

REVISITING ZNANIECKI'S CULTURAL THEORY: DIFFERENT FORMS OF CONTEMPORARY TOURISM IN TERMS OF THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO "THE WORLD CULTURE SOCIETY"

*Julia Murrmann**

Abstract

Purpose. The paper wishes to offer a contemporary reading of a classic cultural theory of Florian Znaniecki and to highlight its relevance within the field of tourism studies: different forms of contemporary global tourism are analyzed in terms of their contribution to the development of "the world culture society."

Method. The article is partly of review character and contains a critical analysis of Znaniecki's legacy. Then, through an intuitive-logical process, the potential of the chosen adjectival tourisms within their contribution to "the world culture society" was measured.

Findings. After a detailed analysis of the important contemporary types of international tourism, we can acknowledge that the concerns of Znaniecki expressed in his text first published in 1952 were fully justified. Despite the potential ascribable to the travels, not every type of travel is a form of contribution to the growth of "the world culture society."

Research and conclusions limitations. New forms of tourism are continuously emerging and gaining popularity and the character of those existing may change.

Practical implications. The article is a kind of tribute to one of the most outstanding Polish culturologists and sociologists who was the early spokesman for the world society and to whom we owe, among others, the basis for research of modern culture and its changes.

Originality. This is an original work on a topic rarely undertaken by researchers.

Type of paper. Theoretical paper.

Key words: Znaniecki, tourism, world society, world culture.

* PhD, University of Warsaw, Faculty of Modern Languages, Department of Italian Studies; e-mail: juliarozewska@wp.pl.

Introduction

Due to his outstanding merits within the social and cultural sciences, Florian Znaniecki (1882–1958) ensured himself a position as one of the founding fathers of modern sociology [Szacki 2007, p. 752; Sztompka 2012, p. 64]. His masterpiece, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* [1996, first published in 1918 (volumes I and II), 1919 (volume III) and 1920 (volumes IV and V)], co-authored by the American sociologist W. I. Thomas, is considered to be one of the classics of sociology, a milestone in the methodological development of social sciences [Ritzer 2004, p. 43] and a “classic landmark because it attempted to integrate theory and data in a way no American study had done before” [Bulmer 1986, p. 45]. Z. Bauman summed up Znaniecki’s contribution to the social sciences in the following way: “Znaniecki, one would say, is *organically* present in today’s sociology. He is a part, and a vital part, of its body. His ideas moved from the margin to the center” [Bauman 2000, p. 74]. Znaniecki’s concepts are being systematically discussed in the context of current studies of globalization processes and multiculturalism, as articulated by R. Robertson [1992], I. Wallerstein [1979, 1999], P. Donati [2000] and others. The resonance of his works is still visible in postmodern sociology and can be helpful in understanding the dynamics of cultural processes. However, the Polish scholar is customarily addressed in sociological literature as a “neglected classic” [Plummer 1983, p. 34], or an “unrecognized forerunner” [Hałas 1994]. Therefore, the present article, by referring to a less known work of Znaniecki [1952], wishes to pay tribute to this outstanding Polish sociologist and culturologist who was an early spokesman for the world society and to whom we owe, among others, the basis for research of modern culture and its changes.

The purpose of the paper is to offer a contemporary reading of Znaniecki’s classic cultural theory and to highlight its relevance within the field of tourism studies: tourism has truly become a global social force and the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) predicts its further development: international tourism arrivals will increase by 3.3 percent per year between 2010 and 2030 and reach 1.8 billion total arrivals by 2030 [<http://www2.unwto.org/annual-reports>; 20.05.2015]. While analysing, through an intuitive-logical process, the chosen forms of contemporary global tourism in context of their contribution to the development of the world culture society, we will refer to both the examples provided by Znaniecki (who was a frequent traveler himself and as such gathered a lot of experience [Abel 1996]) and the findings of the contemporary researchers of tourist activity (studies dedicated to reasons, patterns, consequences, modalities and characteristics of travelers’ mobility).

