TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY RESEARCH: SUPPORTING A SHIFT TO HOLISTIC, SITUATED AND MULTIPLE WORLD-VIEWS RESEARCH AGENDAS

Gayle Jennings
Imagine Consulting Group International Pty Ltd

Abstract

In order to forge ahead within global and glocal contexts of challenging growth, tourism and hospitality research needs to shift from a reliance on limited dimensional, objective and western-centric research to holistic, situated and multiple worlds-focused research endeavors. Such a shift would embrace the development of multidisciplinary, and interdisciplinary research teams and serve to reconnect tourism and hospitality research to broader growth related global, environmental, cultural and societal issues. While the beginning decades of the twenty-first century have been punctuated with a growing number of researchers who are attempting to advance such a shift; more needs to be done. Researchers regardless of their experience need to become more familiar with, appreciative of and engage with the various theoretical paradigms, methodologies and methods that inform research. Further, to support the development of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary teams, intrapersonal and interpersonal researcher abilities and capabilities need honing and refining in conjunction with development of personal knowledge and skill sets of researchers regarding team roles, cross-cultural communication, power and politics. Relatedly, the education of future tourism and hospitality researchers also needs to involve the development of similar knowledge, skills, and competencies.

Keywords: researcher education, researcher knowledge, research paradigms, researcher skills, world contexts

Introduction

The twenty-first century is punctuated by global and glocal contexts of challenging growth, changing social, cultural, political and environmental situations, and a constant fluidity in these contexts and situations. Relatedly, a first premise of this paper is that tourism and hospitality phenomena vary temporally and contextually from society to society, social group to social group, cultural grouping to cultural grouping, individual to individual. Subsequently, tourism and hospitality research needs to shift from a reliance on limited dimensional, objective and western-centric research to holistic, situated and multiple worlds-focused research endeavors (Jennings, 2007). Undertaking such a shift would work towards the development of multidisciplinary, and interdisciplinary research teams (Jennings, 2010a) and serve to reconnect tourism

and hospitality research to broader growth related global, environmental, cultural and societal issues.

A growing number of researchers are already participating in such a shift; more needs to be done. Thus, a second premis of this paper is that researchers regardless of their experience need to become more familiar with, appreciative of and engage with the various theoretical paradigms, methodologies and methods that inform research. A third premis is that in order to support the development of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary teams; the intrapersonal and interpersonal abilities and capabilities of researchers need honing and refining along with the development of personal knowledge and skill sets of researchers regarding team roles, cross-cultural communication, power and politics. Relatedly, the education of future tourism and hospitality researchers also needs to involve the development of similar knowledge, skills and competencies.

Methodology

The writing of this paper was heuristically informed based on successive action research cycles, which commenced in 1995 and focussed on tourism and hospitality education and research. Action research is an iterative process of planning, implementing, monitoring and reflecting (Kemmis and McTaggart 1988). In particular, I have reflected on the cultural lenses or epistemological approaches that have been applied with regard to interpreting the world as well as the theoretical paradigms used to design tourism and hospitality research projects. The dominant epistemology has been western based with strong Eurocentric and American-centric influences. The dominant hegemony of research design has been post/positivism and again the viewpoint has been western-centric. In addition to action research, as already noted, I have also used heuristic research (Moustakas, 1990). The phases of heuristics research are "initial engagement, immersion in the topic and question, incubation, illumination, explication and culmination of the research in a creative synthesis" (Moustakas 1990, p. 27). This may be framed more simplistically as empirical material collection, self-reflection, interpretation and synthesis. The processes of heuristics and action research have complementarity with each other. The heuristic approach to understanding research processes and viewpoints used to research tourism and hospitality included empirical material (data) collection of experiences and literature, self-reflection and interpretation (analysis) then synthesis of key components of the phenomenon being studied (in this case, tourism and hospitality research). Specifically, 'initial engagement' occurred when I was a student, an educator and a researcher. 'Immersion' resulted through my researching of the literature and phenomena of associated with tourism and hospitality research. 'Incubation' regarding hegemonic epistemologies and paradigmatic viewpoints occurred in the process of educating tourism and hospitality students, teaching research methods and engaging in research associated with tourism and hospitality. 'Explication' occurred over twenty years of educating students, teaching research classes and undertaking research projects. 'Creative synthesis' occurred in writing this paper amongst others. Informing both the heuristic and action research processes reported in this paper was a social

constructivist paradigm. This paradigm assumes that there is no universal "truth" but multiple realities, this paradigm is also explained later in this paper.

