uspješno istražuje uz pomoć niza socioloških perspektiva. Takvo se znanje, zato što je vezano uz jednu disciplinu, naziva intradisciplinarnim, tj. unutar iste discipline.

Okolo dvije godine nakon što su Dann i Cohen predstavili svoja razmišljanja u spo-

and Cohen state in relation to sociology, for example:

There is no single sociology of tourism, just as there is no single sociology of education or of the family. Instead, there have been several attempts to understand sociologically different aspects of tourism departing from a number of theoretical perspectives' (1991:157)...

that cumulatively provide a kaleidoscope of insights. Moreover, just as there is no single sociological perspective that can provide a complete understanding of tourism, sociology itself 'provides only a partial interpretation of the multifaceted phenomenon of tourism. For a more complete picture, it is necessary to combine sociological insights with those from other social science disciplines' (Dann and Cohen 199:167). The first citation relates to intradisciplinarity; the second to multidisciplinarity. Within a given discipline, there may be a variety of perspectives or schools each with idiosyncratic paradigms that are judged as appropriate for application to specific fields. Thus, for example, sociology as a discipline includes symbolic interactionism among its many perspectives. That approach in turn is often applied to the field of role negotiation. Tourism is another field that has been successfully examined by a number of sociological perspectives. Such knowledge, because it is confined to one discipline is known as intradisciplinary, i.e., within the same discipline.

Some two years after Dann and Cohen were elaborating their foregoing views in the

hvaća u potpunosti predmet istraživanja. Postdisciplinarnost je i epistemološki pothvat koji se bavi proizvodnjom znanja i načinima na koje je moguće razumijeti svijet fizičkih i društvenih fenomena. Ona je i ontološki diskurs jer se odnosi na ono što zovemo „turizmom“. Upravo u ovoj posljednjoj rečenici kontradiktornosti postdisciplinarnosti pokazuju se u toj mjeri da se, ako želi uspjeti, ona mora osloniti na filozofiju, koja ne samo da je disciplina društvene znanosti po sebi, već kroz epistemologiju i ontologiju, koje su filozofske grane koje se bave oblicima znanja i oblicima bivstvovanja, ona i pruža točna značenja.

social phenomena can be known. It is also an ontological discourse as it concerns what we call "tourism". It is in this last sentence that the contradictions of postdisciplinarity are exposed to the extent that for it to succeed it must rely on the contributions from philosophy which is not only a social scientific discipline in its own right, but also provides the correct meanings of epistemology and ontology which are branches of philosophy dealing respectively with ways of knowing and ways of being.

menutom posebnom broju časopisa *Annals of Tourism Research* posvećenog društvenoj znanosti turizma, Przećławski (1993) je objasnio da se turizam, zbog toga što je tako složen fenomen, može definirati na mnogo načina, ovisno o svrsi. Pa ipak, razlike među definicijama često su male. Definiciji turizma kao oblika provođenja slobodnog vremena, na primjer, nekako nedostaju cjelovitost i konceptualna jasnoća. Stoga je bilo nužno uvesti razne discipline društvenih znanosti, poput povijesti, filozofije i političkih znanosti kako bi se dobila cjelovitija slika. Međutim, čak i na taj način dobila se samo “djelomična, a ne holistička slika” (1993:13). Svaka disciplina naprosto rabi vlastite koncepte i metode; predmet je isti, ali je njegova filozofska osnova različita. U tome je nedostatak multidisciplinarnosti. S druge strane, interdisciplinarni pristup mogao bi dijeliti istu filozofiju, tako da isti problem promatra iz raznih aspekata. Tako bi se, na primjer, iz marksističke perspektive turizam mogao opisati kao otuđeni oblik provođenja slobodnog vremena, dok sljedbenici Teilhard de Chardina (1955) turizam mogu povezati s interpersonalnim kvalitetama života nakon smrti iz kršćanske perspektive.

Przećławski se ne referira na nešto što mu je moglo poslužiti kao dobra ilustracija njegovog viđenja problema, a to je istraživanje koje je proveo takozvani bečki centar (Bystrzanowski, 1989; Bystrzanowski i Beck, 1989) u kojemu je on bio jedan od glavnih sudionika. Taj ambiciozan projekt obuhvatio je pojedince iz mnogih disciplina društvenih znanosti koji su surađivali na istraživanju turizma kao čimbenika društvene promjene iz komparativne multinacionalne perspektive. Svatko od njih trebao je temu teorijski obraditi iz perspektive discipline kojom se bavi, što je, kombinirano sa znanjima iz drugih disciplina, pomoglo da se dobije cjelovitija slika. To je svakako bila interdisciplinarnost na djelu.

previously mentioned special issue of *Annals of Tourism Research* devoted to tourism social science, Przećławski (1993) explained that because tourism was such a complex phenomenon, it had many definitions, and these definitions in turn were often predicated on purpose. Yet these differences were often too limited in scope. Tourism as a form of leisure, for instance, was somehow lacking in completeness and conceptual clarity. Thus it became necessary to introduce various social scientific disciplines, such as history, philosophy and political science in order to obtain a fuller picture. Yet even these only provided a “partial rather than a holistic point of view” (1993:13). Each discipline simply used its own concepts and methods; while the subject was the same, its philosophical underpinning was different. Such was the shortcoming of multidisciplinarity. By contrast, an interdisciplinary approach could share the same philosophy, by treating the same problem from different aspects. Thus from a Marxist perspective, for example, tourism could be described as a form of alienated leisure, while followers of Teilhard de Chardin (1955) could relate tourism to the interpersonal qualities of the after-life from a Christian viewpoint.

