Research Productivity of Academic Professionals in Tourism and Hospitality (TH)

Hyojin Kim

Florida State University, Florida, USA

Hyun-Seok Choi, Hye-Ryeon Lee

Texas Tech University, Texas, USA

The purpose of this study is to identify how much tourism- and hospitality-related academic professionals have contributed to their fields in recent years and to apply an authorship analysis following Sheldon's work to reconfirm her observation that full professors contribute more to academic professional journals more than authors with lower academic ranks. Our analyses of research productivity showed that tourism and hospitality (TH) academicians published more than non-TH professionals in some Social Science Citation Index (SSCI)-listed TH journals and that experienced scholars were more productive than novice professionals in other SSCI-registered TH journals. By conducting not only an authorship analysis in the senior TH-related journals but also a research productivity analysis of TH versus non-TH professionals and English-speaking (ES) versus non-ES researchers, in particular, the results of this study provide helpful information to young journals such as *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management* to be a high-quality academic journal across varied disciplinary boundaries and to collect extensive opinions from elder TH journals.

Keywords: research productivity, authorship analysis, tourism and hospitality (TH)

Introduction

Since the hospitality program related to "hotels" was first established by Cornell University in 1922, and the first class associated with "tourism" was introduced to undergraduate students in 1963 at Michigan State University, a large number of collegiate-level programs and departments have emerged both across the United States (US) and internationally (Pearce, Rutledge, & Morrison, 1998). Currently, there are more than 200 tourism and hospitality (TH) programs and departments in the US, and this number continues to grow (Hospitality Schools, 2012). Coincident with their proliferation, TH academic programs have been discussed in professional journals and books with greater frequency. These writing have discussed the typology and identity of TH, as well as the tradition and history of the field of study (Dann, Nash, & Pearce, 1988; Echtner & Jamal, 1997; Goeldner & Ritchie, 2003; Leiper, 2000; Pearce & Butler, 1993; Tribe, 1997, 2000). Academic

Hyojin Kim, Ph.D., Dedman School of Hospitality, Florida State University. Email: hkim13@fsu.edu.

Hyun-Seok Choi, M.S., Department of Nutrition, Hospitality, and Retailing, Texas Tech University.

Hye-Ryeon Lee, M.S., Department of Nutrition, Hospitality, and Retailing, Texas Tech University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Hye-Ryeon Lee, Department of Nutrition, Hospitality, and Retailing, Texas Tech University, Box 41240, Lubbock, TX 79409-1240, USA. Phone: 1-806-742-3068; Fax: 1-806-742-3042. Email: hyeryeon.lee@gmail.com.

professionals have made an effort to establish conceptual definitions and identities, theoretical systems, and research methodology in the TH fields using multiple methodological approaches (Jafari & Ritchie, 1981; Leiper, 1981; Smith & Brent, 2001).

However, little is known about the research productivity of TH academics over the past decade in spite of long-running effort and much research by academics in these industries. By improving our understanding of the research productivity of TH educators, we are able to observe their relative contribution rate. These results may serve as a motivation for TH scholars to conduct more research both in their own academic fields as well as in other related disciplines. The results of this study provide not only an opportunity to raise awareness of the importance of publication within the TH realm, but also a trend overview of research contribution to neophyte journals (e.g., *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management* established in 2013) to be wishful to encounter a wide variety of TH genres. Therefore, it is necessary to unearth the productivity of professionals engaged in TH departments or programs at a college or university, compared to that of non-tourism and non-hospitality (non-TH) professionals. Scholarly productivity is often assessed by a number of factors including the number of journal publications as well as other outputs including the publication of books and conference proceedings (Bentley & Blackburn, 1990; Creswell, 1986; Dundar & Lewis, 1998; Jordan, Meador, & Walters, 1988; Levin & Stephan, 1989; Tien & Blackburn, 1996). The authors argue that the number of relevant articles published in professional journals is the most reliable and decisive determinant. We hypothesize that the academic ranking of researchers, such as assistant, associate, and full professors, does influence research productivity. Indeed, this issue has already been dealt with by Sheldon (1991). She analyzed research productivity in three professional journals for 10 years between 1980 and 1989 and uncovered that higher academic rank corresponded with more productivity, unlike a general expectation that novice professionals are published more frequently than experienced professionals. With the growth of TH research, it is important to assess whether Sheldon's findings remain valid 20 years later.

