



Artículo
Article

**Unspeakable discrimination: underlying concerns in
instrumentalizing English as Lingua Franca in tourism
Research**

Discriminación sutil: preguntas subyacentes en el uso del Inglés como
lengua franca en la investigación turística

Maximiliano E. Korstanje¹

ABSTRACT: The globalizing process, as well as the industries of tourism, rests on the needs of adopting a “lingua franca” in order for nations to understand each other. Historically, empires have interposed their own language as a sign of civilization, and education. What is equally important, ruling elite tried systematically to incorporate foreign language to distinguish themselves from lower classes. French aristocracy spoke Russian with fluency, while the British ruling elite was enthusiastic in speaking French. Roman aristocrats devoted serious resources to improve their Greek. The imposition of a lingua franca, no matter than its nature, divides the world in two parts, the native and the non-native speakers. This conceptual essay-review enumerated and analyzed a set of problems which revolve around the adoption of English as a global language in the constellations. We hold the thesis that tourism research replicates the same epistemological model originated in the economic-based paradigm, incorporating a business English grammar. Nowadays, English acts as a gatekeeper marking the radical selection in the papers quality. Echoing Dann and Gretzel, English has cemented a centralized form of production which excludes many other voices and knowledge while shaping the Anglophone hegemony over other idioms. The commercial-based vision is leading the epistemology of tourism to a gridlock very hard to reverse. We offer a diagnosis

¹ University of Palermo, Argentina & CERS, Centre for Ethnicity and Racism Studies, University of Leeds, UK.
E-mail: mkorst@palermo.edu

on a short study-case based on the CONICET repository and the ethical dilemmas around the paid-for journals and editorial rankings. The expansion of great publishers worldwide and the concentration of financial resources in Anglophone editorial in-house publishers have been successfully supported by English as a global tongue, locating English speaking scholars as the masters of a game where the non-English speakers will never win. The monolingualism, far from embracing universal theories, is ultimately ended to protect the dominant discourse orchestrated by the economic-centered theory. **Keywords:** Tourism Research, English, Epistemology, Hospitality.

RESUMEN: El proceso de globalización, como así también la industria del turismo, ha descansado en la necesidad de adoptar un idioma como lengua franca con la finalidad última que las naciones puedan comunicarse entre sí. Los imperios, históricamente, han impuesto sus propias lenguas como un signo civilizatorio, pero lo que es más importante, en el mismo momento, sus respectivas elites adoptaban un idioma extranjero para distinguirse de la plebe. La aristocracia francesa adoptaba el ruso, a la vez que los británicos hablaban el francés con fluidez. Asimismo, los romanos no disimulaban su gusto por el griego. En este sentido, la imposición de un lenguaje común divide el mundo en dos, los nativos y los no nativos del idioma. En este ensayo discutimos las limitaciones y problemas que tiene la adopción del inglés como lengua franca dentro de los estudios turísticos. Nuestra tesis es que el inglés instrumentaliza una nueva epistemología centrada en el negocio y en una perspectiva económico-céntrica del turismo. En la actualidad, el inglés no solo es un problema para miles de investigadores no nativos, sino que funciona como el órgano de control de la calidad de los papers científicos en turismo. La discusión continúa la línea esbozada por Graham Dann y Ulrike Gretzel con un perfil crítico. Como estudio de caso final, exponemos los obstáculos del CONICET, organismo científico argentino para crear y sostener un repositorio digital con vistas a la publicación de trabajos científicos en revistas de categoría superior. El inglés como lengua franca deja a muchas otras veces sin posibilidad de ser oídas, al momento que alimenta la capacidad discursiva del mercado editorial, hoy monopolizado por los países angloparlantes. **Palabras claves:** Investigación Turística, Inglés, Epistemología, Hospitalidad.

INTRODUCTION

The history teaches us that Roman Empire expanded through the European continent from I. BC to the V A.C. Romans not only indexed new economies and territories to their imperial matrix but also exported their language (Latin) to the peripheral (conquered) new colonies. Of course, these imperial encounters were fraught of conflicts and discrepancies. Doubtless, the expansion of Latin as lingua franca happened with further tensions between the Romans and their new colonies (Richardson 1991; Edwell 2013; Lavan 2013). As David Riesman explained, Empires has historically developed an “Other-directed character” to locate and subordinate to “the Otherness”. This character, which is centered on the needs of discovery and curiosity for over-seas landscapes, is defined by a much deeper tendency to understand the external world through the internal mainstream cultural values. The over-valorization of the proper language seems to be a quintessential feature of this process, Riesman names as “the evolution of society”. The point suggests that empires, imperialism and the tendency for peripheries in adopting a lingua franca are inextricably intertwined (Pagden 1995). The end of WWII marked the

consolidations of the US as one of the two main superpowers, and with this tendency, the imposition of English as lingua franca for global commerce (Jenkins 2007). Specialists agree that English offers particular flexibility in the fields of its grammar to be applied to countless cultures and contexts, and echoing J. House is the main reason which helped to become in a global language. Beyond the hegemony of British Empire, where the idiom was profusely expanded to overseas territories, English not only gained considerable terrain in the negotiability and openness to be merged with other native tongues; in a nutshell, any lingua franca should combine a fast expansion of the grammar codes, laying the foundation towards an inter-language which endows in different cultures, with the willingness of locals to speak more or less regularly the global language. When this happens the original codes mutate and change, probably, to give as a result a new hybridized lexicon splitting the world between native and non-native speakers (House 2003). Everything that can be expressed in a language not necessarily makes sense when translated to another. To wit, any language provides the native speakers with all grammar structures to understand their external worlds; linguistics have shown that nothing can be said or understood outside the hegemony of the language (Ryle 1968; Whorf, 2012). The globalizing process posed a more than interesting dilemma revolving around the needs of homogenizing a polyglot world in only one language. Over the recent decades, some strategic technological breakthroughs (above all in the fields of digital technologies) associated to the reduction of working hours crystallized a globalizing process that connected the world through the lens of tourism consumption (Aramberri 2009; Korstanje 2018).