What Przećławski did not refer to, but which on reflection would have been a good illustration of his position was the research undertaken by the so-called Vienna Centre (Bystrzanowski 1989; Bystrzanowski and Beck 1989), a study in which he was one of the major participants. This ambitious project involved persons from many social science disciplines who collaborated in examining tourism as a factor of social change from a comparative multinational perspective. Each had a contribution to make in terms of theory derived from the participant’s discipline which, when combined with the insights from other disciplines, helped provide a more complete picture than would otherwise have obtained. That was surely interdisciplinarity in action.

8. ZAKLJUČAK: PONOVO PROPITIVANJE INTERDISCIPLINARNOSTI I NJEZINE BUDUĆNOSTI

Na kraju rada potrebno je u obliku kratkog sažetka razmotriti što su navedeni autori rekli o pitanjima multidisciplinarnosti i interdisciplinarnosti. Na primjer, Leiper se 1981., ohrabren svojim početnim uspjehom u definiranju turizma, posvetio području obrazovanja u turizmu. Tako navodi:

Tradicionalno temeljeno na multidisciplinarnim studijima, obrazovanje u turizmu se razvilo u toj mjeri da su mu, kako ćemo vidjeti, ti temelji postali preprekom. Kako bismo prevladali nedostatke koji proizlaze iz činjenice da je temelj kurikula fragmentiran, potrebno je stvoriti novu disciplinu koja će postati jezgrom sveobuhvatnih programa, osobito na profesionalnoj razini (Leiper, 1981:71.)

Nadalje, smatra da je, kako bi turizam postao disciplinom (u vrijeme nastanka toga rada to se još nije dogodilo, a taj cilj nije postignut ni do danas), potrebno da se multidisciplinarni studiji (dvije ili više disciplina koje se bave nekom temom) pretvore u interdisciplinarne (stapanje raznih disciplina kako bi se stvorila teorijska i metodološka sinteza) kako bi njihov spoj postao novom disciplinom (Leiper, 1981:72).

Zanimljivo je da je iste godine kad je video raspravu s Tribeom Leiper (2000b) svoje ideje o multidisciplinarnom obrazovanju izložio u kratkoj natuknici na tu temu objavljenoj u Jafarijevoj (2000) *Encyclopedia of Tourism (Enciklopediji turizma)*. U njoj navodi da se turizam može poučavati, i da se do tada i poučavao, na četiri različita načina: (1) kao predavanja na raznim odsjecima (npr. za sociologiju, psihologiju) gdje nije bilo moguće turizam povezati s drugim disciplinama; (2) specijaliziranom nastavom o turizmu koju izvode nezavisni odsjeci i koji o njemu ne znaju puno; (3) na malim pododsjecima koji predaju glavne predmete iz područja

8. CONCLUSION: INTERDISCIPLINARITY REVISITED AND PROJECTED

At this juncture and by way of complementary summary, it is also instructive to see what the already cited commentators had to say on the questions of multidisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity. Leiper, for example, encouraged by his initial success in defining tourism, in 1981, turned his attention to the ancillary domain of tourism education. According to him:

Traditionally based in multidisciplinary studies tourism education has developed to the point where, it will be argued, that base has become an impediment. To overcome the defects stemming from a fundamentally fragmented curriculum, a new discipline needs to be created to form a core strand in comprehensive programs, especially at the professional level (Leiper 1981:71).

He went on to explain that for tourism to become a discipline (at that time of writing this had not come to pass, nor indeed has it achieved this goal today), then it was necessary for multidisciplinary studies (two or more disciplines tackling a given topic) to become interdisciplinarity studies (the blending of various disciplines towards a theoretical and methodological synthesis), so that this amalgam in turn could become a new discipline (Leiper 1981:72).

Interestingly in the same year as his later exchange with Tribe, Leiper (2000b) spelt out his ideas on multidisciplinary education in a short entry on this theme that was published in Jafari's (2000) *Encyclopedia of Tourism*. There he maintained that tourism could be and indeed had been taught in four different ways: (1) as classes in scattered departments (e.g., sociology, psychology) where there were no links provided to connect tourism with other disciplines; (2) specialist instruction on tourism from independent departments without knowing much about it; (3)

turizma s inputom kojeg dobijaju s drugih odsjeka; (4) u školama turizma na kojima predaju akademski stručnjaci specijalizirani za turizam, a koji su stručnjaci i u raznim disciplinama. Prema Leiperu, tek kad se turizam razvio u disciplinu, došlo je do tranzicije kroz ove četiri faze. U tom je razvojnom procesu bilo daleko manje fragmentiranosti, osobito ako su istovremeno prihvaćeni modeli zajedničkih sustava. Svoje je ideje sažeo na sljedeći način:

U idealnom obliku, napredak će biti moguće ostvariti razvojem zasebne discipline. Međutim, to ne znači da je time umanjena važnost multidisciplinarnog obrazovanja. Prednosti multidisciplinarnosti veće su od problema koje ona nosi, osobito zato što se osnovni problem može postupno rješavati kako se bude razvijala zasebna disciplina (Leiper, 2000b:182).

