

## **The Distorted Mirror: applying the pragmatic paradigm to end-user research.**

**Alexandra Coghlan**

**School of Business, James Cook University**

**Bruce Prideaux**

**School of Business, James Cook University**

### **Abstract:**

This paper discusses the difficulties of providing user-friendly information to tourism stakeholders, whilst still keeping some of the essence of the tourism experience. We describe research undertaken as part of the Marine and Tropical Science Research Facility's (MTRSF) study of the sustainable use of marine resources, and in particular the drivers and trends of tourism to the Great Barrier Reef (GBR). Using the qualitative/quantitative debate as a starting point for reviewing a "pragmatic" paradigm, we compare data from visitor surveys with data collected through informal interviews with tourists. Whilst the former often understates the complexity of events, we recognise the practical value of presenting stakeholders with numbers that summarise the tourism experience. However, the qualitative data presents some interesting twists on what may appear on paper (surveys) to be relatively uncomplicated travel narratives. We conclude that the craftsmanship of the researcher determines how research remains true its inherent complexity whilst presenting key information in bite size portions to the stakeholders who need it.

**Keywords:** mixed method research, Great Barrier Reef tourism

## Introduction

The debate regarding the respective merits of qualitative and quantitative research has been going strong since the 1980's. It is a sometimes heated discussion that has been taken up in most fields that seek to understand human experiences and behaviour. In disciplines such as psychology, nursing and medical sciences, and anthropology, the debate has moved on and the concept of "mixed methods" has been explored and by and large adopted by researchers in those fields (Walle, 1997; Sale, Lohfeld & Brazil, 2002). The acceptance of such mixed-method approaches centres on a recognition of the advantages of both qualitative and quantitative methods and for some, their complementarity.

In this paper we present the case that mixed methods may have particular relevance in stakeholder-driven research, where qualitative research may inform the researcher and quantitative research may inform the end-users. In our case, we investigate the ways in which we understand and deliver information to stakeholders about tourism in the Great Barrier Marine Park, in a public good study funded by the Federal Government through the Marine and Tropical Science Research Facility (MTSRF).

Tourism research is widely recognised as an example of a field of study that draws upon many disciplines or "tribes". As a result, tourism academia is blessed with a range of methodologies, paradigms, ontologies and epistemologies. The diversity of research backgrounds in tourism accommodates both highly quantitative research, used to develop policy models, forecasts and so forth, as well as ethnographic studies and critical discourse, based on interpretivism rich with detail and a depth of understanding of the individual's construction of reality. More recently, with the growth of experiential industries, tourism research has pushed deeper into the area of qualitative research (Tribe, 2005), enabling researchers interested in the tourism experience to understand the subjective components of a tourism product or service, and the process that goes into creating the meanings that go with it.

The central tenant of this paper is to investigate how researchers interested in the subjective tourism experiences can collect information and present their results in a meaningful way to stakeholders and other end-users. We suggest that this is a not an easy task, and academics must apply themselves to balancing good science with usable research. We look at how surveys, whilst most amenable to delivering information to end-users, may not capture all of the tourist experience, and may limit our understanding of the event. Qualitative data on the hand, are not so easy to present in bite size formats to those who have a stake in the research questions and

the “deliverables” of the research. In this case, we must consider the needs of our end-users, as well as those of the researchers themselves.

CAUTHE itself has indicated an interest in the qualitative/quantitative debate with the formation of the Critical Approaches in Tourism and Hospitality Group in 2008. Whilst the foremost aim of critical tourism studies is to redress knowledge and power imbalance, amongst other aims, CATH promotes “interpretive and critical modes of inquiry” and encourages critical methods and paradigms (Gale & Botterill, 2009; Wilson, Harris & Small, 2008). In line with the strengthening emphasis on alternative research methods and critical tourism, a panel session based on the theme: Managing Tourism Research was also held in 2008. In this session, panellists were encouraged to present a number of perspectives, postdisciplinary, interpretivist/critical tourism, mixed methods, critical realist and postpositivist approaches.