The tourism and hospitality industries appear to be growing sectors going towards multicultural landscapes. It is safe to say that in such a process English certainly occupied a central position not only shaping the dialogues between different stakeholders but determining a common global tongue in tourism-research. Douglas Pearce coins the term *internationalization of tourism* to denote the interest and consequence acceptance of non-English native speakers to write and publish their recent advances in English as a real proof that evinces the formation of global culture, applicable to all socio-economic backgrounds (Pearce, 2010; 2014). What is more important, English was the only language academicians recurred to publish their papers and books, relegating other voices, cosmologies and narratives to a peripheral condition (Fox, 2008; Korstanje 2010;

Dann & Parrinello, 2009). To put the problem in concrete terms, Botterill (2003) has eloquently shown how in 2003 almost 40 English language journals were producing more than 500 papers annually, a cypher that increased 25% for 2009 (Dann & Parrinello, 2009). Complimentarily, a review of the publications in Annals of Tourism research reveals that a whole portion of authors come from English-speaking countries (Burns & Holden 1995; Hitrec & Turkulin 1998). To some extent, the intention to accept English-written papers authored by non-English native writers rests on a fallacy or a cynic position because they do not reach the standardized patterns of qualities fixed by the Anglo-world (Korstanje 2010). An inter-crossing analysis of three main journals such as Annals of Tourism Research, Journal of Travel Research and Tourism Research conducted by Pauline Sheldon, describes with some accuracy how leading position in the scholarly-rankings, as well as the number of publications, seem to be reserved by scholars who come from the Anglophone world (Sheldon 1991).

Beyond this controversy, the current research explores the benefits and limitations of adopting English as lingua franca while reminds the importance of incorporating other idioms to overcome the current crisis the tourism industry faces today. As Graham Dann (2011) puts it, English not only has monopolized a whole portion of what it is published in the leading journals but the Academia is mainly formed by native English scholars. As a result of this, the dominance of English in tourism research has invariably led to a state of saturation –if not stagnation- that cyclically prevented the progress of tourism epistemology towards multiculturalism. Unfortunately, the adoption of English as a global language has not determined the maturation of tourism research, as some scholars envisaged. Despite a uniform and unique tongue, tourism research has gone through a great knowledge dispersion which John Tribe (2010) named as “the indiscipline of tourism”. An inevitable disinterest for the Academia to set a standardized agenda adjoined to the knowledge fragmentation which simultaneously triggered the rise of countless academic tribes and networks derived in an epistemological crisis.

With the benefits of hindsight, Anglophone scholars look to read and consequently cite English-written texts ignoring ethnocentrically other types of material. Neither the read nor speak any other language with fluency; there is little interest to learn a foreign language which helps to open the doors for scholars to interrogate furtherly on the academic paradigms. To set an example, for tourism historians tourism should be defined

as a modern and capitalist phenomenon consolidated after the WWII and the inter-war periods (Cohen 1972; MacCannell 1976; Lash & Urry, 1993). This erroneous standpoint has been gradually grounded on the impossibility of historians to read Latin and other dead languages. There are interesting evidence that probes something more similar to tourism was historically practiced in ancient empires like Babylon, Romans or Assyrians. In fact, the Latin term *Feriae* denoted a leave given to Roman citizens for three months to visit relatives, friends and wives geographically located in the Roman provinces. Travels, in this way, not only kept the Empire united but also stimulated global commerce. Today, in Portuguese and German languages the term *holidays* can be translated as *Das Ferias* (Por.) and *die Ferien* (Ger). *Feriae* remains still a long-lasting formula which has been replicated in many western idioms (Korstanje 2016; 2018a; 2018b).

The conformation of a lingua franca is helpful to communicate with other cultures coordinating efforts and resources for management but at some extent, it singles out the critical thinking leading the communication to a unilateral (imposed) discourse (Korstanje 2010; 2018a; 2018b). As Dann arguably adheres, the Anglophone hegemony obliges non-English native readers to rework their research according to international methodological standards, originally determined by English-speaking countries-, which distort the meaning of what they would express in their mother tongue. This happens simply because there is some reluctance of English speaking scholars to recognize other conceptual paradigms forged in Anglo-speaking cultures (Dann & Parrinello 2009; Dann 2011). Following this, Xiao and Smith (2006) painstakingly explore the publication metrics of three leading journals. Per their outcomes, those publications included in the prestige journal *Annals of Tourism Research* has been authored by scholars who are institutionally affiliated to universities from Canada, the US, Australia, New Zealand or the UK, which means “Anglophone territories”. In the same token, Eric Cohen called the attention to the problems a monolithic and mono-linguistic position generates to understand the position of the “Otherness” in knowledge production (Cohen 2004).

As the previous argument is given, English has recently installed as lingua franca not only in the businesses, as well as the tourism marketing but also in scientific world re-appropriating of the main prestigious journals and publishers worldwide. While some voices applaud that English offers an outstanding possibility to embrace a global language situating all researchers in equal conditions and positions (Cooper & Latham, 1988;

Pearce, 2014), others emphasize on the hegemonic and ethnocentric logic of an Academia originally designed to reinforce the old center-periphery dependency in a post-colonial context (Hyma, Ojo & Wall, 1980, Palmer 1994; Dann 2011; Korstanje 2010; Aramberri 2018). Its instrumental nature does not give further insights to solve the methodological problems of tourism research, but to enhance the performativity of tourist destinations. Finely-ingrained in the economic-centered paradigm, English is dominated and particularly applied by the managerial perspective, so to speak, indicating mainly what can be done to protect the tourist destination (Airey et al, 2015; Dann 2011; Korstanje 2010).