Literature Review

This section focuses on eight theoretical paradigms (see Guba, 1990) from which a tourism and hospitality researcher may select and of which tourism and hospitality students need to be informed with regard to tourism and hospitality research: a positivist/postpositivistic approach, a chaos theory/complexity theory orientation, critical theory approach, an interpretive social sciences approach, feminist perspectives, "postmodernism", a participatory approach (see Jennings, 2010) and pragmatism (Jennings, 2015). In the course of this section, four elements of each of the paradigms or perspectives will be considered: ontology, epistemology, methodology and axiology. The ontology is the worldview. The associated relationship between the knower and the known represents epistemology, which may be etic or emic. The informing research design principles constitute the methodology, which may be primarily quantitative or qualitative (Guba and Lincoln, 1994), while values and ethics are the axiological position of the researcher and the research study (Lincoln and Guba, 2000, 2005).

In the main, tourism and hospitality research has been informed by positivism and the use of quantitative research methodology, which uses an etic perspective. Goodson and Phillimore (2004), Jennings (2010b), Riley and Love (2000), Walle (1997), Hollinshead (1996), and Cohen (1988) note that qualitative methodologically informed research can also contribute to understanding the phenomena of tourism. A qualitative methodology is associated with a specific set of paradigms, for example, the interpretive social sciences as well as others that are overviewed in this section but not with positivism. The paper will now commence the consideration of each of the aforementioned eight paradigms by first focussing on positivism.

Positivism was founded by the French philosopher, Auguste Comte (1798-1857) and based on physical sciences principles. The ontological premise of positivism is that 'universal' laws within a bounded system govern the natural and social world, which is stable and patterned. In such a system, "reality" may be determined and behaviour and events predicted. Epistemologically, positivism is objective, that is, etic, and as noted above utilises quantitative methodologies. Axiologically, positivism is intrinsic, propositional and value neutral. In the words of Comte, who coined the term positivism, positivism is about:

> … the study of … laws, -that is their invariable relations of succession and resemblance. Reasoning and observation, duly combined, are the means of this knowledge. … an explanation of facts is simply the establishment of a connection between single phenomena and some general facts, … (Comte, 2000, p.28)

Because of its deterministic nature, positivism was and has been critiqued. Emerging from this critique, was postpositivism. While postpositivists acknowledge that there is a 'reality', they concede that it is imperfectly and probabilistically determined (Robson, 2002). The epistemological position of

postpositivism is objective—etic, albeit, postpositivists acknowledge researchers through their decision-making may influence results despite essays at objectivity. Accordingly, such biases are acknowledged. Primarily, postpositivism uses a quantitative methodology, however, mixed methods may be utilized in association with an emphasis on internal and external validity as well as reliability. Similar to positivism, postpositivism's axiology is propositional, intrinsic and objective.

A tradition related to postpositivism is critical realism. Critical realism is associated with the work of Bhasker (1978, 1982, 1990) and Harré (1981, 1986). For Bhasker (1986), critical realism should have an emancipatory role (axiology). Such a role differs from positivism. In this paper, critical realism has been positioned in association with postpositivism, however, it should be noted that Byrne (1998) does not consider it as being either positivist or alternately phenomenological in nature (refer to interpretive social sciences section).

Chaos theory/complexity theory paradigm is associated with the works of Edward Lorenz, Michel Hénon, Robert May, Benoit Mandelbrot, Mitchell Feigenbaum (Gleick, 1987). Chaos and complexity are connected to realism and subsequently have links to postpositivism (Byrne, 1998). The ontological position of chaos theory envisages the world as dynamic and non-linear. The dynamic nature means that minute changes can generate large-scale ramifications. While some social sciences apply chaos theory metaphorically, others base their scientific inquiries on descriptive algorithms as well as non-linear and non-integral systems. Epistemologically, chaos theory aims for objectivity—an etic position and methodologically draws on either quantitative (algorithms) or qualitative (use of chaos as a metaphor) methodologies. McKercher (1999) provides an overview of chaos theory as a mechanism to understand tourism systems.