From the panellists and other researchers, there appeared to be a trend towards adopting mixed-method research in order to blend the strengths of qualitative and quantitative research in essentially what appeared to be a postpositivist approach. According to Gale and Botterill (2009), post-positivism is based upon an understanding that whilst reality does exist, it is never fully understood, and thus knowledge remains fallible and critical. They liken it to Critical Realism, where it is accepted that there is a mind-independent reality that can be known, but that this reality is hidden from the casual observer, operating at a deeper level than our experiential knowledge.

The debate was taken in a new direction at CAUTHE 2009, as Cara Aitchinson highlighted the divergent paths of tourism studies and tourism management. She suggested that tourism studies may be distinguished as distinct field from tourism management, based upon the social and cultural underpinnings of the first and the economic focus of the latter. As researchers follow their chosen path they may find themselves becoming more fluent in the languages of quantitative or qualitative methods, and less able to understand their colleagues walking the other path. To a large extent, the argument made by Aitchinson stimulated some of the thoughts in this paper

### *The qualitative/quantitative debate*

Practitioner disciplines such as management and marketing have traditionally relied upon towards rigorous, quantitative, and scientific methods (Walle, 1997). As two of the most active areas in tourism research focus on these aspects of tourism research

(c.f. the A\* journal *Tourism Management*) quantitative methods still dominate much of tourism research (Tribe, 2005).

There are many reasons why tourism academics may choose to use surveys as their primary research tool. Some of these reasons may be based around particular paradigms, reflecting the desire for broad scale data, from large sample sets, and which may be clearly and objectively articulated to a larger scientific community. Other reasons may be based upon the pragmatic approach, as surveys are generally considered a cost and time-effective research tool. Alternatively, tourism researcher may have a tradition of using quantitative data if they are working across disciplines, or have been trained in a quantitative discipline such as the natural sciences or economics. Research carried out at the boundaries of social and natural science, e.g. tourism impacts on the natural environment, visitor use of nature-based resources, etc, may fall into this latter category.

More generally, surveys are essentially a quantitative tool within social sciences. They permit the measurement and analysis of causal relationships, supposedly within a value-free, objective framework. Techniques that uphold this framework include randomisation, blinding, highly structured protocols and a limited range of predetermined responses, as well as large sample sizes that provide a certain degree of confidence that results are representative of a wider population. The key to this approach is deduction based upon accumulating enough data to test hypotheses generated by the researcher.

The Foucauldian approach suggests an alternative approach to “mass” datasets; instead power is seen to reside within individuals and therefore each of us has the opportunity to create our own distinctive knowledges, which are uniquely our own and not rule-bound by tradition. This is a relativistic approach that, by and large, denies generalisations whilst creating more opportunities for exploring differences and diversity. Instead of looking for patterns and generalisable conclusions, the interpretive approaches seek to understand the social world in its own context. They place a greater importance on intersubjective systems of meanings that are present and shape interactions in a social setting.

In order to study this subjective reality, it has been argued by the authors such as Duijnhoven and Roessingh (2006) that tourism research lends itself easily to qualitative approaches drawn from anthropology such as participant observation and informal interviews. They argue that the issues related to tourism can only be understood if one considers the multiple and dynamic processes that are related to the phenomenon. They refer to the interactions between hosts and guests at the local destinations, among different groups of tourists, the role of the environment,

personal motivations to travel and the way people are changed by making sense of these interactions.

According to Szarycz, as qualitative techniques become more popular in tourism research, these have become a “potpourri” of ideas derived from phenomenology, social constructionism (the development of phenomena relative to social contexts), social constructivism (an individual's making meaning of knowledge within a social context), postmodernism, the naturalistic paradigm, hermeneutics, feminist standpoint theory, grounded theory and so on. It is indeed likely that many researchers new to qualitative inquiry may intuitively know that they must seek out subjective meanings without being entirely familiar with the tools that facilitate this process.

