Progress in Tourism Management: From the geography of tourism to geographies of tourism – A review

C.M. Hall a,b,⁎, S.J. Page c

a Department of Management, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand
b Department of Geography, University of Oulu, Finland
c Department of Marketing, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA Scotland, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

This Progress in Tourism Management paper seeks to review the development of geographical contributions to the study of tourism over the last decade. Given the limited number of surveys of geography published in academic journals since the 1970s, it is particularly timely to question and debate where the subject has evolved to, the current debates and issues facing those who work within the subject and where the subject will evolve in the next five years. The paper is structured around a number of distinct themes to emerge from the research activity of geographers, which is deliberately selective in its coverage due to the constraints of space, but focuses on: explaining spatialities; tourism planning and places; development and its discontents; tourism as an ‘applied’ area of research, and future prospects.

1. Introduction

Geography has as its central concerns a focus on place, space and environment. Geographers and the various institutions of geography, in the form of academic associations, departments, journals and other geographical oriented publishing outlets, have also long contributed to the study of tourism (Hall & Page, 2006; Lew, 2001), enriched by a long tradition of doctoral theses in tourism by geographers or supervised by geographers (Jafari & Aaser, 1988). However, the impending or semi-retirement of a number of geographers who have contributed substantially to the study of tourism in recent decades such as Richard Butler (Western Ontario, Canada; Surrey, UK), Felix Juelg (Vienna, Austria), Peter Murphy (Victoria, Canada; La Trobe, Australia), John Pigram (University of New England, Australia) and Geoff Wall (Waterloo, Canada), combined with the emergence of a new generation of geographers and geographical thought, suggests that a review of the state of the field is extremely timely for Tourism Management as it has almost been publishing articles by geographers for nearly 30 years. Given the limited number of reviews published on the field and its contribution to tourism studies and management (Butler, 2004; Mitchell & Murphy, 1991; Pearce, 1979), a review of recent literature is particularly pertinent to question and debate where the subject has evolved to, the current debates and issues facing those who work within the subject and where the subject will evolve in the future. Much of the interest by geographers in tourism and the wider domain of leisure studies can be traced or dated to an interest in tourism and recreation by geographers that mirrors the pre-1945 development of the discipline and the post-war boom in many countries as a subject of study in Universities and other institutes of higher education (Hall & Page, 2006; McMurray, 1954; Wolfe, 1964). Nevertheless, while the field has some long established theoretical and applied interests a number of substantial new developments and research foci have emerged in recent years, leading to the notion of tourism geographies, i.e. that there is more than one paradigmatic approach towards the geography of tourism and tourism management.

At an institutional level the geography of tourism appears at first glance to be reasonably healthy as demonstrated by recent contributions to a Companion to Tourism (Lew, Hall, & Williams, 2004), published as part of the Blackwell Companions to Geography Series, which are predominantly by geographers. This study also documents the dominance of geographical subject matter in journals indexed by databases such as CABI’s Leisure, Recreation and Tourism Abstracts as well as the database Geography illustrating continuity in the subjects interest since reviews by Pearce (1979) and more substantive volumes of research outputs that emerged in the 1980s...
and 1990s with the development of a number of influential texts by geographers (i.e. Hall & Page, 1999; Mathieson & Wall, 1982; Pearce, 1981; 1987; Shaw & Williams, 1994) to serve the growing demand for undergraduate education predominantly within programmes based in geography departments and, to a lesser extent, in environmental studies and resource management. In educational terms, the subject would also still appear to be buoyant and still in an expansionist mode, though clearly not of the same scale as the 1980s, when much of the initial growth occurred globally. Furthermore, as detailed below, geographers have made a substantial contribution to the field of tourism overall.

The geography of tourism is now taught as a course in over 50 geography departments in North America while in Europe a number of departments of geography have expanded to include tourism as an offering, with some even changing names to represent this shift, e.g. University of Iceland. Indeed many institutions even offer joint degrees where tourism and geography co-exist side by side. This has particularly been the case in the transition economies of Eastern Europe where tourism has been regarded as a way of increasing the relevance of geographical department offerings. Several geography associations also have specialist groups with tourism as a focus, often in conjunction with leisure and recreation. The latter area being historically important in terms of the development of tourism geography (Butler, 2004) but which, as a result of increasing mobility in society which has blurred the distinction between recreation and tourism, is increasingly used virtually interchangeably with tourism, especially day-tripping (Hall, 2005b). Academic societies with specialty groups include the Association of American Geographers, the Canadian Association of Geographers and the Royal Geographical Society/Institute of British Geographers, while strong specialist groups also exist in French and German speaking geography. At the international level a tourism oriented group has existed in various forms since 1972 in the International Geographical Union (IGU), the global association of national geography associations. From 1994 to 2000 it was known as the Study Group of the Geography of Sustainable Tourism, while from 2000 to 2008 it was a Commission for the Study of Tourism, Leisure and Global Change. Name changes that themselves reflect the shifting focus of the geographical imagination. The Commission was particularly successful in attracting participants at conferences and meetings and had some of the largest paper programmes at the IGU meetings in Durban (2002), Glasgow (2004), and Brisbane (2006).

A specific journal, Tourism Geographies, edited by Alan Lew and published by Taylor and Francis, is also available while the publication of a number of tourism geography texts in multiple editions also indicates ongoing demand for geographically oriented teaching material (e.g. Lew, Hall, & Williams, 2004; Pigram & Jenkins, 1999; Shaw & Williams, 2002; 2004) although a number of these are more regionally oriented works that may be used for courses on travel geography (e.g. Boniface & Cooper, 2005; Davidoff, Davidoff, & Eyre, 2002; Hudman & Jackson, 2003; Lew, Hall, & Timothy, 2008). Nevertheless, tourism geography usually only gets passing acknowledgement in some of the disciplinary surveys of geography (e.g. Johnston & Sidaway, 2004) including reviews in geography journals (Gibson, 2008).