Literature review

There were already a few attempts to offer a contemporary reading of the work of Znaniecki. His sociological legacy is multifold and has been extensively revisited by many researchers. Among experts on Znaniecki's output we must cite J. Szacki [1986], E. Hałas [1994, 2000, 2010] and P. Donati [2000]. We can equally mention some other successful attempts of papers inspired by Znaniecki's works. M. Łuczewski analyzed in his paper the affinities between R. Boudon's concept of axiological rationality and the theory of values developed by Znaniecki [1919; 1925; 1934; 1936]. Then, "armed with their conceptual tools", he wanted to show that the concept of axiological rationality and the theory of values can help us analyze emergence of national ideologies, i.e. peasant-into-Pole processes, on the example of the village of Zmiaćca in Polish Galicia [Łuczewski 2009].

G. Sinatti [2008] referred to the masterpiece by Znaniecki and Thomas *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* [1996], an extensive five-volume study on the transformations occurring in Polish society in their home country and among its emigrants in the United States. According to the sociologist, it should be emphasized that although the work was published almost a century ago, it offers a model of research that is exemplary and therefore should be valued for its theoretical contributions made to the understanding of migrations. Sinatti stresses that the book addresses a number of issues that have acquired new relevance today in the current era of an increasingly transnational nature of contemporary migration flows. Actually, already Znaniecki's daughter – Helena Znaniecka Lopata, also a prominent sociologist herself, explored the topic of migrations referring to her father's legacy [1996]. In *Polish Americans. Status Competition in an Ethnic Community* [1976] she examined the impact of post-communist changes in Poland and the presence of the third wave of immigrants on Polish communities abroad. She studied the community as a living entity, with internal divisions and conflicts, and explored relations with the home nation (Poland) and the country of settlement (United States) [Znaniecka Lopata 1976; revised and reissued in 1994]. With regard to the very same work by Znaniecki and Thomas [1996], irrespective of the fact that their theory of desorganization and reorganization originally concerned the processes of migration *par excellence*, there were already attempts to adopt it to the theory of tourism. According to the Polish tourism sociologist K. Przeclawski, this theory can successfully function within the tourist reality [Przeclawski 2004, p. 58].

Theoretical background

Referring to the former philosophical conceptions of unity of the universe Znaniecki outlined the perspective of dynamics of the global society. E. Hałas summed up the achievements of the eminent Polish sociologist in this domain: “Znaniecki’s vision of modernity covers more than just the conception of the world society. Having transformed himself back into the philosopher that he was at the beginning of his career, Znaniecki constructed a model of a future civilization. It would be a secular one, but based on spiritual values, harmonious and flexible, permeated by innovative dynamism” [Hałas 2010, p. 207]. In fact, according to Znaniecki’s cultural theory, there are different types of society, with a different status and different features. The old, preliterate ‘tribal society’ is gradually disappearing. The ‘political society’ (also known as the ‘state society’) has a common legal system and an organized, independent government controlling the inhabitants of a given territory. The ‘ecclesiastic society’ has a common and distinct literary, religious culture and an independent, organized church. The ‘national culture society’ has a secular culture and an independent organization enabling the preservation, growth and expansion of this culture [Znaniecki 1952, p. 21]. There is, however, another emerging type: “Perhaps we should recognize a fifth type of society - a world society [also referred to as a ‘world culture society’]. This ideal, long cherished by thinkers and leaders, has, I believe, begun to be realized” [Znaniecki 1952, p. 21]. Znaniecki believed that a united well-ordered world society, characterized by an active social solidarity (political unity followed by cultural unity or the other way round) is the future of mankind. World culture, i.e. the common possessions of humanity, is considered as a foundation of the emergent world society. The concept of world culture includes both past achievements and existing accomplishments (the common cultural heritage of mankind, i.e. works of art – architecture, sculpture, paintings, music, literature, philosophy, etc.) and future potentialities, because sharing common cultural products of the past is by itself not enough to stimulate and maintain active social solidarity [Znaniecki 1952, pp. 176-179]. World culture society can therefore be seen as the next step, an advanced stadium of permanent, functional and peaceful cooperation between national culture societies, together aiming at “universal human progress”, which includes steady improvement of human health, technological advancement increasing the level of people’s welfare, intellectual, moral and aesthetic development of human personalities through education, gradual functional integration of all the powerful social groups into one well-ordered world society, continuous collective promotion of creativity in every realm of culture [Znaniecki 1952, p. 181]. It can be noted that there are different types of social cooperation

between nationalities: initialized, popularized and carried by different social groups or leaders. Here, among other forms, the prominent Polish sociologist highlights the role and potential of tourism.