The first section of this chapter reviews succinctly the already-published works which focused on the impact of English in tourism research. The question of whether nations tend to share common idioms to communicate, no less true is that sooner or later, they fall in a fabricated monoliguism which is ethnocentrically evoked to subordinate the periphery to the center. The second section delves into the problem of over-estimating English as international and global tongue in tourism research. Echoing Graham Dann's contributions, we hold the thesis that tourism research borrowed from business and marketing fields English as a dominant language, and in so doing, other voices –originated in France, Spain, Italy or Germany who have widely theorized on the nature and evolution of leisure – tourism- were systematically covert into the dust of oblivion. To unpack this occulted (repressed) knowledge to discuss new paradigms to come to the current crisis in tourism research is the main challenges posed by epistemologists in the years to come (Franklin & Crang 2001; Tribe 1997; Tribe & Airey, 2007). The last section deciphers the connection of hospitality –a-la Derrida- which is only offered to those who speak the same language, and the imposition of English as the gatekeeper of tourism knowledge. The common-thread argument seems to punctuate that far from moving to multicultural geographies proper of a global spirit, tourism research is circumstantially trapped in a stagnant point, where the economic-based theory as well as business and marketing perspectives finally prevail.

Let's remind readers that the economic-based paradigm struggles to impose a managerial perspective about the nature of tourism, introducing marketing and management as the tugs of war towards the formation of a pseudo-scientific theory. This does not authorize to say marketing or management are spurious disciplines, both –

combined- plays a leading role in the multiplication of jobs warranting a fairer wealth distribution. The problem lies in the fact that marketing should be understood as an instrument to achieve an end, while science has an explanatory logic. As a cultural instrument of engineering, marketing looks for “the good practices” regarding a specific activity or industry, take special care of all variables which may place the project –for this case a tourist destination- in jeopardy. Social sciences, rather, are not orientated to solve practical problems –as successfully marketing does- but to describe the causality of inter-related issues. Science, which works hard to understand -not to measure- the nature of tourism, operates with the hypothesis of the first order (which means causes and effects). Marketing and management go hand-in-hand to operate with the hypothesis of second order. An opinion poll or closed-ended questionnaires formulated to measure the potential evolution of French tourist demands in Cuba or any other destination falls in this category. The key-factor of the second-order hypothesis is measuring, not understanding. Having said this, the economic-centered theory systematically excludes methodologies (like ethnographies, content analysis or another qualitative method) that do not provide a statistical analysis of the tendency. More interested in maximizing profits than expanding the understanding, the theory replicates itself through the imposition of different meanings about tourism. The term tourism which was motivated the classic approaches in the 70s sets the pace to new sub-terms such as War-tourism, Slum-tourism, dark-tourism, or virtual-tourism. All these connotations have the same epistemological origin, though they are dispersed with the end to reach broader segments. The meaning of tourism seems to be adjusted to what the tourist demands. For this partisan thinking, eco-tourism can be explained by those tourists flying to get an eco-friendly experience while dark tourism is based on those who travel to visit death or war-stricken sites. As Franklin brilliantly noted, there is a clear tourist-centricity in tourism research which is based on the needs of studying tourism limiting the focus to the tourist’s voice. This tourist-centricity, which remains constrained by the use of commercial English, marginalizes other actors in the tourist system, leading the derived research to see only a part of reality (Franklin 2007). Whenever a newly emerging approach (voice) interrogates furtherly the dominant ideology of the economic-centered paradigm, which today -so to speak- monopolizes the knowledge production in tourism, English grammar issues are exposed as the main reason behind the rejection. In this vein, English, or the

manipulation of linguistic matters for the acceptance or rejection of polemic material occupies a central strategy in the discipline. Also, non-English scholars are passively shackled to replicate empirically in their local environments the doctrines and theories externally- fabricated in the Anglo-phone world. Of course, the act of writing in a foreign language is always a very hard task to perform, and non-native English speakers come with serious obstacles to write and ultimately proofread their manuscripts in a polished English style. Sometimes, they are pressed by their institutions to publish their advances in top-ranked or high-impact journals. Since English dominates the editorial market, professional researchers are conditioned to write in foreign language. Universities whose researchers publish in English have further opportunities to be better ranked than those which stimulate other languages. Needless to say, a better position warrants further profits. By their side, these universities rarely invest financial resources to be assisted in the proofreading process, in which case the experience turns really frustrating. Other mix-balanced journals that opt to alternate publications written in different languages are circumscribed to peripheral positions in the impact factor rankings. Not surprisingly, Scimago (SCOPUS- Journal Rankings in Tourism, Leisure and Hospitality Management) offers an explanatory illustration, simply because Spanish-speaking journals are located in bottom tiers (Q4). To put it simply, the Q1, and Q2 tiers are entirely formed by English-speaking journals.

