

Maximiliano E. Korstanje^a, Geoffrey R. Skoll^b

^aUniversity of Palermo (Buenos Aires, Argentina); PhD, Professor; e-mail: mkorst@palermo.edu

^bBuffalo State College the State University of New York (Buffalo, NY, USA); PhD, Associate Professor; e-mail: skollgr@buffalostate.edu, skoll@uwm.edu

TOURIST RISK: AN ALL ENCOMPASSING MODEL TO UNDERSTAND SAFETY IN TOURISM FIELDS

Though risk perception theory has advanced a lot over the last decades, its preferred methodologies much of them closed-led questionnaires or intrusive instruments obscures the derived conclusions. This text aims not only to explore the problems and limitation of risk perception theory to understand the difference between fear, anxiety, panic and risk, but also the tourist-safety. The adoption of risk research, post 9/11 was based on quantitative methods alone. This creates a serious conceptual myopia to understand the connection of risk and late-capitalism. Our attempt to fulfill this gap is shown in this essay-review.

Keywords: risk, fears, tourism, disasters, epistemology.

1. Introduction. Every culture has developed ways to adapt to its environment. One method is the construction of feared object which serves as a mechanism to adjust social perceptions of danger. Elements which instill fear vary from one society to another [35]. In recent years policy makers in the tourism and hospitality industry have acknowledged problems with mass media in maintaining images of tourist destinations. Through an ever changing world, where humankind seems to be subject to a state of instability, the tourism industry is affected by a kind of risk inflation. Though many sociologists have observed that risks are inextricably intertwined with postmodernism [4, 6, 22, 45], the fact is that the term was widely adopted by tourism fields after the September 11, 2001 (9/11) attacks to World Trade Center and Pentagon [8, 11, 12, 17, 18, 49]. The attacks caused serious financial losses to tourism even years after the event. In part, this has been because terrorists employed mobile technologies, which are the pride of West, against the symbolic epicenter of world. At bottom, the message was that nobody will feel safe anywhere anymore [29, 34, 78].

Although the concept of risk has served scholarship on the safety of tourist destina-

tions, there remains much to say about the conceptual problems of risk. The present essay aims to explore not only the roots of risk in capitalist societies and attendant methodological limitations, but also to differentiate among fear, risk, and safety. We argue that an all encompassing model is needed to understand tourism risks and needs for protection required by the industry.

2. Fear. Fear can be defined as a basic emotion, which protects the survival of an organism. Not just human beings, but all animals experience fear of external threatening stimuli. Alerted by fear, the organism has three possible reactions: paralysis, attack, or withdrawal [20, 44, 54, 65]. Nonetheless, the concepts of behavioral psychology have not embraced by other social sciences. Anthropology has developed its own sense of what fear means. Although, recognizing a strong neurobiological basis that reduces or enhances the fear, ethnologists evaluate the social factors by which some fears are over-valORIZED while other rejected [47]. Therefore, culture plays a vital role not only conferring a specific meaning to objects, but also to fears.

Mary Douglas, a pioneer scholar interested in exploring the connection of fear, evil, and

risk, argued that psychological fear represents an attempt to react when faced with a hostile situation. To some extent, the preservation of culture is at stake in contexts of uncertainty or instability. When socialized, fear unites a society. Without fear, Douglas added, societies would experience substantial fragmentation [14]. In subsequent studies, Douglas developed a new thesis arguing that risk, danger, and sin are intertwined social constructs. Sin and risk give further legitimacy to the status quo, which would otherwise discredit privileged groups if they did not give solutions to lay people. Risk and sin both provide rationalizations for how the world works. The potentiality of threat provides legitimation for social solidarity and status hierarchies [15].

Anthropological perspectives gained less notice in their treatment of the problem of fear for two reasons. First, psychological explanations advanced considerably with recourse to neuro-dynamic explanations for emotions. Second, sociologists tended to devote attention to risk. Consequently, the qualitative meaning and narrative of fear failed to expand to other social areas of study. In psychology, fear represents a basic emotion. Academic psychologists have largely eschewed qualitative approaches to study fear. They have left the study of fear as a subjective experience in the hands of philosophy.

Philosophically, the self experiences anxiety when faced with a decision. Existentialism defined anxiety as a result of freedom or uncertainty. The self opts for a way out of choosing. While fear corresponds with a specific object or stimulus, anxiety has an abstract nature produced by the presence of nothingness [27, 31].

3. Risk. Following the observations of K. Tierney, risks should be defined as any probability of damage resulting from an event where the integrities of victims are at stake. In recent decades, sociologists have treated risk as a social construction. Within sociology, two contrasting waves have historically discussed the nature of risk [67]. One group explored the probability of harm, focusing on the effects of unseen risk for social systems. Another paid attention to the perception of citizens and the paradoxes this generates [16]. The specialized literature in risk management took the pragmatic perspective that bad evaluations of risk

may lead to bad decisions. In this sense, efforts to mitigate risks open new ones [52].

Z. Bauman [3] explained that risks are social constructions to try to control the future. In the Middle Ages, happiness was thought to be restricted to few people, who can attain it only through suffering and expiation. The American Revolution introduced a radical change in the way that happiness was conceived, as suggested by Thomas Jefferson's claim in the Declaration of Independence (1776) that the pursuit of happiness is a self evident truth of the human condition. This assertion of a global right to happiness broadened its possibilities, but linked the possibility of happiness to freedom and choices. Risk, then, came to regulate the uncertainty of the future, but also conferred on the subject the liability for failure to be happy.