More worrying is Szarycz's concern that some researchers employing phenomenology may be “in danger of mimicking science at least subliminally. They want to talk, in generalisable terms about reality, they want to be objective and they want to do theory”. He argued that setting aside one's assumptions to perceive and understand another person's viewpoint is to all extent and purposes impossible, whilst drawing out common or universal themes by its very nature, destroys all uniqueness or subjective experiences. Finally, he pointed out that by studying the subjective experience, the extent to which we can draw out general conclusions is zero, and thus it cannot indicate anything of a general nature nor used as the basis for recommendations.

The points raised by Szarycz's epitomise the tensions between increasing our understanding of the tourist experience, whilst at the same time reporting in a meaningful way to stakeholders. For those researchers dependent upon stakeholder support to build their research projects, there is clearly a need to address this issue of providing information to stakeholders in a usable format that reflects the (personal) nature of tourism. Gale and Botterill (2009) have made their bid for a post-positivist/realist approach to tourism research. Indeed, postmodern trends can be said to lean towards mixed-method approaches and a paradigm of pragmatism (Prayag, 2009). In this case, researchers employ what works under the circumstances, using a diversity of approaches and valuing both subjective and objective knowledge.

Using the pragmatic approach, a compromise is reached, encompassing both subjective and objective forms of knowledge, creating a melting pot of tourism studies that focus on details and minutiae of the tourism experience and more generalisable tourism management research. Essentially, the mixed-method approach is an attempt to reconcile the inherent subjectivity of the tourism

experience as described by Foucauld with the needs of tourism management and stakeholders. It puts the tourist experience at the forefront of tourism research; as both McIntosh (1998) and Ryan (1995) have argued that Likert-scales do not teach us how tourists themselves view the experience, and reduces the experience to a few tick-in-boxes. Using a mixed method approach may draw out the multiplicity of meanings given to any tourist experience, as well as permit an analysis of the relationships within the experience.

Before moving on to our research into tourism on the Great Barrier Reef, it is worth mentioning Sale et al.'s noteworthy paper on mixed-method research. Sale et al. (2002) tackle the issue of comparing qualitative and quantitative data. They refer in particular to the process of cross validation, where the two approaches are combined to study the same phenomenon. These authors warn that cross validation not only violates paradigmatic assumptions but "it also misrepresents data. Loss of information is a particular risk when attempts are made to unite results from the two paradigms because it often promotes the selective search for similarities in data" (p.49). As it is, they argue, "we rarely know the extent of disagreement between qualitative and quantitative results because they are not reported" (p.47).

Notwithstanding their earlier warnings about cross validating using mixed method research, this paper represents an attempt to demonstrate some of the agreements and disagreements of data collected using the different approaches. We test Sale et al.'s assertion that we must distinguish between the phenomena under scrutiny by labelling them appropriately as "lived experience" and "measure" to determine what it is that we have been presenting to our stakeholders. Consequently, we also question what it is that our stakeholders want to know and have we been presenting it to them.

### *Background to the research*

The research presented here falls under the Marine and Tropical Science Research Facility's study of the sustainable use of marine resources on the Great Barrier Reef. A key feature of this research is its public good nature; it is end user driver in the sense that stakeholders inform the research agenda, and research results are then made publically available by Reef and Rainforest Research Centre who manage the research on behalf of the Federal Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and Arts, the funding agency.

The scope of our project on the drivers and trends of reef tourism, was determined by undertaking a thorough literature review of past research on GBR reef tourism, followed by discussions with key researchers and research providers and meetings

with key stakeholders (such as GBRMPA, regional tourism bodies, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Australian Marine Tourism Operators Association, AMPTO). Follow up meetings were held with AMPTO to discuss potential survey distribution methodologies and design a pilot survey based on existing research and stakeholder needs. Due to funding constraints, surveys are distributed by boat crews, not paid survey staff. In exchange for this contribution, boat operators are given a confidential report on the findings of the surveys distributed on their boat.

The pilot survey was reviewed by an external researcher and his comments taken into consideration. In preparation for the launch of the survey program, several fieldtrips were undertaken to observe the distribution of the survey to identify any potential distribution issues and to obtain feedback from both crew and passengers. The pilot survey was tested over a two week period in October 2006 and involved five operators in the Cairns region. After refinements were made to the survey distribution commenced in the first week of November 2006.