The purposes of this study are to identify how much TH scholars have contributed to their academic fields within the past 11 years and to apply Sheldon's (1991) analysis to the authors. Additionally, the contributions of English-speaking (ES) and non-ES researchers are investigated by year to compare the contribution rate of the two groups in Anglophone journals.

Method

TH research is a sub-discipline of the social sciences, therefore, TH professionals deal with research topics observed in social phenomenon. Publication rate is often used to assess the research productivity of social scientists (Baird, 1991; Dundar & Lewis, 1998; Feldman, 1987; Miller & Tollison, 1975; Toutkoushian, Porter, Danielson, & Hollis, 2003; Wanner, Lewis, & Gregorio, 1981). For this study, research productivity is confined solely to the number of articles published by authors in professional journals, excluding other available evaluation criteria such as the volume of books, reports, proceedings, patents, book reviews, commentaries, and research notes in journals. To examine the research productivity of the TH professionals, we selected four professional journals not only listed in the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) but also considered among the most historically important and traditional in the fields of TH: *Annals of Tourism Research* (ATR), *Journal of Travel Research* (JTR), *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly* (CHQ), and *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* (JHTR). These four are regarded as representative of TH academia. They are also relatively well-presented journals in that they provide biographical information about their authors including the

academic rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, student, or other, including instructors, lecturers, or industry employees). Therefore, the four journals were singled out, and the authors of all research articles published during the past 11 years, between 2000 and 2010, were analyzed.

Other journals in the field include far less information about their authorship. Table 1 shows the presence or absence of the authors' information from the 16 SSCI research journals. *Tourism Management*, for example, presents only affiliations of individual authors, excluding academic positions. *Tourism Geographies*, *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, and *Journal of Hospitality Leisure Sport and Tourism Education* were ruled out for the study, because they were regarded as journals focusing on specific issues such as geography, marketing, and education. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* was eliminated because of its relatively less time on the SSCI journal list, compared to the four selected journals. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* and *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* did not provide constant biographical notes of authors from 2000 to 2010.

Table 1

Biographical Information Released by 16 SSCI Journals

16 SSCI journals as of 2011	Presence (√) or absence (×)		
	Position	Affiliation	Country
ATR	√	√	√
JTR	√	√	√
CHQ	√	√	√
JHTR	√	√	√
<i>Tourism Management</i>	×	√	√
<i>Tourism Geographies</i>	√	√	√
<i>Tourism Economics</i>	×	√	√
<i>Journal of Sustainable Tourism</i>	×	√	√
<i>International Journal of Hospitality Management</i>	×	√	√
<i>International Journal of Tourism Research</i>	×	√	√
<i>Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research</i>	×	√	√
<i>Current Issues in Tourism</i>	×	√	√
<i>Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing</i>	√	√	√
<i>Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism</i>	×	√	√
<i>Journal of Hospitality Leisure Sport and Tourism Education</i>	√	√	√
<i>International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management</i>	√	√	√

Most of the articles from the four journals chosen provided both brief academic positions and affiliations of their respective authors. If an author's biography on an article was absent, the academic position of that individual author was obtained through Google Scholar. Should no author information be found, the article was classified as "no information".

In scholarly work, it is commonly thought that the first author listed on an article contributed more than did the authors listed subsequently. It follows that research productivity from each author deserves to be given different weight depending on author rank. However, because there is no way of accurately measuring the degree to which each author contributed to the article, equal weight was applied to each author irrespective of the total number of authors listed. Therefore, all of the authors are given equal weight in this study.