Travel to be sure, is the oldest and best-known method of becoming at least superficially acquainted with foreign cultures. But such superficial acquaintance does not always promote a positive valuation of those cultures. Far from it. When we read descriptions by travelers of their experiences and observations, we notice that, unless they originally aimed to understand and appreciate other cultures, negative rather than positive valuations of foreigners prevail. Modern tourists travelling rapidly and stopping briefly in foreign countries about which they know little frequently manifest negative prejudices, which are reciprocated by the attitudes of aborigines toward mutual understanding and positive appreciation of foreigners and their cultures. On the one hand, groups which want to attract tourists, whether for economic reasons or to promote national prestige, planfully try to make travel as attractive as possible to foreign visitors and to guide them in such a way as to acquaint them with only the best cultural products and patterns of the country which they are visiting. This was perhaps best exemplified by the treatment and guidance of foreign tourists in Soviet Russia before World War II. On the other hand, groups of tourist are being organized under the guidance of competent leaders who try to make their travel not only satisfactory, but also instructive, by helping them become acquainted with the most important components of foreign culture and learn to understand and appreciate them as well as can be done during the brief periods at their disposal [Znaniecki 1952, pp. 166–167].

In this short fragment dedicated to travel, Znaniecki pointed out very important features of tourist activity: 1) the fact that not every type of travel contributes to the understanding, tolerance and acceptance of other cultures and hence – in the long term – to the growth of world culture society, 2) the role of the groups, which organize tourism for foreign visitors (in other words – the expansion of the tourism industry), 3) the role of tour guides in the tourist experience (nowadays we often talk about culture brokers or middlemen). Znaniecki recognized potential in tourism, but some important conditions must be fulfilled in order to ensure positive impact on the travelers. Mobility *per se* does not guarantee any contribution to the promotion of world solidarity or peaceful coexistence. To the contrary, it can even lead to hostility and negative perception of the visited environments. It is therefore interesting to analyze different kinds of contemporary global tourism in terms of their contribution to the development of world culture society. However, as well known, today's tourism has many faces. It is enough to realize how many adjectival tourism forms we can distinguish (agritourism, ecotourism, enotourim, dark tourism, medical tourism, space tourism, sustainable tourism, wellness tourism – just to cite a few). Additionally, new forms of tourism are continuously emerging and gaining popularity, and the

character of those existing may change. Considering the enormous variety of forms of travelling, the venture to analyze tourism on the whole – as a homogenous phenomenon – is doomed for failure. Hence, only an arbitrary chosen sample of types of contemporary international tourism regarding different specialty travel forms will be discussed in detail, and these are: 1) business tourism, 2) educational tourism, 3) language tourism, 4) thanatourism, 5) sentimental tourism, 6) ethnic tourism, 7) religious tourism, 8) sport tourism, and last but not least 9) heritage tourism. Further forms of tourism can be analyzed by adopting the same procedure.

Results and discussion

The term ‘business tourism’ (also referred to as ‘meeting industry’) includes conferences, congresses, motivation journeys (also known as ‘incentive tourism’), fairs, exhibitions and business corporation trips. This type of tourism is typical for certain professional domains, such as commerce or trade entrepreneurs travelling to their contracting partners and business associates [Gaworecki 2010, p. 34]. This is not a new kind of tourism, but in the era of intensified international cooperation, it is experiencing its revival, or better – expansion. Nevertheless, Znaniecki was already mentioning the importance of such travels (not classifying them as ‘tourism’ though): “Every nationality participating in the Fair [New York Wolds’s Fair in 1939-40] had an opportunity to make the public at least superficially acquainted not only with samples of its technical products, but also with its creative achievements in art, music, literature, knowledge; its distinctive customs and mores; and its ethical and political ideals” [Znaniecki 1952, p. 158]. Indeed, business tourism is almost always accompanied by a very rich cultural program for the participants of the international meetings, which enables them to get acquainted with other cultures. It is to recognize that this kind of travel contributes to world society, as ‘business tourists’ are truly interested in dialogue and smooth collaboration with their contractors, even if it must be emphasized that this is underlined by economic motivation.