With the institutional grounding of tourism geography it could be assumed that the field has a firm foundation. However, one of the growing trends for geographers with doctorates in tourism, at least in Anglo-American geography, is for them to migrate to teach and research tourism in business schools with many focusing on business issues (e.g. see many of the contributions in Coles and Hall (2008) volume on international business and tourism), although environment and place remain significant themes. For example, in the UK, the graduate tourism programme that used to be based in the Department of Geography at the University of Exeter is now based in the Business School, while in Australia and New Zealand a number of business school tourism programmes are staffed by geographers. As Hall and Page (2006) observed, themselves both now located in business schools, the growing movement of many geographers away from departments of geography may potentially serve to weaken the field of the geography of tourism in the long-run, especially as institutional pressures may mean that such individuals are not encouraged to maintain contact with the field through research and publishing.

The difficulties encountered by tourism geographers are arguably faced by a number of geography’s sub-disciplines (Johnston & Sidaway, 2004). As Janice Monk, then President of the Association of American Geographers noted that ‘it seems unlikely that the movement towards interdisciplinary and hybrid units will diminish in the near future. While remaining vigilant in supporting geography as a distinctive field, we also need to pursue efforts that will permit geographers to thrive in new territories and to learn to build and sustain interdisciplinary ties’ (Monk, 2001: 4). For example, in areas such as geographical information systems and techniques of spatial analysis. Undoubtedly many of the main contemporary issues with which tourism management deals (i.e. environmental change, destination management, human mobility) are related to geography. Yet disciplinary relations and spaces are, as Monk herself acknowledged, ‘caught in local academic politics and funding opportunities’. Indeed, the closing or structuring of academic spaces has been a significant area of discussion by geographers with respect to the role of various national research assessment exercises (Coles & Hall, 2006; Hall, 2005a; Mckchercher, 2005; Page, 2003, 2005a), in which tourism has usually been ‘lost’ in the interdisciplinary spaces between business and social science disciplines or has been explicitly tied in with business disciplines. For example, in the case of New Zealand’s Performance Based Research Funding tourism is assessed as part of the marketing and tourism category within business and management. Such a situation significantly problematises the place of tourism geography in institutional terms. Should researchers in countries which have national research performance assessments submit to social science or business studies panels, or in some cases environmental science or sports? Regardless of which panels submissions are made to, tourism historically may not have been favourably considered as an appropriate subject of academic study and tourism journals may not be known by members of review panels, particularly given the relatively limited numbers of tourism and even geography journals in bibliometric analyses such as ISI (Hall, 2006a; Paasi, 2005). Indeed, such a situation is mirrored in Gibson’s (2008) comment with respect that

Tourism geography has its own geography of production and circulation, variegated differently than for other parts of geography. It still struggles to pervade publishing in ‘global’ journals, and yet, when eventually appearing elsewhere, tourism geography appears to be on the whole more cosmopolitan. To me this seems an important – even defining – contradiction of tourism in contemporary geography (Gibson, 2008: 418).

Table 1 indicates the publication of tourism oriented articles in selected leading international geography journals from 1998 to 2007. Although Progress in Human Geography had not published any tourism specific papers in the time period examined it should be noted that it published two relevant articles in 2008 (McNeill, 2008), including the first of three progress reports on the geographies of tourism by Gibson (2008) representing the first time a systematic review of tourism has been provided by the journal. Interestingly, Gibson (2008: 407) comments, "Although not taken seriously by some, and still considered marginal by many, tourism constitutes an important point of intersection within geography, and its capacity to gel critical, integrative and imperative research appears to be increasingly realized".
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Therefore, in one sense tourism geography may find itself at a peripheral intersection of the social sciences despite the major contribution it has made to the establishment and development of knowledge in tourism studies. However, despite such a sanguine possibility it is nevertheless clear that geographers have made a substantial contribution to the study of tourism in recent years, even if, in some cases, the wider field may not even recognize them as ‘geographers’ or their conceptualisations as ‘geographical’. For example, McKercher’s (2008) analysis of the most frequently cited tourism scholars indicated that nine of the 25 most cited tourism scholars from 1970 to 2007 have graduate qualifications in geography (names and rankings: Michael Hall [3], Richard Butler [5], Geoff Wall [8], Douglas Pearce [10], Don Getz [13], Greg Ashworth [15], Allan Williams [19], Martin Oppermann [22], Stephen Page [23]) and seven of the 25 most cited in the period 1998–2007 (Michael Hall [1], Allan Williams [5], Stephen Page [12], Nigel Morgan [15], Bob McKercher [18], Gareth Shaw [22], Dallen Timothy [23]). Furthermore, as noted above, it is perhaps as inappropriate to talk of a ‘tourism geography’ – even though there are linking concepts of space, place and environment to such a field – as it is to talk of a single approach to tourism. Instead, while institutional geographical collectivities exist there are in fact a range of tourism geographies marked by differences not only in subject but also in philosophy, method, scale and funding. The remainder of the review therefore seeks to identify some of the main developments with respect to the various tourism geographers’ outputs primarily in relation to tourism management since the earlier reviews by Pearce (1979), Mitchell and Murphy (1991), and Butler (2004) finish in 2003 to identify some of the main contributions and contributors as well as issues and directions since these earlier reviews. Given that entire books have been devoted to trying to provide an overview of the field it must of course be acknowledged that space clearly does not permit inclusion of all worthy publications, while the primary focus is also on literature published in English.