CONCEPTUAL DEBATE

Countless studies and books have punctuated on the benefits of learning foreign languages in tourism-related contexts. Overseas educative courses and syllabuses are certainly enriched with the provision of foreign languages worldwide. In the recent decades, Anglophone destinations such as Australia, the UK, Canada or the US have received particular interests for global students who are motivated to enhance their English skills (Simpson, 2011; Al-Khatib, 2005; Prachanant 2012; Rata 2013). As Vukonic-Vojnovic & Nicin (2013) eloquently observe, the existence of global language corresponds with the needs of nations to communicate each other, its expansion depends upon many factors as a military power, communication technologies and commerce. English was not a privilege of native speakers any longer at the moment the UK and the US decided to go

across the globe to index new economies and territories. The British Colonization, at least as it was imagined in England, brought English to many non-western cultures creating a durable liaison with these nations even to date. Almost more than 20% of people speak English with some proficiency –a marginal percentage respecting other idioms, as these experts hold. This point reflects very well the number of native speakers, somehow, does not determine a language to situate as “lingua franca”. No matter than this, English has energetically gravitated in the fields of tourism and hospitality sectors. The question seems to be why?

As this backdrop, Vukonic-Vojnovic & Nicin explain that English has been epitomized as a global language for tourism stakeholders to communicate each other while exerting an important influence for tourism-delivery and tourism-receiving societies regardless English is the native tongue. Hotel staff or tour guide whose skills in English are higher than other language have more probabilities to get better-paid jobs. At the same time, English plays a leading role in the configuration of academic syllabuses and tourism careers in the four continents. In consonance with this assertion, it is noteworthy that language exhibits a complex interplay between ethnic groups and the state’s authority which sometimes leads to conflictive situations. By this end, Zamir Hauptman & Tal dissect the problems of foreign language in Israel. Issues regarding national identity or security are of vital importance at the time of studying the factors that operate in the conformation of a dominant language and the relegation to others to the dust of oblivion. The interaction and dynamics of languages vary on culture and time. In Israel, the Arabic language seems to be undermined in a lower position while English is systematically placed as a third-desired language. By learning English, in Israel, obeys to achieve instrumental ends which mean the possibilities to get jobs in the tourism and hospitality industries (Zamir, Hauptman & Tal 2013). To say the same in other terms, while in some countries English is the native language, in others the adoption of English as global tongue represents better opportunities to buttress local economies (Fox 2008; Sarem, Hamidi, Mahmoudie 2013; Tetik, 2016; Bruyel Olmedo & Juan Garau, 2009). This begs some more than interesting questions, why have scholars adopted English, which is a global language for commerce and business, exclusively for tourism research? what is the point of conflict between native and non-native speakers in tourism research?

ENGLISH IN TOURISM RESEARCH

One of the pioneering who has studied the influence of English in tourism research was Professor Graham Dann, who does not need the previous presentation. In his seminal book *The Language of Tourism*, Dann (1996) argues convincingly that the urgency of seducing different stakeholders, audiences and segments facilitated the arrival of a specific-based code of communication to connote what he dubbed as the language of tourism. Dann, who analyzes brochures, travelogues, and other channels of communication, holds the thesis that a global language makes it easier to inaugurate a new ideological mechanism of colonization. Following this, Julio Aramberri (2018) alerts the adoption of English as lingua franca seems to be clear discrimination to non-English native scholars who want to be read globally but have no English as a primary option. Still further, there remain some residual colonial structures operating in the constellations of language where the Global North re-produces the skeleton or the architecture of the building, and the Global South is passively limited to provide the flesh or dataset, in order to confirm some externally-generated knowledge. In consonance with this point, Dann (2011) reiterates the importance of *deciphering critically the “language of tourism”, which consists in “a structured, monological, multi-strategical and controlling way of communicating between often anonymous parental senders and readily identifiable childlike receivers. To this sentiment the following qualifications can be added: “Through many registers, diverse media and all stages of a trip, the language of tourism transmits timeless, magical, euphoric and tautological messages which contain the circular expectations and experiences of tourists and tourism” (Dann, 2011b: 27).* What is more important, the main body of the language of tourism, which is principally drawn in English, alludes to a managerial perspective empowered by marketing and the needs of gain-maximization that allocate efficiently in the channels of promotion and advertising tourist destinations often take. To put the same in bluntly, beyond the so-called supremacy of English, the tourism industry –as well as any other global service industry- adjusts standardized and mechanized forms of communication, aimed at stimulating consumption through a lingua franca which allows the introduction of a one-sided discourse (Jennings, 2001; Korstanje 2010). Renata Fox (2008) alludes to English as a world-making process finely ingrained in configuring a unique experience where hosts

and guests meet. The problem lies in the fact English has gradually shaped the methodologies, as well as epistemologies of tourism research in recent decades. In this way, tourism generates a systematic discourse constituted in the social function of English. These remarks coincide with Catherine Palmer dubbed as “Englishness”, a conceptualization which is culturally constructed through the site consumption. As she noted, societies cement its hierarchal circles through the articulation in of inclusive and exclusive circles where some persons are accepted while others rejected. This ideological instrument gives dominant groups a privileged position to impose specific-based cosmologies to understand what philosophers know as “reality”. Identity is never a neutral entity, it appeals to re-organize internal tensions and discrepancies. To wit, the British Empire is based on the mythical construction of a shared identity but, other ethnicities as Scots, Irish or Welshmen struggle to impose their own cosmologies. The notion of Englishness not only allows resolving this dichotomy but homogenizes multiple cultural belongings to the values forged in England –as a state-sponsored ideology-. Above all, the sense of Englishness –exhibited in the tourist destination sites- endorses to a much deeper re-evaluation of history under the lens of an ideological post-colonial narrative, the supremacy of Great Britain through English values (Palmer 2005). In so doing, the language transmits a type of national intimacy where visitors take part of an imagined community. As Palmer cites: *“The creation of intimacy is thus a key component in the communication of nationness. Intimacy is not only personal but also deeply felt. It is about close personal relationships. Imagined intimacy is perhaps the most private relationship of all as it goes to the heart of a person’s most secret thoughts, desires, values and beliefs. In this instance it relates to the fundamental relationship between the nation and its people. It is thus important to understand what themes of Englishness are symbolically communicated by each of the three sites as these help to construct the tourists’ intimate, national imagining” (Palmer 2005: 25).*