‘Educational tourism’ seems to be a perfect example of a form of tourism supporting the development of world culture. Znaniecki himself traveled frequently between different universities, giving lectures or participating in international conferences and meetings of sociological associations – T. Abel revealed that he was regularly asked to replace Znaniecki during his lecture [Abel 1996, p. 70]. This kind of mobility includes, above all, different kinds of pupil and student exchange programs consisting of a stay at a foreign school or university for a certain period, which is, in fact, a “continuation, or rather a revival, of the custom of medieval universities” [Znaniecki 1952, p. 149]. We should stress the difference between the role

of the university and the university exchange programs: while “the theoretic function of nearly every university is to promote the creative growth of knowledge within its own national culture society by training students for creative work and offering teaching roles, with right to economic subsistence, to those who are making or are expected to make significant contributions to this growth” [Znanięcki 1952, p. 69], the university exchange programs should rather be seen as a factor promoting the growth of knowledge within world culture, as they involve the international collaboration of students and academic teachers. Such cooperation spreads the achievements and products of world culture and fertilizes national cultures through the feedback of the visitors in foreign academic centers (both visiting professors and students, both mentors and mentees). Considering the range and popularity of the phenomenon, we should emphasize that such a type of international cooperation promotes mutual fertilization: the host university (or other educational center, which receives the guests) profits as well as the sending university through the visiting scholars and professors coming back home after being trained abroad.

‘Language tourism’ (sometimes recognized as a sub-category of educational tourism [Bieńczyk, Łobożewicz 2001, p. 190]) is a kind of travel mainly dedicated to language learning [Mikos von Rohrscheidt 2007, p. 88]. International language (summer) courses are frequently organized by different universities or educational centers specialized in language and cultural training. Unlike mass tourism, linguistically-oriented travels are associated with a profound tourist experience based on immersion in the target culture. The process of language learning has many specific features and differs a lot from the traditional way of learning in one’s home country. It is more practical, focus on speaking improvement and cultural knowledge is provided [Różeńska 2008]. Language tourism is not just language learning, but a multi-layered touristic, educational and cultural experience that appeals to many people, not only those interested in language acquisition. Linguistic tourism creates an opportunity for inter-cultural training, which, considering the frequency of international relationships in the modern world, is indispensable for successful existence in social and professional life. The core of this type of tourism is a voluntary meeting of people from all over the world, who are additionally keen on harmonic coexistence and direct interaction [Murrmann 2012]. Thus, international summer language courses provide the unique chance to get acquainted with many cultures and consider one’s own culture from a different perspective, which activates the process of making comparisons and recognizing limitations. Undoubtedly, linguistic tourism contributes to the growth of world culture. In this context, we can remember that Znanięcki recognizes language, especially literary language, as a very important component of national culture [Znanięcki 1952, p. 13]. The participants of the language course

are acquainted with the literature of a definite target culture during the classes. At this level, it is promotion of a certain national culture. However, the ‘linguistic tourists’ do not only get to know the target language and target culture. Their community forms a so called “salad bowl” (mixture of the representative of different cultures) and the students acquaint themselves with many aspects of cultural and linguistic differences represented by participants from all over the globe. In this perspective, it is all about the promotion of world culture.

‘Thanatourism’, also known as ‘dark tourism’, attracts travelers motivated by the desire to visit death sites [Seaton 1999]. There are many types of such “black spots”, to use the term coined by Chris Rojek [1997, p. 62]. “Traditional” destinations are concentration and extermination camps, for instance: Auschwitz-Birkenau in Poland, Mauthausen-Gusen in Austria or Dachau in Germany. Monuments such as the Lincoln Memorial in Washington or Nelson’s Column in Trafalgar Square also belong to this category. Another important tourist attraction are cemeteries which contain the remains of celebrities, graves, disaster sites, suicide sites, murder sites [Rojek 1993, pp. 137–45]. Unfortunately, new “dark places” are emerging. Here, we can mention the Ground Zero site in the Financial District of Manhattan, the location where the original twin towers of the World Trade Center once stood. This memorial place became a “must see” in New York City. Interestingly, this kind of tourism should be recognized as contributing to the growth of world society. The visitors of the Ground Zero are not only Americans. Far from it. People from all over the world come to pay respects to the victims of the terrorist attack and to honor the lives of American heroes from the rescue team. The same can be said referring to the places of death (often tragic death) or burial places of the celebrities. Hundreds of bouquets are being left close to the place of Princess Diana’s fatal car accident in Paris, not to mention special tours organized to the place of death of Grace Kelly or John F. Kennedy.

