Tourism Recreation Research

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rtrr20

Kinmaking: toward more-than-tourism (studies)

Tomas Pernecky

To cite this article: Tomas Pernecky (2023): Kinmaking: toward more-than-tourism (studies), Tourism Recreation Research, DOI: 10.1080/02508281.2023.2207154

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2023.2207154

TOURISM RECREATION RESEARCH
https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2023.2207154

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Kinmaking: toward more-than-tourism (studies)

Tomas Pernecky

Faculty of Culture and Society, School of Hospitality and Tourism, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

ABSTRACT
The field of tourism studies has entered an epoch of manifold vulnerabilities, a period in which the academic community will have to respond to the environmental and planetary crises and consider the wellbeing of not just humans but also nonhumans and multispecies. In these momentous times, it is imperative not to overlook tourism studies' ontological, epistemological, and axiological vulnerabilities and to survey the potential viabilities. Although the blossoming criticalities in the field have greatly fuelled the urgency to correct, rectify, and recalibrate existing relational arrangements and replace these by more sustainable, just, and inclusive visions for/versions of tourism, there is still a pressing need for more conceptually, theoretically, and philosophically malleable architecture. Inspired by Donna Haraway's scholarship on broader planetary matters, this contribution offers 'kinmaking' as a critico-creative, disruptive space and fitting thoughtscape for transitioning into more-than-tourism (studies). Among the key ideas covered in this paper are the dangers of epistemocentricism, the necessity for sympoietic approaches, the rise of postdisciplinary and posthuman acumen, and the overall ripeness of tourism studies to become a domain of critical relationalities.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 20 July 2022
Accepted 14 April 2023

KEYWORDS
Tourism ontology; tourism epistemology; postdisciplinary; posthuman; relational; critical posthumanities

Introduction

It has been well established that global tourism and the planet at large are facing multiple crises (Cheer et al., 2021; Espiner & Becken, 2014; Hopkins, 2021; Lew et al., 2020), with some colleagues reaching a point of intensified apprehension about our planetary future and declaring Code Red for sustainable tourism (Higham et al., 2022). The tourism industry, and with it also tourism studies, has thus admittedly entered a period of manifold vulnerabilities. In accordance with the need to fundamentally rethink tourism operations, systems, and philosophies (Gössling et al., 2009; Scott et al., 2012) and the possibilities for positive transformation amid the Covid-19 pandemic (Lew et al., 2020), this contribution centres on the intertwined vulnerabilities of ontological, epistemological, and axiological kinds. Ontological vulnerability is considered here as a process of change, whereby the properties of an entity or a phenomenon are altered, resulting in a modified, and thus ontologically different, entity or a phenomenon (in the extreme, the entity/phenomenon may cease to exist altogether). Axiological vulnerabilities arise when there is a weakening, reformation, or crisis of values. And epistemological vulnerabilities are related to knowledge. In the context of tourism, they can be defined as weakened dispositions to understand and investigate tourism phenomena. There are, of course, numerous ways in which epistemological vulnerabilities may arise, and so, in this paper, the focus shall remain solely on metaepistemology: the assumptions, commitments, and shifting values that underpin the study of tourism, and hence the ensuing tourism knowledges. The trio of ontological, axiological, and epistemological vulnerabilities are intimately interwoven, because through the act of defining, articulating, and making epistemic claims about something, that something is affirmed/reaffirmed. And as different values take hold, knowledge of the things we study, as well as the things themselves, can be subjected to radical modifications. Accordingly, what tourism is is reiterated through the activities of tourism studies academics, official bodies, and institutions, who play an essential role in the production of authorised understandings, which always occur in evolving axiological landscapes.

This brief philosophical prelude bears relevance for at least two reasons: (1) the embryonic values that have started shape the future of tourism and tourism studies (e.g. posthumanism, Indigenous revival, overthourism/tourism degrowth, climate emergency, and

CONTACT Tomas Pernecky tomas.pernecky@aut.ac.nz Faculty of Culture and Society, School of Hospitality and Tourism, Auckland University of Technology, Private Bag 92006, Auckland, New Zealand

the mainstreaming of sustainability) are revealing tourism horizons that are considerably different from the ones we have become accustomed to, and (2) the growing recognition that there is no return to the 'old normal' (Lew et al., 2020) suggests that the field will have to deal with increased ontological, epistemological, and axiological vulnerabilities. In these transitional and potentially existentially restless times, and whilst ruminating on the possible vitalities of tourism, this paper contends that the field might be moving towards more-than-tourism studies with scholars ready to embrace other-than-tourism perspectives. It proposes that the next evolutionary leap in tourism thinking/being/doing could stem from 'kinmaking' sensitivities. The capstone term 'kinmaking', after Haraway (2016, 2018), is adapted and developed aspiringly to demarcate the critical resolve of many colleagues who recognise that resuming the old ways of 'doing' tourism would be detrimental to both humans and nonhumans, and who may be looking for conceptual, theoretical, philosophical, and methodological alternatives.

Tourism knowledge and its makers

The field of tourism studies has shown remarkable growth since its conception in the 1970s, when it was established as a new social science with a unique set of focuses formed largely by interdisciplinary thought, including input from economics, sociology, psychology, geography, and anthropology (Jafari & Ritchie, 1981). As an object of knowledge, tourism has always been studied in close association with the industry. It arose mainly as an economic force after World War Two, with much of the early interest directed to its rejuvenating potential, job creation, and economic growth. This meant that the knowledge of tourism until the late 1960s was coloured by industrial/managerial optimism and little desire for criticality (Xiao et al., 2013). It would take another decade for a more scrupulous inquiry to start developing, with researchers scrutinising the less desirable and damaging side of tourism. The epistemic dance uniting tourism studies, conceived from business perspectives as well as social science perspectives, was captured by Tribe (1997), who eschewed disciplinary definitions and emphasised that tourism studies ought to be comprehended not as a discipline but as two distinct fields: the interdisciplinary tourism business studies, and the inter/multidisciplinary non-business tourism studies. But this conception, too, was eventually deemed as limiting, with academics calling for postdisciplinary inquiries and approaches that transcend the divisionary, narrow, disciplinary/field-bound thinking (e.g. Chambers, 2018; Coles et al., 2005, 2006, 2016; Hollinshead, 2010, 2012; Hollinshead et al., 2009; Munar et al., 2016; Pernecky, 2020a). The postdisciplinary scholars saw a fundamental weakness in the restricted ability of any discipline to deal with the complexities underpinning tourism. In their view, that which makes any discipline unique, i.e. its methods and the ways in which problems are included/excluded and grasped conceptually, is insufficient in addressing heterogeneous, assemblage-like phenomena that are always in flux. Thus, according to some postdisciplinarians, tourism is better understood by means of process ontologies and through relational, post-paradigmatic perspectives (Hollinshead, 2021; Pernecky 2020a, in press).

