TOWARD A FRAMEWORK FOR TOURISM EDUCATION
Problems and Prospects

Jafar Jafari
University of Wisconsin-Stout, USA

J.R. Brent Ritchie
University of Calgary, Canada

ABSTRACT
Jafari, Jafar, J. R. Brent Ritchie, Toward a Framework For Tourism Education: Problems and Prospects. Annals of Tourism Research 1981, VIII(1):13-34. The purpose of this article is to offer a framework for analysis and discussion of tourism education. It first adopts a definition of tourism within which interaction among its components and extraneous aspects are considered. Specifically, it addresses issues related to travelers, tourism goods and services, socio-physical factors, and the host-guest relationship. Second, it discusses some social science disciplines relevant to the study of tourism, with reference to some methods of research and teaching of tourism. Finally, the article moves on to present some other issues pertinent to curriculum development in tourism. Throughout the paper, a number of questions are raised and attempts are made to point out some critical issues in tourism education. Keywords: tourism education, definition of tourism, disciplinary approaches, concepts, curriculum development.

Jafar Jafari is a member of the Department of Habitational Resources. He is founder and editor-in-chief of Annals of Tourism Research.
Brent Ritchie is Associate Dean in Faculty of Management at the University in Calgary, Alberta, Canada. He is also Director of the Division of Travel and Tourism in the Institute for Transportation Studies at the same university.
RESUME


INTRODUCTION

This article, prepared for the special issue on Tourism Education, seeks to achieve four goals. These goals have been identified as part of the process of developing this volume, which is believed to be one of the first formal attempts to provide a state-of-the-art, scholarly review of the rapidly expanding field of education for tourism.

First, an attempt is made to reflect upon the framework of tourism which underlies the educational efforts to be discussed. Unless the contextual boundaries and concerns of tourism are known, it is difficult to even suggest what tourism education involves and what should be studied.

Second, the article examines alternative disciplinary approaches to the study of tourism. This discussion reviews the various disciplines related to tourism and addresses some particular concerns related to these disciplines.

Third, this paper raises a number of questions and attempts to focus on a number of critical issues in tourism education which
have arisen from reflecting on the subject in general and the contents of the articles which follow. The purpose here is not, in most cases, to provide readers with answers. Rather, the presentation of these questions and concerns is viewed as a valid end in itself; tourism is now at that critical initial stage of development in which raising the right questions may be one of the most valuable contributions. The contention is that continued debate of such questions is essential in order to identify and understand exactly what should be taught in a well-defined tourism curriculum. Any courses or programs developed without this understanding are merely unfounded creations.

Finally, this paper attempts to employ the questions and concerns noted above to whet the reader's appetite for the articles appearing in this issue. In addition to highlighting some of the key points made in these articles, the discussion provides an overview of the ideas which link them, identifies major gaps which have not been addressed, and summarizes what evidently are the main priorities for future development of tourism education as a field of scholarly endeavor.

THE FRAMEWORK: DEFINITION OF TOURISM

The need to identify the disciplinary boundaries of tourism and its building blocks is a sine qua non of tourism education. To do so, one needs to have a working definition of tourism. During recent years, attempts have been made to define tourism and discuss some of its major concerns (e.g. cf. Heeley 1980; Leiper 1979). But there still is no universally favored definition of tourism.

Most of the recently developed definitions strive for a holistic presentation of tourism. For example, "Tourism is a study of man away from his usual habitat, of the industry which responds to his needs, and of the impacts that both he and the industry have on the host socio-cultural, economic, and physical environments" (Jafari 1977:8). For the purpose of simplicity, this definition is taken as the working frame of reference for this article, without any implications that it should be accepted as the only definition of tourism (see also Heeley 1980; Leiper 1979).

