Title: Tourists, Mobilities and Paradigms

Article Type: Research Paper

Corresponding Author: Professor David Harrison, B.Sc.(soc), Ph.D (soc, Ant)

Corresponding Author's Institution: Middlesex University

First Author: David Harrison, B.Sc.(soc), Ph.D (soc, Ant)

Order of Authors: David Harrison, B.Sc.(soc), Ph.D (soc, Ant)

Abstract: Kuhn's perception of paradigms changed over time, and eventually he considered the exemplar to be defining feature of specialised scientific communities, the sole arbiters of scientific progress, who possess a shared lexicon, more or less incommensurable to non-members. The ensuing debate as to whether or not paradigms, including the new mobilities paradigm (NMP), are found in the social science is summarised, and claims it is of special relevance to tourism studies are examined. Authenticity has indeed been a key concept, but the 'discourse of authenticity' has not dominated tourism studies, and Western and Asian scholars, despite a slow start, are now increasingly and successfully applying Western social science concepts to Asian (especially Chinese) tourism without recourse to a 'Non-Western' or 'Asian' paradigm. However, while 'mobilities' is not a paradigm, the NMP is a useful perspective that is commensurable with different theoretical approaches to tourism and other forms of travel.

Tourists, Mobilities and Paradigms

- Kuhnian paradigms are defined by their exclusivity and incommensurability.
- Much debate has centred on the existence of paradigms in the social sciences.
- Some claim the New Mobilities Paradigm (NMP) in tourism studies avoids ethnocentricity.
- But tourism scholars do not ignore emerging societies and NMP is not a paradigm.
- It is a valid, non-exclusive addition to Western social science and tourism studies.

TOURISTS, MOBILITIES AND PARADIGMS

INTRODUCTION: KUHN AND PARADIGMS

Published more than five decades ago, Kuhn's '*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*' (1962) is a twentieth century classic. Its central thesis, on changes in scientific thinking, has been subject of much discussion and numerous revisions, many by Kuhn himself (1970a, 1970b, 1970c, 1974, 1987, 2000, 2012). Moreover, while he was not the only philosopher of science to question 'the received view' of scientific theories (Suppe 1977: 4-5), his work on paradigms and paradigm change has been especially important, reportedly changing the prevailing image of science (Hacking 2012: xxxvii).

When first discussing 'normal science,' Kuhn (1962) portrayed it as passing through four stages: first, a more or less random collection of facts; secondly, a pre-paradigm stage, characterised by competing schools of thought; thirdly, a period when one school's paradigm becomes pre-eminent and, finally, normal science, when an agreed world view and standard methods of problem-solving comprise a paradigm into which newcomers to the science are socialised. A period of consensus and stability follows: the dominant paradigm is unquestioned, problem-solving more efficient, and progress in accumulating scientific knowledge – as defined by the scientific community - is made. Eventually, however, disagreements emerge over the problems to be solved; new terms emerge, old ones are redefined, and there is 'misunderstanding' among different schools of thought. A period of crisis ensues, alternative paradigms emerge which are incommensurable with the dominant paradigm and, through argument or (more) conversion, there is a revolutionary shift in (some) scientists' world views. Eventually, 'after the last holdouts have died, the whole profession will again be practising under a single, but now different, paradigm' (Kuhn 2012: 151).

PROBLEMS WITH PARADIGMS

As indicated in the following pages, Kuhn's work stimulated immediate debate and prompted him to make substantial revisions in his position. However, the issues continue to centre on how far paradigms are characterised by mutual

incommensurability, whether they change through conversion to new ways of thinking or because previous theories have been disproved or falsified (Bird 2013; Toulmin 1970) and, for present purposes, how far the social sciences are characterised by paradigms and paradigm change. This debate is especially relevant to tourism studies, both theoretically and in matters of empirical research for, as shown below, in recent years several tourism scholars have advanced strong claims that a mobilities perspective is, in effect, a new and more appropriate paradigm for the study of tourism, especially in non-Western societies.

The overall purpose of this paper is to assess the validity of such claims. However, first it is necessary to examine Kuhn's changing views on the nature of paradigms and then to summarise arguments as to how far paradigms exist in the social sciences. This provides the context for asking how far what is claimed to be the 'New Mobilities paradigm' is indeed a paradigm in any meaningful Kuhnian sense, rather than a useful perspective that is quite commensurable with different theoretical and empirical approaches to tourism and other forms of travel.

At the outset, it should be noted that all disputants, including Popper and Kuhn, who differ in many other respects, accept that natural sciences *are* sciences (Kuhn 1970c: 2,3,6; Popper 1970). However, soon after *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* was published, contradictions in Kuhn's concept of paradigm became evident (Masterman 1970: 61). Consequently (Kuhn 1970b, 1974; Hacking 2012: xvii-xxv), he redefined 'paradigm' as both a disciplinary matrix and exemplar. The former is the global or world view of an independent scientific community and includes symbolic generalisations, shared commitments to 'particular models,' and shared values (Kuhn 1970a: 182-185). The fourth component of the disciplinary matrix is the exemplar, the second and narrower sense in which Kuhn initially used the term paradigm. This is a template for 'concrete problem-solutions,' accepted by the scientific group, taught to students of science, and is the a guide to their research activities (Kuhn 1970a: 186; Kuhn 1974: 463).

Paradigms, then, are disciplinary matrices and, more locally, exemplars, and in both senses they are the property of the appropriate scientific community, which functions 'as a producer and validator of sound knowledge' (Kuhn 1974: 463). As Kuhn puts

it: 'A paradigm is what the members of a scientific community, and they alone, share' (1974: 460). The community is defined by its disciplinary matrix, by its world view, underpinned by commonly held commitments and values, and by its dominant exemplar, which is the community's accepted way of solving problems.

Another issue is how much dissent over problem-solving approaches among adherents to an exemplar can be accommodated before different problems and the need for different solutions are perceived. After all, even within normal science, with its shared commitments and value consensus, agreement is never total. Unfortunately, neither Kuhn nor his supporters resolved this matter. Perhaps, as Hacking notes, 'new disciplines are to some extent mutually incomprehensible (2012: xxxiii), but that simply fudges the question: at what *point* does incommensurability across paradigms (both as world views and exemplars) occur?

However, Kuhn does suggest how incommensurability might be approached. In particular, he links paradigm change to the acquisition of a new language. As competing paradigms emerge, and old terms take on new meanings, some adherents of the previously accepted paradigm familiarise themselves with the new language, slipping into it 'without a decision having been made' (Kuhn 2012: 203). But bilingualism is not enough. The emergent paradigm will be 'native' only to the newly-initiated, for whom it is, so to speak, a first language. By contrast, those who once accepted the earlier paradigm- even those who are bilingual - remain outsiders, 'foreigners in a foreign environment' (Kuhn 2012: 203), until they experience conversion and make the 'gestalt switch' which, for Kuhn, is 'at the heart of the revolutionary process' (2012: 203).