These developments are important to register because of the wider implications, which are at once ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological: they are ontological in that what tourism is – including its properties and entities – is not fixed: rather, what emerges, are relational assemblages and flows; they are epistemological in that what and how we can know about tourism is determined not so much by rigour and objectivity but by ways in which problems are coded and framed (i.e. still deeply entrenched in Eurocentric biases); they are onto-axiological in that the values that shape the manifold tourism worldmaking processes are connected to existential apprehensions (such as the survival of peoples, species, ecosystems, and the planet as a whole) and matters of being and becoming, which are always tied to histories, customs, politics, desires, etc.; and they are methodological in that what ensues methodologically must be intimately connected to the aforementioned ontological, epistemological, and axiological concerns, and thus requiring comprehensions and toolkits capable of dealing with the ever-dynamic, ever-flowing nature of tourism. To better understand what has been shifting on the onto-epi-axiological register, it is necessary first to consider the kaleidoscopic nature of tourism knowledge makers.

Transcending the notions of 'generations' and 'pioneers'

The producers of tourism knowledge have occupied diverse intellectual habitats. Whereas some have transitioned and settled into tourism studies from other disciplines and fields, others have flourished within tourism doctoral programmes and established their careers in what is now an autonomous field of studies, while yet others have held on to their other disciplinary caps bearing the emblems of sociology, anthropology, environmental sciences, marketing, public culture, economics, geography, and management and business studies. And there are the already mentioned postdisciplinary/adisciplinary thinkers for whom the field of

tourism studies has become too narrow – too narrow in terms of ontology and the restricted notions of what tourism is (i.e. essences vs. flows and relations); too narrow in terms of epistemology and the stubborn resistance to epistemic diversity; and too sluggish in accommodating the axiological shifts that have begun to alter the landscape of tourism. Taking these concerns together, these latter thinkers intuit that whatever tourism amounts to in the twenty-first century will be co-shaped and reconfigured in light of community, planetary, and other shifting/clashing/competing values and knowledges. This multifacetedness, although giving a glimpse into the rich spectrum of philosophical and methodological orientations, makes it somewhat difficult to paint tourism studies academics with simple colours, let alone propose a cohesive whole.

Nevertheless, a popular way of making sense of the variety of intellectual pursuits in tourism studies has been attempted by clustering scholars into 'generations'. McKercher and Prideaux (2014, p. 26), for example, argue that tourism studies is exactly three generations old: the first generation were the 'true pioneers of the field'; the second generation were those with 'strong intuitive knowledge of the practice of tourism' responsible for the expansion of standalone tourism degrees; and the third generation extends to most academics who have been trained in dedicated tourism doctoral programmes, dating back to the late 1990s. Others (Franklin, 2009; Morgan et al., 2018; Ren et al., 2010) have taken a more nuanced approach and concentrated on the changing research focuses, proposing that the second and third generations are defined not so much by age or linear progression but by a way of thinking about tourism inquiry, namely social justice, social equity, reflexivity, intellectual enrichment, and criticality. When understood as critical engagement with, and advancement of, tourism knowledge, the second and third generations have indeed grown in numbers, as evidenced by the sustained and ongoing successes of the Critical Tourism Studies conferences (Critical Tourism Studies, n.d.), now held in North America (Critical Tourism Studies North America Conference, 2016, 2021) and Asia Pacific (Critical Tourism Studies – Asia Pacific, n.d.). Notably, the labours exerted by the critical arm of tourism scholarship have resulted in the field ripening critically, and whilst there is still much work still to be accomplished (Gibson, 2021; Morgan et al., 2018), the ontological, epistemological, political, and axiological footprint has been widened.

However, any attempt to neatly divide academics into generations is problematic. One only has to consider the marginalisation of non-English intellectuals, the failure to take into account the propensity of academics to embrace new ways of thinking, and the aptitude of some theorists to transcend the linear notion of generations and be agenerational or part of multiple generations. Moreover, 'pioneers' and colleagues who have 'strong intuitive knowledge of the practice of tourism' – associated mainly with the first and second generations of tourism scholars by McKercher and Prideaux (2014) – are even more needed within the concurrent epoch in which the comprehensions and study of tourism may require novel approaches and ardent academic stewardship, and thus new 'pioneers' and multifacetedness. Indeed, many colleagues have been galvanised by persistent calls for more conceptual, philosophical, and theoretical developments in the field (Ateljevic et al., 2007, 2011; Goeldner, 2005; Pritchard et al., 2011; Pritchard & Morgan, 2007), more flexible forms of understanding (Hollinshead, 2010), and pleas to resist building knowledge by imitation and reproduction (Chambers & Buzinde, 2015). Vital to underscore is that not only have some researchers grown a thicker skin to counteract what Caton (2012) termed 'hegemonic pinching' (p. 1914), there is now a much wider acceptance of qualitative and soft science approaches (Wilson & Hollinshead, 2015), which have played a key role in grounding the vibrancy of qualitative acumen into tourism inquiry. Crucially, there has also been continuous commitment to challenge the 'uneven and violent geographies' of tourism so that more just, more sustainable, more Indigenously sovereign, and less violent and destructive forms of tourism can emerge (Devine & Ojeda, 2017, p. 606).