Ulrich Beck has argued that modernity opened new global risks, which were alien to the medieval world view. Chernobyl in the Ukraine was the symbolic of the role played by technology in fabricating new risks. In Beck's view, technology had helped enhance security, but today it generates new and dire risks that threaten human existence. In Beck's «risk society» the old modes of production, which fabricated commodities, have turned into methods that produce risks [4, 5]. Parallel to Beck, Anthony Giddens acknowledged globalization as a project based on two key factors. The first is that money has come to serve as a mechanism of connecting presence with absences, or needs with their satisfaction throughout the world. The second element is a network of experts, who not only evaluate potential risks but also devise ways for mitigating risks. Starting from the premise that experts monopolize the trust of lay people, for Giddens, risk is what society creates to sustain its efficient functioning [22, 23].

In opposition to Giddens's argument, Niklas Luhmann has criticized the thesis of risk society because of the increasing alarmism it spreads in public consciousness. Certainly, Luhmann adds, risks always are rooted into a previous profits or benefit, whereby the subject should decide. It corresponds with the principle of contingency. Unfortunately Beck did not contemplate the distinction between risk and threat. While risk signifies a previous decision by the self, threat refers to something external

to the self. A terrorist attack, an airplane accident, or a natural disaster are threats, since the victims have no way to reverse the situation. The passengers in an airplane crash have no way of avoiding the harm. In contrast, for the air travel company owner, who opted to reduce costs, the accidents are a risk. Generally, those who make the decision are generators of risks. They are not the same as those who face the risks [45]. J. Richardson says that threats which jeopardize society are introduced in the social system by means of knowledge. Risk, in these terms, would be the efforts to intellectualize the future by offsetting costs and benefits. The final decision made on the possibility to face or avoid the damage is given by the degree of contingency, with respect to the problem to be solved [60]. This seems to be the reason why technology designed to mitigate risks under some conditions of uncertainty, generates new risks. A discussion of this nature, coined in the core of social sciences, has not been duly evaluated in tourism fields. In the next section, some of the more relevant studies in tourism risk are scrutinized.

4. Tourist Risk. The theory of risk perception has more than forty years of empirical research behind it. Nonetheless, it has been adopted by tourism industry only after the attacks of 9/11 [7, 8, 11, 12, 19, 24, 41, 75]. Why is risk important for tourism industry?

S. Dolnicar [11] argued that the intangibility of tourist products generates a high degree of uncertainty in consumers. He said that the tourist industry needs a model that helps policy makers to delineate and define types of risks so that mitigations can be deployed. Following this argument, A. Fuchs and G. Reichel [21] classify risks depending on the human intervention: there are risks which are fabricated by human beings, while others like disasters followed natural reasons. In recent decades, the world has witnessed disasters and crises which have affected tourism. J.C. Henderson [28] evaluated the importance of risk management plans to mitigate potential risk for the industry. If risks are controlled, the disaster can be prevented. The perception of risk, far from being pathological, is conducive to recreate a precautionary principle so that the society can avoid the catastrophe. The theory of risk applied in the context of leisure and tourism can

be classified in four main categories: a) social bonds, b) nationality and cultural differences, c) residency, d) personality.

Scholars who assert that risk perception is limited or enhanced by the trust travellers have were very popular in the first decade of the twenty-first century. They proposed that those travelers who were accompanied by relatives or friends perceive less risk than other groups. The sentiments of vulnerability are awakened when the travelers go beyond the security of home would be controlled by the social trust associated with accompanying companions [9, 55, 61, 75]. A. Reichel, G. Fuchs, and N. Uriely [58] found that those who prioritized the political instability as the main threat at time of vacationing, travelers in company of others are more likely to suffer physical wounds than single travelers.

For other scholars, nationality was the significant variable that explains the variation of risk perception. H. Sackett and D. Botterill [62] collected evidence that British and Americans perceive more risk than other nationalities. This happens because of the Anglo-American alliance in the Iraq and Afghanistan invasions. These findings were previously inferred by P. Dominguez, E. Burgette and A. Bernard [13]. To these researchers, nationality plays a vital role in risk perception depending on the geopolitical policies of their respective countries. C. Ertuna and Z. I. Ertuna [17] validate the idea that there is a connection between risk perception and national or religious affiliation. The mass media disseminate news about terrorism and political instability worldwide. Those nationalities directly involved in international disputes would develop more sensibility to risk than others. For example, while British holiday-makers perceived less risk from natural disasters after the tsunami in Sri Lanka, other nationals, such as Germans and Italians, confessed to experience more concerns. The psychological impacts deepened on the number of victims portrayed by the media.

The place of residency seems to be another variable that explains why risk evolves over time. M. Floyd, et al. [19] explain that inhabitants of New York City showed higher anxieties after 9/11. This trauma persisted for approximately one year, and was more persistent in those nearer to ground zero. After the

attacks, Americans closed their collective perception, and tended to think that going beyond the country was a dangerous and risky venture. J.Y. Wong and C. Yeh [73] focused on the decision at time of selecting the holiday destination. The level of reliable knowledge and not residency would be the variable that determines whether a destination is avoided. Though risk tends to be rooted in a territory, the sense of danger is broadly associated with more complex trends. The 9/11 attacks represented the onset of a new way of imagining urban life in great cities. What scares people is not proximity to ground zero, but living in urban spaces. Terrorism is presented by establishment media as not occurring in rural areas [74, 75]. Psychologically, we tend to compare the context of risk to be replicated in related environments.