Linked to chaos theory is complexity theory. The ontological viewpoint of complexity theory envisages the world as comprised of complex systems that quickly progress from chaos to order based on self-organising processes (Rubinstein and Firstenberg, 1999). Both chaos and complexity theory are axiologically intrinsic and interactional in nature. Both endeavour to contend with:

> … a past of conflicting certitudes, be they related to science, ethics or social systems, to a present of considerable questioning, including questioning about the intrinsic possibility of certainties. … the end of a type of rationality that is no longer appropriate to our time. … [to an accent] on the complex, the temporal and the unstable, which corresponds to a transdisciplinary movement …
> (Gulbenkian Commission 1996, p. 79).

Critical theory paradigm is founded on the works of Karl Marx (1818-1883). The ontological position of critical theory perceives the social world as constrained by rules, however, these rules can be changed. In particular:

> Critical forms of research call current ideology into question, and initiate action, in the cause of social justice. In the type of inquiry spawned by the critical spirit, researchers find themselves interrogating commonly held values and assumptions, challenging conventional social structures, and engaging in social action.

(Crotty, 1998)

Critical theory's epistemological perspective is half-way between subjectivism and objectivism. As noted above, critical theory should lead to transformational change as its aim is to alter social circumstances of those being studied. Subsequently, its axiology is intrinsic, value laden, emancipatory, and transformative. In general, a qualitative research methodology is applied albeit a quantitative methodology may also be used.

An interpretive social sciences paradigm (ISS) is sometimes synonymously connected with social constructionism, social phenomenology and social constructivism (Jennings 2004). Constructionism is associated with William Thomas (1863-1947). Social phenomenology is connected to the work of Alfred Schutz (1899-1959), who was influenced by Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) and the latter's philosophical phenomenology. Social constructivism originated from the works of Peter Berger (1925-) and Thomas Luckmann (1927-), who were students of Schutz. The interpretive social science paradigm is linked to the work of Max Weber (1864-1920) and Wilhem Dilthey (1833-1911). ISS and related approaches reflect that:

> …[h]uman beings do not find or discover knowledge so much as
> we construct or make it. We invent concepts, models, and schemes
> to make sense of experience, and we continually test and modify
> these constructions in the light of new experience. Furthermore,
> there is an inevitable historical and sociocultural dimension to this
> construction. We do not construct our interpretations in isolation
> but against a backdrop of shared understandings, practices,
> language, and so forth.   (Schwandt, 2000, p.197)

ISS assumes an ontological position that recognises multiple realities, and is subsequently oppositional to postpositivists who perceive a 'reality'. Epistemologically, ISS is subjective—emic and value-laden. Moreover, researchers primarily utilize a qualitative methodology and apply an intrinsic, instrumental and transactional axiology. Traditions connected with ISS include phenomenology, ethnomethodology, ethnology, symbolic interactionism, and ethnography.

The feminist perspectives 'paradigm' as interpreted from a western perspective is associated with three waves (Hill n.d.). The first occurred in the nineteenth century and focussed on righting social and legal inequalities experienced by women. The second wave took place in the late 1960s and connected women to anti-discrimination activities and strategies as well as the formation of women's groups. The third wave arose in the 1990s. This wave was a reaction by young women (15-30) who used different means to counter discrimination and to be women differently from their Second Wave counterparts. Subsequently:

> the term "feminism" is itself a contested zone not only within
> feminism but also between feminism and its critics. (Harding,
> 1991, p.6)

As Harding also noted:

> If androcentric and Eurocentric beliefs and practices are part of the evidence for one hypothesis over another (inadvertently or not), then as part of scientific practice we must learn how to detect and eliminate them. (Harding, 1991, p.15)

The feminist perspectives paradigm essays to illuminate lived experiences of women and to challenge and/or break down dominant patriarchal and Eurocentric hegemonic views of the world (ontology). This paradigm has linkages with the interpretive, critical theory and postmodern paradigms. Some debate exists regarding feminist perspectives being a paradigm in their own right or solely a perspective of interpretive social sciences, critical theory or postmodern paradigms. Relatedly, there are a variety of feminist approaches, such as, radical feminism, liberal feminism, socialist/Marxist feminism, poststructuralist feminism, postmodern feminism. Generally, qualitative methodologies are adopted and the researcher and the researched are subjects together or co-analysts. The epistemology is emic and subjective, while axiologies are propositional, transactional, instrumental and intrinsic in nature.