In effect, Kuhn effectively abandoned the notion of paradigm, especially as a disciplinary matrix, and focused on incommensurability, which he defines as 'a sort of untranslatability, localized to one or another area in which two lexical taxonomies differ' (Kuhn 2000: 93). Every scientific community has a shared lexicon, which validates its standards and activities and, simultaneously, maintains 'its isolation from practitioners of other specialities' (Kuhn 2000: 98). Knowledge across scientific communities, with different lexical taxonomies, is *more or less* commensurable, but the *extent* incommensurability occurs depends on the emergence of new forms of

normal science, and overlap in scientific lexicons decreases *as scientific communities become more specialised*. The greater the specialisation, the more incommensurability is encountered.

Scientific communities exist at different levels. For Kuhn, the most global is 'the community of all natural scientists' (2012: 176), though it could be argued that, above this, there is an even wider community, comprised of scientists of all backgrounds who follow science as 'a vocation' (Weber 1948). The next level is made up of 'the main scientific professional groups' (physicists, chemists, astronomers, and so on), followed by such major subgroups as organic chemists and radio astronomers (Kuhn 2012: 176-177). However, it is only *below* this level that normal science is found; here, in the world of specialist conferences, peer-reviewed papers, citations and interest-based networks, are 'the producers and validators of scientific knowledge' (Kuhn 2012: 177), and it is into these communities, the arbiters of scientific progress (Kuhn 2012: 205), that newcomers are socialised and converts welcomed.

PARADIGMS AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Kuhn was reportedly horrified at how social scientists 'misappropriated 'and 'mangled' his theory of paradigms (Walker 2010: 433). He recognised commonalities in the development of natural sciences and other fields of endeavour, 'none necessarily unique to science,' but considered it was their '*conjunction*' which set the scientific activity apart' (Kuhn 2012: 208 My emphasis). More particularly, he believed social and natural sciences differed in several key respects (Kuhn 2012: 164). The former, categorised by him as 'proto-sciences' (1970b: 244), are comprised of competing schools, lack concrete achievements and a single, dominant paradigm (either worldview or exemplar), and have not built on the work of 'classics' of the field. In addition, social scientists must continually reinterpret inherently unstable socio-political systems (Kuhn 2000: 223), and seek validation of their choice of subject matter and their findings from *outside* their communities, rather than from their peers who, in normal science, are the sole validators of progress (Kuhn 2012: 164).

Despite such objections, many social scientists persisted – and persist – in seeking paradigms, especially in the sense of a disciplinary matrix (even though it was a concept Kuhn largely abandoned). Van den Berghe, disillusioned with social theory, suggested the 'paradigm of evolutionary biology' should be bridged 'with several of the major lines of thinking in the social sciences, especially ….. economics, exchange theory, game theory, behaviorism, and, at the "macro" level, Marxism and…even some brands of functionalism' (van den Berghe 1978: 45), thus incorporating almost the entire range of social sciences as a single paradigm.

Slightly less comprehensively, Ritzer saw paradigms as 'subsuming theories, methods, exemplar and image of the subject matter of sociology' (1978: 2) which he considered to be dominated by 'social facts, social definition, and social behaviour,' derived respectively from Durkheim, Weber and Skinner (1978: 2). He also suggested that sociobiology, structuralism and environmentalism were *en route* to 'paradigmatic status' (1978:3), and advocated 'paradigmatic integration' (1978: 10), for which he was heavily criticised by Eckberg and Hill (1979).

Many other suggestions followed. Hammersley lists positivism, constructivism and critical theory (1992: 133); McGregor and Murnane characterise the human and social sciences as defined by the post-positivist 'paradigm' (2010: 419), and Cresswell, defining paradigms variously as philosophical assumptions, epistemologies and ontologies, or research methodologies, and noting methods themselves may be qualitative, quantitative or mixed, adds pragmatism and advocacy to post-positivism and constructivism, seeing all as 'alternative knowledge claims (Cresswell 2003: 6-12). Punch, too, opts for positivism and constructivism as 'the main paradigm positions' (2013: 16-17). By contrast, after rightly noting that quantitative and qualitative methods are ways of obtaining data, and not paradigms, Mertens produces yet another list, preferring dialectical pluralism, pragmatism and 'transformative' paradigms, the last of which portrays research, the outcome of negotiations of researcher and researched, as necessarily orientated to social justice and community empowerment (2007, 2012). Similarly, Shannon-Baker discusses four 'paradigmatic perspectives,' notably pragmatism, transformative-emancipation, dialectics and critical realism, that together comprise a variety of tool-kits available to the fledgling researcher (Shannon-Baker 2015).

It is noteworthy that incommensurability, as a distinguishing feature of paradigms, figures little in such discussions. Indeed, many commentators advocate combining paradigms in research (Mackenzie and Knipe 2006: 200; Punch 2013: 18) and mixed methods has itself been accorded the status of a separate paradigm, enabling researchers to combine different research techniques (Morgan 2007: 73; Denscombe 2008; Feilzer 2010),

While most contenders for paradigmatic status might be described as methodologies (i.e. systems of approaching research) or distinctive research techniques, there are exceptions. Some have isolated a key, pre-defined aspect of social life and developed a conceptual framework around it, as when Rojek and Urry focus on the mobility of people and cultures (1997: 11) and when Urry, more comprehensively, argues that 'mobilities rather than societies should be at the heart of a reconstituted sociology' (2000: 210). His work on mobilities, and that of several others, led in the mid-2000s to a coalescence of interests around this theme, the first issue of the journal *Mobilities*, and somewhat tentative claims in two important editorials that there was a 'new mobilities paradigm' (NMP), though in neither case was the term 'paradigm' actually defined (Sheller and Urry, 2006; Hannam, Sheller and Urry, 2006).

As put forward in these editorials, the NMP is a cross- and inter-disciplinary perspective where the emphasis is on

> complex networks by which hosts, guests, buildings, objects and machines are
> contingently brought together to produce certain performances in certain
> places at certain times (Sheller and Urry 2006: 214).

The focus is no longer on (allegedly) static social structures but on dynamic social processes, interlinking structures and systems, negotiated cross-border networks, connectivities and exclusions, on movements of bodies and images, even of places. Mobilities is a lens, opening up the vista of 'a distinctive social science that is productive of different theories, methods, questions and solutions' (Urry 2007: 18). Drawing on a variety of theoretical insights, ideologies and methods, on 'paradigmatic fragments' from 'multiple archives,' a mobilities approach highlights

'various kinds of movement of people, or ideas, or information or objects…And in so doing this paradigm brings to the fore theories, methods and exemplars of research that have been mostly subterranean, out of sight' (Urry 2007: 18).

For some, at least, mobilities approaches are potentially able to revolutionise social sicnece. The 'new paradigm' is nothing less than a reformulation of sociology as the study of the 'social as mobility,' where 'the social is an open system of mobilities (and immobilities) or networks' (Mavrič and Urry 2009: 648).

Is the NMP a paradigm? Urry once considered Kuhn's concept of paradigm to be inappropriate to the social sciences (1973: 464-466, 1995: 41-42). Later, though, he suggested the NMP was 'derived from Kuhn's exemplary analysis of normal science, scientific exemplars and what constitutes scientific revolution' (2007: 18), a position repeated in 2016, with the distinction 'between a general disciplinary matrix, which we term here "paradigm," as opposed to specific models of good research which we refer to as "exemplars"' (Sheller and Urry, 2016: 11). Now, though, the assertion is buttressed by evidence of the increased importance of mobilities approaches: in the increased number of citations; in numerous peer-reviewed papers in journals, book chapters and commentaries and, thirdly, in the emergence of several active mobilities-orientated academic and other institutions in Europe, the USA and Australia (Sheller and Urry, 2016: 14-15).