### **Aims:**

Notwithstanding earlier warnings about cross validating using mixed method research, this paper represents an attempt to demonstrate some of the agreements and disagreements of data collected using the different approaches. We test Sale et al.'s assertion that we must distinguish between the phenomena under scrutiny by labelling them appropriately as "lived experience" and "measure" to determine what it is that we have been presenting to our stakeholders. The specific aims of the study are to:

1. test the representative our survey data are of the typical reef experience
2. tease out some of the great diversity and range of experiences that are created by individuals
3. illustrate some of the personal contexts that shape a tourist experience of the reef.
4. consider how we might best present this information to our stakeholders.

### **Method:**

As outlined in the introduction, the study adopts a mixed method approach to compare qualitative and quantitative data by analysing the results of the reef visitor survey (the quantitative approach), and by conducting participant observation and informal interviews on the boats (the qualitative approach).

The surveys are distributed by the crews of 10 GBR marine tourism operators from Port Douglas, Cairns, Townsville and Airlie Beach. Data were collected on reef

visitors' socio-demographic characteristics, and travel patterns, motivations (using a 12 item Likert-scale), activities, alternative destinations considered and satisfaction (including expectations and best and worst experiences).

Some limitations of this technique are that it is reliant upon the boat crews to distribute the surveys, raising some issues of randomisation and return rates; and was only distributed to tourists who speak English (as a first or foreign language). A final limiting factor was that questions were confined by space-commitments made to the industry so that the survey did not exceed three pages in length. This limitation in particular prevented deeper probing of a range of issues.

The qualitative data were collected through conversation-style informal interviews with respondents. Respondents were informed (conversationally) that the interviewer worked on a reef tourism project at the local university. This did not appear to deter respondents but instead appeared to encourage them to share their stories and experiences. The interviews took place on six trips over a two week period on four partner operators who assist in the survey work. By using the same operators, it was felt that a similar profile of survey respondents could be identified and interviewed in the qualitative data collection stage.

### **Results:**

Based on a general tourism management and marketing approach, the first step was to carry out a descriptive analysis of the socio-demographic characteristics and travel behaviour of the 6235 respondents who completed the reef tourism visitor survey. This approach is commonly used to identify important and distinctive groups. Where the analysis showed a large bias towards a particular response, i.e. at least one in three respondents selected this response, these respondents were selected as representing large market segments within GBR reef tourism. Thus, the most common characteristics of respondents suggest that visitors to the Great Barrier Reef are female (56% of the sample), from Australia (40%), between 20 and 29 years old (35%), travelling with a significant other (37%), visiting the region and the reef for the first time (77% & 71.5% respectively) and travelling by plane (53%).

Whilst these categories are clearly not linked by any statistical measure, by presenting the information in this way (and in the manner of many similar reports) the reader is likely to use the information provided to create an image of the typical tourist, all the while ignoring all other possible combinations of characteristics. Indeed, presenting the data in this way is designed to draw attention to certain characteristics and lead the reader to certain conclusions about the type of tourism visiting the region.

Guided by these characteristics, the next stage was to conduct informal interviews with reef tourists who fit these characteristics. The authors sought out young, Australian females travelling with their partners, and asked if this was their first visit to the region and to the GBR. Once the screening information had been confirmed, the authors asked the respondent about her experiences on the reef, to determine how her responses matched the typical survey responses; based on the results of the survey, we expected to find that these respondents were motivated to visit the region to see the GBR, go snorkelling and diving, rest and relax, enjoy the climate and the natural environment. She went snorkelling on the reef, and felt that her knowledge of the reef had somewhat increased, as did her appreciation of the reef. She was most satisfied with the crew, whilst diving and snorkelling were among her best experiences. She would recommend the trip to others, and felt that she had got good value for money out of the trip.

Taking the first set of characteristics, socio-demographics and travel behaviour, 0.5% of the entire sample meet that description; whilst one in three respondents might be female or young or Australian or travelling with their partner or first visitors or travelling by air or used information provided by friends and relatives, only one respondent in 200 was all of these things. Identifying these respondents in the field proved to be difficult. During the first three days on the reef no suitable respondents were identified. The characteristics of passengers were also checked by going through the boat manifest with operator crew, who are provided with information on passengers' travel party and place of residence. The difficulty of finding respondents who conform to the descriptive statistics confirms some of the issues surrounding the way we present information to stakeholders.