A postmodern paradigm is linked to the writings of Jean-François Lyotard (1924-1998) and Jean Baudrillard (1929-2007) as well as Jacques Lacan (1901-81), Roland Barthes (1915-80), Michel Foucault (1926-84), and Jacques Derrida (1930-2004). Postmodern researchers dispute grand theory and views the world (its ontological perspective) as being constructed of multiple realities and that no one reality has favour over another. Specifically:

> … postmodernism offers an idiom for characterizing lived experience that challenges, if not subverts, traditional forms of empirical description.

> .. the lack of unity within postmodernism reflects one of its most widely shared tenets: the possibility of certainty must be regarded skeptically, if not rejected outright. This reverberates throughout the social sciences as a challenge to comprehensive or veridical descriptions of experience. Postmodernism casts doubt on the possibility of any totalizing or exhaustive theories or explanations.
> (Gubrium and Holstein, 2003, p. 4)

There are a variety of approaches such as, ludic postmodernism, oppositional postmodernism and critical postmodernism. Across these approaches, a variety of methods are used, which are derivative of a qualitative methodology. A 'postmodern' paradigm supports a propositional, transactional, instrumental, and intrinsic axiology.

The *participatory paradigm* is founded on "liberation theology and neo-Marxist approaches to community development" as well as "human rights activism" (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2000, p. 568). The participatory paradigm supports an ontological viewpoint that reality is individually and collectively known (Reason 1994). Its epistemology is emic in nature wherein experiential learning stems from participation and self-reflexive directed actions. PR uses a methodology that is essentially qualitative although mixed methods may be used

(Jennings 2001) and action research informs the development of research designs. Lewin (1948) is attributed with coining the term action research.

> Action research is a participatory, democratic process concerned with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purposes, grounded in a participatory worldview which we believe is emerging at this historical moment. It seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing cocnern to people, and more genrally the flourishing of indivudal persons and their communities." (Reason and Bradbury, 2006, p. 1).

Consequently, its axiological position is intrinsic, interactional, emancipatory and co-operative in nature. A number of types of action research exist, for example, cooperative inquiry, participatory action research, action inquiry, appreciative inquiry (Jennings, 2004).

The previous paradigms: positivism, postpositivism, critical realism, chaos and complexity theory, critical theory orientation, social constructivism, feminist perspectives, postmodernism, and participatory paradigms provide a diversity of paradigms from which to frame tourism and hospitality research. One of the key differences amongst the previously discussed paradigms relates to the use of methodologies: either quantitative associated with etic perspectives for paradigms derived from positivism; and qualitative for paradigms linked to interpretive social sciences, which essay towards emic perspectives. While a number of paradigms draw on mixed methods, the use of mixed methods has been disputed by some researchers due to concern regarding the incommensurability of paradigmatic ontologies (see Jennings, 2004). Others see mixed methods as a paradigm in its own right.

Pragmatism, as a paradigm, was proposed in 1988, by Howe. Pragmatists argue that whatever methods will provide answers to research problems should be used in research designs regardless of supposed paradigmatic leanings. In 2009, Teddlie and Tashakkori identified two paradigmatic positions with regard to mixed methods: pragmatism and transformative. Merton described the transformative paradigm in 2003. Its focus on marginalized peoples, social justice, and inequitable power relationships and has some synergy with critical realism and critical theory paradigms. Pragmatism is ontologically aligned with "what works". Epistemologically it is focused on solving problems objectively and subjectively and axiologically it focuses on emancipation, and transformation.

> "A major advantage of mixed methods research is that it enables the researcher to simultaneously answer confirmatory and exploratory questions, and therefore verify and generate theory in the same study." (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2003, p.15).

In practice, the mixing of methodologies is generally applied at different phases of research designs, particularly, before, after and at times concurrently (for further information see Brannen, 1992; Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998; and Creswell, 2003).

Critical and Indigenous Methodologies require address in order to redress

"European imperialism and colonialism" connected with the word "research" (L.T. Smith, 1999, p.1). Research "is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world's vocabulary (L.T. Smith, 1999, p.1). "Indigenous methodologies tend to approach cultural protocols, values and behaviours as an integral part of methodology" (L.T. Smith 1999, p.17). There are varying views with regard to the conduct of Indigenous research, such as, Indigenist standpoint theory, Indigenist research and non-Indigenous research.