2. Explaining spatialities

Arguably one of the most well known contributions by a geographer to the tourism field is that of Butler’s (1980) Tourism Area Life Cycle (TALC). Despite criticisms that tourism is undertheorised (Franklin & Crang, 2001), usually by people whose theoretical positions have not been taken up in the broader tourism literature as much as their proponents would have wished, the TALC remains a clear indicator of the importance of theory in tourism research. As Oppermann (1998: 180) noted: ‘Butler’s model is a brilliant example of how scientific progress could and should work. … [having] been scrutinized in many different contexts with modifications suggested to fit specific situations and circumstances.’ The TALC is one of the most well cited articles in tourism if not the most cited (Hall, 2006a). It is not the intention to cite all articles that reference the Butler paper over the past decade but instead to note the significance of the publication of a two-volume edition on TALC applications and concepts edited by Butler (2006a, 2006b).

The discussions on the TALC by the various contributors to the two volumes on indicate the importance of understanding the diffusion of ideas, not only within disciplines but also between disciplines. For example, a key point of debate in relation to the TALC is the relative importance of marketing and geographical/spatial ideas regarding life cycles, with several chapters arguing that the spatial dimensions of the TALC have not been sufficiently appreciated in the majority of writing on the TALC (Coles, 2006: Hall, 2006b; Papatheodorou, 2006) nor the wider debates that occurred within geography as to the significance of model building and the philosophy of knowledge in which the TALC should be seen. Although these are significant issues as a case can be argued that its relative lack of predictive capacity without an understanding of its
spatial dimension may mean that it does not function as a model that can contribute to theory development in an orthodox sense. In fact, the TALC is much more widely cited in tourism journals than it is in geography journals even though it was originally published in the Canadian Geographer. Also of significance for the present review is the wide range of applications and contexts in which the TALC has been placed in the Butler volumes including authenticity, coastal resorts, economic geography, entrepreneurship, heritage, island states, national parks, natural areas, resort restructuring, retailing, rural areas, spatial interaction, sustainable tourism and urban tourism. As, to an extent, they also reflect many of the major themes of geographical research in tourism overall (see also Hall & Page, 2006; Shaw & Williams, 2002; Williams, 1998) and link to a long-standing interest of geographers on explaining and describing why, how and where people move to engage in leisure, tourism and other forms of voluntary movement.

One of the more interesting and theoretically informed developments in tourism has been the engagement of geographers in the development of concepts of mobility (e.g. Bell & Ward, 2000; Burns & Novelli, 2008; Coles et al., 2004, 2005; Coles & Hall, 2006; Frändberg & Vilhelmson, 2003; Hall, 2005b, 2005c), which although often associated with the work of sociologists such as Urry (2004a) also has a substantial spatial dimensions and academic legacy dating back to the 1950s (Hall, 2005d). Indeed, both the sociological and spatial traditions of mobility studies have drawn upon time geography (Carlstein, Parkes, & Thrift, 1978) as both method and inspiration (e.g. Baerenholdt, Haldrup, Larsen, & Urry, 2004). Time geography examines ‘the ways in which the production and reproduction of social life depend upon knowledgeable human subjects tracing out routinized paths over space and through time, fulfilling particular projects whose realizations are bounded by inter-locking capability, coupling and steering constraints’ (Gregory, 1985: 297), and has been influential in the development of ideas of structuration (Giddens, 1984) as well as in understanding travel and economic flows and patterns.

The ‘mobile turn’ in sociology has been likened by Urry (2004) as the ‘new social physics’. However, Hall (2005d) argued that in developing a new social physics that the contributions of ‘old’ social physics should not be ignored (see Stewart, 1950) and suggesting that there were ways of integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches to human mobility, as well as reiterating the suggestions of Coles et al. (2004, 2005) that there was a need to develop a coherent approach to understanding the range of mobilities undertaken by individuals, not just the category of tourists. From such a position tourism and associated mobilities need to be understood over an individual’s and co-decision-makers lifecourse as well as over the totality of a trip. ‘Without such an approach... we are forever doomed to see tourism’s effects only at the destination scale rather than as part of a broader understanding of mobility’ (Hall, 2008: 15). Indeed, Hall (2005d) argues that if the analogue with physics is to be maintained then macro-level quantitative accounts of patterns of human mobility can be regarded as classical Newtonian physics in which the description and prediction of travel flows and patterns can be undertaken with a reasonable degree of certainty while micro-level accounts of individual human behaviour can be likened to quantum physics in which far greater uncertainty about the paths of individuals exist. Nevertheless, relationships clearly exist between the different paradigms of physics as they do between individual and collective tourism behaviour. The substantial contribution of tourism geographers to understanding the spatial attributes of tourism (e.g. Lew & McKitcher, 2002, 2006; McKitcher & Lew, 2003; 2007) may therefore serve to shed light on the behaviours of individuals – and vice versa (Hall, 2005b; Li, 2000).

In the development of the ‘mobile turn’ in tourism geography strong links have also been drawn to studies of diaspora (e.g. Coles & Timothy, 2004; Duval, 2003; Duval & Hall, 2004) and migration (e.g. Hall & Williams, 2002; Kang & Page, 2000; Williams & Hall, 2000, 2002). Arguably the increased awareness of the interplay between tourism and migration within the context of contemporary globalization, transnationalism and mobility is one of the strongest theoretical and empirical contributions of tourism geographers since the late 1990s. Shedding insights on labour migration (Aitken & Hall, 2000; Hardill, 2004; Uriely, 2001; Williams, 2006, 2007; Williams & Balaz, 2004, 2005), retirement migration (Gustafson, 2002; King et al., 2000; Williams et al., 2000), student migration (King & Ruiz-Gelices, 2003), second homes (Müller, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2004, 2006; Müller & Hall, 2003; Hall & Müller, 2004; McIntyre et al., 2006; Tuulentie, 2007; Visser, 2006), and human mobility over the life course (Hall, 2005b; Frändberg, 2006). In addition, the empirical research on mobility has been aided by developments in tracking technology and spatial information systems that can provide a powerful analysis of patterns of individual mobility (e.g. Shoval & Isaacsan, 2006, 2007a; 2007b; Lau & McKercher, 2007) and the associated impacts of visitor flows (e.g. Boers & Cottrell, 2007; Connell & Page, 2008). Although it should be noted that the connection between tourism and transport studies is actually surprisingly weak in comparison to the vast expanse of research undertaken in transport geography with respect to human movement (e.g. Duval, 2007; Lumsdon & Page, 2004, Page, 2005b).