Subsequently, it was decided that the researcher would approach passengers regardless of their nationality, age or travel party and solicit information about their travel and reef experiences. On day four, the researcher was able to talk to four passengers about their experiences. The first of these passengers was an older male, late 40's to older 50's, who had lived in Oregon State his entire life, and whose previous travel experiences were limited to North America. He was fulfilling a life-long dream to visit Australia. In describing his travel arrangements, he stated that he had no fixed plans, preferring instead to use a booking agent in Sydney who created his itinerary. The result was an adventure holiday, with white-water rafting, skydiving and a reef trip included in his visit to Cairns. A large part of his motivation to visit the reef was to dive, but having sustained a head injury as a young adult he was unable to do so. He was exceptionally pleased with his experience, stating that nothing would deter him from having a good time whilst on holiday, and planned to revisit the reef within the week after a medical check-up in order to go diving.

The next two respondents both had similar profiles. Both male, young adults, from Italy. Both were travelling alone, and keen to practice their English language. They were both visiting Australia on study visas, and were approaching the end of their stay. This was their first visit to North Queensland, and both felt that their year in Australia would not be complete until they had been to Cairns and seen the reef. Whilst one of the interviewees had had a previous snorkelling experience on reefs in Mexico, the other one had not yet been snorkelling. The former had had a satisfying experience in Mexico, snorkelling in netted enclosures rich in marine life, but indicated that he was looking forward to a “wilder” experience on the GBR. He did not expect to see the same number or diversity of marine life as in Mexico, but was content to say that he had been to the reef. The highlight of his in-water experience was an introductory dive, which he did not think that he would be able to complete due to ear equalisation issues, and the friendliness of the crew who taught him (and others) how to weave fish from palm fronds on the return journey.

The following trip was spent primarily with an older Norwegian lady who was on a package tour of Australia with her husband. She was a keen diver, and although had not come to Australia specifically to dive the Great Barrier Reef, indicated that no trip to the Australia would be complete with a dive on the reef. She had started her diving career in 1995, and had visited the Caribbean and the Red Sea – a repeat visitor to the latter due to its accessibility from Norway. She completed several dives that day, and unlike the previous respondents, felt very disappointed with her experiences. She had expected a great deal more and in her words “was bored on the dive”. Her expectations were of more fish and more colourful coral, and she concluded that she would prefer to dive in the Red Sea, which despite its rapid tourism development still offered, in her opinion, better diving opportunities.

The final trip was spent with several tourists, including a family visiting from Tasmania. They were visiting Cairns as part of a reconnaissance trip with a view to escaping the Tasmanian weather and buying a property in Cairns. The father of the family confided that he had taken advantage of weeks of poor weather in Tasmania to entice his wife to Cairns, with a promise that she and the children would enjoy a trip to the reef in exchange for viewing potential cattle properties with him. He himself had very little interest in seeing the reef, and offered no comments on his experience, although he did recognise that his children had thoroughly enjoyed their day in the sun, and being able to swim in warm water.

The next respondents were an American couple in their 50's who had overheard the researcher's conversation with the family, and offered up that they had been “underwhelmed” by the experience. They acknowledged that they were experienced

reef visitors (the wife had been snorkelling, whilst the husband went diving), and were disappointed by the lack of fish and coral colour during their visit to the GBR. When asked if they would recommend the trip to others, they said that they would. Recognising the inconsistency between this and their previous statements, they added they recommended it for the experience of “going to the GBR”, but would not speak highly of their visit.

Two final respondents were engaged in conversation about their experiences. The first was a visitor from Hawaii, who was also on tour with her husband. She had not planned to dive the reef, and was in fact very nervous about her diving ability and the marine environment (she was a certified diver) but had been talked into doing a dive based on the notion that was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. Unfortunately, the researcher was unable to catch up with her later in the trip to discuss her experiences with her.