Međutim, prema Tribeu, Leiperov emotivan poziv za nužnošću stvaranja discipline turizma nije imao velikog utjecaja jer se ta ideja rasplinula pred idejom multidisciplinarnosti i tako podsjetila da su nužda i stvarnost često dva prilično različita pojma.

Treba još napomenuti i da su u narednom broju časopisa *Annals*, u kojemu se pojavila Tribeova "nedisciplina turizma", Echtner i Jamal (1997), (koji prethodno očigledno nisu znali ništa o sadržaju Tribeovog članka, a ipak su došli do sličnih zaključaka), reagirali protiv ideje turizma kao jedne, zasebne discipline jer bi to, kako oni smatraju, bilo previše unilateralno, fragmentarno, imperijalističko, izolirano i teorijski slabo. Zbog toga što je turizam složen fenomen koji se prostire preko nekoliko disciplina (od kojih su najvažnije antropologija, ekonomija, geografija, psihologija i sociologija (Jafari i Ritchie, 1981)), on zahtijeva suradnju tih disciplina kako bi se teorija razvila u nešto više od proizvodnje znanja unutar pojedinih disciplina društvenih znanosti za koje su mnogi znanstvenici u turizmu i većina osnivača Međunarodne akademije studija turizma obično stručnjaci

small sub-departments teaching core subjects in tourism studies with input from other departments; (4) schools of tourism with academics specialising in tourism having expertise in various disciplines. According to Leiper, it is only as tourism evolved into a discipline that there was a similar transition through these four stages. There was thus far less fragmentation associated with this developmental process, especially if there was a parallel adoption of common systems models. He summed up his position by saying:

Ideally progress will be made in the development of a distinct discipline. However, this must not mean that multidisciplinary education is diminished. The benefits of multidisciplinary outweigh the problems, especially since a basic problem can be progressively overcome with the ongoing development of a distinct discipline to stand in the middle (Leiper 2000b:182).

However, according to Tribe, Leiper's emotive appeal for a need to have a discipline of tourism did not carry much weight since such a need evaporated in the face of multidisciplinary, thereby highlighting the realisation that necessity and reality were two quite different concepts.

It is additionally worth noting that in the following issue of *Annals* in which Tribe's "indiscipline of tourism" appeared, Echtner and Jamal (1997), (with apparently no prior knowledge of the contents of Tribe's article, yet reaching similar conclusions), reacted against the idea of tourism being a single, independent discipline as that in itself, according to them, would have been too unilateral, fragmentary, imperialistic, isolated and theoretically weak. Because tourism was a complex phenomenon that crossed several disciplines (the main ones being anthropology, economics, geography, psychology and sociology (Jafari and Ritchie 1981)), it required the cooperation of these disciplines if theory were to advance beyond the production of insights from those single social

(Nash, 2010). Međutim, takva suradnja nije jednostavno multidisciplinarna (zasnovana na jednoj disciplini koja istovremeno uključuje i druge); umjesto toga je interdisciplinarna (međusobno spajanje disciplina koje rezultira njihovom sintezom). Izučavanje turizma je tako u predparadigmatičnoj, Kuhnovskoj (1970) fazi (Cooper, 2003)⁴ jer se još uvijek traži konsenzus oko definicija i teorija, tj. daleko je od toga da postane disciplina, a ipak je u stanju koristiti komplementarna znanja (npr. sociologije i antropologije koje analiziraju turizam kao svrhovito putovanje i

science disciplines in which many tourism scholars and most founder members of the International Academy for the Study of Tourism were typically trained (Nash 2010). However, such collaboration was not simply multidisciplinary (based on one discipline while including others); instead it was interdisciplinary (a blending between disciplines to form a synthesis). Tourism studies was thus at a pre-paradigmatic, Kuhnian (1970) phase (Cooper 2003)⁴ still seeking consensus over definitions and theories, i.e., unlikely to

⁴ Za drugačiji pristup paradigmatima u istraživanju turizma, vidi Aramberrija (2001:740). On navodi primjere takvih paradigmi: turizam kao ponašanje van uobičajenog i životni ciklus turističkih atrakcija. Međutim, turizam kao susret između domaćina i gostiju te autentičnost ne smatraju se paradigmatima jer, prema njemu, previdaju činjenicu da je veći dio turizma veoma raznovrstan. Usto je zanimljivo da Aramberri predlaže tri načina na koja se može izgraditi teorija u brzorazvijajućem području izučavanja turizma. On ih naziva „začinjanje nominativom/genitivom“, „zamiješajte nešto svoje“ i „podijelimo trošak“. Prvi znanstvenicima dopušta da se posluže bilo kojom disciplinom koju pozele; drugi se odnosi na multi ili pluridisciplinarnost gdje se, na primjer, mogu spojiti jedan dio strukturalizma i tri dijela semiotike i uz dodatak mrve političkih znanosti, pomiješano, ne protrese; a treći znanstvenicima dopušta da nađu zrno istine u svim teorijskim pozicijama, a potom ih međusobno križaju bez obzira na činjenicu da se možda izvorno međusobno isključuju (Aramberri 2001:739-740). Pa ipak ta treća pozicija, koju autor ovoga teksta zagovara zajedno s Erikom Cohenom (Dann i Cohen 1991), ustvari se temelji na eklektičkom pristupu koji niti jednoj teoriji ne dopušta monopoliziranje prava na istinu, dok istovremeno zadržava znanja koja se mogu korisno kombinirati s drugima. Tako se Durkheimova anomija može spojiti s Veblenovom razmetljivom potrošnjom kako bi se bolje razumjele motivacije turista, a da pri tome ne treba prihvatiti i inače funkcionalističku poziciju ta dva mislioca. Međutim, po Aramberriju eklektizam je jednak postmodernizmu i to je za njega neprihvatljivo. Međutim, on je ipak bio jedan od glavnih sudionika u spomenutom bečkom projektu u okviru kojega je sigurno koristio nešto od eklektičke interdisciplinarnosti.