‘Sentimental tourism’ may be defined as all kinds of travels, in which the prime motivation of the tourist involves a desire to seek for his/her origins and ancestors and hence his/her own identity. It may also regard their original place of birth. This kind of tourism concerns in the first line emigrants, expatriates, and exiles who feel that they need to go back to their roots [Mikos von Rohrscheidt 2007, p. 110; Kurek 2007, p. 214; Jędrysiak 2008, p. 73]. In Znaniecki’s terms we would rather qualify this kind of tourist movement as growth of national culture society.

We can define ‘ethnic tourism’ as all kinds of travels, in which the prime objective of the tourists is the desire to interact with exotic ethnic people [Gaworecki 2010, p. 47]. In Znaniecki’s terms, it would be an encounter with a ‘tribal society’. These kinds of tours would not be possible without tour guides, also known as culture brokers or middlemen. Their role mer-

its particular attention: they facilitate the interaction between tourists and locals, i.e. native suppliers of exotic experiences. As ethnic tourists recruit mostly from developed countries, highly urbanized and industrialized places, they would not be able to understand tribal customs and ways of life which differ greatly from those back home. Thus, ethnic tourism consists in the encounter and relationship between tourists (guests) and natives (hosts), which should generally be brokered by a third person, because the authentic performance in local cultural *milieu* could be misunderstood. Here we can see the dark side of this kind of potentially “pure” tourism contributing to the world society. What ‘ethnic tourists’ get to know is a rather well-prepared spectacle. Local people place themselves “on stage”. It is all “staged authenticity” to adopt the terminology of Dean MacCannell [1999]. Of course, the locals try to maintain the authenticity in the eyes of tourists so that their performance can even appear to the visitors as true, unmediated and spontaneous. However, it must be highlighted that in fact the ethnic groups modify their behaviors, way of dressing, methods of production and customary practices in order to attract tourists and intensify their experience. Additionally, brokers arrange performances and activities for tourists. All these practices are aimed at economic benefit. It can be argued that native ethnic groups are victims of the tourism industry, but in reality, they actively collaborate with brokers in the “show” in search of income. Ethnic tourism seems to be contributing to the dialogue between the developed and the developing world. Nevertheless, taking into consideration the “staged authenticity” this claim may be reasonably contested.

‘Sport tourism’ is an interesting case. We can consider here both its active and passive forms. By active sport tourism we mean all travels devoted to participation in different sport activities, both at professional and amateur levels, including different disciplines. There is also a passive form of sport tourism, which would be the movement of sport supporters cheering on their favorite team [Gaworecki 2010, p. 87]. The fans follow great sport events, like world championships and tournaments. To name a few, here we can list the World Cup in Football, Tour de France and, last but not least, the Olympic Games – the most important meeting of sportspersons from all over the globe. There is something particular about sport events which makes it impossible to judge unanimously, whether sport tourism (and sport in general) contributes to the solidarity of people (through the principle of “fair play” for instance) or divide them into national camps. Znaniecki divagated on this topic: “Such popularization of foreign cultures [Olympic Games] is designed to appeal to the masses rather than to intellectual specialists. Although sport is indubitably culturally patterned and new varieties have developed in recent times, yet, after all, sport is essentially play, not culturally creative activity. International meetings of sportsmen imply competition, not cooperation, between individuals or teams from different

nationalities; their significance lies in the fact that they stimulate a common, world-wide interest in the individual sportsmen and teams of many nationalities and make the public aware that all of them conform with the same ethical principles of fair play” [Znaniński 1952, p. 158].