The final respondent was a young Frenchman, who lived in Sydney, and was on holiday with his partner. She had not joined him on the reef trip, but had bought it for him as a birthday surprise present. Knowing that she would not want to spend a day out on the water, he had not made any pre-trip plans visit the reef, and was very pleased to be able to come out for a day of diving on his birthday. As the researcher met him after his first dive, she was able to ask him about his diving experience. As some of the others, he was unimpressed by the lack of fish and colour, explaining that he had just returned from a trip to Indonesia, where he was, in his words, “hidden in photos by the number of fish” around him. His second dive, however, was much more enjoyable as he came across two sharks feeding on a large cod, a sight that the other instructors confirmed they had not seen before, and was a very lucky encounter. Overall, he was touched by his partner’s gift of the diving trip on his birthday, was happy to have the opportunity to see the reef, and felt that the encounter on the second dive made up for the lack of fish and colourful coral that would have otherwise defined his reef experience.

### **Discussion:**

The paper presented here sits squarely within the mixed-methodology and qualitative/quantitative debate. Its contribution to the debate has been to compare the results from qualitative and quantitative methods and to question whether the information we are providing to stakeholders is valid, relevant and delivered. Taking Staver’s (1998) view that observations, events, objects, data, laws and theory do not exist independently of observers; in our case, our observers tend to be natural resource managers whose central concern is likely to be tourism’s impact on coral reefs as well as the economic value associated with the industry and the resource

upon which it is dependent, the DMO, who is primarily concerned with the effectiveness of market strategies and the standards of the tourism product, and industry, also concerned with markets (albeit, with who is not visiting the reef, rather than who is) as well as operationally-relevant service quality information.

Drawing upon the arguments and results presented in this paper, it is worth considering several points. In the first instance, some of the tensions between trying to represent the tourist experience to a diversity of stakeholders were highlighted. Numbers form a universal language, one that is, or at least should not be open to interpretation. Thus quantitative data can be adopted for forecasting, benchmarking, systems modelling, strategy monitoring, and so forth. However, adopting a numbers approach can be overly simplistic when trying to capture the tourism experience.

Instead, we have attempted to show the level of complexity that each visitor brings to the reef as part of their personal story. Trying to draw out common themes between a father bribing his family to consider a move from Tasmania to North Queensland, an enthusiastic diver with high hopes of her dive on the world's most famous dive, and a young Frenchman who had been given his day out on the reef as a surprise birthday gift (albeit without his partner's company on the excursion) raises difficult questions. There was however a sense from the different respondents that a trip to Australia, or North Queensland would not be complete with a visit to its iconic drawcard, whilst their level of satisfaction appeared to fluctuate with their expectations of the actual reef, or their level of prior reef tourism exposure.

In a project such as MTSRF's reef visitor monitoring project, we are answerable to a range of stakeholders, many of whom use the data in marketing or policy development. Supplying quantitative data to stakeholders such as DMO's, natural resource managers, industry bodies, and natural scientists offers greater versatility and increased uptake and use of the data. However, as we have tried to demonstrate through the use of visitor stories, and as indicated by Walle (1997), quantitative data "limits the areas of inquiry to those for which ample "facts" can be gathered and leads to the possibility of oversimplifying by only examining phenomena in ways which reflect data gathering" (p.534). There is nothing in our surveys that can capture the complexity of the tourism experience or the personal stories that overlay the data that is captured.

Where studies have specifically identified the experiential and subjective qualities of tourism, we nevertheless find the experience described as averaged measures and common themes. An example of this quantitative treatment of qualitative data is Fallon and Schofield's (2003) study of the influence of "personal and subjective variables such as needs, dispositions, travelling companions and previous experience

which accompany the customer in the service encounter” (p.78); as the article progresses, we are then informed that “a one unit increase in the performance (of the “facilitators” factor) would lead to a 0.287 unit increase in tourists’ overall level of satisfaction, all other variables being held constant” (p.91).