A final viewpoint considered here, emphasizes psychological character or personality as the main factor for analysis. Originally, the pioneer in these types of investigation was Stanley Plog who argued that there is a relation between personality and perception of the environment. Though he was strongly criticized in how he formed the model, it paved the ways for the upsurge of much applied investigation. A. Lepp and H. Gibson [43] wrote that tourist travel is subject to two contrasting sentiments: the quest for novelty and the need for safety. To some extent, the cultural incompatibility between tourist originating and receiving countries may reduce the travelers' feelings of safety. Their degree of adaptation to new landscapes is partially determined by their personalities. While some tourists are sensation seekers, others are risk averse. M. Kozak, J. Crofts and R. Law found the following [40]:

- a) Risk attracts some travelers who change their original destination to seek it.
- b) Those personalities based on higher degree of tolerance to change do not need to alter their plans in context of adversity.
- c) News of disasters or catastrophe not only affect the place of occurrence, but also neighboring countries.
- d) Risks are not restricted to specific locales, but extend too much wider regions.

e) While travellers coming from industrial societies are concerned about terrorism, travelers from underdeveloped nations fear virus outbreaks.

f) Personality variations explain why some travellers perceive more risk than others.

Y. Reisinger and F. Mavondo [59] and D. Yun and T. McLaurin [76] present a scale based on 22 categories to measure the safety of tourist destinations. The specialized literature fails to explain the correlation of personality and risk perception, because the evidence is not conclusive. A remaining question concerns the role of culture as a template for determining which aspects of life are salient in terms of travel safety.

Although research in tourism and risk has advanced in recent years, many of the stereotypes and limitations among tourism scholars were first laid down by the pioneer research conducted by W. Roehl and D. Fesenmaier [61]. Drawing a sample of 258 participants, they found that perception of risk varied with the purpose for travel. Based on an answer-rate of 64 percent, this study concluded that demographic variables of travelers such as age, gender, and family structure correlated directly with risk perception. Social bonds played an important role in explaining why some travelers opt for some destinations while they exclude others. Although Fesenmaier and Roehl's work illuminated whole of the subsequent research in risk fields, their focus was based on a business plan to protect tourist destinations, instead of expanding the current understanding of the issue. The first problem lies in the way they defined risk. Mathematicians evaluate the evolution of risks using complex software which studies the decision making process of participants. However, risk-related research in tourism is based on open or closed-ended questionnaires written to refute or validate hypotheses. Later, these questions are correlated by following complex algorithms to make stable queues or segments, which can be examined to discover tourist perceptions. The goal of these researchers is to give some preview on the tendencies of the tourism market and its segments. The participants' views and attitudes are subject to substantial reductions.

Quantitative research emphasizes data from standardized questionnaires and closed-ended questions. This means that what Roehl & Fesenmaier obtain is the declaration of participants, who sometimes are not familiar with the reasons for their own behavior. Participants may simply lie to impress the researcher. W. Roehl and D. Fesenmaier initiated a new way of investigation, but also introduced techniques of engineering in the production of knowledge. Their assumptions, models, and methods were replicated by followers who, eager for legitimacy and greater status, appeared to make «science». In so doing, they used the experimental model, but fundamentally, their goals were not scientific. Risk studies wanted to promote sales, delving into the psychology of those who have capital to spend – the tourists. Besides, it is contradictory to apply probabilistic models to analyze non-probabilistic methods, such as open-ended questionnaires.

Tourism researchers interested in risk tried to draw larger samples of tourists while excluding other agents who participate actively in the tourist system such as professionals or staff. The researchers concentrated on understanding economic demand by travelers and visitors. Questionnaires were oriented to the consumer. Some other researchers targeted hotel operators using the Delphi or focus group methods. The over valorization of tourists as the axis of industry not only was replicated in risk related issues, but also paved the way to an ethnocentric discourse.

4.1 Conceptual Problems of Risk studies.

There are no scientific reasons for arguing that risk is strictly linked to probability, nor for seeing risk with a strictly quantitative paradigm. Tourism risk studies mainly have aimed at exploring the connection between risk perception and tourism consumption. Their goals are given by the needs of indentifying, controlling, and mitigating some dysfunctional or inefficient factors which jeopardize the tourist industry. A wide range of potential threats ranges from natural disasters to terrorism [50, 55, 75]. What is noteworthy is that travels and tourist destinations are not the same. Sometimes, risk investigation treats tourist destinations as the all-encompassing unit of analysis. These views lead us to trivialize travel as a psy-

chological process which begins and ends irrespective of the date we purchase the ticket.

For example, researchers following terrorism issues do not focus on the biographies of terrorists, but on the perceptions of travelers. The demand, not the offering, is important for these scholars. Their formulated goals lead to basic contradictions. First and foremost, they fail to recognize that perception is the result of social context. We cannot obtain answers to questions without connecting what people say and do. Some misunderstanding is based on the discrepancy by statements and psychological arousal. We may accept some risks without being concerned about them. For example, most people do not hesitate to leave their homes for fear of being struck by lightning, although that risk is far greater than the risk from terrorist attacks. Secondly, less attention was given to the role played by ideology which confers specific reasons for fear. For example, K. Wolff, S. Larsen and R. Doran [71, 72] have been documented a contradiction in the way people construct risk. Despite two attacks against civilians in Norway, interviewees feel this country is safer than others. The attraction of New York as a symbolic centre of civilization made other attacks fall into oblivion.

Other methodological problems with these empirical studies are related to the criterion of sampling. Some samples are not balanced in proportion to the number of participants [61, 62], or the criterion of justification is weak [13, 56, 57, 73]. In other studies, questionnaires are ethnocentric ignoring a division between industrial and rural minds or world views [41] or replicating values associated with nationalism or chauvinism [76], while other studies are determined by conditioned answers because questionnaires are written in English or conducted in the pre-embarkation sections of transportation facilities [73]. If I interview tourists who are about to travel, their sentiments will be different were I do the same at home. Since the context conditions responses, they should be compared in diverse environments. Another clear error in these studies is the way the question is formulated. Sentences such as, «I feel fear to travel abroad», do not reveal any risk, but reveal the prejudice of researchers who consider the world an unsafe place.