In such critically charged environments, it is vital that there are numerous pioneering minds advancing a rich spectrum of ideas and setting new benchmarks. However, the problem with the notion of 'pioneers', and for similar reasons the idea of 'generations', is that pioneers are not always easily discernible, not always communicating in the English language, not always publishing in highly ranked journals, and not always recognised by performance matrices and by those in seats of power. Therefore, it is important to be aware of the dangers of epistemocentricism and the limits of classifications that are not equipped to take into account epistemic diversity. Bourdieu was cognisant of the processes that are deployed socially to organise, rank, and order people, cautioning that it is easy to forget that.

> the *criteria* used in the construction of the objective space and of the well-founded classifications it makes possible are also instruments – I should say weapons – and stakes in the classification struggle which determines the making and un-making of the classifications currently in use. (Bourdieu, 1987, p. 10)[1]

The epistemic muscle with which tourism is studied, reported, quantified, and accepted as one thing rather

than another does not reside outside of the realms of power and practices that are exercised institutionally by agents of authority. The strong critiques offered by Hollinshead (2021) indeed remind us how fundamental it is that 'those senior incumbents in the field take on board reflexive Deleuzian considerations on the world-making power they routinely exercise' (p. 151). Hollinshead puts it in plain packaging when he continues to express what is at stake: 'Let us be clear about it – they work as 'tourism judges' about the world's visitable histories, cultures, natures, and spiritualities' (p. 151). Amid these charges, it is vital not merely to remain cognisant and reflexive about such matters but to actively strive for more epistemological and ontological openness in view of greater intellectual creativity and diversity of thought in and about tourism. But how do we make the transition, and what exactly may we be transitioning to? Furthermore, what are the thoughtscapes and toolkits needed for the concurrent epoch, dubbed by Escobar (2020) as the 'crisis of civilisation'?

Kinmaking: embracing relational consequentialism

Over the past two decades, there has been a growing determination and impatience to fix that which needs fixing, to challenge views and practices that are no longer acceptable, and to actively foster and demand human dignity, equality, and justice. The blossoming criticalities and critical activism (e.g. Alarcón & Cole, 2019; Boluk et al., 2019, 2021; Cole, 2017; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2018; Ladegaard & Phipps, 2020) fuelled by the urgency to correct, rectify, and recalibrate existing relational arrangements and replace these by more inclusive visions for, and versions of, tourism have facilitated a greater awareness of relational consequentialism: the unmistakable comprehension of tourism as being, belonging, and becoming together in ways that have consequences. Donna Haraway has provided much food for thought in these critical terrains and has adopted the phrase 'making kin' to communicate the necessary relational changes facing humanity. In an interview with Paulson, she explains that:

> Making kin seems to me the thing that we most need to be doing in a world that rips us apart from each other, in a world that has already more than seven and a half billion human beings with very unequal and unjust patterns of suffering and well-being. By kin I mean those who have an enduring mutual, obligatory, non-optional, you-can't-just-cast-that-away-when-it-gets-inconvenient, enduring relatedness that carries consequences. (Paulson, 2019, para. 19)

Although the feminist-inspired project of kinmaking has been largely shaped by concerns around reproduction, demography/population, and the environment (Clarke & Haraway, 2018), it can be broadened in the context of tourism to encapsulate the relational alertness with which one is willing to tackle the established doctrines, practices, and modes of being and becoming through tourism. Accordingly, kinmaking as a critical examination of the ways we 'are' with each other and the world – grasped uniquely by tourism/more-than-tourism academics through the lens of tourism/more-than-tourism – has the propensity to establish new architectures of social and natural realities that are less oppressive, less violent, and less exploitative. To think in terms of kinmaking, however, also means having to consider pressing questions, such as: 'What must be cut and what must be tied if multispecies flourishing on earth, including human and other-than-human beings in kinship, are to have a chance?' (Haraway, 2016, p. 2). Pertinently, Haraway's (2016) notion of 'oddkin' – contrasted to 'godkin' and genealogical/biogenetic family – is an invitation to think relationally and existentially about the interconnectedness, vulnerability, and dependence of various entities in the larger scheme of being. And it also is an invitation to 'meet' and respond to multiple existential urgencies while recognising the ontological significance of tourism.

Kinmaking as critical relationalities

Broadly speaking, relational approaches emphasise the interconnectedness and interdependence of entities and phenomena; for scholars interested in relationality, the focus is therefore predominantly on the ways in which people, places, and entities are connected and constituted via relations, which takes precedence over the study of substances and essences. In tourism, such examinations have been carried out mainly as part of actor–network theory (Ren, 2011; van der Duim et al., 2017). But the apparent lack of expansive ontological thinking in the field (with the exception of a small number of colleagues such as Hollinshead, 2004a, 2004b), and importantly, the failure to comprehend tourism existentially and relationally, is intertwined with numerous issues: gender equity, overtourism, social gentrification, the displacement of local populations, the abuse of animals, the way we treat the environment, etc. What critical relationalities and critico-relational scholarship can productively advance in tourism inquiry is the necessity to think cooperatively, not anthropocentrically; relationally, not self-centrically; and diversely but connectedly.

In light of the vulnerabilities rehearsed at the beginning of this manuscript, tourism studies has moved closer to becoming a 'crisis discipline' and a 'survival

science' in that future tourism research will be closely connected to 'the urgent and reactionary pursuit of solutions to pressing environmental problems' (Egan, 2017, p. 26). For tourism to remain viable, it seems inevitable that much of tourism worldmaking processes will have to be rooted in critical relationalities – because of not only the increased scrutiny of the industry but also the aforementioned changing attitudes of tourism academics. In this regard, kinmaking as a critico-relational disposition is a call for more boldness and willpower to dislodge the conceptual, theoretical, and empirical 'givens' of the past in order to transcend the human-centric/tourism-centric worldviews that have presided over the planet, its communities, and its multispecies.

Process ontologies (e.g. Bergson, 2007; Whitehead, 1978) and relational ontologies of thinkers such as Barad (2007) – i.e. the need to grasp the world in terms of actions, doings, and practice vis-à-vis agential realism and intra-action – and Escobar (2020) – i.e. the need for radical relationality and pluriversal perspectives – as well as works in new materialism (e.g. Benson, 2019; Braidotti, 2011) have emphasised the dynamic, events-based nature of reality and contested the notion of matter as something passive. Indeed, new materialists have facilitated important intellectual and existential openings. For instance, if matter is understood as 'a fundamentally indeterminate performance or process-in-motion' (Gamble et al., 2019, p. 125), there are new opportunities – and still largely dormant vitalities – to be unleashed as the onto-epistemological hegemonic grip on what tourism and tourism objects ought to be and facilitate is loosened. The implications and promise these ideas hold are already being tested conceptually (Matteucci et al., 2022) and empirically (Stinson et al., 2022).