The opportunity to share or reject a foreign language offers a fertile ground for the arrival of ideological discourse which is externally constructed, imposed, and negotiated by the non-native speakers. Having said this, Mura, Mognard & Sharif (2017) lament that though non-English researchers work hard to publish their outcomes in a foreign language to gain further visibility, in little occasions English-speaking researchers opt to publish in another language than English. The gap is associated with the material

asymmetries engendered in a post-colonial world where the *Non-western discourse*, which allocated in the periphery, intervenes actively in the knowledge production. These uneven structures of power, far from being shortened or solved, recreate different contours for tourism research, so to speak, methodological contours mainly associated with different socio-cultural background and history. To set a clear example, the methods followed in France to study tourism appear to be pretty different than the US. Unless French scholars make the decision to publish in English or Americans launch to make their works publishable in French, both worlds remain in complete isolation. Here two assumptions should be done. On one hand, the quest for imposing a lingua franca very well leads towards fragmentation of micro-landscapes where the national idiom is culturally affirmed. On another, whether English is unilaterally enthralled as the only language –ignoring other methods- the derived applied-research faces a serious crisis because of an inevitable stagnation. Authors finally conclude that although many studies, which focus on the intersection of tourism scholarly production and metrics abound, less attention was given to non-English speaking works. In consequence, as Korstanje (2010) reminds, starting from the premise that English speaking scholars have taken the lead in monopolizing (as gatekeepers) a whole portion of what is being published in professional and leading journals, non-English speaking researchers who need their works see the light of publicity are forced to adopt conceptual paradigms which are alien to their realities. Equally important, there are little chances for non-Western scholars to confront the dominant paradigm if she or he is unfamiliar with English. Based on his experience as an author, editor and reviewer, Korstanje acknowledges overtly that even once published, a text authored by non-English native authors have fewer possibilities to be a highly-cited document than English native ones. It is unfortunate to see who such a position, which is recently affirmed by the introduction of citation metrics, ushers epistemologists in a grid-lock, simply because they erroneously believe that highly-cited works are in essence of high-quality. In this way, low-cited texts, probably written by Non-English scholars are considered of low quality for English speaking voices. Sarah Wijesinghe, Paolo Mura & Frederic Bouchon (2019) alert on the risk of systematizing tourism-knowledge through the lens of Englishness only. As they brilliantly remark, colonial structures devote symbolic resources to impose a unique and unilateral cultural matrix which serves to subordinate the new colonial subjects. In tourism, the Academia has reserved its rights to

keep its own agenda and lingua franca (English) delineating the contours of knowledge production and dissemination. As a result of this, the countless publications placed on leading journals have systematically neglected any voice or knowledge system originated outside the “English speaking global centers”. An additional problem speaks to us of the limitations amateur researchers, who are geographically located in the third world, go to reach updated publications and applied research. Many non-western universities not only have the language barrier, but they also come with financial restraints to get the hot-released publication. This point leads them to read only the abstract, overlooking the main manuscript. Paradoxically, their interests, as well as motivations and pressures for playing in the big leagues push them away from the system (Korstanje 2010). The access to knowledge production is based on economic and socio-cultural inequalities where language occupies a central position as a watchdog. What seems to be more important, the monolingual use of a unique language associates to methodological myopia which unless resolved saturates the obtained findings. In the next section, we shall discuss critically the problems and limitations to impose English as lingua franca in the constellations of tourism and hospitality research as the only option, as well as the obstacles non-English native researchers often come across in the task of making their research publishable.

ENGLISH AND NON-ENGLISH NATIVE SPEAKERS

In his seminal book, *Of Hospitality*, French philosopher Jacques Derrida (2000) offers an interesting diagnosis on the role of language as the main gatekeeper of hospitality. Per his viewpoint, language divides the world in two, those who share the same language and foreigners who are unfamiliar with the mother-tongue. The “Otherness”, in this way, shakes the “reign of dogmatism” interrogating the hosting cultural values. Derrida recognizes finally that hospitality –like the language- can be offered or not, delineating the borders between the “common-ethos” and aliens (Xenos). Any foreigner comes from a place, keeps a history which should be revealed to the host. The language scrutinizes the guest’s intention through two questions: who are you and what do you want? as Derrida concludes. Questions –which are hosted in the language- play a leading role in the separation of selfhood from the alterity.

As the previous backdrop, let me step back for a moment to the inquiries and legacy left by Dann & Parrinello (2009) regarding the monolingualism of tourism. Unlike sociology, which was originally cemented on a polyglot tradition, tourism research expanded with an “unjustified monopoly of English” as the only valid alternative to communicate with other cultures. Scholars, coming from around the world, are academically disciplined to accept the Anglo-Saxon paradigms which describe a partial version of the story about the evolution of tourism as a social phenomenon. In this respect, Dann & Parrinello struggle to start a multicultural tradition to study tourism from diverse angles and cosmologies, each one respecting the cultural background from where the researcher comes from. Significant and fresh insights carried out in Western Europe, i.e. Spain, France and Germany, have limitations to resonate in English-speaking countries. The Anglophone dominance in tourism studies is evinced not only by the pressure of non-English native scholars to write and publish in English but by the needs of adding an abstract in English for those papers included in non-English journals. This asymmetrical pattern is supported by stronger financial support to conduct applied-research and produce scholarly writings. At a closer look, the tendency marks a clear lack of interests for Anglophone scholars to read other texts, studies and works written in other languages than English. As a direct consequence, everything that is taking place in the world remains in secrecy. Not surprisingly, the interests given to the influence of English in tourism research is not primarily motivated by tourism-related scholars, but from social sciences. Sociologists and anthropologists, over years, have been captivated to understand why English has a clear, if not irreversible, predominance –above other idioms- in tourism knowledge production process.