On another hand, such studies make no clear distinction between risk seekers and risk avoiders. Many of these studies merely assume risk is dysfunctional for international tourism demand. W. Aschauer [2] criticized the risk paradigm for being oriented to businesses, marketing, and profits, as they confuse safety with risk. Indeed, some tourists elect extreme sports and seek elevated the risks to gain status and prestige. Their psychological structure gives meaning to the risk while their perception plays a neutral role. Both categories work in diverse spheres of human minds. Negative evaluation of some destinations is not explained by the risk itself, but by how it is communicated [2]. Safety, and not risk, should be prioritized as a fertile ground of investigation in tourism fields.

Methodologically, if we conduct investigation prioritizing quantitative techniques, the outcome will not explain the behaviour. We will see only correlations between two or more variables. To understand what is happening in the field, we need to introduce qualitative methods to complement the quantitative one [33, 64, 77]. Quite aside from the size of the sample, the correlation of both variables does not entail explanations of why that correlation occurs. That is, there is no causal connection, no accounting for the mechanisms producing the correlations. For example, considerable evidence suggests that women perceive more risk than men. Following a quantitative reading, one might infer the gender is a variable of risk perception but this exhibits an ecological fallacy. Males are socialized and educated to repress their emotions. Though they feel fear, they avoid voicing or otherwise exhibiting fearful emotions. On the contrary, females are socialized to communicate fear and other emotions [6]. P. Manning [48] recognizes the importance of understanding that social practice is embedded in a structure whereby discourse is articulated. Understanding how the narratives of safety are orchestrated, overvalored or silenced, researchers can get a more profound idea of the object of study. This is the reason why questionnaires and interviews alone are not useful in understanding social issues.

C. Waterton and B. Wynne [68] conducted an investigation in towns such as Sellafield

(UK), which are next to nuclear plants. Under some conditions, inhabitants at risk of dangerous exposure intellectualize their situation, repressing their fear and displacing it or negating it with sentiments such as pride and stoicism to rationalize their persistence in a dangerous place. This reveals that risk may confer strong attachments of identity where real dangers become a criterion of status and social distinction. Unless the qualitative view is introduced in risk perception research, biased diagnoses may lead scholars to inaccurate or partial explanations.

Last but not least, one of the main problems of this perspective on risk and tourism relates to the ethnocentric discourse it disseminates. Whenever risk perception is circumscribed within a specific geographical point, as is the case with many of these studies, outcomes tend to demonize civilians living there. If we consider the Middle East a dangerous place, psychologically we will avoid any direct contact with Muslims. This creates geographies of two types: secure and insecure. At a first glance, the former attract more investment and tourism than the latter. Nonetheless, both are inextricably intertwined. Those destinations previously considered unsafe not only direct tourist flows towards particular points, but valorize the product [42]. From an ideological discourse, the theory of risk perception seems to be associated with geopolitical interests, reinforcing the dependency between centre and periphery. Recently, M. Korstanje and D.H. Olsen [37] and M. Korstanje and P. Tarlow [38] explored the qualitative archetype of risk and danger in the American cinema industry. Scholars agreed that not only did 9/11 create a new paradigm to understand horror movies, but also supported an ideological discourse where American tourists feel superior to other nationalities. The events of 9/11 created a hierarchy of tourists where their value is determined by their nationalities. Effects of 9/11 blurred the memories of other events. It became a mythical date so that the forces of order – the United States, Britain, and their allies, which not coincidentally were the colonial powers – launched their crusade against evil. Terrorism, in this view, became represented as the main threat for the West in this century.

Tourists who are victims of attacks, and terrorists share the same cultural values in many respects. Both trust in physical displacement as an instrument of status. Moving to other spaces to rest or knowing diverse landscapes is a pattern terrorists know well in order to plan their attacks. They have been widely educated in Western universities. Because the World Trade Centre and mobile communication industry is a value for West, they have become targets of international terrorism. If Mohammed Atta, one of the leading perpetrators of 9/11, would not know of the importance of civil aviation for the Western public as a source of pride, he would never have opted to direct an airplane against a commercial tower. To better characterize risk we need to launch an exploration of the world of hospitality, as more than a mere set of hotels or leisure industries today. The original sense of hospitality is protection, and the precariousness given by existence.

4.2. The nature of Hospitality and Danger reduction. The multidisciplinary approach has framed hospitality in diverse ways, sometimes obscuring its nature. The managerial sectors unfortunately have monopolized the production of knowledge about hospitality. These studies emphasize the commercial value it confers to a tourist destination and its amenities. In a paper entitled «Theorizing Hospitality,» Lynch et al [46] argue that in social sciences two waves have predominated at different times which delineate the nature of hospitality. While hospitality as a mechanism of control signifies the capacity to control strangers by making their presence more familiar, hospitality as a gift exchange alludes to reciprocity as the stepping stone of social cohesion. As Marshal Sahlins [63] put it, hospitality is the human sign of reciprocity based on gift exchange. The social order and its politics, economies, and demography are structured according to how and where goods are circulated. Historians and archaeologists have developed an all-encompassing theory of hospitality. As shared defences against external attacks, it conferred a common protection in times of war, during which times there developed a compromise with trade and mobility. The rite of hospitality, in ancient times, enabled a circle of reciprocity among clans and