Kinmaking as intellectual decommodification of tourism scholarship

A shift toward kinmaking suggests a resolute step in the direction of intellectual decommodification – an undertaking expressed previously by other scholars who have called for a decommodified research paradigm in tourism (Belicia & Islam, 2018; Jamal & Stronza, 2008; Wearing et al., 2005). The notion of decommodification in this case does not imply the utter denial of the economic, managerial, and business aspects of tourism. To decommodify our thinking about tourism is to continue asking what tourism ought to look like in our current existential epoch marked by intensified vulnerabilities. To put it in Escobarian terms, 'the current problems cannot be solved with the categories and historical experiences that created them' (2021, p. 3). When the answers point to the relations between persons, objects, places, structures, animals, and the planet at large, tourism emerges primarily as a relational phenomenon. The economic, managerial, and business forces are by no means excluded from relational enquiries; rather, they are decentred, becoming one among many objects of analysis. For instance, it is possible, and indeed, important to critically examine the ways in which specific relationalities are 'locked in', determined, and maintained through business practices. Crucially, it is by dissecting the concurrent structures and relational matrices that transformations can be facilitated and new tourism vitalities unlocked. But this is neither an easy nor a quick process, because confronting the concurrent capitalist models – underpinned by accumulation and growth – can be a mammoth task (Blázquez-Salom et al., 2019). If mass tourism/mass consumption is recognised as troublesome and is not the remedy for pressing social, environmental, and planetary concerns, then other alternatives must be considered.

From mass tourism to sympoietic varieties of tourism

In contrast to the varieties of human-centric tourism products, services, and experiences, and the commodifying processes and constructs that underpin these, kinmaking offers the opportunity to radically rethink what tourism can become. In reaffirming that humans are responsible to one another and the planet, kinmaking designates the uncompromising resolve to think and act in ways such that humans, nonhumans, and multispecies 'have a chance'. It prompts questions such as: What are we willing to embrace, and what are we willing to sacrifice/exclude in the tourism worldmaking processes? How is tourism to be 'done', 'undone', and 'redone' so that the previous 'coding' of people, places, objects, and animals as 'touristic' can undergo a critical, relational scrutiny? Moreover, what opportunities exist in adopting alternative ways of conceiving of, being in, and becoming through tourism?

One set of answers points to more relational and sympoietic approaches, whereby 'sympoiesis is about making-with, becoming-with, rather than self-making through appropriation of everything as resource' (Haraway, 2018, p. 68). Accordingly, when the unruly worldmaking tendency to appropriate the things of this world to grow and develop tourism industries gives way to comprehensions and orientations that grasp tourism as way of being and becoming-with the world, tourism has the capacity to become sympoietic. The glimpses of such changes have already surfaced at the 9th Critical Tourism Studies Conference held in

Menorca, Spain in 2022 (Critical Tourism Studies, n.d.), where scholars gathered to advance knowledge under the theme of 'With in Dangerous Times'.

By embracing kinmaking as a critico-creative and disruptive space, it is possible, then, to consider other alternatives. It is possible, for example, to imagine that the mass tourism structures and systems of ordering are superseded by relational mobilities, relational hospitality, and ways of being *in* and *with* places, peoples, and nonhumans that are non-destructive and critically hopeful (Pernecky, 2020b; Pritchard et al., 2011; Swain, 2009). And it is also possible to envision that future 'tourists' gradually metamorphose into kinmakers of sorts, cultivating planetary kinships and global citizenship – a process in which tourism becomes a relational force for the global and planetary good.

Kinmaking and human/nonhuman rights

Consider that two centuries ago it would have been incongruous to demand that tourism be a human right; yet such evolution in ethical thinking has become commonplace toward the end of the twentieth century and is certainly more apparent in the twenty-first century. The Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (WTO, 2001) underscores in Article 7 that '[t]he prospect of direct and personal access to the discovery and enjoyment of the planet's resources constitutes a right equally open to all the world's inhabitants' (para. 1). Consider further that researchers working in this area, such as Breakey and Breakey (2013), agree that the right to pursue tourism is ethically justified in light of two key human rights: the right to freedom of movement and the right to leisure and rest. These developments are not trivial: they amount to the recognition that our flourishing as humans would be diminished if we were to be deprived of the unique forms of being and becoming that tourism facilitates. Of particular importance are the complexities that arise in connection with broader ethical, environmental, social, and political problems. Namely, how is this human right to be achieved sustainably and equitably? And is it morally permissible?

If, as argued by Higham et al. (2022, p. 2), 'it is necessary to move beyond tweaking the status quo, and commit to the radical low-carbon transitions required to achieve ambitious decarbonization pathways over the course of the 2020s and beyond to net-zero 2050', and if, as maintained by Scott and Gössling (2022), it is necessary to maintain long-haul leisure travel at 2019 levels, then there are serious ethico-relational conundrums. These extend to the rights of nonhumans – should these not be considered as part of a broader planetary ethics? To reiterate Haraway's question, many of the decisions and actions backed by kinmaking sensitivities will have to grapple with answering: 'What must be cut and what must be tied if multispecies flourishing on Earth, including human and other-than-human beings in kinship, are to have a chance?' (Haraway, 2016, p. 2). Although attending to these questions is not a simple task, we can see glimpses of inquiries that are motivated by figuring out how to implement more just tourism systems (Mihalič & Fennell, 2015).

Kinmaking and postdisciplinary/posthuman ethical aptitudes

Conventional science has done no justice to nonhuman interests, as persuasively argued by Franks et al. (2020). Similarly, tourism-centric research that focuses on development and growth has achieved limited success for minority groups, marginalised communities, nonhumans, and the environment. From a postdisciplinary vantage point, the problem of disciplinary/field-fixated/tourism-centred thought is that disciplinary foci tend to be stubbornly biased. The vast body of beneficiaries – from the tourism industry and government organisations to tourism academics and university programmes – are existentially invested in tourism. And when tourism is championed blindly and uncritically, there is a silent, unhealthy lobbyism which results in unethical representation of human and nonhuman interests. In this regard, the voices of posthumanist scholars willing to embrace other-than-human perspectives fill an important void.