However, while Sheller and Urry deduce from such evidence that the NMP is, indeed, a paradigm, authors of another important recent commentary on mobilities, in the journal founded to further work from this perspective, are more circumspect, preferring instead to refer to it as a 'field' of study:

> After 10 years, the vibrant and interdisciplinary set of dialogues that characterize the field has largely rendered moot the question of whether there really was a mobilities turn or paradigm shift. More interesting, therefore, are questions of how links and connections, histories and futures, become intertwined in 'state-of-the-art' mobilities research (Faulconbridge and Hui, 2016: 2)

The nature of mobilities contributions may indeed be more interesting than the labels used to define any shift towards this perspective, and it is not intended here to minimise (or review) the work of mobility theorists and researchers over the last decade. Indeed, the significance of their achievements is noted in the two recent reviews just cited. However, the NMP is quite evidently *not* a paradigm in the Kuhnian sense *as defined in this paper*. It is no 'exemplar,' rigorously developed and guarded by an exclusive community of scientists committed to agreed ways of puzzle-solving, insulated from the outside world, participating in peer-based networks of normal science, and possessing a distinctive scientific lexicon or language which is *incommensurable* to outsiders. In fact, it is the very *opposite*, incorporating a wide range of disciplines and theoretical orientations, including Simmel and complexity theory, constructed by intellectually-mobile scholars, who 'parasitically' draw on 'emancipatory' social movements for support and who, in turn, contribute their insights to civil society (Urry 2000: 211).

To summarise: among the perspectives discussed in this section, paradigmatic status has been claimed, *inter alia*, for the social sciences, sociobiology, theoretical presuppositions, worldviews, ways of looking at the world, positivism, post-positivism, critical realism, critical theory, pragmatism, mixed methods, contructivism, interpretivism, dialectical pluralism, and transformative, advocacy and metaphysical approaches, and the NMP. However, if the argument in the first section of this paper is accepted, whatever their respective merits, none can be considered paradigms in a Kuhnian sense.

What emerges, instead, is a motley collection of worldviews, methodologies, even entire constellations of social sciences, that simply confirms Kuhn's portrayal of social sciences as comprised of competing schools, lacking concrete achievements or a dominant paradigm, which have advanced but little from their founders (Heyl 1975: 66; Keith, 2006: 12). As Bergman notes, 'there are as many paradigms as there are authors who feel the need to distinguish a meta, grand, and middle-range theoretical approach from alternatives' (Bergman 2010: 173). Similarly, Eckberg and Hill, who list the fundamentally different views of twelve prominent sociologists, all claiming to present 'Kuhnian paradigms' (Eckberg and Hill, (1979: 929), suggest paradigm hunts succeed only 'by corrupting Kuhn's model of social science' (Eckberg and Hill

1979: 934), and argue that while disciplinary matrices exist in sociology, as in all disciplines, 'a Kuhnian paradigm approach is inapplicable, for no truly extended research can take place at this level' (1979: 934).

Arguably, sociology and other social sciences are different from, perhaps less 'scientific' than, the natural sciences. However, if that were so, Kuhn's framework, developed to look at changes in scientific thinking, 'to analyse the paradigmatic status of the discipline' (Eckberg and Hill 1979: 934), becomes redundant. Alternatively, if social sciences *are* like the natural sciences, we should be able to find exemplars – but there are none. Instead, there is 'constant arguing, bickering, and debate, but very little agreement' (Eckberge and Hill 1979: 935), which is further demonstrated in their extensive exchanges with Ritzer (Hill and Eckberg 1981; Ritzer,1981).

'MOBILITIES' IN TOURISM STUDIES

Discussions on paradigms in tourism research have focused on much the same methodologies as those in the social sciences generally and have been similarly inconclusive (Dann 1997) The lack of consensus and the disagreement over basic terms is apparent in a relatively recent, co-authored paper on tourism paradigms, where Tribe first conflates paradigms and ideologies and then cites neo-liberalism and sustainability as competing paradigms (Tribe, Dann and Jamal 2015: 34). By contrast, Jamal manages to see tourism studies both as a 'young "*disciplinary* matrix" and as an "immature" *field*' (Tribe, Dann and Jamal 2015: 38; my emphasis), while Dann opposes the conflation of paradigms and ideologies, claims that Tribe (along with most tourism scholars, but not Dann) is ignorant of European social theory and thus suffers from 'Anglo-centricism.' He then archly sidesteps the entire paradigm issue by prioritising the need for 'a sociolinguistic change in patterns of communication rather than a xenophobic air-brushing of history' (Tribe, Jamal and Dann 2015: 41).

Clearly, though, the mobility of people within and across borders is central to studies of travel and tourism and 'the 'new mobilities paradigm' has been taken up by some tourism scholars as a way of reconceptualising and re-situating tourism, hoping to move tourism studies from the periphery of mainstream social research to a central

role in an inter-linked system of immobilities and mobilities (Hannam, Butler and Paris 2014: 182; Hannam 2014: 84). Adherents to the mobilities position claim it brings together 'the situated and mobile nature of tourism and allows analysis from many (interpersonal, regional, global) perspectives' (Mavrič and Urry 2009: 650). This theoretical emancipation, where the emphasis is less on structures *per se* than on 'networks of mobilities and immobilities,' is also claimed to facilitate 'new methodological approaches,' though those cited - ethnographic methods, observation, cyberethnography, interviews, time diaries, the use of visual and literary sources, digital recording and historical research (Mavrič and Urry 2009: 650-654) - are less methodologies than established research techniques, none of which are especially innovative or specific to any single theoretical perspective.

Despite such objections, prominent scholars have applied the NMP in tourism studies, and Erik and Scott Cohen, in particular, make important claims for its relevance in addressing tourist phenomena (2012a, 2015a, 2015b). Their contributions to the debate are especially worthy of attention for three reasons. First, they provide a clearer, more concentrated and yet more comprehensive argument in favour of applying the NMP to tourism, developed over several years, than any found elsewhere in the tourism literature. Secondly, both authors come with impeccable credentials as tourism scholars. Indeed, Erik Cohen, in particular, has consistently published on a wide range of topics since the early 1970s and is justifiably considered one of the founders of tourism studies as a field of enquiry (S. Cohen, 2013). Thirdly, the combination of these two factors – the quality of the intervention and the pedigree of the authors – should ensure their contributions are fully recognised and, where necessary, subjected to the most careful of criticism, and it is for such intellectual – and not personal - reasons that the importance of their writing is recognised in this paper.

Cohen and Cohen make three claims: first, as applied by them, NMP is a paradigm. Secondly, there is a dominant 'discourse of authenticity' in tourism studies and, thirdly, NMP is especially appropriate in analysing the development of tourism in 'emerging' societies. However, it is argued here that the first claim is conceptually problematic, the second is historically inaccurate, and the third demonstrably wrong.