tribes [1, 25, 32, 69, 70]. The act of traveling combines two contrasting tendencies, curiosity and the need for protection [35]. At the time that travellers seek to visit new lands, customs, and cultures to validate their own identity; their absence from home can engender a fear. The same applies to the host community which has no idea about the new comer. The pact of hospitality not only undermines the potential risk created by the encounter of hosts and guests, but allows the exchange of gifts. Classical mythology and texts are fraught with examples about the pervasive nature of hospitality. Heracles was invited by Faunus King (Pan) to enjoy his hospitality. The Greek hero realizes the real interests of the king who wanted to kill him while he slept. The dilemma of hospitality rests on the dichotomy between secrecy and appearance. The host does not know the intention of guest. Conversely, the guest may be killed in a state of vulnerability that hospitality offers. Therefore, the exchange between parties entails the possibility of avoiding aggression. Hospitality is a divine mandate. If the host takes advantage of the vulnerability of the guest, the gods intervene causing disasters and climate catastrophes. The studies of ancient myths help explain how the problem of danger posed by the stranger was channelled toward the pacts of hospitality and the elements hospitality's origin [36, 39]. Whatever the case may be, randomness and conflicts may arise at any time. There are a plenty of myths from Helen/Paris to Heracles/Faunus, where hospitality sets the stage for hostility at any moment. In this vein, the philosopher Daniel Innerarity conceptualizes risk as part of the rite of hospitality. One of the most interesting aspects of risk is associated with its forms, which are shaped by those of the host society. Whenever one may face to uncertainty, hospitality makes the sojourn more predictable. Negotiations vary depending on culture and society. While Americans worry about thermonuclear weapons, Latin Americans worry about local crime. Innerarity explores institutional frailties accelerated by postmodernism. The ethic of hospitality keeps the dialectics of two or more cultures from the randomness of encounters with strangers; like a guest who appears suddenly asking for hospitality, risk is part of our life. The frenetic

quest of zero risk is not only anti-human but can lead humankind to a complete disaster. Innerarity also reminds us how any planned policy that attempts to regulate the future open the door to the new risks which were not foreseen [30]. Kevin O’Gorman [51] addresses hospitality from a philosophical foundation. Though many scholars cite Derrida to legitimate their arguments in hospitality-related issues, less attention was given to the fact hospitality still remains a mystery which is almost impossible to frame as an object of scientific investigation. Andrews, Roberts, and Selwyn [1] explain that the roots of hospitality derive from eroticism. The conceptualization of what is the erotic served as linkage to communicate people inside a social order. Commercial hospitality, therefore, not only undermines its real nature but also reduces the social trust of among all parties. An interesting point of discussion is the extent to which the host-guest interplay comes from the politics of love. Another interesting question pertains to the relation of hospitality with politics. The archetype of otherness as it has formulated by anthropology and ethnology emerged against selfhood. This dialectic relationship maintained the mythical structure of what is good or bad in the West. Anthony Pagden has reviewed the political uses of the concept of hospitality to legitimate the conquest of the Americas, and the doctrine of free transit that facilitated the expansion of capitalism and establishment of nation-states [53].

The best example how risk and hospitality work is the horror cinema. Travellers and tourists may be presented as naïve teenagers who are not interested in connecting with local culture. This indifference leads to hedonist practices far away from the industrial societies where they are subject to father’s yoke. The consumption (abusing) of drugs, which is associated with indiscriminate sex, confer to sightseers the veil of what misconduct. The same needs for escaping from oppressive industrial nations lead these tourists to the jaw of evil. From *Psychosis* to *Hostel* the nature of evil-doers is determined by their inability to offer a real hospitality. They introduce tourists to a paradise of food, sex, wine, and all sorts of pleasures. Beyond the theatre of pleasure, the villain plans to kill their guests while they

are defenceless [37, 38]. This ancient point of connection between cultures has prevailed over thousands of years in Europe and other continents. The concept of hospitality gives provides communities with a dialectic bridge to go beyond the uncertainties generated by acculturation. Risk-related research may be improved if the metaphor of hospitality would be taken seriously. The allegory of hospitality as a protective cocoon for vulnerable travellers is found in ancient Greek, Celtic, and German mythology. It offers a fertile source for investigating new sources for understanding risk.

Today, nation-states appealed to the complexity of modern soft ware systems to control the entrance and departures of citizens. These systems, however, are based on the ancient institution of hospitality. The term visa, for example, comes from Latin *Visum*, which means scrutinizing. The state needs to see who the newcomers are, their intentions, and of course their patrimony. In terms of Derrida [10], this restricted hospitality maintains stability of the homeland by means of the stranger’s silence. Most certainly, the issuance of visas and migratory regulations derive from the institution of hospitality. Finally, cultures evolve because of adaptations to disasters and the hostility of environment. A radical historical view of religion suggests that the question of transcendence and divinity is employed by human beings to locate why the universe is not working as we desire. Any glitch – disasters mass death, or serious other problems in the system of production – calls for the protection of the gods [66]. We treat others as God treats us. The mandate of hospitality asks for stranger’s protection in the same way we would be cared for in the afterlife. The sedentary society’s located production and attachment to a territory needs a more mechanism of control than do hunter-gatherer society. The wall as a protective barrier is the precondition for the fabrication of dangers and risks. The fear of traveling as issue has accentuated by industrialism that presented property as the only source of communication. At the time our trust in gods declined, we opted to reject the hospitality as a form of relation closing boundaries to all but those travellers who can pay. The pact of hospitality is a type of ethic for aliens.