Through the lens of kinmaking, colleagues working in the area of posthumanism have challenged the traditional dichotomies and relationships formed with nature, other beings, and the environment. In fact, posthumanists are among the few to embrace 'radical relationality' (Escobar, 2020) and to take tourism out of the 'picture' altogether if that is what is needed in a given context for the wellbeing of nonhumans and the planet at large, because they are attuned to the importance of nonbiological relations in the newly forming axiological landscape of tourism. Hence, the posthumanist-inclined branch of scholarship, as well as sustainability and animal ethics advocates (Cohen, 2019; Fennell, 2014; Guia, 2021; Guia & Jamal, 2020; Kumm et al., 2019; Winter, 2020), prompt necessary raptures for thinking anew about what tourism may be and what it could become if we were to think more relationally and less egocentrically, ethnocentrically, and epistemocentrically. Thus, kinmaking grasped as a 'creative process of fashioning care and reciprocity' (Benjamin, 2018, p. 65) then also speaks more broadly to the ethical shifts in tourism (Caton & Grimwood, 2018). Ethics, however,

must not be conceived of in terms of rigid norms, because these have been grounded in power asymmetries. Tourism ethics is perhaps best approached as a relational tool for reconfiguring the ways we can be *with* and *in* the world vis-à-vis tourism.

Such daring approaches resonate highly with postdisciplinary approaches, for one is no longer tied to advancing a disciplinary/field-specific knowledge but becomes invested in finding solutions to pressing problems. If the tourism community is to tap into its new vitalities, there is much potential in adopting more-than-tourism perspectives. Staying within the powerful coupling of postdisciplinarity and posthumanism, consider, for example, that instead of examining how animals can be safely and sustainably incorporated into tourism practices, the use and involvement of animals is questioned altogether. A posthuman mode of inquiry can legitimately explore what animals want (see, for example, Franks, 2019), with researchers embracing the critico-relational space in which it is permissible, and indeed necessary, to practice disciplinary disobedience. To some, there is no other option, because.

> [t]o meet the modern crises of climate change, environmental pollution and degradation, and mass species extinction, animal interests (including the interests of the particular animals involved in the research) must be given priority over external considerations. (Franks et al., 2020, p. 3)

And so, to better represent nonhuman interests, a multitude of perspectives (e.g. philosophical, political, cultural, environmental, legal, and cultural) and transdisciplinary collaborations are required (Franks et al., 2020). Furthermore, there are emerging unorthodox methodologies and tools that allow for the multiplicity of beings to be accounted for/incorporated into research, such as more-than-human participatory research (Bastian, 2017). And indeed, there is a growing recognition among tourism academics that 'hackneyed theorizing about supply and demand, sustainable tourism and rudimentary economic justifications' must shift towards 'deeper and more critical multidisciplinary engagements that take into account nuanced social, ecological and political viewpoints' (Cheer et al., 2021, p. 290). Importantly, there is also value in thinking in postdisciplinary terms, especially if it can generate out-of-the-box, critico-playful engagement with pressing issues, and provide the required flexibility to look for solutions that are not always available in disciplinary silos. In other words, the future viability of the field may well await beyond the current conceptual and theoretical notions of tourism, with kinmaking demarcating the threshold of academics and practitioners too well aware of the fact that tourism can and does lead to relationalities that produce undesirable consequences. Braidotti's (2019) political and intellectual efforts are particularly useful here as they point to a reservoir of vital nutrients suited for cultivating more-than-tourism prospects. Critical posthumanities – envisaged by Braidotti as a 'rhizomic field of contemporary knowledge production that is contiguous with, but not identical to, the epistemic accelerationism of cognitive capitalism' (2019, p. 52) – are an example of the metaepistemological architecture needed when considering the future of tourism. Table 1 provides a brief synopsis of the key terms incorporated in the kinmaking agenda.

Prospects: toward more-than-tourism (studies)

In considering the vulnerable future of tourism, it is useful to draw on existing scholarly judgements and

Table 1. A brief overview of key terms.

Ontology	The philosophical examination of being and reality. Ontological inquiries in tourism studies can focus on discerning the entities posited to exist and on addressing fundamental questions around the nature of tourism – i.e. what kind of a 'thing'/substance/process tourism might be.
Epistemology	The philosophical theory of knowledge associated with problems such as truth and justification. Epistemological inquiries into tourism can range from higher-level, metaepistemological concerns (e.g. assumptions and processes at the level the field) to specific issues, including the way knowledge is acquired (e.g. empiricism, rationalism, realism; see Pernecky, 2016).
Axiology	The philosophical theory of value, connected to ethics, aesthetics, and politics. Axiology in tourism pertains to examinations of what is valued in a given context, by whom, and why. Axiological probing has a wide reach – it can be pursued the context of method (e.g. research practices), epistemology (e.g. processes of knowledge production), and ontology (e.g. attached to examinations of being and becoming vis-à-vis tourism).
Sympoietic(s)	A term used productively by Donna Haraway (2018) to underscore the collaborative inclinations towards being, becoming, and 'making-with'. In the context of tourism, sympoietic inquiries may centre on relational problems, such on the relationship between humans and nonhumans.
Worldmaking	A term made popular by Nelson Goodman, which has since been adapted and advanced as a 'force' tied to the processes of making, remaking, and demaking. In critical tourism studies, worldmaking has been fruitfully developed by Hollinshead (2010, 2012) and others.
Postdisciplinarity	A working philosophy-cum-approach-cum-orientation built around the notions of complexity, methodological and paradigmatic flexibility, disobedience, and critical/emancipatory/equitable/transformatory knowledge acts (see Pernecky 2020a; in press).
Critical Posthumanities	A postdisciplinary vision of what humanities can become as a 'supra-disciplinary' assemblage of knowledge; described by Braidotti (2019) as 'a constitutive block of supra-disciplinary discourses' (p. 45).

