ASSESSING HOSPITALITY RESEARCH FUTURES

Research findings

Report prepared for the CHME
by

Elizabeth M. Ineson, Amanda R. Miller and Christopher Mitchell

``

Disclaimer

The contributors disclaim any and all liability to any third-party anywhere in the world for any injury, damage or direct or indirect loss resulting from reliance on information compiled, or recommendations made, in this text. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the secondary information provided, the authors will not be held responsible for omissions or transcription errors.

Contents

FOREWORD

The research informing this report was commissioned by the Council for Hospitality Management Education (CHME) Executive Committee in response to issues raised during a debate at the 2010 annual research conference. The debate focused upon three main areas: the location of hospitality subject groupings within higher education institutions, particularly the advantages and disadvantages of being co-located with tourism and events, or with business departments; challenges in getting the hospitality research voice heard at key fora influencing external perceptions of hospitality research, for example, research assessment panels or journal quality grading organisations; and strategies that could be adopted for further enhancing the quality of hospitality research and associated publication outlets. The Executive Committee is very grateful to Liz Ineson and her research team at Manchester Metropolitan University for attempting to get to grips with such complex issues in this report. It provides a useful discussion document which will be considered by the CHME Executive Committee. The report is being circulated to all institutional members; feedback on the contents will be welcomed by the CHME Executive and should be submitted to Paul Lynch (paul.lynch@strath.ac.uk).

Paul Lynch
Vice-Chair (Research) CHME Executive Committee

Acknowledgments

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The **aims** of this research project were:

- to review the current situation with regard to 'Hospitality-related' research
- to determine how it contributes to the status of Hospitality as an academic subject.
- to explore the impact of forces affecting the future development of the subject of Hospitality in universities in the United Kingdom.

Research data were collected from secondary and primary sources. The latter comprised semi-structured interviews (n=10).

Key findings from the interviews included:

- the identification of institutional drivers and impediments that were having a restrictive effect on Hospitality research by determining where research was to be published.

- the influence of the political environment that led to Hospitality's lack of identity as an academic subject within educational institutions due to Hospitality departments being subsumed within business departments.

- an apparent impression that Hospitality has a declining research base (fewer doctoral students, suffocation within business departments and a move to generic business journals for publications)

- strengths of Hospitality research regarded as theoretical underpinning; publishing outside Hospitality journals and the social science perspective

- inherent weaknesses of Hospitality research that were identified as: the UK academics' need to focus on the REF; too many journals; no three/four star Hospitality journals; some articles are too far removed from mainstream theory; insularity of citation; and need to be more critical

- opportunities for the development of Hospitality research were noted, although there were obstacles that would need to be surmounted

- some Hospitality research published in Hospitality journals is of higher quality than Hospitality research that is published in higher rated non-Hospitality journals

- the variable standards of journal editors and reviewers, both within and outside the Hospitality domain, were questioned

- a need for a two-pronged strategy, focusing upon improving the quality of research published in, and the ranking/rating of, Hospitality journals and also publishing high quality in non-Hospitality journals

- a need to give importance to the REF, which is understandable in the current

climate. With a legacy from the RAE which was not necessarily a positive one for Hospitality, there was pessimism as to how the REF could benefit Hospitality as it has been overlooked in the naming of panel experts. In this regard, the CHME could have a key role regarding the development and reinforcing of research networks.

Key findings from the secondary research:

- the evidence from the comparative study of journal quality rating and ranking systems demonstrates a general lack of consensus

- some UK Hospitality researchers who wish to focus on high journal ratings are seeking publication outlets in non-Hospitality journals

- the relatively strong position of several Tourism and Leisure journals is evident.

- 47% of the double blind refereed and quality rated/ranked Hospitality-related journals (n=81), in comparison with only 41% of the non-Hospitality-related journals (n=123), in which UK authors publish their Hospitality research contributions are SSCI/SCI (2010) listed; such strong representation is linked to the Food, Nutrition, Diet and Sports journals.

It is **concluded** that Hospitality research is at a crucial stage where key decisions need to be made to ensure its credibility and its presence within the broader research community.

Recommendations are made for specific stakeholders, comprising Hospitality researchers and educators, journal editors, and the CHME.

It is important to develop and further support the credibility and profile of Hospitality research, whilst ensuring it is fit for purpose and of a requisite quality for publication in higher end journals. Hospitality researchers 'duty' to the subject area seems to be waning in place of individual career progression and there is a place for the CHME to stimulate a sense of community and encourage research collaborations. Furthermore, the continuing commitment of the CHME for the future of Hospitality as a research area is important in light of institutional drivers for the subsuming of Hospitality into business schools.

The CHME *is* able to provide the opportunity for UK Hospitality researchers to retain a national sense of identity. For the CHME, now is the time to be innovative and proactive so determining a clear way forward by networking with researchers to develop a systematic approach to representing, documenting, profiling and promoting UK Hospitality researchers and their research contributions. If Hospitality as an academic subject, and its associated research, are to be given the recognition they deserve, the responsibility lies with not only with the CHME but also requires the commitment and cooperation of individual Hospitality researchers, their institutions, managers and mentors, and Hospitality journal editors and their reviewers.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background
1.1.1 Key issues pertaining to Hospitality research
1.1.1.1 There has been an increasing concern amongst Hospitality researchers that Hospitality research is not being treated with the respect that it deserves. The CHME (Hemmington, 2008) argued that the much stronger focus on the status of tourism academic research, as opposed to the extremely limited treatment of Hospitality academic research, has had negative consequences for quality ratings of Hospitality journals. They pointed to an absence of formal consultation with the UK Hospitality research community regarding these issues. More recently, following an examination of the productivity of Hospitality and tourism researchers in universities and countries worldwide, Park *et al.* (2011) demonstrated the growing diversity of Hospitality research. Based on their study, it is apparent that the evaluation of Hospitality research should be given more serious consideration.

1.1.2 Hospitality: the research context
1.1.2.1 Hospitality is not perceived to be a strong research subject in its own right, so reinforcing isolation and its weak position (cf. Morrison, 2004). There is a belief that the subject of Hospitality was marginalised during the last RAE and in the current REF. Botterill (2010, p.7) reports that "the CHME takes the view that the full range of Hospitality research is not currently recognised by the configuration of the RAE (*sic*) panels. It asserts that Hospitality research encompasses Hospitality management research and research with a strong social science emphasis" and, he continues: the CHME "would support proposals for a combined Sports, Leisure, Tourism and Hospitality panel" and would prefer "that Hospitality experts assess Hospitality research particularly in the Business and Management UOA".

1.1.3 Hospitality as a research subject
1.1.3.1 The location of Hospitality courses and Hospitality researchers within each academic institution's course and research portfolio is variable and may have some impact on the perceived academic status of the subject. Traditionally, when Hospitality research was in its infancy, almost all of the UK Hospitality courses and researchers were located in Hospitality departments. More recently, with limited resource implications being the main justification, a trend of subsuming Hospitality departments within Business and Management (B&M) departments is apparent, with a potential loss of identity for Hospitality per se as an academic subject. A further consequence of such developments is the relocation of Hospitality researchers, who may be perceived to be located in the B&M, as opposed to the Hospitality, research community. Hence the UK Hospitality professoriate numbers are also in decline. The status of Hospitality is exacerbated further due to the low ratings of Hospitality journals relative to those in other subjects. If Hospitality researchers want Hospitality to be recognised as an academic subject within the current evaluation systems, they need, and may be obligated by their institutions, to publish their Hospitality research in non-Hospitality journals, so weakening further the academic status of the subject of Hospitality. The CHME in Botterill (2010, p.4) confirmed this view: "interdisciplinary developments in Hospitality research would be disadvantaged by a mechanism that favours longer standing single disciplines". The position is summarised by Botterill (2010, p.11): "Pressure to publish their work in refereed journals adjudged to be of the highest standing is resulting in Hospitality research being submitted to generic business and management journals in the lead up to the REF and for many Hospitality researchers this is an unwelcome detraction from

building knowledge in the Hospitality academy" (cf. Nkomo, 2009 in a general subject context).

1.2 Assessing Hospitality Research Futures
1.2.1 Clients
1.2.1.1 This report was commissioned by the CHME and sponsored by the CHME and Manchester Metropolitan University

1.2.2 Call for bids
1.2.2.2 CHME wish to commission research that will culminate in a report that explores the impact of forces affecting the future development of the subject of Hospitality in universities in the United Kingdom. In particular, the research will review the current situation with regard to research and how it contributes to the status and perceptions of Hospitality as an academic subject. It is expected that the following areas will be evaluated: 'Hospitality-related' journal rankings; identification of research on Hospitality, and 'Hospitality-related'* topics, published in non-Hospitality journals since 2000; mapping of existing international Hospitality researcher networks and exploration of potential for one unified global network; summary of Hospitality journal reviewing practices; positioning of Hospitality and its representation on former RAE and future REF panels; identification of Hospitality professoriate in the United Kingdom (UK); role, contributions and opportunities for development of CHME annual Hospitality research conference' (CHME 2010).
*(i.e. Hospitality management, Hospitality studies, research with keyword 'Hospitality', and /or broadly-defined Hospitality)

1.3 Structure of report
1.3.1 The aim and objectives of the research, the methodology employed and an analysis and evaluation of the results from the primary and secondary research are followed by conclusions and recommendations.