Chi-squared statistics were used to determine if significant differences existed between TH professionals and non-TH professionals, among groups of academic ranks, and between ES professionals and non-ES professionals.

Results

Table 2 shows the level of academic contributions for TH professionals for the period between 2000 and 2010. Of 3,448 total contributors to the four research journals, 1,668 professionals (48.4%) were from the TH specialty, while 1,271 researchers (36.9%) came from non-TH departments, such as marketing, geography, and sociology. Although TH professionals comprised nearly half the total number of authors, it is irrefutable that non-TH professionals also played a part in the growth of TH scholarship, based upon their level of contributions to the four journals. Meanwhile, each journal showed different contribution levels between the two groups. ATR had a higher share of non-TH professionals (47.0%) compared to TH professionals (36.5%), whereas the three other journals, JTR, CHQ, and JHTR, included a greater contribution from TH professionals than their non-TH counterparts. In particular, the bulk of contributors to CHQ and JHTR were TH scholars, accounting for 451 authors (52.6%) and 427 authors (71.5%), respectively. In total four journals, Pearson's χ^2 test_(2, n = 3,448) = 603.69, $p = 0.000$ confirms a statistically significant difference between the contribution of TH professionals and non-TH professionals in these research publications.

Table 2

Comparison of Level of Contribution to the Four Journals

Group	ATR	JTR	CHQ	JHTR	Total
TH professionals	355 (36.5%)	435 (42.7%)	451 (52.6%)	427 (71.5%)	1,668 (48.4%)
Non-TH professionals	458 (47.0%)	424 (41.6%)	247 (28.8%)	142 (23.8%)	1,271 (36.9%)
No information	161 (16.5%)	160 (15.7%)	160 (18.6%)	28 (4.7%)	509 (14.7%)
Total	974	1,019	858	597	3,448

Table 3

TH Professionals Over Total Professionals by Year

Journal	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
ATR	21/77	18/78	32/84	25/81	34/91	31/99	50/98	31/96	45/103	24/60	44/107	355/974
JTR	37/73	42/95	35/71	27/82	35/104	29/90	38/112	42/110	56/96	44/93	50/93	435/1,019
CHQ	54/104	62/111	37/101	61/115	29/51	28/59	27/58	28/59	37/62	40/77	48/61	451/858
JHTR	26/47	32/48	34/42	42/54	43/61	31/49	44/62	43/60	33/46	51/69	48/59	427/597
Total	138/301	154/332	138/298	155/332	141/307	119/297	159/330	144/325	171/307	159/299	190/320	1,668/3,448

Table 3 presents proportions that show the contributions of TH professionals compared to total professionals in the four journals by year. To better detect the trend of how much TH-related researchers contributed to the four academic journals during the study period, the data are expressed percentages in Figure 1. Overall, the contribution level of TH scholars over time illustrates an increasing trend.

As seen in Table 4, except for a group of "others" including adjunct professors, industrial professionals, post-doctorate scholars, visiting scholars, and research fellows, full professors ranked among the top contributors to ATR (21.6%), JTR (28.2%), and CHQ (24.9%). Unlike these journals, assistant professors

produced the greatest percentage of articles in JHTR (28.3%). This finding from Table 4 corresponds to Sheldon's (1991) finding that higher ranked faculty are more productive. Assessing the authorship of the four journals collectively, the contribution levels of each group were reported as 23.9% for the full professor group, 17.1% for the associate professor group, and 18.3% for the assistant professor group. The results of the Pearson's χ^2 testing found that there is a significant difference between academic positions and research productivity (χ^2 test_(5, n = 3,448) = 835.52 at $p = 0.000$).