incorporate these in the concluding thoughts. Not too long ago, McKercher and Tung (2015) contemplated the field's relevance and vibrancy in the times ahead and put forth two possible scenarios. The first scenario assumes ongoing disintegration of a field that is already fragmented and undergoing what the authors describe as a 'move "away" from the core essence of tourism studies and what it means to "do" tourism' (p. 313). The second scenario suggests a 'move "to" a more comprehensive establishment of tourism, associated with the development of its own core theories developed by scholars who define themselves as being tourism people first and foremost' (p. 313). McKercher and Tung favoured the latter, fearing that tourism studies may succumb to the same fate suffered by the discipline of geography, in which the fragmentation and 'work in the areas defined by the qualifying noun or adjective' (p. 313) (historical geography, economic geography, etc.) has resulted in decreasing relevance. In their view, 'as long as we continue to "do" tourism, research tourism issues from a tourism perspective and explore issues with the goal of understanding better the phenomenon and practice of tourism, the field will thrive' (p. 313).

McKercher and Tung's apprehensions are indicative of the kind of metaepistemological issues that abound as fields of study and disciplines mature; tourism studies is no exception. The more pressing question, however, is not how to maintain what has been built but, rather, whether what has been built is still fit for purpose. If our past tourism 'doings' have contributed to the types of tourism increasingly seen as problematic, then continuing to 'do' tourism and investigating tourism issues from a 'tourism perspective' is not a viable pathway for thriving communities and multispecies. Against the essentialist thinking about tourism, then, one must ask: Whose tourism perspectives are to be maintained going forward? Who will represent the perspectives of communities that may be reluctant and even disinterested in tourism? Who will advise those unaware of the potentially detrimental impacts that tourism can bring? And who will represent the interests of nonhumans in the (human-driven) tourism worldmaking processes? The late Keith Hollinshead (2021) has warned about 'unthought essentialism', or as he put it, 'the unthinking naturalisation of "things" and the unthinking normalisation of populations, territories, inheritances, events, whatever, through tourism and Tourism Studies' (p. 151). To reinforce these observations, the danger of overt commitment to essentialism about tourism is that it can turn into blind orthodoxy, particularly if left unchecked and unquestioned.

Alternatively, to think in terms of more-than-tourism studies, there is much richness in the work of geographers like Nigel Thrift (1996, 2007), who championed non-representational and more-than-representational approaches to geography. Thus, in addition to the representational models devised by academic communities that are coded into disciplinary knowledge, there is efficacy grounded in lived experiences and in new materiality, and in 'non-representational models of the world, in which the focus is "external", and in which basic terms and objects are forged in a manifold of actions and interactions' (Thrift, 1996, p. 6). Conceptually and philosophically, then, to consider tourism beyond tourism studies may commence with capturing the 'onflows' of everyday life, and follow 'the anti-substantialist ambition of philosophies of becoming and philosophies of vitalist intuition equally – and their constant war on frozen states' (Thrift, 2007, p. 5).

Returning to the themes of vulnerabilities and vitalities, if lodged in the assumption that tourism studies amounts to a firm body of knowledge that must be maintained and safeguarded, then the future is one of limited flexibility and stagnation. Conversely, for tourism inquiry – or rather, more-than-tourism intelligences – to remain vibrant, relevant, and enriching, it is inevitable to foster thinking and 'doing' that is daring and explorative: thinking and 'doing' that goes beyond the already well-mapped and well-trekked territories. Whereas the former approach may seek to resist/overcome the inevitable ontological, axiological, and epistemological vulnerabilities, the latter pursues the opposite – it embraces, flows with, and builds upon them. In resonance with Chambers (2018), we ought earnestly to ask: 'To what extent does knowledge, which is a product of imitation, lead to any fundamental change to our thinking and to our being in tourism?' (p. 195). It is by challenging what it means to 'do' tourism, remaining open to grasping it ontologically, and exploring how we can reimagine tourism relationally that new vitalities can be revealed. Vitality, in this sense, does not imply a renewed vigour to keep the existing epistemic machineries going; vitality means intellectual freshness, critical sharpness, and innovative insights. The kinmaking thoughtscapes rehearsed in this paper point to a future of tourism that lies in the reaching beyond and in becoming more-than … – tourism.

Note

1. Although Bourdieu focuses predominantly on social class, his observations are applicable to any social constructs and processes that make it possible to talk about tourism studies, pioneers, generations, etc.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Tomas Pernecky is with the Faculty of Culture and Society at the Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand. He is an advocate of postdisciplinary approaches to knowledge and post-paradigmatic modes of thinking – articulated recently in *Epistemology and Methaphysics for Qualitative Research*.

ORCID

Tomas Pernecky http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6418-8020

References

Alarcón, D. M., & Cole, S. (2019). No sustainability for tourism without gender equality. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *27*(7), 903–919. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1588283

Ateljevic, I., Morgan, N., & Pritchard, A. (2011). *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope*. Routledge.

Ateljevic, I., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2007). *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies*. Elsevier.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press.

Bastian, M. (2017). Towards a more-than-human participatory research. In M. Bastian, O. Jones, N. Moore, & E. Roe (Eds.), *Participatory research in more-than-human worlds* (pp. 19–37). Routledge.

Belicia, T. X. Y., & Islam, M. S. (2018). Towards a decommodified wildlife tourism: Why market environmentalism is not enough for conservation. *Societies*, *8*(3), 59. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc8030059

Benjamin, R. (2018). Black afterlives matter: Cultivating kinfulness as reproductive justice. In A. E. Clarke & D. Haraway (Eds.), *Making kin not population* (pp. 41–65). Prickly Paradigm Press.

Benson, M. H. (2019). New materialism: An ontology for the anthropocene. *Natural Resources Journal*, *59*(2), 251–280. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26800037

Bergson, H. (2007). *The creative mind: An introduction to metaphysics* (M. L. Andison, Trans.). Dover Publications.