Study of Man: The Traveler

The most popular terms used to refer to the consumers of the travel industry are visitors, guests, travelers, and tourists. In many respects, they behave like the consumers of other in-
dustries. What makes travelers different from consumers of other goods and services is that tourists are consumers away from home. Therefore, one of the concerns of tourism is to analyze consumers to see if they remain the same or behave differently while away from home. What motivates people to leave home and take a trip? What factors influence a tourist to visit one destination vs. another? Does a person take his mental frame of thinking and his expectations with him when on a trip? What does a tourist look for? What can guarantee satisfactory consumption of the tourism product?

The answer to these and many other questions would allow one to design the kind of courses which focus on man away from home. Many disciplines (discussed later) offer their theoretical frameworks to assist in such study.

The Travel Industry: Tourism Goods and Services

The tourism business is often referred to as the travel industry. As an industry similar to others, travel represents or offers its own assortment of goods and services. Some of the typically recognizable "goods and services" of the travel industry are accommodations, restaurants, transportation, travel agencies, recreation, and the like. Most of these products are usually produced with the needs of tourists in mind (Jafari 1979).

Although the foregoing may seem to be a clearcut way of perceiving the business, it nevertheless has vague boundaries. Some of the components of the travel industry, such as the restaurant business, fall both inside and outside of tourism's boundaries. This and other vagueness about the travel industry spell out many of today's concerns. What exactly is a tourism product? How can so many diversified goods and services form a unified industry? What is the unifying agent for this myriad of goods and services? How come this giant national industry does not have a representative voice? What has made intra- and inter-industry communication difficult? Should the educational programs begin to plan their program by determining which sector of tourism they are aiming to satisfy (Christie-Mill 1980)? Or, from a different angle, should the programs be more holistic yet offer program specializations? Since the travel industry is made up of its parts, can one suggest that tourism education is the summation of all the specialized programs?

The answer to this latter question is clearly negative. There are many sectoral (specialized) programs such as Hotel Ad-
ministration which are so wrapped up with their own immediate concerns that they do not consciously realize that they are a part of a large entity. A study of the British system of tourism education suggests that while some attention may be given to tourism, "it is the sector or the discipline and not tourism itself which is the main focus of the attention" (Airey 1979:13). This is indeed an important concern when discussing tourism education.

The Setting: Socio-cultural Fabric and Physical Environment

Tourism includes not only moving people away from their home settings, but also responding to their basic needs. The travel industry has assumed this vast responsibility. But, the raison d'etre of tourism is based on so-called "attractions." Attractions are the prime movers in drawing tourists to given destination. Tourists in turn make certain demands on these individual attractions and the environment that they collectively create.

For the purpose of this article, the elements of the setting may be grouped into three general categories: natural resources, man-made resources, and socio-cultural resources (Jafari 1979). Each category presents the industry or the host community with different concerns which need to be accounted for within tourism education programs.

Natural Resources

Since the early days, man has been in search of nature and natural resources — probably the ones he lost in the process of discovering urban settings. He attempts to reach out and reestablish his contact with nature during his leisure time. In reviewing the significance and role of nature and natural resources, it is evident that the travel industry has both used and abused the resources to its "advantage." At the same time, tourism may be credited for preserving certain natural resources, but again to its own advantage.

In any event, the use or abuse of natural resources by the travel industry, remains a major concern of tourism and this relationship should be one of the focuses of any tourism curriculum. What are some of the relationships between tourism and nature? Under what circumstances can tourism contribute to nature or, on the contrary, deteriorate and uproot it altogether? To what extent should government, which owns much of the natural resources, control or invest in the travel industry? What level of knowledge should be acquired by students of tourism in order to not only ap-
preciate and safeguard, as responsible citizens, the resources in their own right, but also utilize and manage, as tourism professionals, natural attractions which create the setting of this business? Though answers to some of these questions may be obvious to some readers, the prominent place of these perplexing issues in the tourism curriculum is emphasized here.

Man-made Resources

The term "sight-seeing" commonly refers to the observation of some man-made creations or buildings. This includes visiting those still in operation as originally intended (factories, churches, tall buildings, architectural masterpieces, etc.). It also means visiting places no longer in use but operated for the purpose of visitations (palaces, castles, etc.).