The interest in understanding tourism-related patterns and flows have also been extended to unraveling the complex international tourism system. Research on global commodity chains (e.g. Mosedale, 2006, 2008) has drawn on a number of sources and influences within economic geography and political economy (e.g. see Agarwal et al., 2000; Britton, 1991; Hudson, 2004; Hughes & Reimer, 2004) as well as from social theory and cultural geography (e.g. Ateljevic & Doorne, 2003, 2004; Jackson, 1999) and has potential as a specific means of expanding tourism research on transnational corporations and cross-border operations. The value of commodity chain analysis is that it provides a more comprehensive account of production, distribution and consumption than simply looking at tourism satellite accounts (TSA) (e.g. Smith, 2004), tourism competitive indices (e.g. Hall, 2007a), distribution channels (e.g. Pearce et al., 2004) or supply and value chains. Whereas distribution channel analysis for example evaluates channel organization and operation for improved tourism marketing, commodity chain analysis helps reveal the system of international tourism actions and the qualitative change in process at each step of the chain (Mosedale, 2008). Arguably, such approaches have facilitated a far more nuanced understanding of global–local economic relationships in tourism (Milne & Ateljevic, 2001) than from focusing on TSAs, distribution or value, as important as these might be in their own right. Indeed, Smith (2007) points to the value of moving our understanding of tourism beyond the TSA dimension by examining tourism as a tradable service from the perspective of the World Trade Organization which has a different way of defining and treating tourism in contrast to other organizations like the UNWTO, World Travel and Tourism Council or the World Economic Forum (see also Coles & Hall, 2008).

Research on international tourism flows has also led to greater connectivity between tourism geography, international business and economic geography. This has included attention to international trade in services, the relationships between labour mobility and concepts of citizenship, internationalization of tourism businesses, and place marketing and the experience economy (Coles & Hall, 2008; Richards & Wilson, 2007a). Hall and Coles (2008) describing this confluence as being part of the ‘mobilities of commerce’ in which tourism is embedded. However, they also noted that significant disciplinary boundaries exist in seeking to gain an improved understanding of the different modes of trade in
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international services, but that there was significant ‘natural ground’ between International Business and Tourism studies, with geographers often having connections to both disciplinary fields. Therefore, tourism geography in general has the potential to expose some of the limitations of extant work on tourism management in terms of (cross-border) location, the dominant use of economics-influenced understanding of location and the firm, and a failure to examine the internal workings and processes of business.

At the same time as links have been developing between economic geography and tourism geography so too has there been greater interplay with cultural geography and social theory (Cartier & Lew, 2005; Minca & Oakes, 2006). Arguably this work has been most pronounced in the work of Aitchison (2001, 2005), who has provided some significant gender perspectives on leisure and tourism geographies, as well as a broader text on cultural geographies of tourism and leisure (Aitchison et al., 2000). Crang (1997) and Crouch (1999, 2000) who have focused on everyday tourism and leisure practices, such as visiting allotments or the translation of hobbies and interests into tourism-related activities such as visiting gardens as visitor attractions (Connell, 2004, 2005; Connell & Meyer, 2004) and their embodiment in tourism practices as well as the role of visual culture in tourism (Crouch & Lübren, 2003; Page et al., 2006). One interesting development as also been the connection of social theory to an improved understanding of hospitality and host–guest/local–non-local encounters as a form of social practice (Barnett, 2005; Bell, 2007) which may provide a new relationship between geographical studies and hospitality management. Nevertheless, the potential of social theory and much contemporary cultural geography to more generally inform tourism management, as opposed to the study of tourism per se, is an area that requires greater investigation.

Intersections between tourism and political geography and the broader political field has taken several directions including issues of borders and political boundaries (e.g. Church & Reid, 2000; Prokkola, 2007; Timothy, 2001, 2004), governance and regional institutions (Church, 2004; Church et al., 2000; Timothy, 2003), and a number of different approaches to the central political issue of power, with the leading contribution perhaps being a monograph edited by Church and Coles (2007) that demonstrates the connection of a number of geographers working in tourism to the various theoretical approaches towards power.

The critique of neoliberalism that has been a significant theme in human geography has not been addressed to the same extent in tourism geography, although a number of significant publications exist, especially in a development context (e.g. Desforges, 2000; Hannam, 2002) as well as with respect to concepts of destination or place competitiveness (Hall, 2007a). Concepts of political ecology have also been utilized to examine tourism and development processes in island destinations (Gössling, 2003a, 2003b). However, while issues of politics and power have formed a significant backdrop to resource management and policy and planning debates in tourism there has perhaps not been as much overt critical connection between theoretically grounded studies power and tourism planning as might be expected.

