Tourism Workshop Glossary

Para-academic

"Para" in this phrase refers to a condition of beside and implies a parasitic relationship. Para-academic refers to the wide variety of discourses and practices that are not officially or formally part of academic institutions, but that nonetheless speak as if they were authorized or backed by "science" and its formally designated institutions. Many New Age and many old age or traditional religions are based on creating a scientific facticity and legitimation of their particular beliefs and forms of spiritualism.   The discourses and practices related to UFOs and aliens similarly require science and are para-academic. Thus, these cultural forms are beside but also dependent upon science and the academy and in this sense are also parasitic.

Paradigm

Formalized by Kuhn, this concept has been modified and reworked by various critiques. 1980s witnessed much debate whether anthropology was or had a or many paradigms. There is something of a family resemblance between Kuhnian paradigm and Foucault's "episteme." Paradigm is not a theory, but the **conjunction** between a theoretical tradition, with its set of assumptions, sets of methodological practices for the conduct of research, determinate objects of study (thereby the exclusion of alternative possible objects of study!), and norms for formulation of research problems (questions, issues, and approaches). In the nonspecific sense of the word, paradigm is generically used to mean "framework" or "tradition" as in the phrase "theoretical paradigm."

methodological individualism

 A set of basic assumptions that guide the basic methods of different social scientific theories. The individual is theoretically assumed to be a holistic and unitary entity from which social reality is produced/created/constructed. Thus, methodologically speaking analysis must privilege the individual, that is, begin with the individual as the origin. Against this position are a variety of theories and competing theoretical traditions that either subsume the individual to structural, systemic, evolutionary, or other factors that determine the individual (that is, pre-shape and pre-structure individuals by giving both form and content to individuals), or that assume some kind of dynamic interchange between "individual" and "structure."

Research Problem

Generally understood as a set of questions, issues, and approaches to the study of an object of study. In the positivist tradition, research problems come after the object of study and before theory (as well as analysis). From the perspective of poststructuralism, research problems are formulated at the intersection of four axes: theory and philosophical traditions; methodologies or strategies and practices; the history of issues and thematics of a given research area; and the individual structures of interest or sociological imagination of a reseacher. Research problems then already come imbued "with theory" (i.e., are theoretically driven and laden with philosophical assumptions) and therefore "determine" the objects of study.

Alterity

1) commonly understood as otherness or difference. 2) more theoretically prescribed meanings refer to the fact that difference and otherness already imply an unstated "zero" point, that is, a notion of "sameness" or of "self" against which the difference/otherness is such. 3) thus, more generally alterity refers to relations of identity and non-identity (e.g., self-other, identity-difference, sameness-difference).

Subjectivity

1) In the common sense of popular culture it is the personal perspective of a given individual; an individual's personal way of viewing and experiencing the world. 2) In social theory and philosophy it is specifically defined in different theories or theoretical traditions in different ways, **nonetheless** it can generally be understood to be that psycho-social system that structures the range and nature of possible "personality-types," "social roles," and "ways of being" that both inhabits individuals and through which individuals socialize themselves into the broader sociocultural community. Subjectivity is thus about how the individual, in their individuality, is already shaped by and formed to fit into the social.   The founding theories of late 19th-early 20th century social theory has been concerned with the emergence of new "modern" forms of subjectivity. Benjamins' concept of the Flaneur is an example as well as that part of Tourism Studies that is concerned with the Tourist, from Boorstin and MacCannell to Baudrillard and Clifford, has likewise been devoted to the problem of the emergence of modernist and postmodernist forms of subjectivity based in the experiential structures of travel. Citizenship, as in the belonging to a nation or nation-state is another crucial form of subjectivity that has become more studied under conditions of "globalization."

Representation

Representation has a thick and difficult history in philosophy, social sciences and humanities. Thus, there are many different and competing theories of this term and thus an equal number of methods and styles of its analysis. Thus, anything can be a representation of anything else for anyone who cares for it to be such. In Tourism Studies representation is used fairly narrowly in terms of the marketing of destinations, whether spaces, activities, peoples, or cultures. Recognition of the broader understandings of what can be representation allows for making "thicker" analyses and understandings of one's object of study. In the anthropology of tourism, the analysis of "representations" in tourism must –should – ultimately consider that one's own analysis is yet simply another representation of tourism and thus analytically grapple with the question of how one's own anthropological representation of tourism articulates (relates to, competes with, emerges or diverges from) the representations one has so painstakingly studied.

Tropes, figures

1) These concepts are taken from the study of rhetoric and can be broadly understood as particular kinds of "metaphors," "signs," and "symbols." However, different specific theories of linguistics, rhetoric, structuralisms, philosophy, and symbolic anthropologies define these terms differently in relation to metaphor, sign, symbol, etc. 2) In basic terms a trope is a figure of speech (and vice versa). When an analysis emphases tropes/figures, they usually define these as "master symbols" (see Victor Turner's _Forest of Symbols_) that articulate (condense or elaborate) thick semantic fields and because of this marshalling of multiple meanings are "dominant" in a culture, subculture, types of interactions, or particular kinds of discourses and

forms of communication. Tropes and figures powerfully shape if not determine ways of thinking and experiencing the world.