What impact does the avalanche of tourists have on these places? Is tourism influencing the preservation of these buildings? Does tourism turn a national "heritage" into a mere tourism sight? With what cultural impact? What historical impact?

Socio-Cultural Resources

This category of resources represents the cultural heritages and social fabrics of the peoples of the world. These resources which have both tangible (e.g., man-made resources, above) and intangible manifestations (e.g. cultural events, festivals) have always been the primary reasons for traveling. Visiting places and destinations which are endowed with uniqueness, character, color and flavor — an exotic culture in action — is among one of the most popular occupations of tourists. What impacts do these visitations have on the host cultures? Is this visiting essentially encounter or conflict (discussed later) between the visitors and the visited? Should culture be "deodorized" and "packaged" for ready consumption of tourists? What can tourism do for and to culture? What does one need to comprehend about a culture which is used as a tourism attraction and consumed accordingly (Jafari 1978, 1980; Ritchie and Zins, 1978).

The above three categories of resources are not in reality treated separately by the tourism industry. At almost all destinations, all three categories combine to create the tourism settings which receive and accommodate the tourists. Not only does each category have impact on the other (e.g., cultural factors influence the man-made outcome), but the tourism industry may exert its own know-how to influence the outcome and offer a more
"saleable" mix. To what extent should tourism education expand its boundaries or framework of reference to include discussion and encourage thinking along these lines? What issues should be selected when designing a well-rounded tourism curriculum? Should tourism education concern itself only with "knowledge" related to the "saleable" mix or should it go beyond the economic and marketing aspects of tourism?

In short, tourism education should also be considered within the framework of the above three types of concerns and thinking. The least that this part of professional education can offer is to ensure tourism's survival by protecting its attractions.

The Encounter: Host-Guest Relationship

Tourism, by its nature, brings outside people to a given destination. At the outset, this involves two categories of people: tourists (guests) and residents (hosts). But the encounter involves other players and elements. The tourism employees and the government of the host destination are examples of other players; various attractions and socio-physical settings are examples of other elements. Therefore, the encounter involves not only residents and tourists, as is popularly believed, but is the outcome of various involvements and inputs into the system — all players, the various roles that they play, the setting, and the part that each element plays in the total setting.

The tourists themselves should be studied and understood. They come from a given culture with its traits and expectations. This alone complicates the matter greatly and makes the study of the tourism encounter even more difficult. The residents also have their own set of socio-cultural values and expectations. Though this aspect of tourism, the encounter, has received some attention during the recent years (cf., Smith, 1977, some past issues of Annals), it continues to be one of the important concerns of tourism. These concerns spring from several sources. How do tourists perceive or consider residents and vice versa? What do they expect from the residents and vice versa? Does serving tourists imply servitude to the tourists? To the residents? Would this attitude vary from host to host or tourist to tourist? What makes the difference? What can be done to facilitate conflict-free yet meaningful visits, to the advantage of both hosts and guests? How can an equilibrium of mutual respect between the tourists and residents be best maintained? Are all cultures gracious hosts? Are some cultures more open than others? What does one need to know about a host culture?
The encounter is not confined to the socio-cultural environment as such. The frame is indeed larger and includes economic and political dimensions as well. The economic influence of tourism, being one of the better studied aspects of tourism, has a very important role to play in setting the stage for the encounter. The reverse may also be true. The political factors, both domestic and international, set the tone of any host-guest relation.

These important concerns have indeed been voiced more frequently during recent years (Cohen 1979; Jafari 1974, 1978, 1980; Smith 1977; Zamora 1978a, 1978b). Many destinations have now realized that the success of tourism is highly dependent on the receptivity of the environment as well as the total socio-economic configuration of tourism. Any tourism curriculum needs to adequately acknowledge these multi-dimensional aspects of tourism education.