2.0 TERMS OF REFERENCE

2.1 Aims
To review the current situation with regard to 'Hospitality-related' research and how it contributes to the status of Hospitality as an academic subject.

To explore the impact of forces affecting the future development of the subject of Hospitality in universities in the UK.

2.2 Objectives
1.
a. To define 'Hospitality-related'.
b. To identify and summarise (author(s), date, title, journal and keywords) Hospitality and 'Hospitality-related' research articles published in Hospitality and non- Hospitality journals since 2000.
c. To identify the roles of the UK Hospitality professoriate and to examine their contributions, together with those of the UK researchers, who are key contributors to the 'Hospitality-related' research body of knowledge
d. For the purpose of evaluation, to develop a system through which 'Hospitality-related' journal rankings are evaluated.

e. To summarise and compare current Hospitality and selected non-Hospitality journal reviewing practices.
f. To identify and summarise existing international Hospitality researcher networks.

2.
To examine the positioning of Hospitality and its representation on former RAE and future REF panels.

3.
a.To explore the potential for setting up one unified global Hospitality network.
b.To review opportunities for the development of the CHME annual Hospitality research conference.

4.
To report on the current situation with regard to 'Hospitality-related' research and how it contributes to the status of Hospitality as an academic subject, including the determination of action points for the CHME and other 'Hospitality-related' organisations.

5.
To develop and deliver a presentation for the CHME 2011 conference.

3.0   METHODOLOGY

3.1   Draft proposal and preliminary discussions
3.1.1   Time frame
3.1.1.1   The project commenced in November 2010, a preliminary draft report was submitted in March 2011 and a further draft report in April 2011 followed by the final report and a presentation at the CHME National Research Conference in May 2011. The aims and objectives, which were derived from the CHME guidelines, were amended following discussion with the CHME representatives who commissioned the project.

3.2   Desk research
3.2.1   'Hospitality-related'
3.2.1.1   The objective of the literature search was to explore the current position with regards to the scope of 'Hospitality-related', recent debates regarding Hospitality research and the definition of Hospitality. The search identified relevant literature from the last 10 years which revolved around the debate regarding the definition of Hospitality. Defining Hospitality proved a useful starting point that branched out into various debates on the future focus and direction of Hospitality.

3.2.2   The academic status of Hospitality research
3.2.2.1   Selected publications were researched to determine the historical perspective on research in Hospitality and 'Hospitality-related' journals. These included:

- Park *et al.*, (2011) Journal article frequency rankings by author, university and country in six major Hospitality and tourism journals (secondary data)

- CHME (Hemmington, 2008) Grading 1* to 4* 'recommendations' for rating 23 Hospitality and tourism journals

- Zehrer (2007) Overall Hospitality and tourism journal ranking (mean) by small group of experts

- Centre for Leisure Management Research, Deakin University (2006) Criteria scores, ratings and cluster categories calculated based on 20 academics' perceptions of the prestige, contribution to theory, contribution to practice and contribution to teaching of 28 Hospitality and tourism journals

- McKercher *et al.* (2006) Academics' (500+) mean quality rating (peer assessment) of 30 Hospitality and 40 tourism journals

- Pechlaner *et al.* (2004**)** Rating of 22 Hospitality and tourism journals according to readership frequency, scientific and practical relevance, overall reputation and the importance of being published in the journals to the academic career of the interviewees.(n=142)

- Ryan (2005) Ranking score Oct 2002 - Dec 2003 of 35 tourism 'leading' journals based on 'hits' derived from data released by CAB International from its leisuretourism.com site

3.2.3 Comparative published quality ratings of journals publishing UK authored Hospitality research papers

3.2.3.1 To determine the scope of UK authored Hospitality research papers, a journal database was compiled via field/subject/keyword/ title searches from Ulrich's web (2010), which is an on-line directory of all journals. A list of double blind refereed Hospitality and 'Hospitality-related' journals, i.e. journals in which Hospitality focused articles by UK authors had been published since 2000 was abstracted and their relative rankings/ratings were recorded based on:

- Social Sciences Citation Index (2010)

- Science Citation Index (2010)

- SCImago Journal Rank SJR (2010), (weighted prestige of journal)

- Association of Business Schools (2010) extracted from Academic Journal Quality Guide

- Source Normalized per Paper (SNIP) (2010)

- Impact factor (2010) from SCOPUS (2010)

- ABCD Australian Business Dean's Council (2010)

3.2.3.2 The findings were listed and tabulated in order to track the movement of the rankings and ratings; historical data were recorded as available.

3.2.3.3 A hierarchical keyword system, with the keywords subsuming associated fields, was used to subdivide the journal titles into two sets:

Set 1 'Hospitality' comprised journals in which research articles with a Hospitality research focus appeared on a regular basis. Within Set 1, the groups were as follows:

- Hospitality and Restaurant
- Tourism, Leisure, Event(s) and Gambling
- Food, Nutrition and Dietetics
- Service
- Sport
- Property and Facilities

Set 2 Hospitality-related comprised journals in which articles with a Hospitality research focus had appeared but not necessarily on a regular basis.

- Management and Business (general)
- Marketing, Advertising, Brand and Consumer
- Human resources, Industrial relations and Psychology
- Education
- Accounting, Finance, Economics, Operational Research and Information Systems
- Geography, Heritage and Environment
- Small business and Entrepreneurship
- Culture, Ethics, Health, History, Humanities, Language, Law, Philosophy, Politics, Sociology, Theology.

3.2.3.4 Following tabulation of the data in Excel, comparative analyses across sets and groups were conducted and the findings were evaluated.

3.2.3.5 The background research provided the basis for a series of semi-structured interview questions, designed to collect qualitative information *(See Appendix A for information on the development of the interview questions and Appendix B for a copy of the interview questions).*

3.2.4   Key informants
3.2.4.1 A list of UK Hospitality professoriate, Hospitality journal editors and relatively prolific UK researchers who had published Hospitality focused research in Hospitality and other higher profile journals in the last 10 years was compiled. Initially UCAS was accessed to generate links to universities where Hospitality courses were run and then staff searches under relevant department names were undertaken. Then further consideration was given to the CIRET database which provided a list of all tourism and Hospitality researchers who are based in the UK. For cross referencing, their names were placed into Scopus to find out more information about them (as CIRET only produced a list of names). From the staff profiles on the university websites, further information regarding journal editorships and journal reviewing responsibilities was recorded.

3.2.4.2 Gathering and maintaining a reliable and up-to-date list of potential key informants proved to be an extremely difficult task due to the dynamic nature of UK academics' careers and the lack of maintenance of some of the websites and

databases. It was not uncommon to find details, including CVs, which were at least five years out of date and, even with time-consuming cross checks, the production of a complete and definitive list was not possible within the time frame of this project.

3.2.4.3 The roles and contributions of a group of UK professoriate and researchers were examined through the interview process.

3.3   Semi-structured interviews
3.3.1   Conduct, content, sampling, data collection and analysis: interviews
3.3.1.1 A series of semi-structured interviews was conducted by telephone to obtain the views of a quota sample (n=10) of the above (selected professoriate and researchers). The interview questions were designed to elicit opportunities for the development of Hospitality research, the positioning of Hospitality in the research environment and its representation on former RAE and future REF panels. The sample was selected using Scopus (to identify publishing record) and journal reviewing involvement (i.e. those who were reviewers/editors of journals).

3.3.1.2 The interview questions were designed according to themes developed from the literature. This analysis involved indexing sections of the text deemed to be relevant to a particular theme; a pilot interview was conducted to confirm the appropriateness of the questions. Following the pilot interview, a further nine participants were selected, predominantly on the basis of institutional and publication diversity and editorship responsibilities; all of the interviews were conducted within a four week period (See Appendix D for further detail).

3.3.1.3 The primary data were collected in February and March 2011.

3.3.1.4 The interviewees were all UK based, in line with the aims of the project. They comprised prolific Hospitality authors from within and outside Hospitality departments, all of whom also reviewed for academic journals and some of whom were academic journal editors. The majority did not want to be identified with their views and, therefore, they and their respective affiliations remain anonymous.

3.3.1.5 The interviewees were contacted by telephone or e-mail to confirm their agreement to participate and then the questions were sent in advance; the telephone responses to the interview questions were tape recorded, with their consent. Subsequently, transcripts were produced and sent to the interviewees for their approval prior to the data analysis. The data were analysed in accordance with Ritchie and Spencer's (1994) framework analysis. This analytical method involved a "systematic process of sifting, charting and sorting material according to key issues and themes" (Ritchie and Spencer, 1994, p.174). The data were organised into a hierarchy with sub-themes emerging from within themes. The analysis is presented according to these themes and sub-themes.