3. Tourism planning and places

Tourism planning, along with associated research on the impacts of tourism, has long been a major applied contribution of geographers to the study of tourism (e.g. Murphy, 1985). Recent years have witnessed not only new editions or at least versions of a number of significant textbooks (e.g. Hall, 2008; Murphy & Murphy, 2004) but also the development of new fields of tourism planning which in themselves have been influenced by theoretical developments in urban and regional planning (e.g. Berke, 2002; Healey, 1997) as well as by the business planning literature (e.g. Bramwell & Lane, 2000; Faulkner, 2003). Long-standing planning debates, such as issues of participation and community-based tourism (Blackstock, 2005) and growth management (Gill, 2004), continue to be featured in the literature (Bramwell, 2004; Dredge & Jenkins, 2007; Singh et al., 2003; Tosun, 2005; Tosun & Timothy, 2003) even if the discourse at times utilizes that of business and focuses on ‘stakeholders’ and ‘visions’ rather than ‘public’ or ‘interests’ (Caffyn & Jobbins, 2003; Murphy & Murphy, 2004; Smith, 2003). Such a change in discourse is a reflection not only of the exchange of different disciplinary languages as tourism geographers locate in business schools but is also reflective of some of the multidisciplinary approaches that occurs within tourism which often regard organizational and public interests as being one and the same thing without adequate appreciation of issues of scale or relevance.

The mix of business and regional studies discourses can be seen, for example, in areas such as knowledge management (Ruhani & Cooper, 2004), networks, clustering (Michael et al., 2007), competitiveness (Hall, 2007a), and innovation (Hall & Williams, 2008) as well as the wider field of tourism and entrepreneurship (Ateljevic & Page, 2005). Much of tourism studies has tended to utilize rather narrow economic or business approaches towards such issues without adequately recognizing the conceptual difficulties in transferring concepts from an organizational or commercial setting to a spatial and social context (Hall, 2007a). This is not to suggest that geographers cannot contribute to understanding tourism businesses, rather it is to suggest that they tend to emphasise the embeddedness of business and entrepreneurial behaviour in place and context (Getz & Larsen, 2000; Getz & Nilsson, 2004; Getz & Petersen, 2005; Hall, 2004; Hall & Rusher, 2004; Ioannides, 2003; Page et al., 1999; Rorison, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2005) rather than see the firm or entrepreneur acting in isolation. Indeed it can be argued that tourism geographers arguably take issues of business location and the production of space far more seriously than business and management as they regard location as far more than a mere factor if production with an economic value attached to it (Connell & Page, 2005).

In some instances, ongoing research studies of the same locale (e.g. Page & Thorn, 1997; 2002) highlight the continuity in problems associated with sustainable tourism planning where national tourism growth objectives may not be congruent with the impacts this causes in spite of rhetoric associated with a sustainable tourism development (however it is interpreted): here the key questions are sustainable for who? and sustainable for the resource base or the economy? Similarly, geographers have also contributed to a better understanding of the regional and spatial dimensions of tourism labour markets and their policy and planning implications (e.g. Chhetri et al., 2008; Lundmark, 2005, 2006; Liu & Wall, 2006). In fact several recent critiques of sustainable tourism and the evolution of the field, particularly the contribution made by different disciplines to this evolving field of study since the 1960s, highlights major contributions made by geographers to this critical area of research (Page & Connell, 2008; Saarinen, 2006).

Urban tourism has been a focal point of geographical research since the 1980s (Ashworth, 1992; Law, 1992; Page, 1995), primarily as a result of economic restructuring and change and associated place marketing, but also in connection to specific tourism products such as hallmark events (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 2000; Cartier & Lew, 2005; Judd & Fainstein, 1999; Page & Hall, 2003; Pearce, 2001; Richards, 2001). More recent research developments include particular attention to ethnic and heritage precincts (e.g. Chang, 2000; Timothy, 2002), their gateway function (Page, 2001) as well as the continuing relationship of tourism to broader processes of urban change, especially in the inner city or waterfront areas. One of the most significant developments with respect to research on
tourism’s role in urban development and place marketing has been its role within the notion of creative industries, regions or cities (Bayliss, 2004, 2007; Gibson & Connell, 2003, 2005, 2007), whereby creativity is regarded as being an important element of place competitiveness and development (Richard & Wilson, 2006, 2007a, 2007b). However, the notion of creative cities and industries and their capacities for innovation is by no means uncontested (e.g. Gibson & Klocker, 2004; Hall & Williams, 2008). Indeed, within much of the literature on regional studies and tourism, which views tourism as a form of regional development, it has been described as a ‘low-road approach of serial reproduction rather than a ‘high road’ approach that utilizes tourism as a means to an end in terms of accessibility, enabling functions and quality of life (Hall, 2007b; Hall & Williams, 2008; Malecki, 2004). In this respect, tourism is the supporting infrastructure rather than the driver of change in the local economic landscape, a feature which has led to the down-shifting of tourism as a principal architect of urban regeneration to one where mixed uses now dominate the public sectors encouragement of cultural quarters and sectors in regional regeneration.

The relationship between tourism and place change is clearly not isolated to urban environments. Rural areas and the countryside have also long been an area of interest to tourism geographers (Robinson, 1995; Sharples, 2004; Harl Sharples, Mitchell, Ambourne, & Macionis, 2003; Hall et al., 2005; Roberts & Hall, 2001; Robinson, 1999; Sharpley, 2004), particular given their role as an urban recreational hinterland and playground of many urbanites (Patmore, 1983), especially in National Parks (Connell & Page, 2008; Frost & Hall, 2009). Farm tourism continues to be an object of interest (e.g. Gösling & Mattsson, 2002) although this has also been developed into a more thorough examination of the role of tourism in the development of new distribution channels such as farmers markets and other forms of direct marketing, sometimes described as food and wine tourism (for reviews of this field see Hall & Mitchell, 2008; Hall & Sharples, 2008; Hjalager & Richards, 2002; Mitchell & Hall, 2006; Nummedal & Hall, 2006). However, the development of the post-productivist countryside in some developed countries also provides opportunities for the study of tourism and rurality as well as conflict between different rural users. The role of second homes in the countryside has been a significant theme addressed by geographers (Hall & Müller, 2004) with several publications noting the extent to which a myth of displacement exists (Marjavaara, 2007a, 2007b) as well as myths of rurality (Pitkänen, 2008).