CHOICE OF DISCIPLINE AND APPROACH

As evident from earlier statements, tourism by its nature penetrates every aspect of life, whether directly or indirectly. It brings into action or reaction several indigenous factors and creates an environment of its own. Traditionally, each discipline having an interest in tourism has focused on one or more particular aspects or functions of the total system (Ritchie and Johnston 1978). It may, then, be useful to refer to some of the disciplines which lend their theories and techniques to the study of tourism (see Figure 1). Moreover, it may be equally important to refer to some of the tourism concerns that might be studied within the context of these disciplines.

Economics

Since tourism has always been considered as an important economic activity, especially for those developing countries needing tourism’s ability to earn needed foreign exchange, many economic theories have been used in the past to elaborate on the significance of tourism. Despite this fact, a number of concerns remain. Should tourism be studied mainly within the context of economics? What contributions can economics make to the study of tourism? To what extent should tourism education deal with the economic concept? Which concepts and methodologies in particular can best respond to some of the present and future needs of the study of tourism? Some of the contributions of economics to the study of tourism, for example, deal with the balance of
payments, multiplier effects, demonstration effects, input/output analysis, employment, and more (see, for example, Gray 1979).

Sociology

Sociology provides a systematic study of the development, structure interaction and collective behavior of organized groups of human beings. While in the past this field has not received the attention it merits (largely because it was not perceived to address issues which were sufficiently practical or operational), this attitude has changed dramatically in recent years. Both scholars and policy-makers in the field have realized that sociological theories and concepts can be of considerable assistance in understanding the complex, subtle processes which take place when interactions occur among visitors and hosts. This dimension is particularly important when those involved have different sets of values, expectations and behavior patterns which may be explicitly expressed, or buried in social norms which are evident only after considerable study (cf., a special issue of *Annals on Sociology of Tourism*, Cohen 1979).

Psychology

Psychology, the study of individual cognitive processes and traits and their influence on human behavior, is an essential complement to sociology in any attempt to understand tourism phenomenon. Psychological concepts as tools of understanding have ironically been both over-rated and under used. Commercial studies, frequently of a rather simplistic nature, have extensively employed psychological theories of motivation, personality and perception to develop specific products and experiences which appeal to various types of tourists. While a number of these studies have proven successful in relation to their immediate objectives, they have generally failed to contribute to a systematic theory of the psychology of tourism. The integration of existing findings is an essential first step in developing such a theory. There is a pressing need for more fundamental, in-depth research which will provide tourism educators with a more comprehensive understanding of the psychological processes which influence the decisions and behavior of both tourists and host populations.

Geography

Geography deals with the earth and its life, especially the description of land, sea, air, and the distribution of plant and
animal life, including man and his industries (Webster's New Collegeniate Dictionary). Fortunately, the importance of this discipline in understanding tourism has been recognized for some time. As a result, the field has benefited from considerable scholarly reflection (cf., a special issue of Annals on Geography of Tourism, Mitchell, 1979). Perhaps for this reason, the development of courses in the geography of tourism has proceeded more rapidly and on a broader scale than has been the case in other disciplines. Further evidence of this progress is contained in this special issue.

Anthropology

Anthropology focuses on the study of man in relation to the distribution of populations, the origin, classification and relationship of races, his physical character, environmental and social relationships, and culture. As such, the discipline represents the most holistic field of study related to tourism. The study of anthropological thought provides the basis for much of the careful reflection which is necessary if tourism is to be developed in a manner which will enhance rather than weaken desirable directions of evolution of a social system (cf., a special issue of Annals on Anthropology of Tourism, Smith, 1980).

The above five disciplines, which may be viewed as the basis for tourism studies, are but a partial listing of useful sources of concepts, theories and ideas. More specialized areas of study such as archeology, religion, language, history and political science can be usefully brought to bear in achieving an understanding of tourism. One must also add to these a number of areas of professional study including law, architecture, management, recreology and communications (see Figure 1).