‘Religious tourism’ appears in many forms, among which the most popular is pilgrimage [Gaworecki 2010, p. 61; Mikos von Rohrscheidt 2007, p. 147; Jędrysiak 2008, p. 86]. Pilgrimage is a sign of what Znaniński would have rather called the development of the ‘ecclesiastic culture’. Pilgrims united by the same faith, confession or Church (but coming from different countries) visit the same important spots. For example for the collectivity of Roman Catholic Church a common destination is the Vatican or Santiago de Compostela. However, it is important to realize that some destinations can attract adherents and representatives of different Churches, like Nazareth for instance.

In the tourism literature the theorists also distinguish ‘heritage tourism’, including all travels resulting from the interest in arts, history and culture and hence dedicated to visits in museums and heritage sites [Gaworecki 2010, pp. 64–70; Jędrysiak 2008; Buczkowska 2008]. Heritage tourists travel to experience the places, artifacts and activities that authentically represent the past. They take part in all kinds of cultural events, such as exhibitions, concerts, arts festivals and others. These attractions have a great tourism-generating power and are worth publicizing abroad, as economic impact studies have shown that the financial contribution of the cultural tourist may be significantly greater than that of the local attendee. At first glance, heritage tourism seems to be a particularly “pure” tourism, contributing to the growth of world culture society. However, it must be underlined that nowadays, we have to do with a distortion of this kind of tourism in the form of mass tourism, or more precisely – mass heritage tourism. A great tourist movement is observed in the direction of the most significant cultural sites, where huge numbers of tourist sector employees (‘tourism industry’ includes accommodation and gastronomic establishments as well as travel agencies and tour operators) are already impatiently waiting to take care of them. Mass tourists and mass tourist staff have both their own, sometimes even contradictory, purposes. Consequently, heritage tourism is being constantly commercialized: we describe it in terms of production and consumption of heritage attractions. Some new artificial sites are being created in order to fuel the tourist movement, otherwise the visitors would have to content themselves with those few historic constructions and outstanding monuments (concentrated mainly in Europe). On the other hand, the travelers are not really willing to immerse in the visited culture. They voluntarily live in tourist enclaves, like five-star hotels, which also could be called “tourist ghettos”. Tourists are closed – in D. Boorstin’s [1964] terms – in an “environmental bubble”,

they are ethnocentric and concentrated on the standards in their culture. They do the typical sight-seeing tours, they agree to be shown the most important “must see-attractions” in order to take a couple of photos. J. Urry [2002] argues that it is all about visual consumption of the places and purchase of some souvenirs. Taking such practices and demeanors into account leads to the conclusion that the whole experience is very superficial. The visitors do not understand, they do not appreciate, they do not participate in the very meaning of the term “culture”. Also here we can revisit Znaniecki’s deliberations on travel: he in fact criticized the “superficial acquaintance” with the visited culture. Indeed, it is justified to question the positive impact of this kind of tourism and discredit its contribution to the development of world culture society.

Conclusions

After detailed analysis of the important contemporary types of international tourism, we can acknowledge that the concerns Znaniecki expressed in his text first published in 1952 (thus, several decades ago) were fully justified. Indeed, not every type of travel has the same potential within the contribution to the growth of world culture society. There is a very important question to be asked: are we going to witness an evolution in global international tourism leading to the growth of the world society and to the fulfillment of the prophetic idea formulated by Znaniecki? If so, the most important change should concern the attitude of the hosts and tourists, aiming at mutual cultural exchange. Tourism should support the smooth functioning permeated with interactions between hosts and guests, encouraging the processes of cultural relations, with significant implications for changing expressions of identity both among locals and tourists. Only then, can world culture be shared by all of mankind. There is still time to do this, in fact, we cannot expect that it is going to change overnight. The evolution of tourism is to be seen as a process. But also world culture is a long-haul endeavor.

A world culture (...) is not yet ready and completed – and never will be. It is being slowly created and will continue to be created indefinitely. Its creation does not mean elimination of the present diversity of culture, for it cannot be created out of nothing: it grows and is expected to grow out of national cultures, just as national cultures grew out of older cultures – but with a difference. Whereas those older cultures were relatively static and hence became partly or entirely supplanted by national cultures as latter developed and expanded, national cultures are dynamic, and it is their continual creative growth which makes the emergence and growth of a “supernational” world culture possible [Znaniecki 1952, p. 176].