Table 4

Level of Contribution According to Academic Position

Group	ATR	JTR	CHQ	JHTR	Total
Full professors	210 (21.6%)	287 (28.2%)	214 (24.9%)	114 (19.1%)	825 (23.9%)
Associate professors	113 (11.6%)	150 (14.7%)	198 (23.1%)	130 (21.8%)	591 (17.1%)
Assistant professors	118 (12.1%)	180 (17.7%)	164 (19.1%)	169 (28.3%)	631 (18.3%)
Students	51 (5.2%)	77 (7.6%)	77 (9.0%)	58 (9.7%)	263 (7.6%)
Others	359 (36.9%)	290 (28.5%)	198 (23.1%)	120 (20.1%)	967 (28.0%)
No information	123 (12.6%)	35 (3.4%)	7 (0.8%)	6 (1.0%)	171 (5.0%)
Total	974	1,019	858	597	3,448

Notes. Students include doctoral candidates and masters; others includes adjunct professors, industrial professionals (directors, managers, and analysts), post-doctorates, visiting scholars, and research fellows and assistants.

Figure 1. Contribution trend of TH group.

The four research journals chosen for this study are in English but include authors who may be considered non-ES. We examined the authors' biographical information in order to identify the contributions of non-ES professionals. Authors affiliated with ES institutions were classified as ES regardless of their nationality. As shown in Table 5, ES professionals played a leading role in the four journals examined compared to non-ES professionals. Statistically, the research productivity of ES professionals was significantly different from non-ES professionals (Pearson's χ^2 test_(2, n = 3,448) = 3,055.10, $p = 0.000$). The level of contribution for non-ES professionals in ATR (30.7%), JTR, (26.0%), CHQ (10.7%), and JHTR (25.8%) begs the question of why the group of non-ES scholars contributed to ES journals.

Table 5

Contribution of ES and Non-ES Professionals

Group	ATR	JTR	CHQ	JHTR	Total
ES professionals	675 (69.3%)	740 (72.6%)	753 (87.8%)	443 (74.2%)	2,611 (75.7%)
Non-ES professionals	299 (30.7%)	265 (26.0%)	92 (10.7%)	154 (25.8%)	810 (23.5%)
No information	0	14 (1.4%)	13 (1.5%)	0	27 (0.8%)
Total	974	1,019	858	597	3,448

Conclusions and Discussion

This statistical study leads to the following conclusions and discussion.

First, excluding ATR, analysis of the other three research journals demonstrated that TH academicians published more work than non-TH workers as assessed by the number of authors. In addition, the level of contribution by TH researchers has continued to increase for the past 11 years. It is encouraging in that most of the contributors to the four academic journals were affiliated with TH departments or programs. On the other hand, it mirrors a concern from TH academia that there is a limited academic interaction between scholarly groups in TH programs and in other disciplines. As a result, less communication between the two groups might be a causative factor in retarding academic progress. Therefore, it is important that TH journals encourage contributions from non-TH professionals to facilitate erudite discussion about diverse and interesting subjects of TH.

Second, like Sheldon's (1991) assertion that full professors were the most productive, this study reaffirmed the same result in three (ATR, JTR, and CHQ) out of the four selected journals. This finding is suggestive, because one might expect that junior faculty would publish more than higher-ranked groups in most academic journals. Future research needs to be done to investigate why a group of assistant professors is less productive than others in TH professional journals despite the fact that the award of tenure is often linked to research productivity.

Third, although all of the journals are in English, non-ES authors contribute significantly to their output. For example, a group of non-ES researchers accounted for one-third of the total authors in ATR. This result calls for future study to identify why non-ES professionals submit work for publication in English research journals. Korean institutes, for instance, more than encourage non-ES TH researchers to contribute to SSCI journals to keep pace with globalization. Additionally, when reviewing faculty job applications, Korean institutes more heavily weigh scores from applicants who published in ES journals, especially SSCI-listed journals, rather than those who contributed to Korean-speaking journals.