⁴ For an alternative view about paradigms in tourism studies, see Aramberri (2001:740). Here he gives as examples of such paradigms: tourism as non-ordinary behaviour and the lifecycle of tourism attractions. However, tourism as an encounter between hosts and guests, and authenticity are reckoned not to be paradigms since, according to him, they overlook the fact that most tourism is of the mass variety. Additionally and interestingly, Aramberri suggests three ways that theory can be generated in the now burgeoning area of tourism studies. He calls them “spicing the nominative/genitive”, “brew your own” and “let’s split the difference”. The first allows academics to insert any discipline that takes their fancy; the second refers to multi- or pluridisciplinarity where, for example, one can blend one part structuralism and three parts semiotics and a twist of political science, stirred not shaken; and the third allows scholars to find a grain of truth in all theoretical positions, then allowing them to cross pollinate irrespective of the realisation that they might have originally been mutually exclusive. (Aramberri 2001:739-740). Yet this third position, favoured by the present writer in tandem with Erik Cohen (Dann and Cohen 1991), is in fact based on an approach of eclecticism which denies a monopoly on the truth of any given theory while retaining insights that can be usefully combined with others. Thus Durkheim on anomie can be amalgamated with Veblen on conspicuous consumption to better understand tourist motivation without having to subscribe to the otherwise functionalist position adopted by these two thinkers. However, for Aramberri, eclecticism is to be equated with postmodernism and that for him is beyond the pale. Yet, Aramberri was nevertheless one of the leading participants in the previously mentioned Vienna project in which he must have engaged in some eclectic interdisciplinarity.

igru). Svoja su razmišljanja saželi na sljedeći način:

Stoga se čini da Kuhnovo viđenje filozofije znanosti ukazuje na to da je malo vjerojatno da će se stvoriti zasebna disciplina izučavanja turizma. Ne samo da je turizam pre-paradigmatski fenomen, već se i zasniva na raznim međusobno neusporedivim disciplinama. To nije osobito zavidna pozicija za nešto što nastoji postati novom disciplinom (Echtner i Jamal, 1997:876-877).

Međutim, Echtner i Jamal su osjetili potrebu i da Kuhnov jednostrani pristup iz perspektive prirodne znanosti nadopune alternativnim Bernsteinovim interpretativnim viđenjem (1991) društvenih znanosti, kojega ne bi trebalo odbaciti kao jednostavno neprikladnim, već bi u njemu trebalo vidjeti priliku za dijalog putem metodoloških pristupa kao što su hermeneutika i praksa.

Za ovaj je rad također osobito zanimljivo nekoliko interdisciplinarnih kolegija koje u svojim programima nudi London School of Economics and Political Science (2010) (npr. antropologija i pravo, ekonomska povijest s ekonomijom, politika i ekonomija, politika i filozofija). Na prvi pogled nije jasno kakva se korist dobija takvim kombinacijama, ali ako se pažljivije pogleda, one mogu pružati kumulativna i komplementarna znanja kakva ne bi bilo moguće postići pristupom kroz samo jednu disciplinu. Čak i sam naziv te akademske institucije ukazuje na njezinu sklonost kumulativnim znanjima kakva je nemoguće izvesti iz onoga što nam društvene znanosti pojedinačno nude.

Nadalje, u posebnom broju časopisa *Annals* posvećenog društvenoj znanosti turizma, u kojemu su po dva vodeća znanstvenika iz svakog područja pozvana surađivati na pisanju poglavlja koja se odnose na discipline za koje su specijalizirani i time su doprinijeli njihovoj intradisciplinarnosti, osjeća se jaka sklonost multidisciplinarnosti:

become a discipline, yet able to benefit from complementary insights (e.g., sociology and anthropology discussing tourism as pilgrimage and play). They summed up their position thus far as follows:

Therefore, Kuhn's view of the philosophy of science seems to indicate that a distinct discipline of tourism studies is somewhat unlikely. Not only is tourism a pre-paradigmatic phenomenon but it is also embedded within various incommensurable disciplinary areas of study. This is not a very enviable position for an aspiring new discipline (Echtner and Jamal 1997: 876-877).

However, Echtner and Jamal also saw the need to complement Kuhn's one-sided natural science perspective with the alternative interpretive view of Bernstein (1991) in relation to the social sciences, one that should not be dismissed as simply inappropriate but rather as an opportunity of dialogue via such methodological approaches as hermeneutics and praxis.