It should also be stressed that tourism is just one of the mechanisms through which the appearance of global society is emerging, but of course supplementing other – more powerful – mechanisms: economic, financial, political, studied in current theories of globalization.

A final remark is due: it is amazing that Znaniecki's deliberations cover the area that was so irrelevant in his times but so socially important these days. Even if the comments on tourism are rather rare and marginal compared to his other theories, they are of great importance and show the polyvalent interest of the pioneer of Polish sociology. It was therefore worth revisiting the "neglected classic".

References

- Abel, T. (1996), *O Florianie Znanieckim. Wybór z dziennika [On Florian Znaniecki. Selections from the Journal]*, Norbertinum, Lublin.
- Bauman, Z. (2000), *Liquid modernity*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bieńczyk, G., Łobożewicz, T. (2001), *Podstawy turystyki [Tourism basics]*, WSE, Warszawa.
- Bulmer, M. (1986), *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Boorstin, D. (1964), *The image: A guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. Harper, New York.
- Buczowska, K. (2008), *Turystyka kulturowa. Przewodnik metodyczny [Cultural tourism. A methodological guide]*. AWF, Poznań.
- Donati, P. (2000), *The challenge of universalism in a Multicultural Post-modern Society: a Relational Approach*, [in:] Hałas E. (ed.) *Florian Znaniecki's Sociological Theory and the Challenge of 21st Century*, Peter Lang Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 31–47.
- Gaworecki, W. (2010), *Turystyka [Tourism]*, PWE, Warszawa.
- Hałas, E. (1994), *Florian Znaniecki – an unrecognized forerunner of symbolic inter-actionism*, [in:] Dulczewski Z., Grathoff R., Włodarek J. (eds.) *What are sociological problems?* Nakom, Poznań, pp. 165–183.
- Hałas, E. (2010), *Towards the World Culture Society. Florian Znaniecki's Culturalism*, Peter Lang International Verlag der Wissenschaften, Frankfurt am Main.
- Hałas, E. (ed.) (2000), *Florian Znaniecki's Sociological Theory and the Challenge of 21st Century*, Peter Lang Verlag, Frankfurt am Main.
- Jędrzyśiak, T. (2008), *Turystyka kulturowa [Cultural tourism]*, PWE, Warszawa.
- Kurek, W. (2007), *Turystyka [Tourism]*, PWN, Warszawa.

- Łuczewski, M. (2009), *Revisiting Boudon, Znaniecki, and Polish Peasants*, [in:] Cherkaoui M., Hamilton P. (eds.), *Raymond Boudon: A Life in Sociology*, 4, Bardwell Press, Oxford.
- MacCannell, D. (1999), *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Mikos von Rohrscheidt, A. (2007), *Turystyka kulturowa. Fenomen, potencjał, perspektywy* [*Cultural tourism. Phenomenon, potential, perspectives*], GWSHM Milenium, Gniezno.
- Murrmann, J. (2012), *Dolce far niente oppure un metodo effettivo per imparare una lingua straniera. Internazionali corsi di lingua in prospettiva glottodidattica* [*The sweetness of doing nothing or an effective method of foreign language learning. The international language courses in glottodidactic perspective*], „Acta Philologica”, 42, pp. 112–121.
- Plummer, K. (1983), *Documents of Life: An Introduction to the Problem and Literature of a Humanistic Method*, George Allen & Unwin, London.
- Przeclawski, K. (2004), *Człowiek a turystyka. Zarys socjologii turystyki* [*Man and tourism. Outline of the sociology of tourism*], Albis, Kraków.
- Ritzer, G. (2004), *Klasyczna teoria socjologiczna* [*Classical Sociological Theory*], Zysk i S-ka, Poznań.
- Robertson, R. (1992), *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, Sage, London.
- Rojek, Ch. (1993), *Ways of Escape: Modern Transformations in Leisure and Travel*, Macmillan, London.
- Rojek, Ch. (1997), *Indexing, Dragging and the Social Construction of Tourist Sights*, [in:] Rojek Ch., Urry J. (eds.), *Touring Cultures. Transformations of Travel and Theory*, Routledge, London, pp. 52–74.
- Różewska, J. (2008), *Motywowanie uczestników wakacyjnych kursów językowych poprzez program turystyczno-rekreacyjny* [*How to motivate the participants of language courses through a tourist and recreational program*], [in:] Michońska-Stadnik A., Wąsik Z. (eds.) *Philologica wratislaviensia: acta et studia. 2. 2. Nowe spojrzenia na motywację w dydaktyce języków obcych*, Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Filologicznej we Wrocławiu, Wrocław, pp. 131–142.
- Seaton, A.W. (1999), *War and Thanatourism, Waterloo 1815-1914*, “Annals of Tourism Research”, 26, pp. 131–155.
- Sinatti, G. (2008) *The Polish Peasant Revisited. Thomas and Znaniecki's Classic in the Light of Contemporary Transnational Migration Theory*, “Sociologica”, 2, doi: 10.2383/27725.
- Szacki, J. (1986), *Znaniecki* [*Znaniecki*], Wiedza Powszechna, Warszawa.
- Szacki, J. (2007), *Historia myśli socjologicznej* [*History of sociological thought*], PWN, Warszawa.
- Sztompka, P. (2012), *Socjologia: Analiza społeczeństwa* [*Sociology: the analysis of society*], Znak, Kraków.