Defining a 'Paradigm' for Tourism Studies

The argument in this section, and the rest of this paper, focuses especially on Cohen and Cohen and the claim that their version of the NMP (which may not be recognised by other mobilities theorists) is more appropriate to tourism studies than other perspectives.

From the outset, NMP's paradigmatic status seems highly dubious: it is referred to variously as a 'paradigm' (2012a: 2180), a 'model' (2012a: 2181), a 'theoretical approach,' a 'theory,' and an 'innovative insight' (2012a: 2185) which, though, cannot 'offer a set of basic (predictive) propositions, which could be evaluated in empirical research' (Cohen and Cohen 2012a: 2185), a stance which rather rules out the NMP as an exemplar. Later, paradigm change is said to involve neither a fundamental shift in epistemologies, nor an empirical shift in public policy; rather, it is 'the substitution of one theoretical approach by another' (2015b: 159). And then, acknowledging a lack of consensus among mobilities theorists, they resort to calling NMP 'a nascent paradigm' (2015b: 161 and 162).

Despite such conceptual ambiguity, it is alleged that by prioritising movement over structure the NMP 'has the qualities of Kuhn's (1970) formulation of a paradigm shift on the theoretical level' (Cohen and Cohen 2015b: 162). However, such a claim can be sustained only by ignoring Kuhn's reflections on his own work, especially the role of the community of scientists, language lexicons and incommensurability, which for him are the defining features of paradigms.

The inadequacy of the 'discourse of authenticity'

The second major claim by Cohen and Cohen is that pre-mobilities Western studies of tourism rely on the dominant 'discourse of authenticity,' which emanated from MacCannell's argument 'that moderns seek authenticity outside modernity' (Cohen and Cohen 2012a: 2179). Such an approach is deemed ethnocentric, Western-orientated and 'culture bound' (2012a: 2180) because 'tourists from the emerging regions, particularly Asians and Africans, are not looking for authenticity as modern

Westerners *allegedly* did,' and so 'current theories are inapplicable to tourism from the emerging regions (Cohen and Cohen 2015b: 161. my emphasis).

Following Winter (2009: 23), Cohen and Cohen later expand their critique to include 'the main theoretical approaches in modernist studies of tourism', asserting that all have been 'explicitly formulated for the study of "Western" tourism"' (2015a: 11), an indictment that apparently includes all perspectives ever applied to tourism, from grand theory, through middle-range theory, to interactionism (Harrison, 2007: 69-77), though they do baulk at supporting the call for 'alternative social sciences in non-Western societies' (Cohen and Cohen 2015b: 159).

The concept of authenticity as a motivating factor has undoubtedly featured prominently in tourism studies (Wang 1999, 2000; Cohen 2007) and in heritage studies (Park, 2014: 60-77), and Cohen and Cohen have themselves contributed to this literature in their discussion of 'hot' and 'cool' authentication (2012b). However, it is misleading to claim 'the discourse of authenticity' is the dominant characteristic of 'Modernist tourist theory' (though maintaining it is 'allegedly' sought by Western tourists leaves some room for manoeuvre).

First, even in their own work, neither Erik nor Scott Cohen have *prioritised* the quest for authenticity as a key motivator of Western tourists. Indeed, the former has long been a critic of MacCannell, asserting 'it is senseless to talk about *the* typical tourist' (Cohen 1979: 21), and authenticity *as a motivating factor* features but little in his impressive and extensive published output (http://sociology.huji.ac.il/sites/default/files/sociology/files/cohen_cv.pdf; Accessed 26th June 2017; Harrison 2007: 73). Moreover, as Erik Cohen himself reflects: 'I hardly followed a theoretical paradigm, which would direct the line of my questioning. My interest, particularly in tourism, was on issues which were new and unexplored (S. Cohen, 2013: 107).

By contrast, Scott Cohen has focused more on mobilities as a concept, but in his work, too, the 'discourse of authenticity' is largely absent, and when discussed it is a function of a more general 'need to escape.' Indeed, he acknowledges that

motivations are *multidimensional*, need to be contextualised, and are changing over time' (S. Cohen 2010: 29 My emphasis).

Secondly, claiming that Western tourism studies have been dominated by the discourse of authenticity ignores the bulk of academic writing on tourism. This includes psychologists with a special interest in motivation which, for them, is largely accessed through empirical research, especially attitude surveys (Ross, 1994: 14-29; Pearce, 1982: 48-67 and 2005: 51-53). They rarely ascribe any importance to authenticity as a motivating factor, and while Pearce did note the distinction between 'real' or 'staged' activities (Pearce 1982: 100-103), he later concluded authenticity was 'weakening as an academic concept' (2005: 141-142).

The 'discourse of authenticity' is also absent from the literature on tourism economics (Dwyer and Forsyth 2006; Dwyer, Forsyth and Dwyer 2010), from accounts of the historical development of European tourism (Walton 2005; Borsay and Walton 2011), and as a motivating factor in anthropological writing on tourism. Indeed, Bruner considered the concept of authenticity 'a red herring' (1991: 241), and Selwyn remarked that 'authenticity' is one of 'a number of reductive terms (along with 'gaze,' 'escape,' and 'consumption')…….made to carry more analytical weight than they can bear' (2007: 50). Finally, 'the discourse of authenticity,' as a reflection of tourist *motivation*, is virtually absent in the extensive literature on tourism as a form of development (Harrison 2001: 28-29; Sharpley and Telfer 2015).

The New Mobilities Paradigm and Tourism in Emerging Countries

It is suggested, then, that the argument that 'the discourse of authenticity' is the dominant perspective in Western approaches to tourism cannot be sustained. Such dominance is absent in the distinguished body of work of some of its strongest advocates, and in the various social science disciplines, including psychology, that contribute to the field of tourism studies.

The third claim of Cohen and Cohen, related to the second, is that while NMP has its limitations, most notably its tendency towards positivism (2015a: 15) and its implicit association with 'neoliberal, individualistic tendencies' (2015b: 163) (assertions likely

to be rejected by many other mobilities theorists), when used in conjunction with other concepts it is less ethnocentric and more universally appropriate than 'the discourse of authenticity' and other (unspecified) Western approaches to the study of tourism in 'emerging' countries, including in East and Southeast Asia.

First, it should be noted that appeals for more emphasis on non-Western tourism are not new (Towner 1995: 340-342; King, 2015a: 39; Winter 2009; Chang, 2015) and that, with notable exceptions (Ghimire 2001; Singh 2009; Winter, Teo and Chang 2009) general treatments of intra-regional and domestic tourism in Asia have been relatively few. However, this is less so for international tourism in East and Southeast Asia. Over more than three decades, Erik Cohen has examined tourism's impacts in Thailand (2000, 2001), and many other Western scholars have researched tourism in Southeast Asia, along with an increasing number of scholars from the region (Hitchcock, King and Parnwell 1993, 2009, 2010; King 2015b; Yamashita, Kadir and Eades 1997; Hall and Page 2000; Chon 2000; Teo, Chang and Ho 2001; Harrison, Eades and King, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c and 2017d, forthcoming). There is also a well established body of research on Japanese tourism, though it has not always been recognised (Graburn 1983; Cooper 2005 and 2007; Guichard-Anguis and Moon 2008).