3.3.2   Hospitality and 'Hospitality-related' journal reviewing practices
3.3.2.1 Hospitality and 'Hospitality-related' journal reviewing practices were also considered in the context of the interviews.

3.3.3   International Hospitality research networks
3.3.3.1 International Hospitality research networks were examined via the interview process. The interviewees were also asked to consider the potential opportunities for

the development of a global 'Hospitality-related' network and the future development of the CHME.

4.0   FINDINGS: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

4.1   The scope of 'Hospitality-related'
4.1.1   The definition of Hospitality
4.1.1.1 To understand the scope of 'Hospitality-related' and some of the issues in relation to the future of Hospitality research it is important to draw upon current research and discussion surrounding Hospitality per se. There has been significant debate on the definition of Hospitality and various thoughts have been put forward and expressed over the last few years (for example, Brotherton, 1999; Ottenbacher *et al.*, 2009). The definition that tends to dominate discourse by industry and academia on the topic is one based on organisational practices and the provision of food, drink and accommodation. Many authors have discussed the aspects of Hospitality management research, which is essentially, the business and managerial function concerned with issues of industry importance (cf. Lashley, 2000; Slattery, 2002, Lugosi *et al.,* 2009). These authors comment on an alignment with the view that Hospitality management research is a management function, reporting findings from an industry perspective or to an industry audience. In some cases this perspective links to aspects of Hospitality management research being published in management journals with management as the principal focus, within which the Hospitality element is subsumed. Park *et al.,* (2011) looked at Hospitality and tourism research rankings over the last 10 years and identified 11 categories into which Hospitality publications might be placed, concluding that Hospitality is a relatively narrow field in the journals identified, with the majority of publications on Hospitality emerging from the business and managerial sector and suggesting that this base could be developed further.

4.1.2   'Hospitality-related' in a research context
4.1.2.1 Although much of Hospitality research is focused in the areas of business and management, the area of Hospitality studies has been a constant but understated dimension of the subject of Hospitality (Lashley, 2008). Although Hospitality may be the main element in Hospitality studies, they are broadly concerned with exploring the social, cultural, political and ethical dimensions of Hospitality and are theory oriented. Much of the literature here is seeking to build and interlink with wider theoretical arguments and propositions for the advancement of knowledge, in an attempt to use Hospitality to understand a wide range of social processes (Lashley *et al.*, 2007, Lugosi *et al.*, 2009). Further developments were discussed by Lugosi *et al.,* (2009) who identified the overlap between these two traditions as 'critical Hospitality management research' and as a 'conceptual meeting ground.... [where] theory-informed practice [with] dual advocacy of management and social-scientific orientations' (Lugosi *et al.*,2009, p.1469).

4.1.2.2 Current literature has encouraged and fostered a debate in the Hospitality academic community in an attempt to focus the research base on areas that can be developed and promoted. It is possible that such diversification could lead either to promoting Hospitality as an academic subject within these other subject areas or, alternatively, such a fragmented approach to publication could weaken the position of Hospitality per se as an academic subject.

4.2   Hospitality research
4.2.1   The academic status of Hospitality research
4.2.1.1 There has been much debate about the status of Hospitality research, its relative relationship with tourism research and, in turn, the relative quality of the journals in which such research is published. Morrison (2004) identified the 'contemporary' challenges relative to Hospitality research as a need to gain academic maturity and legitimacy and quality. Unfortunately, in spite of the efforts of some UK Hospitality researchers to take up the challenge and to raise the quality of their publications, a fundamental issue pertaining to a lack of recognition of Hospitality as an academic subject, with a mature and legitimate research output, remains unresolved. In 2010, Botterill highlighted the "anxieties around who and how the Business and Management UOA [in the REF] will judge Hospitality research published in Hospitality journals will continue as in previous years and the CHME continues to inform the various attempts to quality grade journal titles ……Selection of case studies by submitting institutions is likely to mimic the journal grading process and, consequentially, marginalise case studies of Hospitality research. The nascent area of interdisciplinary Hospitality studies is unlikely to be a beneficiary of the REF as, like its predecessors, it is entirely retrospective and shows no inclination to reward emerging areas of research, however innovative " (p.11).

4.2.2   The Hospitality and tourism subject debate
4.2.2.1 Interestingly, McKercher *et al.,*(2006) found, in their global study with a sample of over 500 Hospitality and tourism academics, that the former ranked Hospitality journals more highly and tourism journals less highly than their tourism counterparts, and vice versa. Furthermore, a definitive journal hierarchy (sample of 70 Hospitality and tourism journals), based on a combination of awareness and perceived quality rating, emerged. A clear distinction between the Hospitality and tourism academic fields has been acknowledged (for example, CHME, 2008; Jamal *et al.,* 2008; Lashley, 2008). In support of this distinction, Howey *et al.* (1999) found a low incidence of cross-citations between the Hospitality and tourism research communities, noting that roughly 80% of their citations are drawn from sources outside either area. Subsequently, the CHME (Hemmington, 2008) questioned the amalgamation of tourism, Hospitality and leisure journals, as one field under the business and management umbrella.

4.2.3   Academic journal quality assessment systems
4.2.3.1 In spite of the numerous criticisms of the various methods employed for ranking and rating academic journals, the fact is that the majority of researchers focus on getting their work published in journals that appear in those citation reports and ranking lists that their peers and superiors recommend as being 'recognised as quality indicators'. Thus Hospitality researchers find themselves in a catch 22 situation as they are under pressure to target certain journals regardless of whether they perceive them as increasing the quality reputation of the article that is submitted. At an institutional level, advice given (cf. MMU, 2010) is that, although it is not completely comprehensive, Journal Citation Reports (JCR, 2011), which provides an annual analysis of impact factors, immediacy, etc in the sciences and social sciences, remains the leading service for the provision of journal rankings. Although there is nothing similar for the arts and humanities, quality indicators are listed in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI, 2010) or in SCOPUS (SNIP, 2010; SJR, 2010).

4.2.3.2 Further evidence points to the ABS (2010) and ABCD (cf. CHME. 2008) as

being sources of information with respect to journal quality; publication in higher rated and ranked journals, based on quality assessment systems, might allow Hospitality academics' some consideration for inclusion in the REF (cf. Nkomo, 2009 in the historical and general context of the RAE).

4.2.3.3 Forms of resistance to journal rankings include not applying for a rating, referred to as 'foot-dragging' (Nkomo, 2009), ridiculing the gamesmanship they evoke (for example, Macdonald and Kam, 2007), and criticising the systems. Hospitality researchers have complained that Hospitality journals are not given the credit they deserve (for example, CHME, 2008). The CHME (2008) have been critical generally of some quality grading systems, reinforced by the evidence of Law and van der Veen (2008), who noted that the ABS (2008) journal list was tourism biased whilst the CHME (Hemmington, 2008) referred to it as tourism-centric. Citation Impact Factors have also come under criticism as they may encourage indiscriminate citation, erroneous use of references and self-citation, leading to 'citation cartels' (Harzing, 2002; Smith, 2006, p. 1129).

4.2.3.4 In turn, ABS (2010) has acknowledged the limitations of Citation Impact Factors as a measure of journal quality, especially with respect to the 'less mature' fields such as tourism and Hospitality management. With few exceptions, ABS (2010) graded journals without a Citation Impact Factor at 2 or lower, unless they had an established reputation or a previous ABS grading of 3. ABS (2010) claim that in certain subfields (including accounting, entrepreneurship, small business, Hospitality, tourism and marketing), editors and contributing authors have not considered impact factors to be important; they believe that all journals graded 3 and 4 should carry a Citation Impact Factor. It is of interest to note here that Annals of Tourism Research and Tourism Management, both ABS (2010) graded 4, have Citation Impact Factors (2010) of only 0.864 and 1.882 respectively.

4.2.3.5 Further general criticisms of international journal quality grading systems include regional, national, editor, sampling, cultural, subject and evaluation system biases, the relevance of the systems employed, subjectivity and lack of consensus with respect to a definitive list (cf. ABCD, 2010; CHME, 2008; Harzing, 2010; McKercher *et al.,* 2006; Polonsky and Whitelaw, 2005; Zehrer, 2007). In particular, the CHME (Hemmington, 2008) further questioned Thomson's ISI as a determinant of the quality of research in Hospitality and tourism journals and recommended that Hospitality journals should have their own journal quality grading field, with greater emphasis being given to The British Food Journal, Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education; Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, FIU Hospitality Review, Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing and International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration in such grading systems.