Discourse, discursive practice

Discourse in theory neutral sense refers to variously sized "units" of spoken and written language use. Refering to oral expression it could be a speech or if in written form, a text. Discourse implies the conscious and non-conscious structuring of expression, form, content, and meanings. Thus, different theories of discourse are concerned with identifying how this ordering or structuring process occurs and its effects. In this sense a discourse is not equivalent to actual expression but to the logic, system of tropes or other "structuring" factors. Poststructuralism extended the notion of discourse to refer to the system, structure, or "order" that inhabits non-linguistic expression such as the discourse of architecture, clothing/fashion, gestural forms, etc. Some theories maintain a theoretical distinction between linguistic and nonlinguistic discourses; some do not. Some theories maintain a theoretical distinction between discourse and the act or activities by which discourses are expressed or come into existence. The idea of discursive practice is the idea that every discourse is expressed/created through precise (sociocultural shaped) activities and that every human, social practice (or activity, behavior) entails a concomitant discourse or discursive expression and content. The concept of discourse in the best of usages would also imply the necessary articulation of discourse with activities and behaviors organized into culturally discernible practices.

Text, textual analysis, intertextuality

A text is in the first instance a written document. But different theories have extended its meaning to refer to nonlinguistic structures of meaning. Geertz' interpretive anthropology for example identified social action as text; it is this assumption that made social life and cultures analyzable as text in terms of meanings behavior has for actors. Poststructuralism extended the idea of text in other directions, away from social action/behavior and toward various kinds of nonconscious structurings of meaning.   A text can be anything that one defines as such by arguing that the way the thing is constructed, organized, or expressed is due to non-immediate levels of meaning or logic. Although text and discourse are therefore related, the use of one or another imply different kinds of analyses, theoretical framings, and questions. Intertextuality is a concept that seeks to identify the ways in which texts are interconnected in ways that are not immediately apparent.

action / behavior / practice

are three concepts that refer to the activities of everyday life, but are actually radically different because of the theoretical heritage of each term. Action is a concept that derives from the Weberian/german tradition of hermeneutic, phenomenologic moral science: action refers to the fact that behaviors of humans are meaningful and exist because of that meaning. Thus, action directs attention to agency, intentions, motives, and subject-ive feelings. Behavior is a concept that derives from positivist tradition of science and structural-functionalist approaches that seek to discover the transcendental or universal rules of behavior that are NOT specific to the situation of agents, the context of forces, nor the individual agencies, motives, intentions. Practice is a concept that emerges from the Marxist and poststructuralist traditions as a way to conceptualize activities as already sociological, that is organized, shaped, structured, and

determined by encompassing, non-individual or non-subjective factors (eg., language, mode of production, institutions, etc.)

Reification, Fetish and Fetishization

The concept of reification comes from the Marxist tradition of thought, specifically from Lukas' study of the novel. It refers to the way ideas become thinglike. Certain ideas or values, which are abstract and intangible, become imbued with a reality, power, and agency such that they are treated in language and behavior as if they were tangible, material agencies. But the analysis of reification shows that such "things" are actually illusive because the force they have are actually not intrinsic but projected onto the idea/value/concept as inherent and immanent to it. Fetishes are exemplary reifications in that this projected agency is then materialized into or as an actual physical object. In anthropological literature, totems are classic examples of fetishes. This last dynamic of materializing a reified value/concept into an object is fetishization. Tourism is a reification since it is actually pure value and concept; _tourism is not a real thing_ except as it is materialized by the fetishes that are attributed the qualities and traits of reified notion. The tourist and tourists are the principal fetish of tourism that make tourism seem real.

Apparatus

This term is mostly developed within the Marxist tradition to refer to the state as a set of hierarchized institutions that have functionally integrated. Foucault has also used the term in a related but different sense. His concept of apparatus (or in the French dispositif) refers to the articulation of heterogeneous discourses, practices, codes, norms, institutions that operate in relation to a "thematic" or "problematic." Tourism is an exemplary "apparatus" because of the diversity of phenomena that can be included under its purview and for the way it articulates this heterogeneity. Foucault's concept of apparatus develops in his work on sexuality; his later concept of governmentality is similar but is developed in relation to questions of the state, politics-domination, the Marxian critique of Foucault's notion of power, and Habermas' idea of public sphere.

Governmentality

1) Concept of governmental can refer to the everyday sense of having to do with government as in the institutions (or apparatus) of the state.

2) In some authors, it can also reference Michel Foucault's concept of "government" and "governmentality." With the rise of the modern, capitalist political state form of government, the state or state apparatus rules (governs, controls, dominants, etc.) **less** by written or customary laws and prohibitions **than** through the capacity to arrange and dispose of " things" (see definition). For this condition to be attained various state and para-state institutions (e.g., philanthropies, universities, museums, community organizations, local tourist boards, business and civil associations, etc.) must come into existence. Through their diverse mechanisms new forms of "citizenship" and "subjectivities" — assumptions and expectations of properly civil behavior — are communicated and inculcated by individuals. These come into existence in a space between the private and polity (or strictly political-state). NOTE: this aspect of the concept provides an important "overlapping" and point of dialogue between Foucault' concept of governmentality and Habermas' idea of "public sphere."