Secondly, the interest of Western academics in mass tourism only emerged some time after MacCannell's pioneering work (MacCannell, 1976; Jafari and Aaser, 1988) and there was a similar time lag before the development of academic interest in Japanese tourism (Williams, 2013: 47-48). Delays also occurred in research on Chinese tourism, and were exacerbated by several factors: a lack of language skills among Western scholars; the insistence in many Western universities that staff publish in a few 'A-ranked' journals, published only in English; the earlier under-representation of Asian scholars in Western institutions (though this is changing), and the fact that tourism research funds (especially in Southeast and East Asia) are often directed at marketing and policy-related projects, resulting in a decidedly descriptive approach and a failure to theorise the relationships of the emergent Asian 'centres' to their 'peripheries.'

However, as Chinese mass tourism (inbound and outbound) developed, it increasingly attracted academic attention. Some interest emerged in the 1980s (Guangrui, 1989; Mings and Liu, 1989), much more in the 1990s (Oakes, 1998; Chee-Beng, Cheung and Hui, 2001) and since the early 2000s there has been an explosion of publications, in both English and Chinese (Andreu, Claver and Quer, 2010: 346; Arlt, 2013; Dai, Jiang, Yang and Ma, 2017: 148; Harrison, 2016: 23; Huang, 2011; Huang and Chen, 2016; Hsu, Huang and Huang, 2010; Kong and Cheung, 2009: 343; Li, 2016; Ryan and Huang, 2013; Tsang and Hsu, 2011: 888; Xiang, 2013; Xie and Li, 2009). Indeed, Zhang, Lan, Qi and Wu report on a survey of 16,024 academic papers on tourism articles published in China from 2003 to 2012 (2017). Such a body of scholarship, drawing on the wide range of theoretical perspectives, methodologies and research techniques available in 'Western' social science, belies suggestions that Chinese tourism has been neglected or that 'Western' social science is inappropriate to the study of tourism in non-Western societies. Rather, it demonstrates considerable and increasing levels of co-operation among ethnic Chinese and Western tourism academics, often arising from student-supervisor collaboration, evidenced in the increasing number of papers published in Chinese- and English-language peer reviewed journals (Law and Cheung, 2008; Tse, 2015; and Zhong, Wu and Morrison, 2015; Xiao, Su and Li, 2010; Xie, 2013), including many published in *Tourism Management* and (less so) *Annals of Tourism Research* (Andreu, Claver and Quer, 2010: 346).

Undoubtedly, much comparative work remains to be done; new approaches to tourism, in Western or non-Western societies, are needed; detailed comparison of the motivation, behaviour and perceptions of tourists from different national, ethnic or cultural backgrounds would be valuable (Chang 2015: 91-94), as would studies of cross cultural interaction involving Chinese and non-Chinese (as residents and tourists). However, such topics are matters for empirical research and require no paradigm change.

Thirdly, if (as argued in this paper) a defining feature of paradigms is the existence of distinctive exemplars, pieces of research uniquely informed and structured by the paradigm from which they have emerged, such links should be evident in applications of the NMP to tourism phenomena. However, while Cohen and Cohen list several

'important areas for problem-oriented work,' including social justice, terrorism and environmental sustainability (2012a: 2177-2186), no link is established with the NMP. Indeed, as King notes, 'rather than the concept of mobility, the issues listed ….. can be understood in terms of the very straightforward notions of encounter and interaction' (2015b 2-3).

Another test of the empirical usefulness of the NMP is its relevance to tourism in non-Western societies. For Cohen and Cohen, it is especially useful in analysing the growth of tourism in 'emerging' regions (2015a), and trace formal, commercial tourism back to visiting friends and relatives (VFR), outings and pilgrimage, the growth of new urban middle classes, especially the Chinese, and the growth of outbound tourism, especially from Japan and China. However, this descriptive, historical account owes nothing to the NMP; indeed, Cohen and Cohen soon jettison their conceptual framework and, apart from occasionally introducing new terminology – for example, 'mobility constellations (2015a: 33) – their overview of tourism in emerging regions is fully accessible to the general reader.

In fact, the appropriateness of the NMP to non-Western societies is questionable. As Coles notes, after a decade of writing on mobilities, we still know little, 'in comparative terms, about tourism mobilities beyond Europe, North America and Australasia' (2015: 65). Could it be, he suggests, that scholars working in or on developing or emerging regions may not consider such topics 'a particularly relevant or pressing research agenda' (2015: 65)?

Elsewhere, too, it is evident that productive writing about mobilities need not depend on adherence to a mobilities *paradigm*. Contributors to edited collections purportedly written to demonstrate the value of the NMP as a paradigm show little inclination to exchange one lexicon for another, or adopt another theoretical perspective (Sheller and Urry 2004; Hannam, Butler and Paris, 2014). Some contributions may be more informed by mobilities theory than others, but in neither collection is there any evidence of exclusivity or incommensurability, a welcome characteristic also found in work of Urry (for example, 1995, 2000 and 2007) and in Sheller's excellent texts on the 'consumption' of the Caribbean (2003) and the ways it is being transformed through tourism (2009). A similar assessment applies to an analysis of vintage

postcards sent from the Turkish town of Smyrna (Izmir) (Andriotis and Mavric 2013: 18), research on slum tourism in India (Diekmann and Hannam, 2012), and Moslem migrant workers in Sharm Elsheikh (Elgammal and Wilbert 2013). In many such cases, 'mobilities' can simply be replaced by 'movement,' with no loss of sense or meaning, which does raise a wider issue: is there any kind of tourism research that does *not* involve an analysis of mobility?

If it is indeed the case that examples such as those cited here are entirely commensurable with alternative stances towards tourism and other forms of travel, two responses are possible. First, there is a tier of scholars, perhaps the majority, who focus on some aspect of mobility in tourism and other forms of travel, or on relationships between mobilities and immobilites, for whom the NMP paradigm is either implicit or intuitive. If so, as indicated above, it is a category of fellow travellers that includes many tourism scholars.

Alternatively, it could be argued there is a smaller and exclusive community of mobilities scholars, members of which are constrained or governed by rules of membership, and with established and *exclusive* patterns of research and problem-solving. However, advocates of NMP assert quite the opposite, claiming it to be characterised by, and benefitting from. a wide range of theories, methodologies and research techniques, which hardly qualify it as a 'disciplinary matrix' even in the earlier and discarded Kuhnian version.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has focused on several key issues. First, Kuhn's concept of paradigm is shown to have been defined by several central features: scientific knowledge is the property of specialist communities of scholars, who share a common language, an agreed perspective on the nature of scientific problems and how they are solved, and whose approach is incommensurable to others – scientists or non-scientists – outside this community.

Secondly, despite Kuhn's objections, social scientists have attempted to apply his concept to their disciplines, especially in the sense of a disciplinary matrix. A

necessarily brief review of some of their efforts shows the concept of 'paradigm' to be differentially defined and hotly contested. It has been applied to a range of worldviews and methodologies, even the entire range of social sciences, and those who advocate the NMP as a distinctive paradigm are but last in a long line of claimants. Faced with such a plethora of positions, it is hardly surprising that some have come to view the notion of paradigm as 'a cultural cliché… [which] is now almost meaningless' (Gorard 2004: 4) or an unnecessary diversion from theoretical development and research priorities (Walker 2010).