4.2.3.6 In fact, in a general sense, Adler and Harzing (2009) questioned whether journal quality assessment systems reward scholarship that addresses the questions that matter most to society. They present evidence to suggest that current systems are dysfunctional and potentially cause more harm than good. They call for an immediate examination of existing ranking systems by scholars worldwide and the global network of institutions, in conjunction with, for example, the Academy of Management, AACSB (The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business), and Thomson Reuters Scientific, the latter having been amongst those systems not supported by the CHME (Hemmington, 2008).

4.2.3.7 Nkomo (2009) reminds us that, because promotion and tenure may be dependent on journal rankings rather than peer review of an academic's scholarship, the seductive power of academic journal rankings should not be underestimated; she argues that we can be seduced in spite of the fact that we may have serious reservations about their value and that the journal publishers are also in the ranking competition. Nkomo (2009, p.106) believes that "we must begin with understanding our subjective orientations and commitments as well as our motivations and desires" and questions whether the journal rankings are preventing researchers from "engaging in more research relevant to contemporary social problems" (p. 110).

4.2.3.8 Nevertheless, it is acknowledged by Park *et al.* (2011) that previous authors (for example, Frechtling, 2004; Pechlamer *et al.,* 2004; Jogoratnam *et al.,* 2005; McKercher, 2005; Ryan 2005; McKercher *et al.*, 2006), who have examined the research contributions in, and determined quality ratings of, Hospitality and tourism journals, have reached a degree of agreement regarding the highest rated publications. Park *et al.* (2011) claim that, based on such previous research, the six most recognised Hospitality and tourism journals comprise: Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research; International Journal of Hospitality Management; Cornell Hospitality Quarterly; Tourism Management; Annals of Tourism Research; and Journal of Travel Research. It may be surprising to some UK authors and editors that the International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management was not included in this list.

4.3 Comparative quality assessments for journals publishing UK authored Hospitality research papers
4.3.1 Overview
4.3.1.1. There is a need to innovate and design more reliable and valid ways to assess academic journal articles with credit being given for promoting relevant up-to-date knowledge, so recognising those individuals and institutions that best fulfil the university's fundamental purpose (Adler and Harzing, 2009). Bearing in mind this ambitious plan, the status of UK Hospitality research is examined from within and outside the subject area per se. Although the number of journals and quality grading lists is increasing, only selected lists tend to be targeted, often for internal comparative purposes, within but also across academic institutions. Word of mouth suggests that some UK Hospitality researchers have been actively encouraged, so feel obliged, to publish in 'prestigious' higher quality rated academic journals; they have gradually moved their research away from the Hospitality domain, particularly over the last decade. Initially there was a focus on selected tourism journals but potentially more lucrative rewards appear to be associated with publications in the business and management or food science domains.

4.3.2 'Hospitality-related' journals
4.3.2.1 In order to examine the research ratings and rankings by author, university and country, based on six journals (See 4.2.3.8), Park *et al.* (2011) divided Hospitality research into 11 categories: Accounting and finance; Education; Green and environmental issues; Food service management, Human resource management; IT and MIS; Legal issues; Marketing; Operations management; Strategic management and Other. Prior to Park *et al.*'s (2011) appearance in the public domain, a similar but not completely comparable classification system was devised for the present study.

4.3.2.2 A search of double blind Hospitality-related refereed journals, in which

articles, with some focus upon Hospitality had been published in the last 10 years, was made. The scope of Hospitality research was so wide that it was difficult to capture every applicable journal. Therefore, this report focuses on 81 Hospitality-related journal entries, which were cited in the 2010 examined ranking/ratings, in the following subject-related fields, subdivided by keywords in the titles. They included Hospitality and Restaurant (HospRest; n=15) and Tourism, Leisure, Event(s), and Gambling (TourLeisEventGamb; n=27); Food, Nutrition and Dietetics (FoodNutDiet=15); Service (Service=9); Sport (Sport; n=13); and Property and Facilities (PropFac; n=2) (See Table 4.3.2 for entries and quality indicators).

Table 4.3.2   Comparative published ratings and rankings of Hospitality and tourism journals listed in > one of selected quality lists

Subgroup	Journal 'quality' indicator					
HospRest: Hospitality; Restaurant (n=15)	SSCI 2010	SJR 2010	ABS 2010	SNIP 2010	Imp. Fac. 2010	ABCD 2010
Cornell Hospitality Quarterly	√	0.087	1	0.27	0.303	B
International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management		0.076	2	0.09		B
International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration		0.076		0.1		
International Journal of Hospitality Management	√	0.082	2	0.12		A
Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing				0.06		
Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education						A
Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research		0.071	2			A
Journal of Hospitality Leisure Sport & Tourism Education	√	0.071	1	0.37	0.225	
Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management						A
Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism		0.071		0.03		
Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism		0.073		0.01		
Restaurant Business		0.071				
Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism		0.071		0.01	0.763	
Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development			2	0.06		B
Tourism and Hospitality Research		0.074		0.07		
TourLeisEventGamb: Tourism; Leisure; Event(s); Gambling (n=27)						
Annals of Tourism Research	√	0.089	4	0.42	0.864	A*
Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research		0.071		0.07		
Current Issues in Tourism		0.079	2	0.07		
International Journal of Tourism Research	√	0.071	2	0.11		A
Journal of Convention & Event Tourism		0.074	2	0.06		
Journal of Ecotourism		0.071				
Journal of Gambling Studies	√	0.148		0.13		
Journal of Leisure Research	√	0.071		0.1	0.784	A
Journal of Retail and Leisure Property		0.071		0		
Journal of Sustainable Tourism	√	0.071	1	0.2		A
Journal of Teaching in Travel and Tourism		0.071		0.06		
Journal of Tourism Studies						A
Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing		0.079	1	0.12		A
Journal of Travel Research	√	0.09	3	0.44		A*
Leisure Sciences	√	0.071	2	0.1	0.792	A
Leisure Studies		0.071	2	0.08		

Journal	√	SJR	ABS	SNIP	Imp. Fac.	ABCD
Managing Leisure			1			
The International Journal of Tourism Research	√	0.071		0.11		
Tourism Analysis			2			A
Tourism Economics	√	0.071	2	0.16		
Tourism Geographies	√	0.071	2	0.11		
Tourism in Marine Environments		0.072		0.22		
Tourism Management	√	0.104	4	0.53	1.882	A*
Tourism Recreation Research			1			
Tourism, Culture & Communication		0.071		0.18		
Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal		0.071				
Tourist Studies		0.071	2	0.38		

Note: *See Appendix E for further information on quality ratings and rankings employed in Tables 4.3.2 and 4.3.3*

4.3.2.3 Table 4.3.2 lists only journals that were rated in at least one of the examined sources (SSCI, 2010; SCI, 2010; SJR 2010; ABS 2010; SNIP 2010; Imp. Fac., 2010; ABCD, 2010) and the relatively low ratings/rankings for HospRest as opposed to TourLeisEventGamb journals are revealed. Although only 3 (20%) of the former are SSCI (2010) listed, 11 (73%) of these journals are recognised by SJR (2010) but with only a maximum rating of 0.087. In contrast, 11 (41%) of the latter appear in the SSCI (2010) and 85% are in the SJR (2010) with maximum ratings of 0.148 for 'gambling' and 0.104 for ''tourism' keywords respectively

4.3.2.4 Regarding the ABS (2010), HospRest has only four grade 2 and two grade 1 entries whilst TourLeisEventGamb has two grade 4, one grade 3, nine grade 2 and four grade 1 entries.

4.3.2.5 With respect to SNIP (2010), the group differences were slightly less marked with HospRest (n=11 entries) scoring 0.37 maximum and TourLeisEventGamb (n=21 entries) scoring 0.53 maximum. However, the impact factors demonstrated a much wider gap with HospRest (n=3 entries) and TourLeisEventGamb (n=4 entries) achieving 0.763 and 1.882 maximum ratings respectively.

4.3.2.6 Finally, ABCD (2010) has awarded HospRest four A and three B ratings with TourLeisEventGamb achieving three A*.and seven A ratings.

4.3.3   Quality assessment: Comparison of 'Hospitality-related' and non-'Hospitality-related' journals

4.3.3.1 It was evident from the search of non-Hospitality–related journal articles that many UK Hospitality researchers who wish to focus on even higher ratings are seeking publication outlets in non-Hospitality journals. Such journals that appear in one or more of the rating or ranking lists examined in this report (n=123) have been classified into eight groups:

- Business and Management (general) (B&M; n=26)
- Marketing, Advertising, Brand and Consumer (MarAdvBrCon; n=21)
- Accounting, Finance, Economics, OR and IT (AccFinEconIS; n=18)
- Human resources, Industrial relations and Psychology (HRIndRPsych; n=15)
- Education (Educ; n=9)
- Geography, Heritage and Environment (GeogHeritEnv; n=10)

- Small business and Entrepreneurship (SmallBusEnt; n=7)
- Culture, Ethics, Health, History, Humanities, Language, Law, Philosophy, Politics, Sociology, Theology (AOther; n=17).