In brief, tourism, like its customers who do not recognize geographical boundaries, does not recognize disciplinary demarcations, no matter how distinct the disciplinary boundaries might seem to be. Its concerns, more often than not, cross disciplinary boundaries and find themselves at home. While other disciplines, such as those social sciences listed above, do cross disciplinary boundaries in search of knowledge, they have a "home" to which to return. Tourism does not. For this reason, the study of tourism has been perceived as being related to the various disciplines in a number of different ways.

Disciplinary Approach to the Study of Tourism

Having acknowledged that tourism is an applied area of study
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which depends on and draws from a wide range of basic disciplines, one must examine how the field should most appropriately be structured for educational purposes (also see Gee 1980). In undertaking this examination it must be kept in mind that the structure finally chosen will have very real implications for very practical decisions involving the institutional location of a program, the financing of programs, the recruitment of faculty, and the type of pedagogies employed.

As a starting point for consideration of this issue, it may be useful to explicitly describe the possible levels of integration that are possible in structuring educational programs in tourism. In this regard, the following set of hierarchical definitions have been put forth by Meeth (1978). Cross-disciplinary studies are those which observe one discipline from the perspective of another. Describing the physics of music or the politics of literature are examples. Multi-disciplinary studies represent the next level of the hierarchy and involve several disciplines focused on one problem or issue. Under this approach, each discipline contributes its own knowledge to the theme with little or no attempt to integrate or interrelate ideas. Multi-disciplinary programs, by their nature, require the student to carry out the integration of the material being presented. When such an integration of concepts and ideas is an integral part of the teaching approach, the resulting programs are defined as inter-disciplinary. The key word here is integration, which implies that a serious effort is made to relate individual concepts to each other, to relate individual concepts to the total field, and to relate the total field to individual concepts. The highest level of integrated study is trans-disciplinary, which means beyond the disciplines. Whereas inter-disciplinary programs start with the discipline, trans-disciplinary programs start with the issue or problem and, through the processes of problem solving, bring to bear the knowledge of those disciplines that contribute to a solution or resolution.

In an ideal world not constrained by finite resources and existing institutional structures, it would appear that tourism would best be taught using a trans-disciplinary model. This would imply the establishment of Faculties of Tourism Studies similar to other professional schools (law, medicine, and management) or, independent Institutes such as those found in the areas of Transportation Studies, Environmental Design, and more recently in the field of Energy. Clearly, however, there are real world constraints which severely limit the viability of the trans-disciplinary approach for tourism education.
From a pedagogical standpoint, trans-disciplinary programs are certainly the most difficult to teach. Professors and students must know not only the techniques of problem solving, but also where to search among the disciplines for contributions. Thus, teachers need to be resource persons, broadly acquainted with theory and practice in many fields (Meeth 1978). As Bodewes emphatically points out in a following paper, it is virtually impossible to find such individuals in today's world, particularly in light of the existing programs by which "tourism educators" are trained. Consequently, very few institutions attempt trans-disciplinary studies in tourism, even though it offers the most logical approach from a pedagogical perspective.

Even if the necessary teaching resources could be made available, it is difficult to imagine that the necessary financial support is likely to be forthcoming to develop and sustain a trans-disciplinary approach to tourism education in more than a few locations. For a variety of reasons, both governments and universities appear unwilling to recognize tourism as an important, legitimate field of study which merits the levels of funding accorded to other professional schools and faculties. While one may optimistically hope that the future holds more promise, tourism educators attempting to develop teaching programs in today's world are forced to recognize that the resources needed to establish an effective trans-disciplinary approach are unlikely to be available.