Thirdly, it is suggested that arguments that the NMP is especially applicable to tourism studies (whether or not accepted by more established mobilities theorists) are flawed. The depiction of 'paradigm' is ambiguous, the dominance of the 'discourse of authenticity' in the tourism literature has not been demonstrated, and tourism in 'emerging regions' can be described without resort to a new 'paradigm.' Indeed, mounting evidence of scholarly writing on tourism in East Asia, both in Chinese and English, indicates that ethnic Chinese and Western scholars, often in collaboration, have increasingly, profitably and productively directed their attention to aspects of Chinese tourism without recourse to a 'non-Western' or 'Asian' paradigm.

Does it matter whether or not the NMP, especially when applied to tourism studies, can be defined as a paradigm? It is argued here that the tighter and more restricted definition, emphasising exclusivity of membership and language, special expertise, and incommensurability, is the only definition that makes sense. Other definitions serve only to confuse. What matters more, though, is how far adherents to different theoretical positions, operating different analytical frameworks, can nevertheless accommodate alternative viewpoints, and it is suggested here that opportunities for cross-fertilisation of mobilities approaches and other positions held by tourism scholars are sufficient to indicate that separate paradigms, in the Kuhnian sense, neither exist nor are necessary. In closing, it is hoped a few examples will suffice.

First, mobilities and immobilities are clearly inter-related. While mobilities theorists direct attention to movement and processes of different types of travellers across time and place, others who compare the movement of holidaymakers, business tourists, economic migrants, refugees or pilgrims, and the various (formal and informal, legal

and illegal) agencies involved in their movement, might prefer rather to situate such movement within the socio-economic, cultural and political context of their origins and their destinations. The continued emergence of East-West tourism, for example, can be understood only within this wider context.

Secondly, the nature of 'place' can change. Societies may be both the origin and destination of travellers, while travellers in different categories may move from place to place: when they first arrive, a place is a destination, but when they leave it becomes a (secondary?) place of origin (as for holidaymakers visiting multiple destinations, or refugees moving across Europe). In like manner, tourist centres (for example, the 'West') may become, or simultaneously are, peripheries (for example, for the Chinese).

Thirdly, the mobilities identified by such commentators as Hannam, Butler and Paris (2014) reflect processes of traveller movement. The ways things move and are moved (mobilities), modes of transport, their control and usage (automobilities), and the technologies of modern travel and communication used, albeit for different purposes, by different categories of traveller, all contribute to the underlying processes of travelling, at places of origin, during the journey, and at the place(s) of destination. Seen phenomenologically, social interaction, the role performance of the travellers and other social actors, whether or not by choice, and the (more or less) negotiated outcomes all constitute the social dynamics and the (apparently solid but in fact highly flexible) *core* of the social institutions and structures which characterise places of traveller origin and their destinations. The likelihood that some mobilities theorists may baulk at the reference to 'structure' is recognised, but the point here is that reference to and analysis of structure is *compatible* with an analysis of mobilities.

Finally, in so far as mobilities approaches complement others, and scholars from different perspectives can learn from one another, tourism studies is characterised by commensurability rather than exclusivity. What, then, is in the word 'paradigm?' In the 'field' of tourism studies, with its plethora of approaches and disciplines, it seems to lead to conceptual confusion and little empirical clarity. To give a final example: when moving from the study of 'Western' tourist to that of the 'Asian' or 'Chinese' tourist (all categories which cannot be assumed to be homogeneous), no 'paradigm

shift' is necessary; there is, though, a need for more comparative research by social scientists from different national and disciplinary backgrounds, using tools provided them by 'Western' social science – until, that is, someone has invented a 'non-Western' social science. As yet, however, no such alternative is on the horizon.

REFERENCES

Andreu, R., Claver, E. and Quer, D.

  2014 Destination Attributes and Chinese Outbound Tourism to Europe. *Journal of China Tourism Research* 10 (3): 275-291.

Andriotis, K. and Mavrič, M.

  2013 Postcard Mobility: Going Beyond Image and Text. *Annals of Tourism Research* 40 (1): 18-39.

Arlt, W.G.

  2013 The Second Wave of Chinese Outbound Tourism. *Tourism Planning and Development* 10 (2): 126-133.

Berghe, P. van den

  1978 Bridging the Paradigms. *Society* 15: 42-49.

Bergman, M.M.

  2010 On Concepts and Paradigms in Mixed Methods Research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 4 (3): 171-175.

Bird, A.

  2013 Thomas Kuhn. In The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, E.N. Zalta, ed. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/thomas-kuhn Accessed 22nd October 2015.

Borsay, P. and Walton, J.K. eds.

  2011 *Resorts and Ports: European Seaside Towns since 1700*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Bruner, E.

  1991 Transformation of Self in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 18 (2): 238-250.

Chang, T.C.

  2015 The Asian Wave and Critical Tourism Scholarship. *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* (IJAPS) 11 (1): 83-101.

Chee-Beng, T., Cheung, S.C.H. and Hui, Y. eds.

  2001 *Tourism, Anthropology and China*. Bangkok: White Lotus.

Chon, K.S., ed.

  2000 *Tourism in Southeast Asia: A New Direction*. New York: The Haworth Hospitality Press.

Cohen, E.

  1979 Rethinking the Sociology of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 6 (1): 18-35.

  2000 *The Commercialized Crafts of Thailand*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press: Honolulu.

  2001 *Thai Tourism: Hill Tribes, Islands and Open-ended Prostitution* (2nd edition). Bangkok: White Lotus.

  2007 Authenticity in Tourism Studies: Aprés La Lutte. *Tourism Recreation Research* 32 (2): 75-82.

Cohen, E. and Cohen, S.A.

  2012a Current sociological theories and issues in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 39 (4): 2177-2202.

  2012b Authentication: Hot and Cool. *Annals of Tourism Research* 39 (3): 1295-1314.

  2015a A mobilities approach to tourism from emerging world regions. *Current Issues in Tourism* 18 (1): 11-43.

  2015b Beyond Ethnocentricism in tourism: a paradigm shift to mobilities. *Tourism Recreation Research* 40 (2): 157-168.

Cohen, S.A.

  2010 Searching for escape, authenticity and identity: Experiences of 'lifestyle travellers'. In *The Tourism and Leisure Experience: Consumer and Management Perspectives* pp. 27-42. M. Morgan, P. Lugosi and J.R.B. Ritchie, eds. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

  2013 A Portrait of Erik Cohen. *Anatolia – An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research* 24 (1): 104-111.

Coles, T.

  2015 Tourism Mobilities: still a current issue in tourism? *Current Issues in Tourism* 18 (1): 62-67.

Cooper, M. (ed)

  2005 Special Issue: Japanese Tourism, Part 1. *Tourism Review International* 9 (3).

  2007 Special Issue: Japanese Tourism, Part 2. *Tourism Review International* 11 (1).

Cresswell, J.W.

2003 *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (second edition). London: Sage Publications.

Dai, B., Jiang, Y., Yang, L. and Ma, Y.

2017 China's Outbound Tourism: stages, policies and choices. *Tourism Management* 58: 253-258.

Dann, G. M.S.