What is also of particular interest to this paper, are the several interdisciplinary degree courses that are offered by the London School of Economics and Political Science (2010) (e.g., anthropology and law, economic history with economics, government and economics, politics and philosophy) some benefits from the combinations of which are not immediately obvious but which, on closer inspection, may provide a cumulative and complementary understanding that single disciplinary treatment might have failed to do. Even the title of that academic institution itself displays a predilection for cumulative knowledge which cannot be derived from unitary social science offerings.

Additionally, and in relation to the special issue of *Annals* dedicated to tourism social science, apart from the fact that two leading scholars in each field were both invited to collaborate on a dedicated chapter relevant to their disciplinary specialisations, hence adding to its intra-disciplinary treatment, there was also a strong

Nijedna disciplina samostalno ne može obuhvatiti turizam, baviti se njime ili ga razumjeti; njega je moguće proučavati samo ako prelazimo granice discipline i ako se traže i oblikuju multidisciplinarni pristupi (Graburn i Jafari, 1991:7-8).

Na sličan je način i konferencija u Surreyu koja je slavila dvadesetu godišnjicu posebnog broja časopisa *Annals* na svoj popis predloženih tema uvrstila “nova dostignuća u interdisciplinarnosti”.

Međutim, iz toga nije odmah očigledno kako multidisciplinarnost, i što je još važnije, interdisciplinarnost funkcioniraju u praksi. Ako pojedinci, na primjer, studiraju politiku i povijest, znači li to da trebaju biti jednako obučeni u obje discipline ili, ako je riječ o više od dvije discipline, jednako obučeni u svima njima, što je daleko zahtjevnije? Osim što trebaju biti “Katice za sve”, postavlja se i problem kako se takvo kombinirano znanje može dosljedno primijeniti na pojedina područja poput, na primjer, turizma. Kad se jedna uz drugu koriste razne discipline, postoji i razlika između “i” i “s”. Na London School of Economics mogu se diplomirati socijalna politika i sociologija, dok se npr. geografija, ako se ne studira samostalno, na toj instituciji može studirati samo s ekonomijom. Čak i ako ta distinkcija dopušta dodjeljivanje “glavnog” ili “sporednog” statusa tim disciplinama, ona još uvijek ne nudi odgovor na pitanje kako je to glavno/sporedno znanje koje posjeduje pojedina osoba poželjnije od onoga kojeg je moguće imati unutar samo jedne discipline.

Uz navedene rasprave o pedagoškim i filozofskim aspektima problema, teško je sjetiti se primjera u kojima su dva ili više istraživača u turizmu spojila znanja iz svojih zasebnih disciplina kako bi proveli obostrano zadovoljavajuće interdisciplinarno istraživanje. Osim onih koji su sudjelovali u navedenom bečkom projektu, gotovo da se ne

commitment to multidisciplinary in the statement that:

No single discipline alone can accommodate, treat or understand tourism; it can be studied only if disciplinary boundaries are crossed and if multidisciplinary perspectives are sought and formed (Graburn and Jafari 1991:7-8).

Similarly the Surrey conference celebrating the 20th anniversary of *Annals*’ special issue, listed “interdisciplinary advances” among its suggested themes.

That said, however, it is not immediately obvious as to how multidisciplinary, and more importantly interdisciplinarity works out in practice. If individuals study for a degree in government and history, for example, does this mean that they have to be equally trained in both disciplines, or if there are more than two disciplines involved does the same, even more onerous requirement obtain? Apart from this “jack of all trades and master of none” difficulty, there is also the problem of how such resulting combined knowledge can be seamlessly applied to given fields, such as tourism, for instance. There is additionally the distinction between “and” and “with” in relation to disciplines that are juxtaposed. While a person can graduate from the LSE in social policy and sociology, for example, geography, if not taken singly, can only be paired at that institution *with* economics. Even if this distinction allows for the allocation of “major” and “minor” status to these disciplines, it still does not solve the problem of how major/minor knowledge demonstrated by a particular person is somehow more desirable than that derived from a single discipline.

Notwithstanding the foregoing pedagogical and philosophical issues, it is difficult to think of examples where two or more tourism researchers have pooled their separate disciplinary trainings in order to conduct a mutually rewarding interdisciplinarity study. Apart from the already mentioned Vien-