4.3.3.2 Based on an inspection of their relative rankings and ratings abstracted from the quality listings examined in detail in this report, Table 4.3.3 was compiled for benchmarking purposes. In column 3, the number of SSCI/SCI (2010) listed journals is recorded for each group; columns 4, 6 and 7 report the maximum SJR (2010), SNIP (2010) and Impact Factor (2010) scores in each group respectively; column 5 highlights the total number of ABS (2010) 3*/4* journals in each group, whilst column 8 signifies total the number of A/A* ABCD (2010) rated journals in each group.

Table 4.3.3 Comparative rankings/ratings of selected journals in which UK researchers have published articles with a Hospitality focus since 2000

Journal Category	n	SSCI/*SCI* (2010) Listed	Max. SJR (2010)	ABS (2010) >3*/4*	SNIP (2010) Max.	Impact Factor (2010) Max.	ABCD (2010) A/A*
'Hospitality-related'							
HospRest	15	3 (20%)	0.087	0	0.37	0.763	4/0
TourLeisEventGamb	27	11 (41%)	0.148	1/2	0.44	0.864	**7/3**
FoodNutDiet	15	1/*8* (64%)	**0.413**	NA	**0.56**	**3.128**	NA
Service	9	3 (33%)	0.083	1/0	0.17	0.283	0
Sport	13	**12 (92%)**	0.078	0	0.28	2.152	0
PropFac	2	No entries	0.076	0	0.07	No entries	0
Sub-total	**81**	**38 (47%)**		**2/2**			**11/3**
Non-'Hospitality-related'							
B&M (general)	26	9 (35%)	0.126	4/4	0.55	**4.429**	**6/7**
MarAdvBrCon	21	10 (48%)	0.14	**8/3**	**0.77**	3.779	4/4
AccFinEconIS	18	7 (39%)	0.179	1/0	0.45	2.908	8/2
HRIndRPsych	15	**8 (53%)**	0.112	4/1	0.28	0.982	4/1
Education	9	4 (44%)	0.082	1/0	0.28	1.46	1/0
GeogHeritEnv	10	3 (33%)	0.126	2/0	0.47	1.47	2/0
SmallBusEnt	7	3 (43%)	0.104	2/0	0.40	1.38	2/0
AOther	17	**9 (53%)**	**0.28**	3/0	0.505	4.371	3/1
Sub-total	**123**	**51 (41%)**		**25/8**			**30/15**
Overall totals	**204**	**89 (44%)**		**27/10**			**41/18**

4.3.3.3 All of the remaining 'Hospitality-related' journals (in Groups FoodNutDiet, Service, Sport and PropFac) were cited at least once in the examined 2010 ratings/rankings. Close inspection of Table 4.3.3 reveals interesting differences across the subgroups, for which some of the ratings and rankings were not apparently superior to either HospRest or TourLeisEventGamb. Also, it is worthy of note that all but one of the listed Sport journals is SSCI (2010) rated and only one is ABS (2010) rated, perhaps indicating their editors' lack of confidence in the ABS grading system (cf. CHME, 2008) *(See Appendix C for further details).*

4.3.3.4 To some extent, the evidence in Table 4.3.3 confirms the superior position of

TourLeisEventGam in the 'Hospitality-related' journal category (Impact factor, 2010; ABCD, 2010; ABS, 2010) but it also highlights the strength of FoodNutDiet and Sport according to SNIP (2010) and SCI (2010) respectively.

4.3.3.5 Regarding the listed non-'Hospitality-related' journals, although B&M (general) feature most strongly in ABCD (2010), MarAdvBrCon occupies the top position according to ABS (2010, SNIP (2010) and Impact Factor (2010) with HRIndRPsych and AOther having the highest percentages of SSCI entries. AOther also has the highest SJR (2010) score. Such evidence demonstrates a lack of consensus in the 'Hospitality-related' publication field (cf. Adler and Harzing 2009 with respect to business quality rating systems).

4.3.3.6 Efforts by editors to achieve higher quality gradings include encouraging 'incestuous' citation, self-promotion, and lobbying on behalf of their journals (cf. Brown, 2007; Adler and Harzing, 2009); the questions are raised:

- Are the MarAdvBrCon research group amongst the 'best' or are they just better at marketing themselves? and, in turn,

- Are the highest ranked journals those whose editors have made the effort to raise the standard of their publications by rejecting poor quality papers from the outset and raising the reviewing bar, to promote themselves in this competitive market?

4.3.3.7 On comparing the findings for the study of 'Hospitality-related' and non-'Hospitality-related' journals, the SSCI/SCI column totals make very interesting reading. It must be noted that 47% of the Hospitality-related journals in comparison with only 41% of the non-Hospitality-related journals in which UK authors publish their Hospitality research contributions are SSCI/SCI (2010) listed. However, closer inspection reveals that it is the FoodNutDiet subgroup that has inflated this figure with its strong representation in the SCI (2010).

4.4   'Hospitality-related' research articles
A trawl of 'Hospitality-related' research articles by UK authors was conducted in order to develop the comparative journal ranking/rating survey but the volume was such that there was neither sufficient time nor resources to record and collate the author(s), dates of publication, article titles and keywords as was planned initially so Objective 1b was not achieved fully.

4.5   Hospitality interviews
4.5.1   Key informants
4.5.1.1 An extensive list of UK academics was generated - over 500 - from the sources of information accessed. The UCAS listing generated over 60 institutions that were offering undergraduate 'Hospitality-related' courses and, due to cost and time constraints, further categorisation and ordering has not been achievable within the time frame. To achieve Objective 1c, further consideration of the list would need to be undertaken to ensure how many of the named academics were actually active in Hospitality research. However, from this list, potential interviewees were identified.

4.5.1.2 As explained in section 3.3 a number of key prolific researchers within the

Hospitality research community took part in semi-structured telephone interviews. The interview questions were developed from an extensive literature review, with the purpose of examining the opportunities for the development of Hospitality research, the positioning of Hospitality in the research environment and its representation on former RAE and future REF panels, and in the global research community.

4.5.2 The positioning of Hospitality in the research environment: Institutional barriers and facilitators

4.5.2.1 The interviewees identified institutional drivers and impediments that were having a restrictive effect on Hospitality research. These were couched within institutional requirements for publishing and staff being required to target four star journals with their research (R3, R4, R5, R7, and R8). It was commonly acknowledged by interviewees that the lack of four star Hospitality journals led to the requirement to publish outside Hospitality: "pressurised by the institution otherwise you would not be included in the REF" (R3).

4.5.2.2 In most cases for interviewees, Hospitality was located within a business school and this arrangement was regarded as both problematic and beneficial for Hospitality. One interviewee (R10) notably saw the location of hospitality and its research future as separate issues with quality being cited as the driving force: "it is the quality of the output from the individual Hospitality researchers that can shape the future of Hospitality research and not their location within the academic institutions". In the context of teaching and the delivery of Hospitality management location in a business school was generally considered apt and fitting. Exceptionally R9 pointed out the close relationship of teaching and research: "it is not just research agenda but teaching and course provision is driving everything into more standardised format at expense of some of the quality…. in the Hospitality degrees in the past" (R9). This interviewee went onto bemoan the disappearance of Hospitality: "It is very sad in some respects that Hospitality has disappeared" (R9). Externally, it has been noted by R2, that a lack of outward facing Hospitality departments and the ability to be visible to industry – a potential audience for research outputs, dilutes and diminishes the identity outside the institutions. Such a situation can also lead to questions of credibility due to fewer and fewer named Hospitality departments: "if there aren't any Hospitality departments, and I suspect there aren't, then what does it say about the subject? It diminishes its importance hugely"(R9). There is the loss of critical mass in the subject area, with subsequent negative effects on doctoral researchers (R7). The move into business schools "dilutes Hospitality as a research subject and it also seems to push it more towards business management" so narrowly looking at Hospitality as an industry rather than as an intellectual concept (R7).

4.5.2.3 The presence of Hospitality management within business schools also led to challenges for Hospitality researchers as they attempt to compete with business researchers. Specifically for research, the subsuming of Hospitality into a business school was noted as "muddying the waters" (R1) and "a general disaster" (R5). The trend for relocating Hospitality within business schools has shaped where staff need to publish, what they need to do and made it more difficult and competitive (R4). Four interviewees also commented upon the difficulty of keeping up with business researchers, as R1 complained: "has tended to put off Hospitality colleagues from actually seriously engaging with research because they are not able to actually compete ….on a level playing field with their other colleagues, and resources within business schools to support research are diverted away from Hospitality researchers

towards those who are producing higher level work". The association with business schools can provide an opportunity for benchmarking and improving criticality (R1) but Hospitality researchers within highly rated business schools tend to get forgotten (R7).