1997 Paradigms in Tourism Research. *Annals of Tourism Research* 24 (2): 472-474.

Denscombe, M.

2008 Communities of Practice: A Research Paradigm for the Mixed Methods Approach. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 2 (3): 270-283.

Diekmann, A. and Hannam, K.

2012 Touristic Mobilities in India's Slum Spaces *Annals of Tourism Research* 39 (5): 1315-1336.

Dwyer, L. and Forsyth, P. eds.

2006. *International Handbook on the Economics of Tourism*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Dwyer, L. Forsyth, P. and Dwyer, W.

2010 *Tourism and Economics Policy*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Eckberg, D.L and Hill, Jnr. L.H.

1979 The Paradigm Concept and Sociology. *American Sociological Review* 44 (6): 925-937.

Elgammal, I. and Wilbert, C.

2013 Tourism mobilities, marriages and 'mimicking': some experiences of domestic migrant tourist workers in Sharma Elsheikh. *Annals of Leisure Research* 16 (4): 332-347.

Faulconbridge, J. and Hui, A.

2016 Traces of a Mobile field: ten years of mobilities research. *Mobilities* 11 (1): 1-14.

Feilzer, M.Y.

2010 Doing Mixed Methods Research Pragmatically: Implications for the Rediscovery of Pragmatism as a Research Paradigm. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 4 (1): 6-16.

Ghimire, K.B. ed.

2001 *The Native Tourist: Mass Tourism within Developing Countries*. London: Earthscan

Gorard, S.

2004 Sceptical or clerical? Theory as a barrier to the combination of research methods. *Journal of Educational Enquiry* 5 (1): 1-21.

Graburn, N.

1983 To Pray, Pay and Play: The Cultural Structure of Japanese Domestic Tourism. Aix-en Provence: Centre des Hautes Etudes Touristiques.

Guangrui, Z.

1989 Ten years of Chinese tourism research: profile and assessment. *Tourism Management* 10 (1): 51-62.

Guichard-Anguis, S. and Moon, O. (eds)

2008 *Japanese Tourism and Travel Culture*. London: Routledge.

Hacking, I.

2012 Introductory Essay. In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 50th Anniversary Edition. T.S. Kuhn, with an Introductory Essay by Ian Hacking, pp. vii-xxxvii. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Hall, C.M. and Page, S. (eds.)

2000 *Tourism in South and South-east Asia*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hammersley, M.

1992 The Paradigm Wars: reports from the front. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 13 (1): 131-143.

Hannam, K.

2014 Tourism Mobilities. In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Tourism*. A.L. Lew, C.M. Hall and A.M. Williams, eds. pp. 78-87. Chichester: Wiley

Hannam, K., Butler, G. and Paris, C.M.

2014 Developments and key issues in tourism mobilities. *Annals of Tourism Research* 44 (1): 171-185

Hannam, K., Sheller, M. and Urry, J.

2006 Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings. *Mobilities* 1 (1): 1-22

Harrison, D.

2001 Tourism and Less Developed Countries: Key Issues. In *Tourism and the Less Developed World: Issues and Case Studies*. pp. 23-46. D. Harrison, ed. pp. 23-46. Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

2007 Developing a Framework for Analysing Tourism Phenomena. *Current Issues in Tourism* 10 (1): 61-86.

2016 Looking East but Learning from the West? Mass Tourism and Emerging Nations. *Asian Journal of Tourism Research*. 1 (2): 1-36.

Harrison, D., Eades, J. and King, V.T. (eds)

2017a (forthcoming) *Tourism in East and Southeast Asia, Volume 1: The Background: Concepts, Region and History*. London: Routledge.

2017b (forthcoming) *Tourism in East and Southeast Asia, Volume 2: Stakeholders in the Political Economy of Tourism*. London: Routledge.

2017c (forthcoming) *Tourism in East and Southeast Asia, Volume 3:The Global and the Local: Tourism, Culture and Identity*. London: Routledge.

2017d (forthcoming_ *Tourism in East and Southeast Asia*: Volume 4: Tourism and Place: Environments and Contexts. London: Routledge.

Heyl, J.D.

1975 Paradigms in Social Science. *Society* 12 (5): 61-67.

Hill, Jnr, L.H and Eckberg, D.L.

1981 Confusions about Paradigms: A Reply to Ritzer. *American Sociological Review* 46: 248-252.

Hitchcock, M., King, V.T. and Parnwell, M. eds.

1993 *Tourism in Southeast Asia*. London and New York: Routledge.

2009 *Tourism in Southeast Asia: Challenges and New Directions*. Copenhagen: NIAS Press.

2010 *Heritage Tourism in Southeast Asia*. Copenhagen: NIAS Press.

Huang, S.

2011 Tourism as the subject of China's doctoral dissertations. *Annals of Tourism Research* 38: 316-319.

Hsu, C., Huang, J. and Huang, S.

2010 Tourism and hospitality research in Mainland China: trends from 2000 to 2008. In *Tourism Research: A 20-20 Vision*, D.G. Pearce and R.W. Butler, eds., pp. 147-160. Oxford: Goodfellow.

Huang, S. and Chen, G.

2016 Current state of tourism research in China. *Tourism Management Perspectives* 20 (1): 10-18.

Jafari, J. and Aaser, D.

1988. Tourism as the subject of post-graduate dissertations. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15 (3): 407-429.

Keith, B.

2006 The Nature of Sociological Knowledge. *The American Anthropologist* 37 (2): 6-14.

King, V.T.

2015a Substantive and Conceptual Issues in Tourism Research: A personal engagement with Southeast Asia. *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* (IJAPS) 11 (1): 15-31

2015b Current Issues in Tourism: Thailand and Beyond – Introduction to Special Issue. *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* (IJAPS) 11 (1): 1-13.

Kong, H. and Cheung, C.

2009 Hotel development in China: a review of the English language literature. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 21 (3): 341-355.

Kuhn, T.S.

1962 *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

1970a *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (2nd edition) London and Chicago: The University of Chicago Press: 173-208.

1970b Reflections on my critics. In *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave, eds. pp. 231-278. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1970c Logic of Discovery or Psychology of Research? *In Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave, eds. pp.1-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1974 Second thoughts on Paradigms, In *The Structure of Scientific Theories*. F. Suppe, ed. pp. 459-482. Urbana Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

1987 What are Scientific Revolutions? *In The Probabilistic Revolution*, L. Kruger, L. Dalston and M. Heidelberger, eds., pp. 7-22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2000 *The Road Since Structure*. Philosophical Essays, 1970-1993, with an Autobiographical Interview. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

    2012 (With an Introductory Essay by Ian Hacking) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. (4th edition) Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Law, R. and Cheung, P.

  2008 An Analysis of Publications in Leading tourism Journals and its Implications on China tourism Research. *Journal of China Tourism Research* 4 (1): 78-97.

Li, X. ed.

  2016 *Chinese Outbound Tourism* 2.0 Oakville, Canada: Apple Academic Press.

MacCannell, D.

  1976 *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Middle Class*. London: Macmillan.

Mackenzie, N. and Knipe, S.

  2006 Research dilemmas: Paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues in Educational Research* 16: 193-205.

Masterman, M.

  1970 The Nature of a Paradigm. In *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave, eds. pp. 59-90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mavrič, M. and Urry, J.