An additional challenge associates to the limitations of leading journals to publish papers in open-access modes. For some reason, which is hard to precise here, Spanish-related journals are prone to publish material in open access while English-speaking journals usually are paid-for options. In this respect, global editorial publishers not only concentrate a large number of resources relegating university presses to extinction, or so to speak to a bankruptcy. Over the recent years, some universities claimed energetically Elsevier they should pay for a fee subscription so that students access to published material while they should re-pay for their researchers to an additional academic fee for publishing in high-impact factor journals. Professional researchers also were pressed to

target the university press instead of global publishers. Somehow, what is a more important, paid-for journals receive more attention from scholarship, as well as material delivered by non-English native speakers. Basically, Here three questions arise: why paid-for journals are highly-cited in comparison with open-access journals? Is the impact factor leading the tourism research to an inevitable crisis? What is the role of English in the process?

A quick answer on these above-noted questions leads us to a bibliometric-based culture and the metrics technologies which are disposed to create rankings among scholars and journals where the fluency and proficiency in English mark the difference between the elite who publishes not to perish and the rest. In an early study, Korstanje (2014) exerts a radical criticism on the limitations and problems of independent tourism research which is subordinated to leading professional publishers worldwide. At a first glimpse, serious dilemmas respecting to copy-right policies surface. The copyright form was originally was designated to protect authors' rights (for example from plagiarism) (Korstanje 2014). This point will be addressed later. With basis on her experience as Editor-in-Chief of ERTR hosted by Texas A&M University, Ulrike Gretzel has called the attention on the advance of great publishers and the ethical dilemmas revolving around profits and Academia. Academic authors often target the potential visibility each publisher offers, which entails further citations sooner or later. One of the problems of high-ranking journals consists of the lack of accessibility which is not paying to subscribe to the journal. This affects not only education establishment and university but scholars. At the bottom, the policy defies the principle of Science which punctuates all material should be accessed and potentially replicated by scholars. Gretzel goes on to say: *"So where does eRTR fit in? It is an open journal that is free and purely based on volunteer work with its contents and technical platform being owned and managed by Texas A&M University. It fulfils a training aspect as well, but with a broader agenda than other journals. First, it has an open policy for its editorial board with volunteers representing all levels of research experience but certainly with a focus on recruiting reviewers early in their career. This, of course, means that there has to be an investment from the editorial team into training reviewers. Reviews are not blindly sent to authors but rather scrutinized by the editor and further interpreted for authors if needed"* (Gretzel 2014: p. 60).

It is important to clarify the question of open-access is being discussed in many disciplines and it is not limited to tourism research. It is unfortunate, as Gretzel marks, that the most prestigious journals are not based on an open-access policy. What is more important, the wages of professional researchers depend exclusively upon the additional payment for publishing in high-ranked journals (Gretzel 2014). The urgency to publish in these journals affects negatively the objectivity of researchers, who are pressed to sacrifice their own vision to the dominant paradigm or the dominant voice. Editorial board members rarely are willing to accept paradigms that directly defy the status quo. Let me return for a moment to the copyright issue. The copy-right form is a document orientated to protect authors' rights. However, the profit-centered culture has undermined the autonomy of authors in recent years. Great publishers are legally encouraged to replicate the published material at their discretion while authors are limited only to pin-out their works at electronic platforms for their students only. The problem aggravates by the fact authors are not paid for their works and open-access policies in paid-for journals should be entirely absorbed by authors. Excessive sums of money ranging from USD 1500 to USD 1200 should be paid for authors who want their works in free-access mode. Authors are paid by their universities when they had the luck to publish in high impact factor journals but the university should pay twice for students to read the material. It is important not to lose the sight of the fact that the academic hierarchy is cemented through the introduction of H-index. This coefficient involves an effort to maximize the quality of performed research alternating impact and productivity. Each author is valorized by its peers respecting the obtained number of citations. H-index proffers an author-level metric focusing on author's most cited papers and its number of publications. Prolific scholars should have higher citation than non-prolific scholars. The concept starts from the premise that H-Index raises when the authors gain further citations while reducing its number of publications. Needless to say, the policy harms not only the scholar's productivity but the creativity adjusting innovative ideas to what can be publishable or at least desired by the academic status quo. The index prevents young researchers are educated to write and research only in the themes or subthemes that have the potential for publication, ignoring probably that most recognized scholars or scientists are not necessarily the most cited experts. Following the H-index criterion, Albert Einstein who published only four papers in his academic life would get an index of

4. Still further, each culture, nation and discipline develops each own pace towards citations. The concept should not be standardized. The h-index may be very well manipulated when authors recur to self-citations to enhance their visibility or when they unethically force students to cite their papers. The peer-review system revolves around two ethical quandaries. On one hand, reviewers are not paid for their efforts but they take the advantage to recommend their works to the authors. On another, many of them are non-English native speakers who emulate the behavior of English native speakers, sometimes rejecting good material because they do not understand the argument. Since it is very hard for publishers to recruit good (valuable) reviewers, most certainly the papers are in the hand of students or low-skilled scholars. This means that interesting papers are buried on the current academic bureaucracy of great publishers. Having said this, the academic hierarchy is legitimated through a Darwinist spirit where only those who publish can survive. The Publish or Perish doctrine equals to “the survival of the fittest”, and English occupies a central position marking the borders between desired and undesired research. While a common tongue is strongly recommended to science, no less true is that it erects a wall to non-native speakers. The economic-based paradigm, which exploits business and profits of tourist destinations, bodes well in the current academic publisher’s policies that prioritize the source of publication (which means the index where the journal is listed) than the paper content. Last but not least, let me explain for a moment the example of CONICET as a main study case. Some years ago, I had the opportunity to take the lead in the conformation of a wider tourism-repository so that all published material of tourism universities, establishments, institutions and independent authors to be freely hosted.