The final barrier, institutional rigidity, presents an equally formidable challenge to those educators who believe that tourism requires a trans-disciplinary orientation. In the event that substantially increased levels of funding were made available to existing institutions of higher learning for programs of tourism studies, it is not clear that they would readily encourage or facilitate the establishment of truly independent, trans-disciplinary programs. Universities, particularly those which are well established, have proven highly resistant to pressures to force a restructuring of the traditional disciplinary model on which they are based. This rigidity derives from two sources: administrators who fear the creation of new components which threaten the "academic integrity" of the university, or alternatively risk becoming "white elephants" should student demand not be sustained over the long term; and faculty members themselves who frequently have little desire to venture outside the comfortable network of personal relationships and scholarly journals with
which they have become familiar and within which they have developed their careers.

The net result of the above noted barriers to a truly trans-disciplinary approach to tourism education has been to adopt either a multi-disciplinary or inter-disciplinary model which is more easily accommodated within existing institutional structures. The second has been to develop programs which are very functionally oriented and designed to serve the needs of a very specialized component of the tourism system. The most successful examples of this approach are the Schools of Hotel Management which produce a graduate having skills that are well defined and highly marketable. While such graduates undoubtedly make a real contribution to the strength of the tourism industry, there is little pretense on the part of the schools concerned that they are producing experts having an understanding of tourism as a whole. Although some broad tourism courses may be included in the curriculum of hotel management students, the programs are by design too heavily loaded with functional courses to permit the breadth of study necessary to develop individuals who have interest in overall tourism policy.

OTHER UNRESOLVED ISSUES IN TOURISM EDUCATION

To this point, the discussion has remained at a fairly conceptual level in the hope of providing a framework for long term discussion and planning of programs for tourism education. In contrast, this section raises a number of very pragmatic concerns and issues which are of immediate concern to educators in the field. These issues have been identified from various sources including other articles in this issue, meetings of tourism educators, and discussions with concerned individuals. The purpose of explicitly identifying these issues is to bring them into focus in the hope that this will stimulate discussion and perhaps facilitate their eventual resolution.

Theoretical Concepts in Tourism Education

Since a major purpose of this article, as well as the entire special issue of *Annals*, is to open a dialogue among concerned educators, a critical starting point is needed to more clearly establish what concepts should be taught in a program of tourism studies. As Watson (1971:17) in relation to another discipline, has stated, "It is now the task of all of us to come to grips with, and to share to our mutual satisfaction, the fundamental questions con-
cerning objectives and goals of our discipline, and to build on the existing foundations a methodological structure enabling us to attain these objectives."

This quotation highlights the need to develop a body of knowledge concerning tourism. There is, however, the need to indicate operationally how one should proceed. Should researchers and educators continue to "borrow" from existing disciplines in the hope that they shall ultimately be able to integrate disciplinary concepts into a new paradigm of tourism; and if so, what concepts should be borrowed? Most recent writings appear to indicate that if such borrowing is to occur, it should be highly selective and based on a fairly radical rethinking of what tourism is all about. Such thinking is typified by Leiper's article in this and a previous issue of Annals. As an extension to his earlier writings on definitional issues in tourism, Leiper (1979) asserts the need for the creation of a new discipline of tourism studies. He argues that the traditionally based multi-disciplinary studies approach has developed to the point where this base has become an impediment to progress. A supporting article by Stear (this issue) provides one example of how courses might be developed within a new discipline of tourism. More specifically, Stear addresses the factors influencing the design of a course in "Destination Region Studies."

Another very different approach to identifying what needs to be taught in a tourism curriculum is outlined in the article by Airey and Nightingale. This article presents the results of empirical work designed to identify the body of knowledge which tourism professionals feel is necessary for a sound education in tourism. As academics, we need to assess the extent to which the findings of Airey and Nightingale are compatible with the conceptual framework which underlies the thinking of Leiper and Stear.

Relation of Tourism to Recreation and Leisure

If the material received for this special issue is any indication, much of the thinking concerning the development of tourism as a field of study tends to ignore the critical question of the interdependency of tourism with the highly related fields of recreation and leisure. It would appear that the cause of this oversight is a continued tendency to view tourism from primarily a commercial perspective, or as a type of vocational training.