Several geographers have also addressed issues of coastal and marine tourism, some from a protected area or ecotourism slant (e.g. Cater & Cater, 2007; Garrod & Wilson, 2003, 2004) and conflict over resources (Funch, 2006), while others have been interested in the position of tourism within coastal management strategies and resort development (e.g. Agarwal & Shaw, 2007; Cotes & Shaw, 2006). Another significant area of research has been the impact of tourism on charismatic marine megafauna such as whales and dolphins (e.g. Orams, 2002, 2005), while Preston-Whyte (2002, 2004) has investigated the liminal spaces of the beach from his Durban waterfront.

Issues of peripherality (see Page, 1994 for a review of the concept’s application in tourism), and the role of tourism as a potential mechanism for economic development in such regions, has been a significant focus for many European geographers with there being a significant overlap with rural geography and rural studies as well as nature-based tourism research (Saarinen, 2003, 2004; Saarinen & Hall, 2004), especially with respect to wilderness areas and national parks (e.g. Mose, 2007; Saarinen, 2005; Saethrsdottir, 2004) and resource management and interpretation (e.g. Ham & Weiler, 2004, 2007). Because of their own location and national interests Nordic geographers in particular have made a very strong contribution to this field (Müller & Jansson, 2007), while both Nordic and other geographers in ‘new world’ countries have also written substantially on the relationship between tourism and indigenous peoples in peripheral areas (e.g. Butler & Hinch, 2007; Pettersson, 2003; Tuulentie, 2006; Viken & Müller, 2006). Such research is important as studies of tourism in peripheral regions in the developed world can often be linked to the contingent marginality of many developing country tourism locations (Hall, 2007c).

4. Development and its discontents

Development studies, whether regional or thematic, has been an area of interest for tourism geographers for many years (e.g. d’Hauteserre, 2003; Schevyens, 2002, 2006) and the seminal studies can be dated to the late 1960s and early 1970s. Several notable regional studies have been produced (e.g. Ait, 2006; Duval, 2004b; Rogerson & Visser, 2004; Williams & Balaz, 2000) although one of the more notable thematic developments has been the focus on tourism-poverty relationships often described under the term of ‘pro-poor tourism’ (PPT) (Hall, 2007b; Torres & Momsen, 2004), and particularly in the post-apartheid context of southern Africa (e.g. Binns & Nel, 2002; Gössling et al., 2004; Kaplan, 2004; Kirsten & Rogerson, 2002; Ndlovu & Rogerson, 2003; Nel & Binns, 2002; Rogerson, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2003a, 2003b, 2004a, 2004b; Page, 2006; Visser, 2003; Visser & Rogerson, 2004). Indeed, Rogerson (2006: 55) suggests that South Africa ‘is a laboratory for the testing and evolution of new approaches towards tourism and the planning of local economic development’. The perceived value of this relationship has been stimulated in great part by the policies of development institutions such as the World Bank as well as the UNWTO – what is often referred to as ‘poverty consensus’ (Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Schevyens, 2007).

As Schevyens (2007) emphasized in her analysis of the field, academic perspectives on the relationship between poverty and tourism have varied widely since the 1950s. While in the 1950s tourism was identified as a specialization strategy that could help newly-independent developing countries earn foreign exchange, in the 1970s and 1980s many social scientists argued that poor people in non-Western countries were typically excluded from or disadvantaged by international tourism development. This is not to deny the importance of reducing poverty, rather because many approaches to pro-poor tourism tend to overlook significant environmental, social and political issues: ‘the pro-poor development paradigm...is considerably circumscribed in its premise of economic growth as the foundation of development’ (Mowforth & Munt, 2003: 34). A conclusion also reached in broader analysis of the ‘poverty consensus’ (Storey et al., 2005).

The embracing of pro-poor tourism by some academics and consultants has also drawn comparisons with the uncritical enthusiasm of some for ecotourism (Butcher, 2007). In the South African context Brennan and Allen (2001: 219) contended that ecotourism was ‘essentially an ideal, promoted by well-fed whites’. As Schevyens (2007: 232) asked, ‘Could the same be said of PPT, or is it likely to deliver genuine, wide-ranging benefits to the poor?’ Indeed, Schevyens own work highlights the importance of connecting poverty alleviation approaches to broader issues of empowerment and the role of place in development processes (e.g. Schevyens, 2002, 2005) in order for pro-poor approaches to succeed.

Many of the issues raised in the pro-poor tourism debate have also been extended by geographers to the developed countries as well particularly with respect to broader discussions of welfare (e.g. Hall & Brown, 2006) and ethics (Duffy & Smith, 2003; Fennell, 2006a, 2006b; Fennell & Malloy, 2007). However, they also have their intellectual origins in the development of concepts of sustainability, alternative tourism and ecotourism (Saarinen, 2006). Although the initial promise of such concepts has arguably not been met given that sustainability has remained a focal point for much...
geographical research (e.g. Aronsson, 2000; Butler, 1999; Hall & Richards, 2003; Saarinen, 2006; Teo, 2003; Weaver, 2006), although with new focus on issues such as ecotourism (Gössling, 2006; Reiser & Simmons, 2005) and ecological footprint analysis (Gössling et al., 2002). However, arguably one of the most significant developments, and one that provides interesting links between human and physical geography is that of climate and global environmental change.