CONICET (National Scientific and Technical Research Council –NSTRC) is the main state agency that fosters science in Argentina. This institution exhibits a great prestige and valuation by other local investigators. Unlike other countries, in Argentina state university has further prestige than private ones. CONICET not only centralizes the agenda or curricula utilizing other institutions but invests great funds and money for knowledge production in nation-wide. The Argentinean researchers in tourism and hospitality fields were pressed to publish in the top-ranked journals as Tourism Management, Annals of Tourism Research or Journal of Sustainable tourism. Even if the linguistic barriers appear to be insurmountable some colleagues had the luck to be

actively supported by English-native researchers for their works to see the light of publicity. However, those published works were restricted to be re-published in CONICET repository. This measure impeded thousands of students and independent researchers whose institutions are not subscribed to global publishers to access the requested material. Authorities coerced their investigators to republish the material regardless of the copyright policies, but authors negated to obey the order. The issue escalated to the hands of former President Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner who issued a resolution to press Argentinean researchers to upload their papers into the repository. But things come always worse to worst, only 2% of participants uploaded successfully the material arguing convincingly that because of copyright issues they were hand-tied to pass the ball to CONICET's repository platform. Though they recognized the importance for other colleagues and citizens to read scientific works democratically, paradoxically they retained their own productions to gain positions in the international ranking lists. A last desperate attempt by CONICET forced its satellite forces, CONEAU, another organization which evaluates the post-grad careers, to equal SCOPUS, ISI THOMPSON to other minor local indexes. Many privately owned universities were encouraged to enroll their journals in local indexes such as Scielo. In their protocols and documents, authorities of CONICET finally gave the same value to Scielo. The point can be better illustrated as follows, at the time CONICET targeted to another index than the already established SCOPUS or WOS, state university research was margined from the major leagues. This triggers a hot debate around the political and economic nature of prestige, which surely is intertwined with specific and centralized forms of production. Without any doubt, Gretzel's worries about the future of free research and publication in tourism for the next years are real. The possibilities of survival for a university hosted publication are uncertain; but whatever the case may be, supporting a project like this deserves our time and attention.

CONCLUSION

The globalizing process, as well as the industries of tourism, rests on the needs of adopting a "lingua franca" in order for nations to understand each other. Historically, empires have interposed their own language as a sign of civilization, and education. What is equally important, ruling elite tried systematically to incorporate foreign language to

distinguish themselves from lower classes. French aristocracy spoke Russian with fluency, while the British ruling elite was enthusiastic in speaking French. Roman aristocrats devoted serious resources to improve their Greek. The imposition of a lingua franca, no matter than its nature, divides the world in two parts, the native and the non-native speakers. This conceptual essay-review enumerated and analyzed a set of problems which revolve around the adoption of English as a global language in the constellations. We hold the thesis that tourism research replicates the same epistemological model originated in the economic-based paradigm, incorporating a business English grammar. Nowadays, English acts as a gatekeeper marking the radical selection in the papers quality. Echoing Dann and Gretzel, English has cemented a centralized form of production which excludes many other voices and knowledge while shaping the Anglophone hegemony over other idioms. The commercial-based vision is leading the epistemology of tourism to a gridlock very hard to reverse. We offer a diagnosis on a short study-case based on the CONICET repository and the ethical dilemmas around the paid-for journals and editorial rankings. The expansion of great publishers worldwide and the concentration of financial resources in Anglophone editorial in-house publishers have been successfully supported by English as a global tongue, locating English speaking scholars as the masters of a game where the non-English speakers will never win. The monolinguisism, far from embracing universal theories, is ultimately ended to protect the dominant discourse orchestrated by the economic-centered theory. Paradoxically, those publications making a seminal contribution to tourism theory appear to be hosted beyond the high-impact factor rankings.

REFERENCES

- Airey, D., Tribe, J., Benckendorff, P., & Xiao, H. (2015). The managerial gaze: The long tail of tourism education and research. *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(2), 139-151.
- Al-Khatib, M. (2005). English in the workplace: An analysis of the communication needs of tourism and banking personnel. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(2), 174-194
- Aramberri, J. (2009). The future of tourism and globalization: Some critical remarks. *Futures*, 41(6), 367-376.
- Aramberri, J. (2018). Why tourism research in non-English speaking systems is ignored?. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 43(3), 400-402.