A major exception to this observation is provided in the paper by Bodewes. This paper, in addition to raising a number of very practical concerns for tourism educators, emphasizes the con-
siderable amount of thought which members of the Netherland Institute of Tourism (NWIT) have put into examining how a tourism studies program should relate to and benefit from courses in leisure and tourism. It is reasonable to suggest that the NWIT conceptualization of tourism and recreation as complementary sub-components of the overall field of leisure has much to offer to individuals and institutions attempting to design and implement tourism programs. It is no accident that one of its most successful tourism programs in North America, that at George Washington University, has its origins in a Department of Leisure Studies.

Tourism Education Coupled with the Travel Industry

Because tourism is an applied field of study, there is little doubt that teaching programs must be developed with at least some serious consideration being given to the skills, as well as the knowledge, that the student must acquire from these programs. Just as it is felt that teaching hotel management without any comprehension of the total field of tourism is unacceptable, there is also a need to recognize that the teaching of tourism as an abstract academic subject is equally inappropriate.

The resulting issue which tourism educators must face concerns the desirable mix of conceptual learning and skill development. A corollary issue concerns who should have input into the resolution of this important question. The pragmatic response is that potential employers represent the most useful source of ideas since they determine the demand for graduates. The academic counterargument to this position is that graduates should be trained not only for entry-level jobs but for lifelong careers as well — and that such career training must develop the ability to think creatively rather than merely the ability to perform certain tasks.

Clearly, the answer to the total question is some sort of compromise. The determination of the "best" form of compromise remains a critical and elusive goal for tourism educators. While several alternatives are no doubt viable, the monitoring of the success achieved by different approaches will be of continuing interest to all in the field.

Role of Research in Tourism Education

In contrast to most disciplines where teaching and research are intimately related, tourism education and tourism research appear to have developed, and be developing, largely independent of each other. In practical terms, this results in a situation where
individuals frequently classify themselves as either "tourism educators" or "tourism researchers." Consequently, efforts to develop better tourism curricula are receiving little support from leading researchers who tend to see tourism research as an extension of their discipline of origin rather than as part of the field of tourism. Conversely, tourism educators are prone to suffer from academic hardening of the arteries, which commonly leads to an overly vocational orientation in course content and pedagogy.

The causes of this situation are easy to comprehend and equally difficult to rectify. The fact that few professors have received extensive formal training in tourism studies means that they are less likely to view the field as their career path of first loyalty. In addition, since those doing tourism research are commonly housed in a disciplinary or professional department, they must frequently teach non-tourism courses as their primary responsibility. Those who do teach in tourism programs often find their teaching loads are excessively onerous and that research receives little recognition in the reward structure of their institutions.

This researcher/educator dichotomy cannot be allowed to persist if tourism is to successfully develop as a field of study. Those institutions which recognize this fact and move to correct it will attract both the best professors and the best students. Those that do not will be perpetually viewed as second class vocational diploma mills.

Where to House a Tourism Program

While it has been repeatedly implied that a program of tourism studies would best flourish in an independent, well-funded department or institute, such is clearly not possible in the short term in most situations. Consequently, the issue of identifying the most acceptable alternatives for developing tourism studies within existing institutional structures must be addressed.

One of the most frequently supported approaches is to house tourism programs within a Faculty of Social Sciences. An example of this approach and some of the issues involved are described in the article by Murphy, a geographer by training. He points out that institutional support for tourism programs can be obtained if efforts are made to demonstrate the academic and community relevance of the subject. A supporting paper by Pearce provides some specific details as to how a course in the Geography of Tourism was structured within a social science setting.
Although not dealt with in this issue, other institutional locations for tourism programs exist. Perhaps the most common is within a Faculty of Business, with a resulting commercial orientation to the program. Other possibilities include the housing of tourism programs in a Department of Recreology or Leisure Studies, or even in a Department of Anthropology. Unfortunately, there is little evidence at this point to measure the probable success of the range of possible alternatives. While there is some indication that "invisible" multi-faculty tourism/leisure programs are gaining increasing acceptance, any assertion that this approach is most desirable is currently premature.