možemo sjetiti nikog drugog.⁵ Međutim, baš zato što su primjeri takve suradnje u prošlosti bili samo sporadični, znači li to da to nije vrijedan cilj u godinama koje su pred nama? Iz svega dosad rečenoga, odgovor na to pitanje svakako je da to jest cilj kojemu se može stremiti i koji je visokovrijedan. Glavno pitanje tako postaje ne toliko treba li provoditi takva istraživanja, već koje bi teme maksimizirale takvu interdisciplinarnost. Mnogo je mogućih tema. Na primjer, važno područje motivacije turista dosad je bilo puno kontroverzi i borbe između sociologa i psihologa, umjesto prostor za zajedničku suradnju. Potom je tu i pitanje utjecaja turizma čije izučavanje može imati više koristi od kombiniranog povijesnog, geografskog, sociološkog, antropološkog i srodnih pristupa nego od onoga iz perspektive samo jedne discipline društvenih znanosti. Razvoj turizma, turizam i društvene promjene i budućnost turizma još su neke teme koje bi se mogle bolje istražiti ako bi se koristio interdisciplinarni pristup. Veoma važna sfera kvalitete života predstavlja još jedno područje u kojemu prihvaćena perspektiva domene implicira veće bogatstvo disciplina koje zajednički rade. Ustvare, što više o tome razmišljamo, to se više primjera samo nameće. Takav komplementarni pristup u toj je mjeri ključan za ponovno istraživanje tradicionalnih tema i otkrivanje novih da to treba biti temom nekog drugog rada koji će se baviti smjerovima budućih istraživanja. Usprkos tome što je taj zadatak ostavljen za budućnost, sigurno je jedno: prvo je potrebno postići konsenzus oko pitanja “kad disciplina nije disciplina”. Tek kad se na to

na project, few others come to mind.⁵ Yet just because there have been only sporadic instances of such collaboration in the past, does this mean that it is not a worthy goal for the present and in the years ahead? From what has been said before, the answer to this question must surely be that it is a pursuable and laudable aim. The issue then turns not so much on whether to carry out such research but what topics would tend to maximise such interdisciplinarity. Here more examples can be conjured up. The important area of tourist motivation, for instance, has until now been more an area of controversy and turf war between sociologists and psychologists than an arena of mutual collaboration. Then there is the issue of tourism's impacts which could well benefit from combined historical, geographical, sociological, anthropological, and allied inputs rather than separate treatments from a single social science discipline. Tourism development, tourism and social change, tourism futures, are other research topics that would surely be enhanced by interdisciplinarity. The all important sphere of quality of life is another arena where an adopted domain perspective implies the added richness of disciplines working in tandem. In fact, the more one thinks about it, the more rapidly do examples suggest themselves. Indeed, so crucial is this complementary approach to a revival of traditional themes and the discovery of new ones that it must remain the subject of another essay investigating avenues of further inquiry. In spite of this postponed agenda, one thing is certain, namely that first consensus has to be achieved over the whole

⁵ Međutim, dobar primjer interdisciplinarnе suradnje na diplomskoj razini je Finska sveučilišna mreža za izučavanje turizma (Finnish University Network for Tourism Studies, FUNTS) u sklopu koje se studenti doktorskih studija, koji na svojim matičnim sveučilištima unutar svojih disciplina rade na projektima vezanima uz turizam, okupljaju na University of Joensuu u Savonlinni kako bi sudjelovali u multidisciplinarnim prezentacijama sa svojim kolegama i nizom stranih gostujućih profesora (Peltonen 2000).

⁵ However, a good example of interdisciplinarny cooperation at the graduate level can be found in the Finnish University Network for Tourism Studies (FUNTS) where PhD students working on tourism projects from within their own disciplines and at their own universities come together at the University of Joensuu at Savonlinna for exposure to multidisciplinary presentations from their colleagues and a variety of overseas visiting professors (Peltonen 2000).

pitanje i na pitanja vezana uz njega nađe odgovarajući odgovor, bit će moguće ostvariti pravi napredak u istraživanju turizma.

Revidirana verzija rada koji je prvi puta predstavljen na konferenciji "Interdisciplinarni mostovi u istraživanju turizma", održanoj na Međunarodnoj akademiji za izučavanje turizma u Taipeiju, Tajvan, od 6.-10. lipnja 2011.

issue of "when is a discipline not a discipline?" Only when that question is adequately answered, along with its corollaries, can true progress be made in tourism research.

Revised version of a paper originally presented to the first academic session on "Interdisciplinary Bridges in Tourism Scholarship", International Academy for the Study of Tourism, Taipei, Taiwan 6-10 June, 2011

LITERATURA - REFERENCES

1. Aramberri, J. (2001) The Host Should Get Lost: Paradigms in Tourism Theory. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 28. No. 3. pp. 738-761
2. Bernstein, R. (1991) *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics and Praxis*, 4thedn. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
3. Boiëlle, J., Payen-Payne, V. (1905) *Cassell's New French-English, English-French Dictionary*. London: Cassell.
4. Buck, R. (1978) Towards a Synthesis in Tourism Theory. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 5. No. 5. pp. 110-111
5. Bystrzanowski, J. ed. (1989) *Tourism as a Factor of Change: National Case Study*. Vienna: International Social Science Council, European Coordination Center for Research and Documentation in the Social Sciences.
6. Bystrzanowski, J., Beck, G. eds. (1989) *Tourism as a Factor of Change: A Sociocultural Study*. Vienna: International Social Science Council, European Coordination Center for Research and Documentation in the Social Sciences.
7. Coles, T., Hall, C. M, Duval, D. (2006) Tourism and Post-Disciplinary Enquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism*. Vol. 9. No. 4/5. pp. 293-319
8. Cooper, C. (2003) Progress in Tourism Research. In: Cooper, C. (ed.) *Classic Reviews in Tourism*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications. pp. 1-8
9. Cooper, C., Fletcher, J., Gilbert, D., Shepherd, R., Wanhill, S. (1998) *Tourism: Principles and Practices*. London: Pitman.
10. Dann, G. (1996) *The Language of Tourism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Wallingford: CAB International.
11. Dann, G., Cohen, E. (1991) Sociology and Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 18. No. 1. pp. 155-169
12. Dann, G., Liebman Parrinello, G. (2009) Setting the Scene. In: Dann, G., Liebman Parrinello, G. (eds.). *The Sociology of Tourism: European Origins and Developments*. Bradford: Emerald. pp. 1-63
13. Decosta, P., Grunewald, A. (2008) *Logics of Tourismology: The Need to Include Meta-Theories in Tourism Curricula*. Paper Presented to the Third International Conference on Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, Monash University Centre, Prato, Tuscany, Italy, 22-25 July
14. Echtner, C., Jamal, T. (1997), The Disciplinary Dilemma of Tourism Studies. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 24. No. 4. pp. 868-883
15. Foucault, M. (1975) *Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la Prison*. Paris: Gallimard.

16. Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House.
17. Goeldner, C. (1988) *The Evaluation of Tourism as an Industry and a Discipline*. Paper Presented to a Conference for Tourism Educators. University of Surrey.
18. Graburn, N., Jafari, J. (1991) Introduction: Tourism Social Science. *Annals of Tourism Research*, special issue. Vol. 18. No. 1. pp. 1-9
19. Gunn, C. (1972) *Vacationscape: Designing Tourist Regions*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
20. Hall, C., Page, S. (2008) Progress in Tourism Management: From the Geography of Tourism to Geographies of Tourism. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 30. No. 1. pp. 3-16
21. Hirst, P. (1974) *Knowledge and the Curriculum*. London: Routledge.
22. Hoerner, J-M. (1993) Introduction au Géotourisme. *Collection Études* (Introduction to Geotourism. *Studies Collection*). Perpignan: Presses Universitaires de Perpignan.
23. Hoerner, J-M. (1996) Les Stations Touristiques. Entre Pôle et Marché (Touristic Short Stays. Between Pole and Market). *Espaces* 47, June.
24. Hoerner, J-M. (1997a) Géographie de l'Industrie Touristique. *Collection Tourisme-Hôtellerie-Loisir* (Geography of the Tourism Industry. *Tourism-Hospitality-Leisure Collection*). Paris: Editions Ellipses.
25. Hoerner, J-M. (2000) Pour la Reconnaissance de la Science Touristique (In Recognition of a Science of Tourism). *Espaces* 173, July.
26. Hoerner, J-M. (2001) Tourisme et Terrorisme. Le Pire n'est Jamais Certain (Tourism and Terrorism. The Worst is never Certain). *Espaces* 186, October.
27. Hoerner, J-M. (2002a) *Traité de Tourismologie: Pour une Nouvelle Science Touristique*. Collection Études (*Treatise on Tourismology: For a New Tourism Science*). Studies Collection. Perpignan: Presses Universitaires de Perpignan.
28. Hoerner, J-M. (2002b) Pour une Nouvelle Définition du Tourisme (For a New Definition of Tourism). *Espaces* 197, October.
29. Hoerner, J-M. (2005) Encore un Pas vers la Tourismologie (Yet Another Step Towards Tourismology) *Espaces* 227, June.
30. Hoerner, J-M. (2006) *Mémoires d'un Nouveau Touriste*. Collection Homo Touristicus (*Memories of a New Tourist*. Touristic Man Collection). Baixas: Editions Balzac.
31. Hoerner, J-M. (2008a) *Géopolitique du Tourisme*. (*The Geopolitics of Tourism*). Paris: Éditions Armand Colin.
32. Hoerner, J-M. (2008b) Essai de Classification des Sites Touristiques. Un Site ne Naît pas Touristique, Il le Devient (Essay Classifying Tourist Sites. A Site is not Born Touristic. It Becomes One). *Espaces* 257, March.
33. Hoerner, J-M. (2010) *Le Tourisme dans la Mondialisation. Les Mutations de l'Industrie Touristique* (*Tourism in the Process of Globalisation: Changes in the Tourist Industry*). Paris: L'Harmattan.
34. Hoerner, J-M. (1997b) La Fin du Tourisme de Masse? Les Tendances Élitistes de L'Industrie Touristique (The End of Mass Tourism? Elitist Tendencies of the Tourism Industry). *Espaces* 147, September.
35. Hoerner, J-M., Mamontoff, A.M. (2009) *Pour une Nouvelle Recherche en Tourisme*. Collection Homo Touristicus. (*For New Research in Tourism*. Touristic Man Collection). Baixas: Editions Balzac.
36. Hoerner, J-M., Sicart, C. (2003) *La Science du Tourisme. Précis Franco-Anglais de Tourismologie*. Collection