4.5.3 The strengths and weaknesses of Hospitality research
4.5.3.1 Some interviewees did mention the inherent weaknesses of Hospitality research, which was referred to as inward looking and insular; the UK academics focus on the REF; too many journals; only publishing in Hospitality journals; too far removed from mainstream theory; the lack of depth: insularity of citation; and need to be more critical (R1, R4, R5). With regards to the lack of depth and lack of mainstream theory underpinning Hospitality research, it was noted that "people …take a very narrow perspective and it does…..if not aware of wider literature on a particular topic…undermine their contribution and the academic quality of what they are saying" (R9) and "the Hospitality research is weak because it is too far removed from mainstream theory and its not been tested by being sent to management or social science journals" (R1). The insularity of Hospitality is acknowledged as problematic: "Hospitality management has to engage with the wider agenda…..Hospitality has suffered from being rather insular" (R9). Criticality is fundamental to the development of Hospitality research and the need to publish outside Hospitality journals: "actually adopting a critical stand is fundamental…… often there is a failure to actually be critical in a lot of Hospitality research" (R5); "If you constantly closet yourself away then I think there is a danger that you become ignored…..If you do publish in other journals you can demonstrate the relevance of study, the research itself and therefore that this is sound academic research" (R2). There is a need to ensure substantive theoretical underpinning for the research being undertaken: "my problem sometimes with Hospitality journals is they are inward looking, there is not enough engagement with the generic management literature" (R4); "the biggest criticism of the whole managerial perspective is that right now we are just importing concepts from management studies. We are not adding new, we are just applying concepts from here there and everywhere" (R8); "historically that has tended to lead to a rather insular view of theory and a failure to keep up with theory development in the more generic areas" (R1).The inability to look to the broader literature leads to dilution: "it can dilute it as a subject because you are not building up a body of knowledge or a body of understanding around that particular theme within Hospitality" (R3). There were also noted difficulties in understanding what hospitality management is and it was questioned as to whether it should be phrased more accurately as "management of Hospitality" (R9, R6). One interviewee (R5) called for a renaming from Hospitality management to Hospitality studies to encapsulate the broader studies occurring within the subject area. Although this may be considered to be an equally problematic use of terminology, from a social science perspective its acceptance into mainstream journals and publishing outside makes hospitality as a subject fragmented (R8).

4.5.3.2 The personal nature of determining and identifying the strengths as opposed to weaknesses of Hospitality research did illustrate some contradictions. For the accuracy and fairness of reporting, the strengths were regarded as: theoretical underpinning; publishing outside; and the social science perspective. Theoretical underpinning was viewed as a strength in relation to the specific subject area of operations management (R3). Publishing outside 'Hospitality' is regarded as a means of strengthening the research being undertaken and showcasing it to a broader audience so ensuring it is more critical and accessible (R9). The social science perspective is applauded by a number of interviewees as a way forward for Hospitality

research: "by sticking with the insular Hospitality management we are not opening our minds to other exciting avenues that could develop. In terms of the social science approach I would argue that Hospitality....can benefit (R6); "it is very evolving and interesting" (R5); and "that would be a strength in terms of being a bit more creative, being a bit more open minded, or a willingness to engage with a broader set of audiences" (R8).

4.5.3.3   Interviewees also made comments about the nature of the current Hospitality researchers and how they were not necessarily supporting the cause of Hospitality research; they were referred to as being both selfish and career oriented. R9 and R6 remarked upon the need for a career-oriented approach by Hospitality researchers that involved publishing outside Hospitality: "I suspect if they want to get on in research terms and get research promotion it's the only way for them (R9). With all interviewees there was a preference for qualitative approaches to research: "most stimulating…tends to be highly qualitative research" (R7). Whilst all bar one interviewee could be considered prolific academic Hospitality researchers, there was also a recognised difficulty with regards to the reviewing of qualitative research: "I think there are insufficient good quality reviewers in Hospitality for more qualitative research" (R7). Whilst there was a bias in the sample towards favouring qualitative research methods, the value of quantitative methods was acknowledged but what was most important was the best fit method being appropriate to the research question: "there is scope to do both quantitative and qualitative work" (R1); "I think the nature of Hospitality is intuitively a much more qualitative paradigm" (R9). It was acknowledged though that there does appear to be a cultural bias regarding preferred research approaches as American journals were noted by several interviewees (R1,R5,R7,R9) as favouring quantitative studies: "like trying to get published in a very top quality academic American journal you have to do quants sadly" (R9). This favouring of quantitative approaches is also present within management research (R1) and, problematically, R5 said: "there has been far too much inappropriate quantitative methodologies", as quantitative methodology may appear to be "academic" but there needs to be a greater focus on what is the right approach. Overall there is a need for a wider range of research methods and for people to look to more multi-disciplinary literature "so that we are not reinventing wheels that have been done in other areas" (R7).

4.5.4   The opportunities for the development of Hospitality research
4.5.4.1   The development Hospitality research is problematic due to the lack of journal quality and the limited journals available (R3, R4). This issue as well as the paucity of good quality Hospitality reviewers (R7) was affecting the criticality of the subject area. There was a noted need for greater criticality and this was at various levels: both as researchers and within research projects; and as reviewers and audience. To be more critical, would require rigorous reviewing (R2) and the ability to be critical of research (R1). Two interviewees felt that the Hospitality academic community was too polite and needed to be more willing to be ruthless and questioning: " we have been a very cosy friendly community" (R6) and "a bit too polite, courteous and kind to each other" (R1). The required approach as indicated by R10 was all encompassing and involved the need for various foci: "by providing more sponsored opportunities for PhD study, by encouraging capable and competent academics with an interest in the subject to publish in high quality journals both within and outside the Hospitality domain, by urging the editors of Hospitality-related journals to raise the standard of papers accepted for reviews and to stop sending papers to the numerous poor reviewers."

4.5.4.2 Beyond the institutional limitations and the political environment it was noted that there had been opportunities for Hospitality management to establish itself but maybe the moment had not been taken and had now passed (R6, R9). In some cases, if Hospitality is the focus, the individual perspective of career advancement took priority over attempts to establish a niche for Hospitality research - R6 remarked that for career progression it would be necessary to publish outside Hospitality: "if I was an early career academic I would be publishing in generic journals". This may well be the current strategy of researchers as the Hospitality community is not growing according to R1 and R6 and neither is the number of Hospitality PhD researchers (R1). Responsibly for the future of hospitality was seen to lie with hospitality researchers despite their own career progression needs: "I think that the future is wholly dependent upon the actions of Hospitality researchers" (R10).

4.5.4.3 In developing opportunities for Hospitality research in the future, a key aspect does appear to be an awareness and understanding of the subject and the audience. A number of interviewees applauded the scope that social sciences would provide and the need to broaden the subject focus: "by sticking with the insular Hospitality management we are not opening our minds to other exciting avenues that could develop". There is a need to allow the management and social science perspective to thrive (R7) and for the future, all strands have to be pushed forward (R7). A cautionary note was expressed by R7 in relation to industry audience: to ensure "that the research is not simply shaped by an industry agenda" (R7).

4.5.4.4 It would appear that, for some researchers, the institutional goals and the REF could not be divorced from one another and they are indeed informing publication targets. Mechanisms of the REF were also criticised, in particular, metrics: "the construction of processes of the metrics which exclude Hospitality experts, so I think it is kind of political gerrymandering going on" (R7). Pragmatically, with regards to journal choice and despite these influencing factors, it may simply be a case of which ever journal will accept your work (R1 and R9): "it isn't so much whether it is in the field of Hospitality but whether or not you want it to get published and which journals you want to get published in" (R1). Another interviewee pointed to this approach as a clear strategy for some Hospitality researchers who purposefully submit higher quality work to higher rated journals and submit lower level work to Hospitality journals (R3). Despite this Hospitality journals are considered important: "I see huge value in Hospitality journals and very important to publish and make them more visible and raise their profile" (R9). Although R1 perceives publishing in generic journals to be more challenging, sometimes it is simply a case of choosing an outlet which is more readily available: "easier to publish in Hospitality journals than…..other generic ones….better have something published than nothing at all" in a Hospitality journal (R1).

4.5.4.5 As for the future, one interviewee questioned if there was indeed a future (R6) and R3 felt Hospitality would disappear and be subsumed by generic journals. R1 was "somewhat pessimistic…[as] the outlook for Hospitality research in the UK is fairly bleak and a very large proportion of that is being driven by the REF" (further discussed below). R2 also emphasised the current poor situation of Hospitality: "there is a real risk that we are on the cusp now that it might be either lost completely or so diminished in its perceived value that it actually does wither on the vine simply

because it won't attract intelligent academics into the discipline to take it further and I think that's the risk". Other interviewees were more positive but emphasised the need for clarity and industry support (R2): "you should do all you can to make sure that you keep the industry onside" (R2). Cutting out the industry has an adverse effect upon the sustainability and future of Hospitality as a research area.