- Thomas, W. I., Znaniecki, F. (1996), *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America: A Classic Work in Immigration History*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana/Chicago.
- Urry, J. (2002), *The tourist gaze*, Sage Publications, London.
- Wallerstein, I. (1979), *The Capitalist World-Economy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Wallerstein, I. (1999), *The End of the World As We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-first Century*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Znaniecki, F. (1919), *Cultural Reality*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Znaniecki, F. (1925), *The Laws of Social Psychology*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Znaniecki, F. (1934), *The Method of Sociology*, Rinehard and Co., New York.
- Znaniecki, F. (1936), *Social Actions*, Rinehard and Co., New York.
- Znaniecki, F. (1952), *Modern nationalities*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Znaniecki Lopata, H. (1976), *Polish Americans. Status Competition in an Ethnic Community*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Netography

<http://www2.unwto.org/annual-reports> (20.05.2015)

Z DOROBKU ZNANIECKIEGO: KONCEPCJA SPOŁECZEŃSTWA ŚWIATOWEJ KULTURY A WSPÓŁCZESNE FORMY TURYSTYKI

Abstrakt

Cel. W artykule proponuje się na nowo odczytać klasyczną teorię kulturową Floriana Znanieckiego i podkreśla się jej znaczenie w obrębie badań turystyki: różne formy globalnej turystyki są analizowane w kontekście koncepcji społeczeństwa światowej kultury.

Metoda. Artykuł ma charakter częściowo przeglądowy i zawiera krytyczną analizę twórczości Znanieckiego. Następnie, za pomocą procesów intuicyjno-logicznych zidentyfikowano potencjał poszczególnych, objętych badaniem, form turystyki w zakresie budowania społeczeństwa światowej kultury.

Wyniki. Po wnikliwej analizie wybranych form współczesnej turystyki międzynarodowej, można stwierdzić, że obawy Znanieckiego wyrażone w tekście opublikowanym w 1952 roku były w pełni uzasadnione. Pomimo potencjału tkwiącego w podróży, nie każda forma turystyki przyczynia się do rozwoju społeczeństwa kultury światowej.

Ograniczenia badań i wnioski. Powstają oraz rozpowszechniają się nowe formy turystyki, a także charakter tych istniejących może podlegać zmianom.

Implikacje praktyczne. Artykuł jest rodzajem hołdu dla jednego z najwybitniejszych polskich kulturologów i socjologów, który był wczesnym rzecznikiem społeczeństwa światowej kultury i któremu zawdzięczamy m.in. podstawy metodologii badań nowoczesnej kultury i jej przemian.

Oryginalność pracy. Praca na rzadko podejmowany przez badaczy temat.

Rodzaj pracy. Artykuł teoretyczny.

Słowa kluczowe: Znaniecki, turystyka, społeczeństwo świata, kultura światowa