5. Conclusion. Undoubtedly, we live in a society of risks. This essay has explored much of the literature relevant to tourism, hospitality, and risk; and explained the limitations as it has been adopted in tourism fields. Those limitations are both theoretical and methodological. Both shortcomings derive from the scholarly context of the field. Tourism studies have remained too closely tied to business models. Tourism studies remains mired in an actuarial approach designed to maximize business plans for maximizing profits in a competitive field. Not unlike the insurance industry, those who employ better actuarial analyses will in the long run obtain more profits than their competitors. This approach, one in which tourists are treated like commodities and consumers, can never gain standing as a true form of academic scholarship. Only when tourism studies transform themselves into true social studies that seek basic knowledge about the human condition will they be able to shake off their current, overly rationalized, in the Weberian sense, models, methods, and theories. Ironically, were tourism studies able to adopt true social scientific

approaches and viewpoints, tourism studies would probably be more effective for profitable business planning by orders of magnitude. A better understanding of how and why people tour and why they go where they go would be far more useful than the current state of knowledge that skims the surface of tourists patterns of travel. To fix the problems resulted from the managerial perspective, a sociological read of hospitality in the fields of politics control and gift-exchange would be fertile grounds for further exploration. Since traveling represents a big epistemological rupture for traveler-delivering and hosting cultures, hospitality paves the ways to reduce and control the potential sentiment of anxieties and conflicts. We have discussed the current conceptual misjudgment of whole risk research adopted in tourism fields, as well as focused on its interest at ignoring hospitality as something else than a classic industry of leisure and entertainment. The rite of hospitality traverses almost a whole of European and non-European cultures. Its conceptualization surfaced by human vulnerability and fragility in this world.

References:

1. **Andrews H., Roberts L., Selwyn T.** Hospitality and eroticism. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2007, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 247–262.
2. **Aschauer W.** Perception of tourists at risky destinations. A model of psychological influence factors. *Tourism Review*, 2010, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 4–20.
3. **Bauman Z.** *La Sociedad Sitiada*. Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2011.
4. **Beck U.** *La Sociedad del Riesgo: hacia una nueva modernidad*. Buenos Aires, Paidós, 2006.
5. **Beck U.** Convivir con el Riesgo Global. *En La Humanidad Amenazada: gobernar los riesgos globales*. D. Innerarity y Solana, J (Editores). Madrid, Paidós, 2011, pp. 21–32.
6. **Becker P.** Whose Risks? Gender and the Ranking of Hazards. *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 2011, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 423–433.
7. **Bhattarai K., Conway D., Shrestha N.** Tourism, terrorism and turmoil in Nepal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 2005, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 669–688.
8. **Boniface B., Cooper C.** *World-wide destinations: the geography of travel and tourism*. New York: Elsevier, 2009.
9. **Castaño J.M.** *Psicología Social de los Viajes y el Turismo*. Madrid, Thomson Ed., 2005.
10. **Derrida J., Dufourmantelle A.** *Of hospitality*. Palo Alto, CA, Stanford University Press, 2000.
11. **Dolnicar S.** Fear Segment in tourism. *CD Proceedings of the 14 International Research Conference of the Council for Australian University and Hospitality Education*. CAUTHE. 1–5 Febrero de 2005, Australia, 2005.
12. **Dolnicar S.** Understanding barriers to leisure travel, tourists fears as marketing basis. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 2005, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 197–208.
13. **Domínguez P., Burguette E., Bernard A.** Efectos del 11 de Septiembre en la hotelería Mexicana: reflexión sobre la mono-dependencia turística. *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, 2003, vol. 12, no. 3–4, pp. 335–348.
14. **Douglas M.** *Risk and Blame*. New York, Routledge, 1992.
15. **Douglas M.** *Pureza y Peligro: un análisis de los conceptos de contaminación y tabú*. Buenos Aires, Nueva Visión, 2007.

16. **Duclos D.** Le Risque: une construction sociale? En J. Fabiani, y J Thyès. *La Societéé Vulnerable*. Paris, Ecole Normale Superieure, 1987, pp. 91–92.
17. **Ertuna C., Ertuna Z.I.** The Sensitivity of German and British tourists to new shocks. *Tourism Review*, 2009, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 19–27.
18. **Floyd M., Pennington-Gray L.** Profiling risk: perception of tourist. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 2004, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 1051–1054.
19. **Floyd M., Gibson H., Pennington-Gray L., Thapa B.** The Effects of risk perception on intention to travel in the aftermath of September 11, 2001. In *Safety and Security in Tourism: relationships, Management and Marketing*, (Eds), 2003.
20. **Fraisie P.** «Las Emociones». En *Motivación, Emoción y Personalidad*. P. Fraisse y J. Piaget (compiladores). Buenos Aires, Editorial Paidós, 1973, pp. 106–187.
21. **Fuchs G., Reichel A.** Health Tourists Visiting a Highly Volatile Destination. *Anatolia, an international Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2010, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 205–226.
22. **Giddens A.** Modernity and self-identity: self and society in the late modern age. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991.
23. **Giddens A.** Consecuencias de la Modernidad. Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 1999.
24. **Goldblatt J., Hu C.** Tourism, terrorism, and the new world for event leaders. *E-review of tourism Research*, 2005, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 139–144.
25. **Gygax M.** *El Intercambio de dones en el mundo griego: reciprocidad, imprecisión, equivalencia y desequilibrio*. Gerión, 2007, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 111–126.
26. **Hall M., Timothy D., Duval T.** (Eds.) *Safety and Security in Tourism: relationships, Management and Marketing*. New York, Haworth Hospitality Press, 2003.
27. **Heidegger M.** *El Ser y el Tiempo*. Santiago, Editorial Universitaria, 1997.
28. **Henderson J.C.** Managing crises: UK civil aviation, BAA airports and the August 2006 terrorist threat. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2008, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 125–136.
29. **Howie L.** *Witnesses to terror: understanding the meanings and consequences of terrorism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
30. **Innerarity D.** *Ética de la Hospitalidad. Ethics of Hospitality*. Barcelona, Quinteto, 2008.
31. **Kierkegaard S.** *Temor y Temblor*. Buenos Aires, Losada, 2003.
32. **Korstanje M.** Elemental Forms of Hospitality. *RBtur, Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, 2010, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 86–111.
33. **Korstanje M.** Re-visiting the risk perception theory in the contexts of travels. *ERTR: e-review of Tourism Research*, 2009, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 68–81.
34. **Korstanje M.** Pre-emption and terrorism. When the future governs. *Cultura*, 2013, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 167–184.
35. **Korstanje M.E.** Why risk why now? Conceptual problems around the risk perception in tourism industry. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em turismo*, 2011, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 4–22.
36. **Korstanje M.E.** Exegesis and myths as methodologies of research in tourism. *Anatolia*, 2014, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 299–301.
37. **Korstanje M.E., Olsen D.H.** The discourse of risk in horror movies post 9/11: hospitality and hostility in perspective. *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*, 2011, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 304–317.
38. **Korstanje M.E., Tarlow P.** Being lost: tourism, risk and vulnerability in the post-‘9/11’entertainment industry. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 2012, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 22–33, doi: 10.1080/14766825.2011.639455.
39. **Korstanje M., Busby G.** Understanding the Bible as the roots of physical displacement: the origin of tourism. *E-Review of Tourism Research*, 2010, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 95–111.
40. **Kozak M., Crotts J., Law R.** The Impact of the pereption of risk on international Travellers. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 2007, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 233–242.
41. **Kuto B., Groves J.** The Effects of terrorism: evaluating Kenya’s tourism crisis. Pero ¿como definir un acto terrorista? *E-review of tourism Research*, 2004, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 88–95.
42. **Lash S., Urry J.** Economies of signs and space. *Time & Society*, 1994, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 97–102.
43. **Lepp A., Gibson H.** Sensation Seeking and Tourism: tourist role, perception of risk and Destination Choice. *Tourism Management*, 2008, vol. 29, pp. 740–750.
44. **Levenson R.W., Ekman P., Friesen W.W.** Voluntary facial expression generates emotions-specific nervous system activity. *Psychophysiology*, 1990, vol. 27, pp. 363–384.
45. **Luhmann N.** *Sociología del Riesgo*. México City: Universidad Iberoamericana, 2006.
46. **Lynch P.** Theorizing Hospitality. *Hospitality & Society*, 2006, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–24