4.5.4.6 There is a need for a two-pronged strategy, focusing upon improving the quality of research published in, and the ranking/rating of, Hospitality journals and also publishing outside in non-Hospitality journals. Such a strategy should counter the difficulties identified by R10: "Hospitality researchers in general are neglected and are often viewed as second class citizens within their Universities regardless of whether they are located in Hospitality or Business Departments. In part this perspective is justified as there are some very weak papers in some of the less reputable Hospitality journals". We "need to improve the ranking of our journals first and foremost, and also get to publish more in generic management anyway to show what we're doing in our area" (R4). Such action will result in greater audience reach and greater profile and credibility for Hospitality (R3). The need to lobby for improving ranking was also put forward by R3 to reflect and acknowledge the substantial research that is being published in the one or two good Hospitality journals. However, it was also mooted that some generic as well as tourism and Hospitality journals are not being given the quality recognition that they deserve (R7).

4.5.5   Hospitality and the RAE and the REF
4.5.5.1 The effect of the previous RAE and the upcoming REF was not regarded favourably: "the REF you see is very much …….well more or less a uniquely British phenomenon, which is not serving our discipline at all well" (R1). The lack of political astuteness in dealing with the research assessment exercise (R4) and the problem of where Hospitality sat in the last RAE is going to be seemingly repeated with the REF: "the RAE as it was, has not done any favours to the Hospitality research subject" (R7). "The outcome of the last RAE has led many senior managers in institutions to decide that Hospitality research is not supportable – partly because the RAE resulted in it not being funded, and partly because of the returns in other areas appear to be higher" (R1). Being placed within business and management provided no favours to Hospitality research: "the overall ratings for Hospitality and tourism in the RAE was the lowest from all the different disciplines …… very much at the bottom end in terms of the average ratings of outputs in those different disciplines" (R1). There has been a lack of proper representation (R5) although R5 accepts the criticism of the previous RAE: "clearly some genuine criticism of the research, which has been somewhat immature and somewhat driven by inappropriate agendas".

4.5.5.2 As for the next research assessment exercise, it is predicted that the REF and how it is set up will lead to the exclusion of Hospitality (R3). It is likely not to be present in the REF and to be included there would appear to be a need for a clear institutional strategy to allow for this. The current position of Hospitality is not viewed favourably: "It is all driven by standards and lists and thresholds and everything else. If you look at any of the lists of publication there aren't many in tourism and Hospitality anyway" (R9). Whilst this might be the case, the REF continues to influence the publishing choices of academics. The choice for publishing is very much influenced by the RAE: "driven by research assessment and always has been in terms of journal quality. So my first port of call will always be a non-Hospitality journal" (R9). "Kind of obliged to publish outside……it just reflects the intellectual flaw in the general grading list so it

becomes an economic metric that can justify poor quality decision making in terms of the research submission of the REF" (R7).

4.5.5.3 Submission to the business and management panel was not considered good for Hospitality: "I don't think that it is in harmony with what would be [seen as the] best [for the] intellectual development of Hospitality (R7). Hospitality has been inaccurately regarded as a subset of business management (R7) when it is much more than that. Such a viewpoint has been a disservice to Hospitality: "it is broader than kind of a narrow business management disciplinary approach and I don't think that gets captured by the REF structure" (R7). Positively an opportunity does exist with the REF in the context of its encouragement of collaboration across institutions (R1). Although there continues to be uncertainty as to where Hospitality will be placed whilst tourism is now within the sports-related panel, there were some calls for Hospitality to follow suit. Notably though there are connotations associated with different panels and there would be reluctance for business schools to submit to anything other than the business and management panel: "business schools are a bit nervous about putting things under sport-related studies because it is not glamorous enough for them" (R8).

4.5.5.4 The focus on the REF and the ranking of journals was seen to be damaging: "all that stuff about how many stars does it carry and all that I find deeply offensive" (R5). The importance is the audience and informing practitioners and other academics (R5) and the importance of the work being accessible to the audiences. It is argued by R2 for it to survive as a research area, Hospitality needs the support of industry and clear lines of communication with industry: "if you have lost that audience because they don't understand what you are talking about, or they don't see its relevance, then it is much more difficult to engage with them". R8 confirms the importance of the management focus: " management is always going to be the core audience……I don't think we can or should lose the focus on the industry we have to make our work more accessible to the industry audience.. less …abstract".

4.5.6   International Hospitality research networks
4.5.6.1 All interviewees considered there to be current network opportunities within Hospitality but they were not necessarily considered favourably. The current networks that were referred to were i-CHRIE (R3, R4), CHRIE (R5, R1) CHME (R4, R5, R6, R9) and Institute of Hospitality (R2 and R10). In comparison with tourism, R7 noted the lack of a network equivalent to TRINET (the tourism research network e-group) and questions how such a forum could be further examined as a possibility for Hospitality, specifically in relation to their funding mechanisms and organisation. R3 concurred there was a lack of a global network and means for communication and R5 raised questions as to where funding could be sourced to facilitate such mechanisms. Whilst R1 accepts the role of CHRIE as a research conference, its effectiveness is questioned: "CHRIE is a global 'Hospitality-related' research network………whether it is good at it might be another issue". Interestingly R6 identified a need for a "champion" and for people to be willing to invest the time and effort into developing such networks: "you need catalytic people, if you like, an academic entrepreneur, to lead these networks and develop them. If we look around the current generation of Hospitality academics I don't know where that type of person is going to come from". The value of such networks was noted and it was believed that the past role of CHME in facilitating such a network (R5, R6, R9) could be resurrected but with a clear focus and strategy (R5). Of interest is R10's acknowledgment of the scale of the task of setting up such networks as it requires "hard work, dedication and TIME……most

Hospitality researchers….[are] so busy keeping their heads above water that they do not have time to develop such a network". To overcome these difficulties of time and work, a collaborative venture was proposed between the Institute of Hospitality and the CHME: "if IoH could be persuaded to take on such a role in conjunction with CHME, it might be feasible" (R10).

4.5.6.2 It was questioned as to whether the time had gone by and the opportunity was past: "at one time it was looking quite promising, there was a core of people very determined to push Hospitality forward but they tended to be people interestingly now in business schools and not necessarily even researching Hospitality any longer" (R9). There would appear to be willingness and need to develop a global network and an acknowledgement that there are networks currently in place which could be replicated (as with TRINET) and utilised (as with the CHME). The purpose of these would be to facilitate communication, but they could also be used to go beyond communication as technological developments allow for international collaborations to take place (R1). R8 also looked beyond the role of communication within the community and saw networks as an opportunity for developing an external presence and profile, through opportunities for involvement in journals outside Hospitality and developing strategies for publishing.

4.5.7   Hospitality and 'Hospitality-related' journal reviewing practices
4.5.7.1 The websites of the Hospitality and Hospitality-related double blind reviewed journals (Table 4.3.2) were searched for information regarding the reviewing process and author guidelines. This method was considered unenlightening and too limiting. It was not informative with regards to perceptions and how hospitality articles were received and reviewed. In the context of the interviews, some comments were made with regards to the variable quality of the reviewing practices for papers submitted to both Hospitality and Hospitality-related journals and the difficulties of submitting Hospitality research to higher ranked journals were noted. It is advised that further work should be undertaken in this context, commencing with interviews with editors of Hospitality and 'Hospitality-related' journals.

5.0   CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
5.1   Conclusions
5.1.1   The current status of Hospitality and 'Hospitality related' research
5.1.1.1 Within Hospitality literature there seems to be an attempt to unite Hospitality research under categories to give the discipline a focus and foundation from which to move forward and strengthen its research profile. Recent literature suggests that much of the 'Hospitality-related' research is focused in the areas of business and management, exploring the social, cultural, political and ethical dimensions of Hospitality and the theoretical meeting ground of management and practice. This development has prompted discourse between key researchers within the discipline and fostered healthy debate that has given a practical foundation for the subject under headings such as Hospitality management and Hospitality studies. Although this may not be a universally accepted foundation, it could be described as another 'milestone' that provides impetus for further discourse and debate.

5.1.1.2 It would seem from the literature that a Hospitality journal hierarchy, based on a combination of awareness and perceived quality rating, has evolved. Although, overall, the study highlights International Journal of Hospitality Management,

International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Cornell Hospitality Quarterly and Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research as being the 'top' rated/ranked Hospitality journals, their relative rankings and ratings are not entirely consistent so consensus in terms of their quality cannot be assumed. It has been shown that 54% of the Hospitality-related journals in comparison with only 48% of the non-Hospitality-related journals in which UK authors publish their Hospitality research contributions are SSCI/SCI (2010) listed due to the strong position of food, nutrition, diet and sports focused journals.