The relationship between climate and tourism has long been a significant research theme that bridges human and physical geographical interests (e.g. Gomez-Martín, 2005; Harflinger, 1991; Mieczkowski, 1985). Given improved datasets and methodological improvements a new generation of climate and tourism indices (de Freitas, Scott, & McBoyle, 2004) as well as evaluations of tourism demand in relation to climatic factors have been developed (Gomez-Martín, 2004, 2006). However, increasingly the focus of the relationships between climate and tourism and recreation has shifted to be primarily related to climate change (Scott, McBoyle, & Schwartzentruber, 2004), and often with respect to specific at-risk environments, such as alpine (Scott, 2006), polar areas (Johnston, 2006) and wetlands (Wall, 1998), or climate related attractions and activities, such as skiing (e.g. Bicknell & McManus, 2006; König, 1999; Jenkins, McBoyle, & McBoyle, & Illsley, 2006; 2007) or nature-based tourism (e.g. Scott, Jones, & Konoprek, 2007). Nevertheless, substantial uncertainty surrounds the long-term implications of climate change for tourism flows, patterns and destinations (Gössling & Hall, 2006a), especially in relation to transport (e.g. Go¨ssling, 2000; Freitas, Scott, & McBoyle, 2004), as well as evaluations of tourism demand in relation to climatic factors have been developed (Gomez-Martín, 2004, 2006). However, increasingly the focus of the relationships between climate and tourism and recreation has shifted to be primarily related to climate change (Scott, McBoyle, & Schwartzentruber, 2004), and often with respect to specific at-risk environments, such as alpine (Scott, 2006), polar areas (Johnston, 2006) and wetlands (Wall, 1998), or climate related attractions and activities, such as skiing (e.g. Bicknell & McManus, 2006; König, 1999; Jenkins, McBoyle, & McBoyle, & Illsley, 2006; 2007) or nature-based tourism (e.g. Scott, Jones, & Konoprek, 2007).

5. Tourism as an ‘applied’ area of research: Problems for the discipline or a valid contribution to society?

In geography, basic research aims to develop new theory and methods that help explain the processes through which the spatial dimensions of physical and/or human environments evolve. In contrast, applied research uses existing geographic theory or techniques to understand and solve specific empirical problems (Hall & Page, 2006). Whilst some critics of this categorisation point to the lack of validity in differentiating between the rationale of research and its intended use, there is a widely accepted premise within academic geography (see Johnston, 2000 for more detail) that there are clear divisions between pure and applied research. This debate is particularly relevant for tourism given the commercial focus of the subject matter and the debates aired earlier on the lack of embeddedness between the spatial focus of geographical research and the business and commercial practices of tourism. Pacione (1999) also developed the argument of ‘useful knowledge’ which also raises the inevitable criticisms of what might be non-useful geographical knowledge and useful for whom? However, in practice, this dichotomy between pure and applied knowledge has been and remains extensively laboured, particularly to question the academic value of applied research. As Johnston (2000: 696) observed, ‘Workers in the various fragments of Geography seek to establish their relevance in very different ways, which occasionally stimulates debates over what should be privileged in disciplinary promotional activities: for too long, the concept of relevance has been narrowly construed’.

Yet the debate of applied versus theoretical knowledge has now been elevated beyond the level of geography as discipline and is becoming significant for tourism as a whole (Ruhanen & Cooper, 2004; Shaw & Williams, 2008) as many universities embrace government objectives and funding for increasing knowledge transfer as part of the knowledge management agenda to improve the skill base and research available to the wider economy. Perhaps, as Harvey (1984:7) commented, ‘geography is far too important to be left to generals, politicians and corporate chiefs. Notions of applied and relevant geography pose questions of objectives and interests served... There is more to geography than the production of knowledge’. By engaging with the public and private organizations outside of the academy, applied geography has a contribution to make to society, even if there are questions about the values and objectives of applied research and its potential uses (Smith, 1977). Examples of such applied research are as diverse as tour guiding (Black & Weiler, 2005), crime (Barker & Page, 2002; Walker & Page, 2002).
that, as yet, has not been identified’’ (Coles et al., 2006: 300), but relevance to tourism studies within higher education in a manner funding reflects that ‘‘the basic tenets of Mode 2 may have increasing spatiotemporal analytical tools of the geographer will be usurped by other foreseeable future. However, there is a danger that many of the offer fruitful research agendas for tourism geographers for the impacts of tourism within and at destinations that will continue to tourism products by using yield management epitomised by the 2007a). Whilst the tourism industry has been adept at developing wiser development of the field over the last decade or so. This review has been necessarily limited in scale and scope due to the space available, but it does seek to illustrate the change, evolution and new directions which tourism geographers have engaged as well as debates within the subject area. Previous reviews of geographical studies of tourism (e.g. Butler, 2004) have noted that while the fields of tourism and recreation studies remain outside much mainstream academic geography, geographers have made considerable contributions to the understanding of tourism and recreation phenomena even if treated as different ends of the same spectrum – our leisure lives and the way we use the free time we have. To an extent several of the geographies of tourism, and particularly those dealing more directly with tourism management issues, exist outside the corpus of whatever one might describe as mainstream geographies. While institutionally, tourism geography would appear to be in reasonable health, there are a number of challenges with respect to cross-disciplinary mobility that affect the discipline as a whole and the sub-discipline in particular as well as the impact of research assessments (Coles et al., 2006). Nevertheless, a number of key areas of development emerge, particularly with respect to the spatialities of mobility and global environmental change. The latter continuing the ‘impact’ tradition in tourism studies but reflecting a far more sophisticated account of change at various scales than previously appreciated.