To draw out the full meaning of the tourism experience requires a certain level of word-smithing, intuition and creativity at the data collection process and a significant amount of craftsmanship at the reporting level. We might also give pause to some of the comments made Walle (1997) regarding the involvement of the researcher within the study. In Walle’s words, “since much of the research of science can be routinised, these studies are not dependent upon the insight or intuition of each research associate” and “simple surveys can be performed with people with a minimum of training; when research is more qualitative, however, the skills, training and insight of the frontline researcher must usually be increased”. We invite readers to dwell upon the last time they (as researchers) were willing to provide their opinion based on intuition not numbers, or they (as stakeholders) asked for an opinion that did not have numbers to back it up? Surely the art of knowledge (perhaps wisdom) should be encouraged alongside the science of knowledge? And the individual, intuitive and artistic qualities of individual researchers be cultivated (Harris, 2006)?

Following this line of argument, we find ourselves at the start of the path towards of *transdisciplinary* work. This type of work involves the joint production of knowledge and joint definition of the underlying norms and interpretive patterns of knowledge (Gibbons et al., 1994). Specifically, it involves interaction between different actors including scientists, experts and non-scientific actors (Hurni & Wiesmann, 2004), and recognizes the place of the individual, his or her experiences in the creation and sharing of knowledge.

Whilst the authors recognise that others are far more skilled in the application of qualitative methods and that some of our reasoning may be flawed due to our limited knowledge, we also feel instinctively that the survey methodology alone is inadequate to provide the answers that our stakeholders are looking for. Delving into qualitative techniques may not easily translate into reports, measures and facts for our end-users, but we do feel that it allows us as researchers to both broaden and deepen our knowledge of the topic to warn against simple formula-like responses to our stakeholders. Borrowing from Tribe who cites Silverman (1997, p.251) a closing comment from these researchers may be that:

“We owe it to our audience to surprise them by inviting them with great clarity to look anew at the world that we already know.”

### References:

Aitchinson, C. (2006). The Critical and the Cultural: Explaining the Divergent Paths of Leisure Studies and Tourism Studies. *Leisure Studies* 25(4): 417-422.

Duijnhoven, H. and Roessingh, C. (2006). The Tourist with a Hidden Agenda? Shifting roles in the field of tourism research. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 8: 115-126

Gale, T. and Botterill, D. (2005). A Realist Agenda for Tourist Studies or why destination areas really rise and fall in popularity. *Tourism Studies* 5: 151-174.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., Trow, M., (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge the Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. SAGE Publications, London.

Harris, J. (2006). The Science of Research in Sport and Tourism: Some Reflections upon the Promise of the Sociological Imagination. *Journal of Sport and Tourism* 11(2): 153-171.

Hurni, H. & Wiesmann, U. (2004). Towards transdisciplinarity in sustainability-oriented research for development. In: Hurni, H., Wiesmann, U., Schertenleib, R. (Eds.), *Research for mitigating Syndromes of Global Change*. Geographica Bernensia, University of Berne, pp. 31–42.

McIntosh, A. J. (1998). Mixing Methods: Putting the Tourist into the Fore-front of Tourism Research. *Tourism Analysis* 3 (2): 121-127.

Ryan, C. (1995). Learning about Tourists from Conversations: the over 55s in Majorca. *Tourism Management* 16(3):207-215.

Sale, J., Lohfeld, L. and Brazil, K. (2002). Revisiting the Quantitative-Qualitative debate: Implications for Mixed-Methods Research. *Quality and Quantity* 36: 43-53.

Szarycz, G.S. (2009). Some issues in tourism research phenomenology: a commentary. *Current Issues in Tourism* 12(1): 47-58.

Tribe, J. (2005). New Tourism Research. *Tourism Recreation Research* 30(2): 5-8.

Walle, A. (1997). Quantitative versus qualitative tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research* 24(3): 524-536.

Weaver, A. (2008). When Tourists Become Data: Consumption, surveillance and commerce. *Current Issues in Tourism* 11(1): 1-23

Wilson, E., Harris, C. and Small, J. (2008). Furthering Critical Approaches in Tourism and Hospitality Studies: Perspectives from Australia and New Zealand. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 15: 15-18.