Cross-cultural methodologies, tourism researchers need to understand and appreciate different ways of knowing and the use of cross cultural research methodologies and methods (Sofield, 2000, ㅣ. A number of principles apply to cross-cultural research, such as, an emically informed perspective (Sofield 2000), adherence to cultural "rules of practice"; realising that western-based English and concepts when translated (and back translated) may have no cultural relevance to non-English cultures (de Mooij, 1998); and that after the granting of host culture permission, research teams should include a cultural insider (Jennings, 2010b).

To conclude, increasingly within our globalised and connected world, travel and tourism experiences will continue to be framed as part of peoples' life experiences. In particular, 'space and place' have contracted and widened due to globalisation, internationalisation, knowledge and experience economy participation as well as constant and unexpected change. Continued participation in both the knowledge and experience economy will increase emphasises on understanding tourism and hospitality phenomena. The diversity of interpretations associated with tourism and hospitality phenomena need to bear in mind intracultural, intercultural, cross-cultural, cross-national differences. In particular, the first premise of this paper is that tourism and hospitality phenomena vary temporally and contextually from society to society, social group to social group, cultural grouping to cultural grouping, individual to individual. Subsequenlty, research methods used should constantly question whether "positivism and postpositivism and western-centric paradigms and epistemologies" (Jennings, 2007) are being privileged. The second premis of this paper was that researchers regardless of their experience need to become more familiar with and appreciative of as well as engage with the various theoretical paradigms, methodologies and methods that inform research. A third premis is that in order to support the development of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary teams; the intrapersonal and interpersonal abilities and capabilities of researchers need honing and refining along with the development of personal knowledge and skill sets of researchers regarding team roles, cross-cultural communication, power and politics. Researchers need to consider other approaches and develop their overall knowledges, skills and competencies in order to design and affect studies in order to conduct research that will understand the diversity of tourism and hospitality phenomena and the broader social, cultural, political environmental contexts in which they occur and the broader growth-related global, environmental, cultural and societal issues that arise.

References

Bhasker, R. (1978). *A realist theory of science*, second edition. Brighton: Harvester.

Bhasker, R. (1982). Emergence, explanation and emancipation. In P. Secord, (Ed.). *Explaining social behaviour: Consciousness, behaviour and social structure.* Beverley Hills: Sage.

Bhasker, R. (1986). *Scientific realism and human emancipation*. London: Verso.

Bhasker, R. (Ed.). (1990). *Harré and his critics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brannen, J. (Ed.) (1992) *Mixing Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Research.* Averbury: Aldershot.

Byrne, D. (1998). Complexity theory and the social sciences: an introduction. London: Routledge.

Cohen, E. (1988). Traditions in the qualitative sociology of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 15, pp. 29-46.

Comte, A. (2000). *The positive philosophy of Auguste Comte*. Vol. 1. Translated by H. Martineau. Kitchener: Batoche books [URL: http://www.ecn.bris.ac.uk/het/comte/philos1.pdf].

Creswell, J.W. (2003) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 2nd edition. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: meaning and perspective in the research process*. St Leonards: Allen and Unwin.

De Mooij, M. (1998). Global markeitng and advertising: Understanding cultural paradoxes. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, Norman.K., Lincoln, Yvonna.S. and Linda. Tuhiwai Smith (eds). 2008 *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Gleick, J. (1987). *Chaos: making a new science*. New York: Penguin.

Goodson, L. and J. Phillimore. (2004). *Qualitative research in tourism: ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*. London: Routledge.

Guba, E. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialog. In Guba, E. *The paradigm dialog.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Guba, E.G. and Y.S. Lincoln. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Gubrium, J.F. and J.A. Holstein. (2003). Postmodern sensibilities. In J.F. Gubrium and J.A. Holstein, (eds.). *Postmodern interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Gulbenkian Commission. (1996). *Open the social sciences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge?* Milton Keyes: Open University Press.

Harré, R. (1981). The positive-empiricist approach and its alternative. In P. Reason and J. Rowan, (eds.), *Human inquiry: a sourcebook of new paradigm research.* Chichester: Wiley.

Harré, R. (1986). *Varieties of realism: a rationale for the natural sciences*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hill, C. (n.d.). 1st, 2nd, 3rd wave. [URL: http://spider.georgetowncollege.edu/ws/1st_2nd_3rd_wave.htm downloaded 17 February 2005.]

Hollinshead, K. (1996). The tourism researcher as bricoleur: the new wealth and diversity in qualitative inquiry. *Tourism Analysis*, Vol. 1, pp. 67-74.