Blázquez-Salom, M., Blanco-Romero, A., Vera-Rebollo, F., & Ivars-Baidal, J. (2019). Territorial tourism planning in Spain: From boosterism to tourism degrowth? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *27*(12), 1764–1785. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1675073

Boluk, K. A., Cavaliere, C. T., & Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2019). A critical framework for interrogating the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals 2030 Agenda in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *27*(7), 847–864. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1619748

Boluk, K. A., Cavaliere, C. T., & Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2021). *Activating critical thinking to advance the Sustainable Development Goals in tourism systems*. Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1987). What makes a social class? On the theoretical and practical existence of groups. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, *32*, 1–17. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41035356

Braidotti, R. (2011). *Nomadic subjects: Embodiment and sexual difference in contemporary feminist theory* (2nd ed.). Columbia University Press.

Braidotti, R. (2019). A theoretical framework for the critical posthumanities. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *36*(6), 31–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276418771486

Breakey, N., & Breakey, H. (2013). Is there a right to tourism? *Tourism Analysis*, *18*(6), 739–748. https://doi.org/10.3727/108354213X13824558470943

Caton, K. (2012). Taking the moral turn in tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *39*(4), 1906–1928. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.05.021

Caton, K., & Grimwood, B. (2018). Ethics for a wild world. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, *18*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2017.1403802

Chambers, D. (2018). Tourism research: Beyond the imitation game. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *25*, 193–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2017.11.010

Chambers, D., & Buzinde, C. (2015). Tourism and decolonisation: Locating research and self. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *51*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.12.002

Cheer, J. M., Lapointe, D., Mostafanezhad, M., & Jamal, T. (2021). Global tourism in crisis: Conceptual frameworks for research and practice. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, *7*(3), 278–294. https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-09-2021-227

Clarke, A. E., & Haraway, D. (2018). *Making kin not population*. Prickly Paradigm Press.

Cohen, E. (2019). Posthumanism and tourism. *Tourism Review*, *74*(3), 416–427. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-06-2018-0089

Cole, S. (2017). Water worries: An intersectional feminist political ecology of tourism and water in Labuan Bajo, Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *67*, 14–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2017.07.018

Coles, T. E., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. T. (2005). Mobilizing tourism: A post-disciplinary critique. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *30*(2), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2005.11081471

Coles, T. E., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. T. (2006). Tourism and post-disciplinary enquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *9*(4&5), 293–319. https://doi.org/10.2167/cit327.0

Coles, T. E., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. T. (2016). Tourism and post-disciplinarity: Back to the future? *Tourism Analysis*, *21*(4), 373–387. https://doi.org/10.3727/108354216X14679788636113

Critical Tourism Studies. (n.d.). Retrieved February 2, 2020, from https://www.criticaltourismstudies.info/

Critical Tourism Studies – Asia Pacific. (n.d.). Home. Retrieved February 2, 2020, from https://www.criticaltourismstudies.com/

Critical Tourism Studies North America Conference 2016. (2016). Retrieved June 2, 2021, from https://uwaterloo.ca/critical-tourism-studies-north-america-2016/

Critical Tourism Studies North America Conference 2021. (2021). Retrieved June 2, 2021, from https://sites.grenadine.uqam.ca/sites/gritts/en/cts-na/home

Devine, J., & Ojeda, D. (2017). Violence and dispossession in tourism development: A critical geographical approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *25*(5), 605–617. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1293401

Egan, M. (2017). Survival science: Crisis disciplines and the shock of the environment in the 1970s. *Centaurus; International Magazine of the History of Science and Medicine*, *59*(1-2), 26–39. https://doi.org/10.1111/1600-0498.12149

Escobar, A. (2020). *Pluriversal politics: The real and the possible* (D. Frye, Trans.). Duke University Press.

Escobar, A. (2021). Reframing civilization(s): From critique to transitions. *Globalizations*, 1–18. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2021.2002673

Espiner, S., & Becken, S. (2014). Tourist towns on the edge: Conceptualising vulnerability and resilience in a protected area tourism system. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *22*(4), 646–665. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2013.855222

Fennell, D. A. (2014). Exploring the boundaries of a new moral order for tourism's global code of ethics: An opinion piece on the position of animals in the tourism industry. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *22*(7), 983–996. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.918137

Franklin, A. (2009). The sociology of tourism. In T. Jamal & M. Robinson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies* (pp. 65–81). SAGE.

Franks, B. (2019). What do animals want? *Animal Welfare*, *28*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.7120/09627286.28.1.001

Franks, B., Webb, C., Gagliano, M., & Smuts, B. (2020). Conventional science will not do justice to nonhuman interests: A fresh approach is required. *Animal Sentience*, *4*(27), 17. https://doi.org/10.51291/2377-7478.1552

Gamble, C. N., Hanan, J. S., & Nail, T. (2019). What is new materialism? *Angelaki*, *24*(6), 111–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969725X.2019.1684704

Gibson, C. (2021). Critical tourism studies: New directions for volatile times. *Tourism Geographies*, *23*(4), 659–677. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2019.1647453

Goeldner, C. R. (2005). Reflections on the historic role of journals in shaping tourism knowledge. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, *16*(2), 44–51. https://doi.org/10.3316/ielapa.200603951

Gössling, S., Hall, C. M., & Weaver, D. (2009). *Sustainable tourism futures: Perspectives on systems, restructuring and innovations*. Routledge.

Guia, J. (2021). Conceptualizing justice tourism and the promise of posthumanism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *29*(2-3), 503–520. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1771347

Guia, J., & Jamal, T. (2020). A (Deleuzian) posthumanist paradigm for tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *84*, 102982. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102982

Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulecene*. Duke University Press.

Haraway, D. (2018). Making kin in the Chthulucene: Reproducing multispecies justice. In A. E. Clarke & D. Haraway (Eds.), *Making kin not population* (pp. 67–99). Prickly Paradigm Press.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2018). The potential for justice through tourism. *Via Tourism Review*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.4000/viatourism.2469

Higham, J., Font, X., & Wu, J. (2022). Code red for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *30*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2022.2008128

Hollinshead, K. (2004a). A primer in ontological craft: The creative capture of people and places through qualitative research. In L. Goodson & J. Phillimore (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies* (pp. 63–82). Routledge.

Hollinshead, K. (2004b). Ontological craft in tourism studies: The productive mapping of identity and image in tourism settings. In L. Goodson & J. Phillimore (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies* (pp. 83–101). Routledge.