Even though this study leads to understanding the publishing leaders in the TH fields of study, a few spatial and temporal limitations are found. This project considered research productivity from only four academic journals excluding other SSCI-registered journals as well as other relevant professional journals. Further, a group of TH professionals has contributed as much effort to non-TH research journals (e.g., *Journal of Marketing* and *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*) as their non-TH counterparts. Therefore, a study to discover the state of TH professional authorship in non-TH journals is needed to measure the extent to which TH researchers devote themselves to publication in other research journals. Another constraint for this study is its use of 11-year-old data providing authors' academic positions, affiliations, and countries. If similar studies are conducted in the future, the argument will be more convincing because of a longer dataset. The authors suggest that there are many more important determinants to explain research productivity such as the age of researchers and presence of graduate programs and tenure. Plus, a decade later, with the same research method as the current study, a comparative study of a more than 10-year-old journal (e.g., ATR) versus a young journal (e.g., *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*) will be another interesting research issue.

References

- Baird, L. (1991). Publication productivity in doctoral research departments: Interdisciplinary and intradisciplinary factors. *Research in Higher Education*, 32(3), 303-318.
- Bentley, R., & Blackburn, R. (1990). Changes in academic research performance over time: A study of institutional accumulative advantage. *Research in Higher Education*, 31(4), 327-353.
- Creswell, J. W. (1986). *Measuring faculty research performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dann, G., Nash, D., & Pearce, P. (1988). Methodology in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(1), 1-28.
- Dundar, H., & Lewis, D. (1998). Determinants of research productivity in higher education. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(6), 607-631.
- Echtner, C. M., & Jamal, T. B. (1997). The disciplinary dilemma of tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(4), 868-883.
- Feldman, K. (1987). Research productivity and scholarly accomplishment of college teachers as related to their instructional effectiveness: A review and exploration. *Research in Higher Education*, 26(3), 227-298.
- Goeldner, C. R., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2003). *Tourism: Principles, practices, philosophies*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hospitality Schools. (2012). *Hospitality school rankings*. Retrieved from <http://www.hospitalityschools.com/resources/hospitality-education/hospitality-school-rankings.html>
- Jafari, J., & Ritchie, B. (1981). Toward a framework for tourism education: Problems and prospects. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(1), 13-34.
- Jordan, J. M., Meador, M., & Walters, S. J. K. (1988). Effects of department size and organization on the research productivity of academic economists. *Economics of Education Review*, 7(2), 251-255.
- Leiper, N. (1981). Towards a cohesive curriculum tourism: The case for a distinct discipline. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(1), 69-84.
- Leiper, N. (2000). An emerging discipline. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 805-809.
- Levin, S., & Stephan, P. (1989). Age and research productivity of academic scientists. *Research in Higher Education*, 30(5), 531-549.
- Miller, J. C., & Tollison, R. D. (1975). Rates of publication per faculty member in forty-five "rated" economics departments. *Economic Inquiry*, 13(1), 122-123.
- Pearce, D. G., & Butler, R. W. (1993). *Tourism research: Critiques and challenges*. London: Routledge.
- Pearce, P. L., Rutledge, J. L., & Morrison, A. M. (1998). *Tourism: Bridges across continents*. Sydney: McGraw-Hill.
- Sheldon, P. J. (1991). An authorship analysis of tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(3), 473-484.
- Smith, V. L., & Brent, M. (2001). *Hosts and guests revisited: Tourism issues of the 21st century*. New York, N.Y.: Cognizant Communication Corp..

- Tien, F. F., & Blackburn, R. T. (1996). Faculty rank system, research motivation, and faculty research productivity: Measure refinement and theory testing. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 67(1), 2-22.
- Toutkoushian, R., Porter, S., Danielson, C., & Hollis, P. (2003). Using publications counts to measure an institution's research productivity. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(2), 121-148.
- Tribe, J. (1997). The indisciplineline of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3), 638-657.
- Tribe, J. (2000). Indisciplined and unsubstantiated. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 809-813.
- Wanner, R. A., Lewis, L. S., & Gregorio, D. I. (1981). Research productivity in academia: A comparative study of the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. *Sociology of Education*, 54(4), 238-253.