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Session Description:
The scholarly credentials of tourism as a bona fide discipline and one that makes a meaningful contribution to mainstream disciplinary discussions has been thoroughly cross-examined. At the intersection between geography and tourism lies tourism geography, multivalent in its connotations and intra/cross/trans disciplinary by rights drawing from physical, human, cultural, urban and economic geographies among others. Whether tourism geography has earned a seat at the ‘geography table’ has come prone to debate and argumentation with proponents lauding its suitability and detractors decrying its perceived slipperiness and disciplinary infidelity (Gibson, 2008). In launching the journal Tourism Geographies nearly two decades ago, Lew (1999, p. 1) argued: “Geography has always had the knowledge and study of places as its defining core, despite various attempts to quantify and divide the discipline into finer domains of specialization”. Lew (1999a, p. 1) emphasised that for many geographers, they are “far better represented in the international academy of tourism scholars than one might expect for a discipline that is actually fairly modest in size” and this remains so.

In proposing this panel, we take up Lew’s sentiments and revisit, reframe and reaffirm the place of tourism geographies within its parent discipline and within a post-disciplinarity framework (Coles, Hall & Duval, 2016). This session takes a backward glance in order to acknowledge the particularities inherent in the articulation of tourism geography and how it has developed, and continues to morph within the discipline of geography. In doing so, Pearce’s (2000, p. 406) line of questioning is evoked:

1. How might a national geography of tourism best be characterized?
2. What factors shape a national geography of tourism?
3. What are the implications of the existence of national geographies of tourism for the overall development of the geography of tourism?

The question whether tourism geographies has matured or not, especially its trajectory and scope, remains pertinent given the enormous shifts in international relations, geopolitics, global mobilities and destination development since the turn of the last century. Furthermore, technology has reshaped the manifestation of tourism geography and such shifts are reflected in the emergence of particularised geographies in tourism.
research including evolutionary economic geography (Brouder, 2014), geographies of compassion (Mostafanezhad, 2013), development geography (Mowforth & Munt, 2015), environmental geography (Holden, 2016), indigenous tourism geographies (Butler & Hinch, 2007) and tourism and resilience (Cheer & Lew, 2017; Lew & Cheer, 2017).

Papers in this session should exemplify Lew’s (1999b) early attempt to demonstrate that tourism geography maintains scholarly ‘breadth and depth’ and Coles, Hall and Duval’s (2016) recent assertion that disciplinary binaries will no longer suffice. It is expected that papers will draw on both empirical and conceptual underpinnings of people, place and space through a tourism geography lens, and exemplify post-disciplinarity as a hallmark of contemporary tourism geographies.

For any queries, please contact joseph.cheer@monash.edu.
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