47. **Malinowski B.** *Una Teoría de la cultura*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1967.
48. **Manning P.K.** Semiotics and Social Theory. In *Action and Structure: research methods and social theory*. London: Sage, 1989, pp. 80–98.
49. **Mansfeld Y., Pizam A.** *Tourism, Security and Safety: from theory to practice*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, 2006.
50. **Niyaz A.** Terrorism and extremism: a threat to Maldives tourism industry. *UNISCI discussion papers*, 2010, no. 24, p. 221.
51. **O'Gorman K.** The hospitality phenomenon: philosophical enlightenment? *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2007, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 189–202.
52. **Oliver-Smith A.** Theorizing disasters, nature, power and culture? In Hoffman S. and Oliver-Smith A. (Eds.). *Catastrophe and culture: the anthropology of disasters*. Oxford: School of American Research James Currey, 2002, pp. 23–47.
53. **Pagden A.** *Lords of all the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c. 1500-c. 1800* (p. 126178). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
54. **Panksepp J.** (1982). Toward a General psychobiological theory of Emotions. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1982, vol. 5, pp. 407–467.
55. **Park K., Reisinger Y.** Differences in the perceived influence of natural disasters and travel risk on international travels. *Tourism Geographies*, 2010, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1–24.
56. **Plog S.** Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 1973, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 13–16.
57. **Plog S.** *Leisure travel; making it a growth market. Again!* New York: Wiley and Sons, 1991.
58. **Reichel A., Fuchs G., Urieli N.** Perceived risk and the non-institutionalized tourist role: the case of Israeli student ex backpackers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 2007, vol. 46, pp. 217–226.
59. **Reisinger Y., Mavondo F.** Travel anxiety and intention to travel internationally: implication of travel risk perception. *Journal of Travel Research*, 2005, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 212–245.
60. **Richardson J.** The certainty of uncertainty: risk management revisited. *Foresight*, 2010, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 47–64.
61. **Roehl W., Fesenmaier D.** (1992). Risk perceptions and pleasure travel: an exploratory analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1992, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 17–29.
62. **Sackett H., Botterill D.** Perception of international travel risk: an exploratory study of the influence of proximity to terrorist attack. *E-review of tourism Research*, 2006, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 44–49.
63. **Sahlins M.** *Stone Age Economics*. London, Routledge, 1992.
64. **Slovic P.** Perception of Risks. *Science, new series*, 1987, vol. 236, no. 4799, pp. 285–285.
65. **Strongman K.T.** *The Psychology of Emotions: theories of emotions in perspective*. Chichester, Wiley and Sons, 1996.
66. **Thomas K.** *Religion and the decline of magic: studies in popular beliefs in sixteenth and seventeenth-century England*. London, Penguin UK, 1991.
67. **Tierney K.** *Sociology's Unique Contributions to the Study of Risk*. Disaster Research Center, Preliminary Paper, 1994, p. 204.
68. **Waterton C., Wynne B.** Can focus groups assess community views? In *Developing Focus Group. Politics theory and practices*. (Eds.) R. Barbour & J. Kitzinger). London: Sage, 2001, pp. 127–143.
69. **Weiner A.B.** Inalienable wealth. *American ethnologist*, 1985, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 210–227.
70. **Weiner A.B.** *Inalienable possessions: The paradox of keeping-while-giving*. California, University of California Press, 1992.
71. **Wolff K., Larsen S.** Can terrorism make us feel safer? Risk perceptions and worries before and after the July 22nd attacks. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 2014, vol. 44, pp. 200–209.
72. **Wolff K., Larsen S., Doran R.** How dangerous is Norway? Risk perceptions before and after Utoya. *CAUTHE2013: Tourism and Global Change: On the Edge of Something Big*, 2013, p. 941.
73. **Wong J.Y., Yeh C.** Tourist Hesitation in Destination decision making. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 2009, vol. 36, no.1, pp. 6–23.
74. **Woods J.** et al. Terrorism Risk Perception and Proximity to Primary Terrorist Targets: how close is too close? *Research in Human Ecology*, 2008, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 63–70.
75. **Yuan M.** (2005). After September 11: determining its Impacts on Rural Canadians travel to U.S. *E-review of tourism Research*, 2005, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 103–108.
76. **Yun D., MacLaurin T.** *Development and validation of an attitudinal travel Safety scale*. Canada Chapter TTRA Conference, Montebello, QC, 2006.