- Homo Touristicus. (*The Science of Tourism. French-English Summary of Tourismology*. Touristic Man Collection). Baixas: Editions Balzac.
37. <http://en.wiktionary.org> [accessed 25/08/2010]
 38. <http://www.amforht.com> [accessed 03/09/2010]
 39. <http://www.danielgfuchs.com> [accessed 25/08/2010]
 40. <http://www.differencebetween.net> [accessed 25/08/2010]
 41. <http://www.english.usab.edu> [accessed 25/08/2010]
 42. <http://www.etymonline.com> [accessed 25/08/2010]
 43. <http://www.kaznu.kz/en/755> [accessed 03/09/2010]
 44. <http://www.tourismology.org> [accessed 03/09/2010]
 45. Hunziker, W., Krapf, K. (1942) *Grundriß der Allgemeinen Fremdenverkehrslehre (Outline of the General Teaching of Tourism)*. Zurich: Polygraphischer Verlag.
 46. *Hürriyet Daily News* (2011) www.hurriyetdailynews.com/n.php?n=tourism-should-be-considered-as-a-branch-of-science-academics-agree- [accessed 25/04/2011]
 47. Jafari, J, ed. (2000) *Encyclopedia of Tourism*. London: Routledge.
 48. Jafari, J. (1977) Editor's Page. *Annals of Tourism Research* 5 (special issue). pp. 6-11
 49. Jafari, J., Ritchie, B (1981) Towards a Framework of Tourism Education: Problems and Prospects. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 8. No. 1. pp. 13-34
 50. Jovičić Ž. (1993) A Plea for Tourismological Theory and Methodology. *Tourist Review*. Vol. 43. No. 1. pp. 2-5
 51. Jovičić, Ž. (1972) Turizmologija (Tourismology). *Collected Papers*. Beograd: Faculty of Geography, University of Belgrade.
 52. Jovičić, Ž. (1980) *Osnovi turizmologije (Essentials of Tourismology)*. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.
 53. Kuhn, T. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 54. Leiper, N. (1979) The Framework of Tourism: Towards a Definition of Tourism, Tourist and Tourist industry. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 6. No. 4. pp. 390-407
 55. Leiper, N. (1981). Towards a Cohesive Curriculum in Tourism: The Case for a Distinct Discipline. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 8. No. 1. pp. 69-83
 56. Leiper, N. (1993) Defining Tourism and Related Concepts: Tourist, Market, Industry and Tourism System. In Khan, M., Olsen, M and Var, T. eds., *VNR's Encyclopedia of Hospitality and Tourism*, pp. 539-558. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
 57. Leiper, N. (2000a) An Emerging Discipline. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 27. No. 3. pp. 805-809.
 58. Leiper, N. (2000b) Education, Multidisciplinary. In: Jafari, J. (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Tourism*. pp. 179-182. London: Routledge.
 59. London School Of Economics And Political Science (2010) <http://www2.lse.ac.uk> [accessed 27/08/2010]
 60. Nash, D. (2010) *Balance of Power in Development of an Association of Tourism Researchers*. Hong Kong: School of Hotel and Tourism Management, Hong Kong Polytechnic University.
 61. Oter, Z. (2011), *Message to TRINET*, 27.04.
 62. Peltonen, A. (2000) Finnish University Network for Tourism Studies (FUNTS). In J. Jafari, ed., *Encyclopedia of Tourism*, pp. 231. London: Routledge.

63. Przeclawski, K. (1993) Tourism as the Subject of Interdisciplinary Research. In Pearce D., Butler, R. eds., *Tourism Research Critiques and Challenges*. pp. 9-19. London: Routledge.
64. Rogoziński, K. (1985) Tourism as a Subject of Research and Integration of Sciences. *Problemy Turystyki (Touristic Problems)* 4. pp. 7-19
65. Singh, S. (u postupku izdavanja) Tourism as a Discipline: An Anthropologist's Perspective (cited with permission of and discussion with the author)
66. Smelser, N., P. Baltes, eds. (2002) *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 26 vols. Oxford: Elsevier.
67. Teilhard De Chardin, P. (1955) *Le Phénomène Humain (The Human Phenomenon)*. Paris: Seuil.
68. Tran Du Thanh (2009) *Introduction to Tourism Science*, 5th ed. Hanoi: Vietnam National University.
69. Tribe, J. (1997) The Indiscipline of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 24. No. 3. pp. 638-657
70. Tribe, J. (2000) Indisciplined and Unsubstantiated. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 27. No. 3. pp. 809-813
71. Tribe, J. (2004) Knowing about Tourism. In Phillimore, J & Goodson, L. eds. *Qualitative Research in Tourism: Ontologies, Epistemologies and Methodologies*, pp. 46-62. London: Routledge.
72. Wu, B. (2010) The Way to and from Shanghai: A Chinese Tourism Geographer's Story. In Smith, S. ed. *The Discovery of Tourism*. pp. 163-177. Bradford: Emerald.
73. University Of Manchester, UK. (2010) School of Social Sciences <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk> [accessed 27/08/]
74. University Of Surrey (2010) Conference on Tourism Social Science, June-July 2011 <http://ocs.som.surrey.ac.uk/pristupljeno> [accessed 27/08/]
75. Urry, J. (1990) *The Tourist Gaze. Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
76. Vukonić, B. (2009) Tourism Theory in the Former Yugoslavia. In Dann, G, & Lieberman Parrinello, eds. *The Sociology of Tourism: European Origins and Developments*, pp. 195-219. Bradford: Emerald.
77. Wallerstein, E. (1999) The Heritage of Sociology and the Promise of Social Science. *Current Sociology*. Vol. 47. No. 1. pp. 1-37

Primljeno: 27. rujna 2016. / Submitted: 27 September 2016

Prihvaćeno: 25. listopada 2016. / Accepted: 25 October 2016