  2009 Tourism Studies and the New Mobilities Paradigm. In *The Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies*, pp. 645-657. T. Jamal and M. Robinson, eds. London: Sage.

McGregor, S.T. and Murnane, J.A.

  2010 Paradigm, methodology and method: intellectual integrity in consumer scholarship. *International Journal of Consumer studies* 34: 419-427.

Mertens, D.M.

  2007 Transformative Paradigm: Mixed methods and Social Justice. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1 (2): 212-235.

  2012 What Comes First? The Paradigm or the Approach? *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 6 (4): 255-257.

Mings. R.C. and Liu, W.

  1989 Emerging tourism in China – the case of Xian. *Tourism Management* 10 (4): 333-336.

Morgan, D.L.

2007 Paradigms Lost and Pragmatism Regained: Methodological Implications of combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1 (1): 48-76.

Oakes, T.

1998 *Tourism and Modernity in China*. London: Routledge.

Park, H.

2014 *Heritage Tourism*. London: Routledge.

Pearce, P.

1982 *The Social Psychology of Tourist Behaviour*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

2005 *Tourist Behaviour: Themes and Conceptual Schemes*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Popper, K.

1970 Normal Science and its Dangers. In *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, pp. 51-58. I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Punch, K.F.

2013 *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Los Angeles and London: Sage.

Ritzer, G.

1978 Reflections on the Paradigmatic Status of Sociology. *Mid-American Review of Sociology* 3: 1-15.

1981 Paradigm Analysis in Sociology: Clarifying the Issues. *American Sociological Review* 46 (2): 245-248.

Rojek, C. and Urry, J.

1997 Transformations of Travel and Theory. In *Touring Cultures: Transformation of Travel and Theory*. pp. 1-19. C. Rojek and J. Urry, eds. London: Routledge.

Ross, G.F.

1994 *The Psychology of Tourism*. Melbourne: Hospitality Press.

Selwyn, T.

Ryan, C. and Huang, S. eds.

2013 *Tourism in China: Destinations, planning and experiences*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Selwyn, T.

2007 The Political Economy of Enchantment: Formations in the anthropology of tourism. *Suomen Antropologi*: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society 32 (2): 48-70.

Shannon-Barker, P.

2015 Making Paradigms Meaningful in Mixed Methods Research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 9 (1): 1-16.

Sharpley, R. and Telfer, D. eds.

2015 *Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues* (2nd edition). Bristol: Channel View.

Sheller, M.

2003 *Consuming the Caribbean*. London: Routledge.

2009 The new Caribbean complexity: Mobility systems, tourism, and spatial rescaling. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 30 (2): 189-203.

Sheller, M. and Urry, J.

2004 Places to play, places in play. In *Tourism Mobilities: Places to play*, *places in play*. pp. 1-10. M. Sheller and J. Urry, eds. London, Routledge.

2006 The New Mobilities Paradigm. *Environment and Planning* A 38: 207-226.

2016 Mobilizing the New Mobilities Paradigm. *Applied Mobilities* 1 (1): 10-25.

Singh, S. ed.

2009 *Domestic Tourism in Asia: Diversity and Divergence*. London: Earthscan.

Suppe, F.

1977 Introduction. In *The Structure of Scientific Theories*. pp. 3-5 F. Suppe, ed. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Teo, P., Chang, T.C. and Ho, K.C. eds.

2001 *Interconnected Worlds: Tourism in Southeast Asia*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Towner, J.

1995 What is tourism's history? *Tourism Management* 16 (3): 339-343.

Toulmin, S.

1970 Does the distinction between normal and revolutionary science hold water? In *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, pp. 39-45. I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tribe, J., Dann, G. and Jamal, T.

2015 Paradigms in tourism research: a trialogue. *Annals of Tourism Research* 40 (1): 28-47.

Tsang, N.K.F. and Hsu, CHC.

  2011 Thirty years of research on tourism and hospitality management in China: A review and analysis of journal publications. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 30: 886-896.

Tse, T.M.

  2015 A Review of Chinese Outbound Tourism Research and the Way Forward. *Journal of China Tourism Research* 11 (1): 1-18.

Urry, J.

  1973 Kuhn as Sociologist of Knowledge. *The British Journal of Sociology* 24 (4): 462-473.

  1995 *Consuming Places*. London: Routledge.

  2000 *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century*. London: Routledge.

  2007 *Mobilities* Cambridge: Polity.

Walker, T.C.

  2010 The Perils of Paradigm Mentalities: Revisiting Kuhn, Lakatos and Popper. *Perspectives on Politics* 8 (2): 433-451.

Walton, J.K. ed.

  2005 *Histories of Tourism: Representation, Identity and Conflict*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Wang, N.

  1999 Rethinking authenticity in tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research 26 (2): 349-370*.

  2000 *Tourism and Modernity: A Sociological Analysis*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Weber, M.

  1948 Science as a Vocation. In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. pp. 129-156 . H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Williams, D.

  2013 30 years of tourism research: a bibliography of Japanese tourism (1980-2009) *Josai International Bulletin* 21 (7): 43-70.

Winter, T.

  2009 Asian tourism and the retreat of Anglo-Western centrism in tourism theory. *Current Issues in tourism* 12 (1): 21-31.

Winter, T., Teo, P. and Chang, T.C. eds.

  2009 *Asia on Tour: Exploring the rise of Asian Tourism.* London: Routledge.m

Xiang, Y.

  2013 The characteristics of Independent Chinese Outbound Tourists. *Tourism Planning and Development* 10 (2): 134-148.

Xie, Y. and Li, M.

  2009 Development of China's Outbound Tourism and the Characteristics of its tourist Flow. *Journal of China Tourism Research* 5: 226-242

Xiao, H., Su, D. and Li, M.

  2010 Diffusion of knowledge across linguistic communities: the case of using 'foreign' sources for tourism research in China. *Journal of China Tourism Research* 6 (4): 326-342.

Xie, P.F.

  2013 The 'Great Wall' in tourism research – a portrait of Geoff Wall. *Anatolia – An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research* 24 (2): 282-287.

Yamashita, S., Kadir, H.D. and Eades, J.S. (eds)

  1997 *Tourism and Cultural Development in East Asia and Oceania.* Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan, Malaysia.

Zhang, L., Lan, C., Qi, F. and Wu, P.

  2017 Development pattern, classification and evaluation of the tourism academic communities in China in the last ten years: from the perspective of big data of articles in tourism academic journals. *Tourism Management* 58: 235-244.

Zhong, L., Wu, B. and Morrison, A.

  2015 Research on China's Tourism: A 35-year Review and Authorship Analysis. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 17: 25-34.

Author Biographical Sketch

David Harrison (davidharrison53@btinternet.com) is Professor of Tourism at Middlesex University, London. A sociologist and anthropologist, he has studied tourism's role in development since the mid-1970s. Author of *The Sociology of Modernisation and Development* (1987), editor and co-editor of numerous books on tourism and development, most recently *Mass Tourism in a Small World* (2017), and writer of many peer-reviewed papers, he has studied tourism's impacts in Eastern Europe, Southern Africa, the Caribbean and the South Pacific and is currently focusing on the significance of mass tourism as a feature of globalisation.