- Botterill, D. (2003). An autoethnographic narrative on tourism research epistemologies. *Loisir et société/Society and Leisure*, 26(1), 97-110.
- Bruyèl-Olmedo, A., & Juan-Garau, M. (2009). English as a lingua franca in the linguistic landscape of the multilingual resort of S'Arenal in Mallorca. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6(4), 386-411.
- Burns, P. M., & Holden, A. (1995). *Tourism: A new perspective*. New York, FT Prenticehall.
- Cohen, E. (1972). Toward a sociology of international tourism. *Social research*, 164-182.
- Cohen E. (2004). *Contemporary Tourism: diversity and change*. Oxford, Elsevier.
- Cooper, C., & Latham, J. (1988). English educational tourism. *Tourism management*, 9(4), 331-334.
- Dann, G. M. (1996). *The language of tourism: a sociolinguistic perspective*. Wallingford, Cab International.
- Dann, G., & Parrinello, G. L. (Eds.). (2009). *Sociology of tourism: European origins and developments*. Wagon Lane, Emerald Group Publishing.
- Dann, G. (2011a). "Take me to the Hilton": The language of tourism paradigm. *Folia Turistica*, 25(1), 23-40.
- Dann, G. (2011b). Anglophone hegemony in tourism studies today. *Enlightening Tourism: a pathmaking journal*, 1(1): 1-30.
- Derrida, J., & Dufourmantelle, A. (2000). *Of hospitality*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Edwell, P. M. (2013). Definitions of Roman imperialism. In *A Companion to Roman Imperialism*. London, Brill.
- Fox, R. (2008). English in tourism: a sociolinguistic perspective. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 14(1), 13-22.
- Franklin, A. (2007). The problem with tourism theory. *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies*, 131-148.
- Franklin, A., & Crang, M. (2001). The trouble with tourism and travel theory?. *Tourist Studies*, 1(1): 5-22
- Gretzel, U. (2014). A Vision for eRTR. *e-Review of Tourism Research*, 11(1-2), 59-61.
- Hitrec, T., & Turkulin, B. (1998). Document processing in tourism: A scientific approach. *Leisure, Culture and Tourism in Europe*, 335-370.
- House, J. (2003). English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism?. *Journal of sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 556-578.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Jennings, G. (2001). *Tourism research*. Sydney, John Wiley and sons Australia, Ltd.
- Hyma, B., Ojo, A., & Wall, G. (1980). Tourism in tropical Africa a review of literature in English and research agenda. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 7(4), 525-553.

Korstanje, M. E. (2010). Supremacy of English in tourism research. *Anatolia*, 21(2), 383-387.

Korstanje, M. E. (2016). The portrait of Dean MacCannell–towards an understanding of capitalism. *Anatolia*, 27(2), 298-304.

Korstanje M. E. (2014) Science and Profits: problems and controversies for tourism research. *ERTR review*, 11(3-4): 54-59

Korstanje M. E (2018a) *The Mobilities Paradox: a critical analysis*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.

Korstanje, M. E. (2018b). The Lost Paradise: The Religious Nature of Tourism. In *Global Perspectives on Religious Tourism and Pilgrimage* (pp. 129-141). Hershey, IGI Global.

MacCannell, D. (1976). *The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Mura, P., Mognard, E., & Sharif, S. P. (2017). Tourism research in non-English-speaking academic systems. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 42(4), 436-445.

Lash, S. M., & Urry, J. (1993). *Economies of signs and space* (Vol. 26). London, Sage.

Lavan, M. (2013). *Slaves to Rome: paradigms of empire in Roman culture*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Pagden, A. (1995). *Lords of all the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c. 1500-c. 1800* (p. 63). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Palmer, C. A. (1994). Tourism and colonialism: The experience of the Bahamas. *Annals of tourism Research*, 21(4), 792-811.

Palmer, C. (2005). An ethnography of Englishness: Experiencing identity through tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 32(1), 7-27.

Pearce, D. G. (2010). Tourism distribution: a review and strategic research agenda. *Tourism research: a*, 20-20. Pearce, D, Butler R. Oxford, Goodfellow Publishers.

Pearce, D. G. (2014). The internationalization of tourism research. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(3), 267-280.

Prachanant, N. (2012). Needs analysis on English language use in tourism industry. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 66, 117-125.

Rață, G., Petroman, I & Petroman, C (Ed.). (2013). *The English of tourism*. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Richardson, J. S. (1991). Imperium Romanum: empire and the language of power. *The journal of roman studies*, 81, 1-9.

Riesman, D. (1950). *The Lonely Crowd: a study of changing American character*. New Haven, Yale University Press.

Ryle, G. (1968). Thinking and reflecting. In *The Human Agent* (pp. 210-226). London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Sarem, S. N., Hamidi, H., & Mahmoudie, R. (2013). A critical look at textbook evaluation: A case study of evaluating an ESP course-book: English for international tourism. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4(2), 372-380.

Sheldon, P. J. (1991). An authorship analysis of tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(3), 473-484.

Simpson, J. (2011). Integrating project-based learning in an English language tourism classroom in a Thai university. Doctoral Thesis. Australian Catholic University, Faculty of Education.

Tetik, N. (2016). Tourism guidance students' attitudes towards the English language course. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 4(3), 271-284.

Tribe, J. (1997). The indiscipline of tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 24(3), 638-657.

Tribe, J. (2010). Tribes, territories and networks in the tourism academy. *Annals of tourism research*, 37(1), 7-33.

Tribe, J., & Airey, D. (2007). A review of tourism research. *Developments in tourism research*, 3-16.

Vukovic-Vojnovic, D & Nicin, M. (2013) "English as a global Language in the tourism industry: a case study". In *The English of tourism*. Rață, G., Petroman, I & Petroman, C (Ed.). Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 3-18

Whorf, B. L. (2012). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Cambridge, MIT press.

Wijesinghe, S. N., Mura, P., & Bouchon, F. (2019). Tourism knowledge and neocolonialism– A systematic critical review of the literature. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(11), 1263-1279.

Xiao, H., & Smith, S. L. (2006). The making of tourism research: Insights from a social sciences journal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 490-507.

Zamir, S, Hauptman S & Tal R. (2013) "Teaching lingua franca: the significance of English for Bedouin High School Students in Israel". In *The English of tourism*. Rață, G., Petroman, I & Petroman, C (Ed.). Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 115-130.