77. Zinn J.O. *Biography, Risk and Uncertainty – Is there Common Ground for Biographical Research and Risk Research? In Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung. Forum: Qualitative Social Research* (2010, vol. 11, no. 1).
78. Zizek S. *Violence*. Buenos Aires, Paidós, 2009.

Корстанье Максимилиано Эмануэль^а, Сколл Джеффри Р.^б

^а Университет Палермо (Буэнос-Айрес, Аргентина); доктор философии (PhD), профессор; e-mail: mkorst@palermo.edu

^б Государственный колледж Буффало, Университет штата Нью-Йорк (Буффало, штат Нью-Йорк, США); доктор философии (PhD), доцент; e-mail: skollgr@buffalostate.edu, skoll@uwm.edu

РИСКИ В ТУРИЗМЕ: КОМПЛЕКСНЫЙ ПОДХОД К ПОНИМАНИЮ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ В СФЕРЕ ТУРИЗМА

В последние десятилетия мир стал свидетелем катастроф и кризисов, которые не могли не повлиять на туризм. Все это привело к появлению множества исследований, посвященным рискам и угрозам человеческой безопасности. В то же время, все эти работы находятся в научном поле разных дисциплин, и, следовательно, имеют разные объекты исследований, разные цели и задачи, а также используют разные научно-методологический аппарат. Для их обзора, изучения преимуществ и недостатков в применении к исследованиям рисков в туризме необходим комплексный подход, реализованный автором в данной работе.

В статье рассмотрены базовые понятия, формирующие основу понимания рисков в туризме: страх, тревога, риск, проведены границы между ними и выявлено их место в системе общественных наук. Страх – это базовая эмоция, присущая не только человеку, но многим представителям животного мира. Понятие человеческого страха имеет двойственную нейробиологическую и культурную подосновы, и выступает важным механизмом консолидации социальных групп в трудные моменты, защиты, стимула принятия решений. Тревога – чувство, тесно связанное с понятием «страх». Экзистенциализм определяет тревогу как следствие свободы или неопределенности, и в отличие от страха, тревога связана с размытыми, неопределенными угрозами. Согласно наблюдениям К. Терни, под риском понимается возможность вреда, который может быть причинен потенциальной жертве вследствие какого-либо события или явления.

Именно поэтому эти понятия лежат в поле зрения разных научных дисциплин, преимущественно общественных: поведенческой психологии, социологии, философии, антропологии, этнологии и пр. Возросшая роль туризма в современном обществе, а также ряд природных и социальных угроз, вызванные этой сферой жизнедеятельности человека, привлекают внимание к изучению риска и его природы, связанных с ним концептов страха и тревоги в системе наук о туризме.

Автором рассмотрена теория восприятия риска. Она имеет опыт более чем сорока лет эмпирических исследований. Несмотря на это, в изучении рисков в туризме она стала активно применяться лишь после терактов 11 сентября 2001 г. Автор приводит краткий обзор подходов и взглядов научных работ, посвященных теории риска в туризме, а также выявляет и характеризует ряд концептуальных проблем. Исходя из проведенного обзора, в статье делается вывод о том, что теория риска, применяющаяся в контексте активного отдыха и туризма, учитывает следующие основные факторы, влияющие на восприятия рисков и угроз в туризме: а) социальные связи; б) национальность и культурные различия; в) место жительства; г) психология личности; д) цель путешествия.

Автором освещается общая проблематика, связанная с критериями, факторами, параметрами, показателями риска в туризме. В частности, автор подчеркивает наличие несогласованности между качественными и количественными методами и методиками исследования безопасности в туризме, игнорирование поведенческой составляющей, объясняющей выбор туристом тех или иных мест отдыха и его приоритеты относительно безопасности этих мест. Также автором рассмотрена связь гостеприимства и рисков в туризме. При этом первое не всегда является гарантией безопасности, а даже наоборот, являет для туриста особую форму риска. В целом же, проблема безопасности в гостеприимстве по-прежнему остается малоизученной, которую практически невозможно сформулировать в качестве объекта научного исследования. Автор охватил и описал наиболее значимые научные работы, связанные с туризмом, гостеприимством, и рисками в данных сферах; охарактеризовал теоретические и методологические недостатки, связанные, прежде всего, со спецификой научного поля исследования. Автор подчеркивает в качестве существенного недостатка большинства работ слишком тесную связь исследований рисков в туризме с бизнес-моделями, и их направленность на максимизацию получения доходов и оптимизацию отрасли, и как следствие, игнорирование ценности понимания личности туриста как основного объекта туризма. Только тогда, когда исследования туризма трансформируются в истинные социальные исследования, направленные на получение базовых знаний о человеческом состоянии и поведении, они смогут избавиться от их текущих, чрезмерно рационализированных моделей, методов и теорий. Только в таком случае туристские исследования станут более выгодными и приемлемыми для туристского бизнеса, нежели сейчас.

Ключевые слова: риск, опасность, туризм, стихийные бедствия, эпистемология.