Howe, K.R. (1988). "Against the quantitative-qualitative incompatibility thesis or dogmas die hard". *Educational researcher*, 17, pp. 10-16.

Jennings, G. (2010a). Research processes for evaluating quality experiences: Reflections from the "experiences" field(s). In Morgan, M., Lugosi, P. and J.R.B. Ritchie. (eds.). *The experience of tourism and leisure: consumer and management perspectives*. Clevedon: Channel View.

Jennings, G.R. (2010b). *Tourism Research*, 2e. Brisbane: John Wiley.

Jennings, G.R. (2003). Tourism research: Theoretical paradigms and accountability. Targeted Research: the gateway to accountability: TTRA 34th Annual Conference Proceedings [CD Rom], June 15-18, St Louis, Missouri.

Jennings, G.R. (2004) Business Research, Examples of Theoretical paradigms that inform, *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement*, San Diego, CA: Academic Press, pp. 211-217.

Jennings, G.R. (2007) Advances in tourism research: Theoretical paradigms and accountability' In Matias, A., Nijkamp, P. and P. Neto (eds.). *Advances in Modern Tourism Research, Economic Perspectives*. Heidelberg:Springer, Physica-Verlag, pp. 9-35.

Kemmis, S. and R. McTaggart. (1988). *The action research planner*, 3rd edition. Deakin University Press: Deakin University.

Kemmis, S. and R. McTaggart. (2000). Participatory action research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 567-605.

Laclau, E. (1990). *New reflections on the revolution of our time*. London: Verso.

Lewin, K. (1948). Action research and minority problems. In Lewin, K. (Ed.). *Resolving social conflicts*. New York: Harper and Row.

Lincoln, Y.S. and E.G. Guba. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 163-188.

Lincoln, Y.S. and E.G. Guba. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 163-188.

McKercher, B. (1999). A chaos approach to tourism. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 425-34.

Mertons, D.M. (2003). Mixed methods and the politics of human research: The transformative-emancipatory perspective . In Tashakkori, A. and Teddlie, C. (eds.). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 135-166.

Moustakas, C. (1990). *Heuristic research, design, methodology, and applications*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Nickerson, N.P. (2006). Some Reflections on Quality Tourism Experiences. in Jennings, GR and Nickerson, N (eds.) *Quality Tourism Experiences*, Burlington, MA: Elsevier, Chapter 13, 227-235.

Reason, Peter. (1994). Three approaches to participative inquiry. In N. K. Denzin and Y S. Lincoln, (Eds.). Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 324-39.

Riley, R.W. and L.L. Love. (2000). The state of qualitative tourism research. *Annals of*

Tourism Research, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 164-187.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research, a resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers*, 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rubinstein, Moshe, F. and I.R. Firstenberg. (1999). *The minding organization: Bringing the future to the present and turn creative ideas into business solutions*. New York: John Wiley.

Scheurich, J.J. (1997). *Research methods in the postmodern*. London: The Falmer Press.

Schwandt, T.A. (2000). Three Epistemological Stances for Qualitative Inquiry: Interpretivism, Hermeneutics, and Social Constructionism. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, (Eds.). *Handbook of Qualitative Research,* 2nd edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp.189-213.

Schwartz, S.H. (1992). Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. Vol. 25. New York, NY: Academic Press, pp. 1-65.

Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies – research and Indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Smith, Linda. T. 2005. On tricky ground: researching the native in the age of uncertainty. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook of qualitative research*. Third edition . Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 85-107.

Sofield, T.H.B. (2000). Re-Thinking and re-conceptualising social and cultural issues of tourism development in South and East Asia. *Institute for Sustainability and Technology Policy, Case Study*. Murdoch University, Australia. Downloaded 19 September, 2007. URL: http://sustainability.murdoch.edu.au/casestudies/Case_Studies_Asia/toursea/toursea.htm

Tashakkori, A. and Teddlie, C. (eds.). (2003). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Tashakkori, A. and C. Teddlie. (1998). *Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Applied Social Science Research Methods Series, Volume 46. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Teddlie, C. and Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of Mixed Methods Research: Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Urry, J. (1996). Sociology of time and space. In Turner, B.S. (Ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 369-395.

Walle, A.H. (1997). Quantitative versus qualitative tourism research. *Annals of Tourism*, *24*(3), pp. 524-536.