Hollinshead, K. (2010). Tourism studies and confined understanding: The call for a "new sense" postdisciplinary imaginary. *Tourism Analysis*, *15*(4), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.3727/108354210X12864727693669

Hollinshead, K. (2012). The under-conceptualisations of tourism studies: The case for postdisciplinary knowing. In I. Ateljevic, N. Morgan, & A. Pritchard (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope* (pp. 55–72). Taylor & Francis.

Hollinshead, K. (2021). Thinking imaginatively via generative vitality in tourism studies (after Deleuze). *Journal of Tourismology*, *7*(2), 149–170. https://doi.org/10.26650/jot.2021.7.2.943900

Hollinshead, K., Ateljevic, I., & Ali, N. (2009). Worldmaking agency–worldmaking authority: The sovereign constitutive role of tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, *11*(4), 427–443. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616680903262562

Hopkins, D. (2021). Crises and tourism mobilities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *29*(9), 1423–1435. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1905969

Jafari, J., & Ritchie, B. J. R. (1981). Toward a framework for tourism education: Problems and prospects. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *8*(1), 13–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(81)90065-7

Jamal, T., & Stronza, A. (2008). 'Dwelling' with ecotourism in the Peruvian Amazon: Cultural relationships in local–global spaces. *Tourist Studies*, *8*(3), 313–335. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797608100593

Kumm, B. E., Berbary, L. A., & Grimwood, B. S. R. (2019). For those to come: An introduction to why posthumanism matters. *Leisure Sciences*, *41*(5), 341–347. https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2019.1628677

Ladegaard, H. J., & Phipps, A. (2020). Intercultural research and social activism. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *20*(2), 67–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2020.1729786

Lew, A. A., Cheer, J. M., Haywood, M., Brouder, P., & Salazar, N. B. (2020). Visions of travel and tourism after the global COVID-19 transformation of 2020. *Tourism Geographies*, *22*(3), 455–466. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1770326

Matteucci, X., Nawijn, J., & von Zumbusch, J. (2022). A new materialist governance paradigm for tourism destinations. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *30*(1), 169–184. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1924180

McKercher, B., & Prideaux, B. (2014). Academic myths of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *46*, 16–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.02.003

McKercher, B., & Tung, V. (2015). Publishing in tourism and hospitality journals: Is the past a prelude to the future? *Tourism Management*, *50*, 306–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.03.008

Mihalič, T., & Fennell, D. (2015). In pursuit of a more just international tourism: The concept of trading tourism rights. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *23*(2), 188–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.943763

Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., Causevic, S., & Minnaert, L. (2018). Ten years of critical tourism studies: Reflections on the road less traveled. *Tourism Analysis*, *23*(2), 183–187. https://doi.org/10.3727/108354218X15210313504535

Munar, A. M., Pernecky, T., & Feighery, W. (2016). An introduction to tourism postdisciplinarity. *Tourism Analysis* *21*(4), 343–347. https://doi.org/10.3727/108354216X14600320851578

Paulson, S. (2019, December 6). *Making kin: An interview with Donna Haraway*. Los Angeles Review of Books. https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/making-kin-an-interview-with-donna-haraway/

Pernecky, T. (2016). *Epistemology and metaphysics for qualitative research*. SAGE.

Pernecky, T. (2020a). An unintroduction to postdisciplinarity. In T. Pernecky (Ed.), *Postdisciplinary knowledge*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429058561-1

Pernecky, T. (2020b). Critical tourism scholars: Brokers of hope. *Tourism Geographies*, *22*(3), 657–666. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1760925

Pernecky, T. (in press). Postdisciplinarity. In F. Darbellay (Ed.), *Elgar encyclopedia of inter- and transdisciplinarity*. Edward Elgar.

Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2007). De-centring tourism's intellectual universe, or traversing the dialogue between change and tradition. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard, & N. Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 11–28). Elsevier.

Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., & Ateljevic, I. (2011). Hopeful tourism: A new transformative perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *38*(3), 941–963. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.01.004

Ren, C. (2011). Non-human agency, radical ontology and tourism realities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *38*(3), 858–881. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2010.12.007

Ren, C., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2010). Constructing tourism research: A critical inquiry. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *37*(4), 885–904. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.11.006

Scott, D., & Gössling, S. (2022). Destination net-zero: What does the international energy agency roadmap mean for tourism? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *30*(1), 14–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1962890

Scott, D., Hall, C. M., & Stefan, G. (2012). *Tourism and climate change: Impacts, adaptation and mitigation*. Routledge.

Stinson, M. J., Hurst, C. E., & Grimwood, B. S. R. (2022). Tracing the materiality of reconciliation in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *94*(2022), 103380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2022.103380

Swain, M. B. (2009). The cosmopolitan hope of tourism: Critical action and worldmaking vistas. *Tourism Geographies*, *11*(4), 505–525. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616680903262695

Thrift, N. (1996). *Spatial formations*. SAGE.

Thrift, N. (2007). *Non-representational theory: Space, politics, affect*. Routledge.

Tribe, J. (1997). The indiscipline of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *24*(3), 638–657. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(97)00020-0

van der Duim, R., Ren, C., & Jóhannesson, G. T. (2017). ANT: A decade of interfering with tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *64*, 139–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2017.03.006

Wearing, S., McDonald, M., & Ponting, J. (2005). Building a decommodified research paradigm in tourism: The contribution of NGOs. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *13*(5), 424–439. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580508668571

Whitehead, A. N. (1978). *Process and reality*. The Free Press.

Wilson, E., & Hollinshead, K. (2015). Qualitative tourism research: Opportunities in the emergent soft sciences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *54*, 30–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.06.001

Winter, C. (2020). A review of research into animal ethics in tourism: Launching the annals of tourism research curated collection on animal ethics in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *84*, 102989. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102989

World Tourism Organisation (WTO). (2001). Global code of ethics for tourism. https://www.unwto.org/global-code-of-ethics-for-tourism

Xiao, H., Jafari, J., Cloke, P., & Tribe, J. (2013). Annals: 40–40 vision. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *40*(Suppl. C), 352–385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.10.003