Several of the issues identified in this review are likely to continue and if not intensify in the immediate future particularly in an environment in which governments are often providing more direction in terms of research areas they will fund and courses they will support. A key issue will clearly continue to be the tension between ‘applied’ and ‘theoretical’ research, particularly given the increasing pressure being applied to public universities with respect to developing closer relationships with business and attracting more ‘third stream’ funding. This is occurring not only within geography but is also a significant issue in other academic areas such as business schools and environmental studies where geographers are employed and is arguably part of broader issues surrounding the role of universities and their research in contemporary society. However, for a field such as tourism geography the pressures to conduct industry related research are likely to be substantial given the interpretation of some tourism academics that their role is to undertake research for the tourism industry rather than of the industry.

Another tension exists between the disciplinary drives inherent in research assessment exercises (via the subject scope given to panels) and the increasingly multiple disciplinary nature of the academic units within which geographers are located. For example, in Australia and New Zealand universities as of the beginning of 2008 there are now only two departments of geography remaining as separate units. All other departments have been combined with environmental studies or sciences, anthropology, development studies, natural resource management, planning or geology. Similar pressures exist in Europe and North America as university administrations seek greater management efficiencies. Such structural change may well have long-term effects on the skill mix sought by such departments. The multidisciplinary nature of many tourism departments, especially in business schools, may also downplay spatial skills, with only Nordic business schools tending to have departments, sections of or strong linkages to economic and social geography as part of their academic structures. Add to this the debates in universities over the critical mass necessary for a discipline to function academically (and financially), then geography per se is more inclined to give way to more multidisciplinary groupings. Therefore, it is not surprising to find that much of the mobility and migration of spatially-trained geographers to business school settings has been accompanied by a growth in the subject of tourism studies outside of the normal boundaries of what was identified institutionally as geography. Ironically at a time when
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geography has seen challenges to its position as a subject, there has been a relative failure to embrace an opportunity available to grow its significant role in academic portfolios of universities. The perceptions of geography departments in the 1980s and 1990s of tourism as a vocational and applied area devoid of theory and scholarly pursuits are a misnomer as this review indicates. Geographers have provided one of the principal subjects and several of the pillars supporting the intellectual development of tourism since the 1970s, but especially in the boom years of the 1980s and 1990s, reflected in the research outputs reviewed here.

The loss of spatiality in some areas is interestingly matched by its adoption by others. As noted above, the ‘mobile turn’ in sociology has been substantially influenced by time geography while spatial systems approaches such as GIS are now often have their own departments or units separate to that of a geography department. Indeed, it could be argued that there is increased convergence between some areas of tourism geography and the sociology and anthropology of tourism as well as cultural and post-colonial studies. Although, in contrast, the increasingly substantial contribution of geographers to understanding tourism’s role in regional development, entrepreneurship and innovation is arguably still retaining a strong emphasis on place and space. However, geography is therefore also within some of the broader tensions that exist within the field of tourism studies as a whole with respect to the reasons why not only research is conducted but also that the academic institution of tourism exists at all (Coles & Hall, 2006; Hall & Page, 2006). We can conclude that a shift has occurred from Pearce’s (1979) geography of tourism to geographies of tourism but with an important caveat: that the definition of what constitutes the geographical focus of tourism has been expanded substantially with the wider contributions from other social science subjects, especially sociology and cultural studies.

The geography of tourism is therefore at a crossroads. On the one hand, a number of the research areas exist within the subject which depict it at its strongest such as human mobility, crisis management, conservation and biosecurity, destination planning and management, regional development, international business, poverty reduction and pro-poor tourism, and global environmental change. These are all regarded as key issues for the future of international tourism management in the next five to ten years and should be seen as impetus for the field. Although a number of these are external to tourism firms it should also be noted that geographers have also made very significant contributions to understanding tourism entrepreneurship, innovation, distribution channels, and tourism-related international trade and business. Indeed, it is likely that this research will remain a significant focus for geographers, particularly those based in business schools, in the foreseeable future. Nevertheless, geography is also facing increasing institutional challenges for its long-term survival, especially with respect to a separate identity and skill base. Even though it is a field which has been a major contributor to the sustainability of tourism its own long-term sustainability is becoming increasingly problematic. Much of the future role of geographer’s research on tourism in universities, society and in the wider policy-making environment will depend upon their ability to foster and adapt to the new research agendas which will bring tourism into the public domain, particularly with respect to conservation and environmental change. For example, debates over the desirability of long-haul travel and tourism carbon footprint on society (e.g. Gössling & Hall, 2006a, 2006c; Gössling, Hall, & Weaver, 2009; Hunter & Shaw, 2007; Scott et al., 2007; Simpson et al., 2009) as well as growing concerns over social inclusion and exclusion debates in the developed and developing world associated with how tourism can create artificial social divides and exacerbate notions of poverty (Aitchison, 2007; Hall, 2007b; Hall & Brown, 2006). Whilst geographers will clearly not have a monopoly on the way tourism develops as a subject in the next five to ten years, their continued role is vital, so that the subject embraces many of the contemporary debates and research agendas facing tourism not only at the level of the firm and its economic concerns but some of the broader social and environmental challenges. Tourism and the communities that depend on it clearly face an uncertain future given the issues of global security, environmental change and energy supply. Yet with the growing blurring of the boundaries of the social science subjects that now contribute to the study of tourism and the potential homogenisation of disciplinary space in the short-term and skills in the longer, it is perhaps pertinent to conclude with a reconfiguration of Cohen’s (1974) ‘who is a tourist?’ to ‘who is a tourism geographer?’ The conceptual clarification of both tourism and tourism geography remains an important ongoing task, not just because it influences how we think, but perhaps far more significantly, what we actually do now, given the broader development of spatiality in tourism research.
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