Tourism Programs and the Needs of Developing Countries

Since the operation of advanced education institutions requires considerable resources, it is not surprising that the great majority of tourism programs have been established in economically developed countries. Because of this fact, the focus of most of these programs has been on courses and training designed to equip graduates for employment in societies in which tourism is part of a highly sophisticated economic and technological environment.

This focus of existing programs overlooks a serious need on the part of developing countries for trained tourism policy-makers, planners, and personnel. In fact, it can be argued that such countries have an even greater need for tourism education programs given their dependency on tourism as a mechanism for providing the funds necessary for overall economic development. While certain tourism education programs, such as that sponsored by the World Tourism Organization (Centre International d'Etudes Superieures de Tourisme - CIEST) are concerned with the interests of developing countries, most are not relevant to their needs. This point is made forcefully by Blanton in his article in this issue. The inclusion of this article, which emphasizes the social and cultural differences in training needs of developing countries, is made in the hope of stimulating greater interest and concern for this neglected and important dimension of tourism education.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As stated at the outset, the purpose of the special issue of Annals is to initiate what will hopefully become an ongoing process of reflection and dialogue which will lead to the establishment of
tourism studies as a rigorous, legitimate field of academic endeavor. To achieve this purpose, attempts were made to provide a widely publicized forum which would attract the best thinking currently available.

A critical self-assessment of the success realized reveals, as is usually the case, both positive and negative dimensions. In terms of the volume of material submitted, one would be pleasantly surprised. A total of 22 complete manuscripts were submitted, thus indicating that there does exist a substantial number of individuals and institutions having a serious interest in tourism education. With advice from a dedicated group of reviewers, the guest editor of this issue and the editor-in-chief attempted to select those articles judged to be of highest quality. Given limited space, only one-third of the manuscripts received could be accepted for publication. They contain much valuable information which will serve as a stimulus for future development of the field.

While the editors are pleased with the material submitted, it may still be useful to comment on the types of inputs which were NOT received, or received only in limited quantities. These gaps may be viewed as both weaknesses and opportunities in the field.

First, generally speaking, lack of empirical research on which to base the design of tourism curricula may be stated. The notable exception to this observation is the article by Airey and Nightingale. While the remaining material often referred to valuable individual experiences, there appear to have been relatively few instances in which the structure and content of tourism programs were derived from systematic scientific inquiries or major gatherings of tourism educators.

Second, and in a related vein, it appears that most academics in the field are forced to conceptualize and design tourism courses and programs largely as individuals or in a setting of relative isolation. In this regard, the Netherlands Institute of Tourism stands out as an important exception. While other examples of concerted efforts by groups of individuals exist, there would seem to be a real need to develop mechanisms which will encourage and facilitate the exchange of ideas and experience among those interested in developing tourism curricula.

A third observation, which is made at perhaps considerable risk, concerns the highly vocational nature of material received from North American sources as compared with that from other geographical regions. It would appear that tourism is being conceptualized in much broader terms in places such as Europe and
Australia as compared to most institutions in the United States and Canada. While the inputs may not be representative of all that is occurring, it is nevertheless believed that this general observation is probably valid. No doubt, there is much to be gained from additional interaction among those having a conceptual orientation and those having a more pragmatic approach to tourism education.

Finally, the editors gained the impression, that despite the many barriers to progress, the field of tourism studies is involved in a process of emergence that will not be denied. While many in the field have their origin in a variety of disciplines from which escape is difficult, there is a growing desire on the part of many individuals to identify with the trans-disciplinary field of tourism studies. The satisfaction of this desire will require new forums for the exchange of ideas and experiences as well as considerable mutual support of fledgling efforts. It is hoped that this special issue on Tourism Education will make some small contribution to this process.
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