5.1.1.3 The relatively low ratings/rankings for Hospitality as opposed to tourism journals remain as does the debate about the distinction between the Hospitality and tourism academic fields, substantiated by a low incidence of cross-citations between the Hospitality and tourism research communities (cf. Howey *et al.,* 1999; CHME, 2008; Jamal *et al.,* 2008; Lashley, 2008). Furthermore, it is claimed that the majority of citations are drawn from sources outside either area so lowering the impact factor when such articles are published in Hospitality and Tourism journals. Although Citation Impact Factors have been criticised, the evidence suggests that ambitious Hospitality researchers are being seduced by non-hospitality journals that are of higher quality than hospitality journals, which begs the questions raised by Nkomo (2009): Do we understand our subjective orientations and commitments as well as our motivations and desires? Are the journal rankings preventing researchers from engaging in more research relevant to contemporary social problems? International journal quality grading systems have been criticised as being biased, employing systems of questionable relevance and subjective judgments that lack consensus. It is apparent that to promote themselves in this competitive market some academic journal editors are achieving higher quality ratings by what might be termed underhand practices whilst perhaps others are not 'au fait' with, or disapproving of, such activities. Indifference, laziness, fear of failure and other reasons might be put forward by editors who simply want to hold an editorial position for personal benefits. Without doubt, those editors who have managed to raise the standard of their publications have taken a relatively firm stance and rejected poor quality papers from the outset then raise the reviewing bar.

5.1.1.4 Given the need for a balance between qualitative and quantitative research, it would seem that UK hospitality researchers need to also focus on the latter if the subject is to gain credibility globally, especially if it is to compete with the work of high profile authors from America and the Asia-Pacific regions.

5.1.2   The research future of the subject of Hospitality
5.1.2.1 Morrison (2004) highlighted gaining academic maturity, legitimacy and quality as challenges for Hospitality research. It is concluded that there remains a strong desire amongst key Hospitality researchers to promote Hospitality per se as an academic subject. However, if hospitality researchers are to be forward-looking, it is probably not very smart to look at the subject of Hospitality in isolation as there is a risk that they will not make their mark and so be wiped completely off the subject map. In a broad sense, Hospitality encompasses numerous academic disciplines and, because of the interactive nature of the subject, it might be argued that pure Hospitality research is not possible.

5.1.2.2 Hospitality research is becoming even more firmly embedded in business and management and it is also percolating into other academic subject fields. If the profile

of Hospitality as a subject is going to be raised, its visibility needs to be increased to demonstrate its relevance as an academic subject. An obvious way of doing this is to publish at least some of the high quality Hospitality output in highly rated and ranked journals, based on quality assessment systems. In turn, such publications should also encourage 'selectors' to consider allowing Hospitality academics for inclusion in the REF. Interestingly a preference for qualitative methodological approaches emerged from the interviews with the prolific UK Hospitality researchers, followed by a somewhat contradictory comment that there were not enough good quality reviewers in Hospitality for qualitative research!

5.1.2.3 Participants in the telephone interviews were identified for their standing within the Hospitality research community and they are some of the leading researchers in UK institutions. However, it is clear from the interviews that many of these researchers are encouraged to publish in journals that are more likely to support their institutional goals rather than their own. This focus on the institutional needs creates mixed fortunes for Hospitality but has been identified as necessary in the light of ratings within the RAE/REF during the last few years The results of this move may raise the research quality of Hospitality researchers and their work through submission to higher rated journals; however, the attempt to gain acceptance with a wider audience including non-Hospitality researchers may also dilute the focus of Hospitality research. In some cases, examples of lesser quality research is submitted to Hospitality journals and better quality research is refocused and submitted to generic journals with a higher rating. Such practice may also be contributing to the weakening of Hospitality as an academic subject in the long term in favour of short term gains for the REF.

5.1.2.4 It is clear that recently increasing pressure on Hospitality researchers from their institutions to publish research in 'high standing' refereed journals has done nothing to raise the status of Hospitality as an academic subject in the last decade. As Nkomo (2009) pointed out, academic journal rankings are seductive also in relation to individuals' promotion and tenure. If the profile of Hospitality as an academic subject is to be enhanced, Nkomo's (2009) suggestion that we need to examine our individual perspectives, motivations and desires is worthy of consideration.

5.2   Recommendations
N.B.   The following recommendations should be considered in the context of the limited sample with whom the qualitative research exercise was conducted; sampling bias may limit their external validity.

5.2.1   For Hospitality researchers and educators

- Websites need to be maintained and, in particular, on-line personal profiles and CVs of Hospitality researchers should be kept up-to-date.

- More effective systems for managing websites, for example, access rights of individuals should be devised and implemented.

- If researchers in the field of Hospitality choose to publish articles in Hospitality journals, it might be prudent for them to target just a few selected publications.

- Perhaps it is incumbent on high profile Hospitality researchers to also submit some of their better articles to Hospitality journals rather than just submitting their lower level work.

- Articles cannot be submitted twice to REF from one institution so researchers should cooperate and publish across institutions

- Hospitality researchers should adopt more varied approaches to research.

- UK Hospitality researchers might consider focusing on improving the number and quality of the quantitative studies so as to raise the benchmark for such Hospitality research and to access higher level journals.

5.2.2   For journal editors

- The citation of Hospitality research should be encouraged to increase Impact Factors if Hospitality journal editors want to achieve ABS ratings.

- Hospitality journal editors should focus on promoting and publishing both quantitative and qualitative high quality research.

- Suitably experienced and qualified academic paper reviewers, including experts in both quantitative and qualitative methodology, need to be identified and previous poor reviewers should be excluded.

- Encourage an openness to accept more varied approaches to data collection and analysis.

- A further option is to publish high quality articles but resist journal rankings, not apply for a rating and keep criticising the systems!

5.2.3   For the CHME

Profiling and establishing credibility
- The CHME is advised to gather knowledge and information to support and corroborate the importance of the research being undertaken within the area of Hospitality.

- The CHME should improve its web presence by creating and maintaining a database to promote and record Hospitality research by listing authors and their publications; such a core of information should nurture and regain a critical mass of Hospitality research.

- The CHME is advised to benchmark the Hospitality academic research community to consolidate and improve its national and international identity and profile.

- The CHME has put forward various criticisms regarding the current status of Hospitality as an academic subject. It should continue to move forward by using its position to try to rebuild and reinforce the credibility of Hospitality

and its associated research, ensuring that it involves both academia and industry.

- The CHME members should be involved in promoting and supporting the Hospitality research community within their respective departments and institutions.

Sense of community and research collaborations
- It is important to encourage research collaboration so the CHME is advised to facilitate and engage Hospitality researchers in cross-institutional national and international projects. The CHME should also assist in developing a cross-institutional system of collaboration and mentoring with new and seasoned researchers.

- The CHME is advised to develop guidance for new Hospitality researchers on publishing routes and the REF.

- The CHME should emphasise and improve the links with industry as they are an important audience, and a potential source of research support and funding.

Continuing commitment and the future
- Key information from the present report should be disseminated in order to raise the CHME's national and international profile amongst Hospitality educators, industrialists, students and potential students.

- Focusing on the sustainability and future of Hospitality research should raise its status and help to shape the future direction of the CHME.

- The CHME is recommended to develop and expand the present research on Hospitality Research Futures and to present the findings at subsequent CHME annual Hospitality research conferences.

- The CHME should consider funding a further research project in which interviews should be conducted with editors of Hospitality and 'Hospitality-related' journals to determine: methods for selecting papers for reviewing rejection rates and reasons for rejection; ways in which reviewers are selected and mentored; ways in which, and the extent to which, their reviews and resubmitted articles with author responses are checked by editors; the proportion of submissions that reach publication; and their current and future plans for raising the profile of their journals.

5.2.3 Suggested actions for the CHME in relation to the REF
- The CHME should lobby for Hospitality representation on a REF panel, be it Business and Management or Sports-related (as with tourism) and support a Hospitality expert being allocated to it (Note: An opportunity for same is identified on REF 2014 website. During 2013 specific bodies will be invited to make further nominations for assessors with specific research expertise required by panels (HEFCE, 2011)).

- The CHME should lobby institutions on the appropriateness/ inappropriateness of the Business and Management panel and suggest Hospitality researchers contribute to the sports-related panel.

- The CHME should contribute to the development of a framework for assessing Hospitality and 'Hospitality-related' research and journals to inform the REF.

- The CHME should encourage collaborations between colleagues in various institutions to increase the representation and presence of Hospitality.

- A strategic approach to the REF and inclusion in same should help to further enhance the position and profile of Hospitality but outside the REF it is necessary for the CHME to:

  o lobby ABS to include Hospitality experts to advise on journal rankings in the subject.
  o improve the quality of Hospitality journals through higher quality reviewing practices and broader acknowledgement of both quantitative and qualitative research methods

- The CHME should continue to highlight and streamline the number of high quality Hospitality journals that it recommends as there may be too many currently and this might be leading to a fragmented view of the research area.

In the immediate future, if Hospitality as an academic subject and Hospitality research are to be given the recognition they deserve, the CHME appears to be in a strong position to play a leading and visible lobbying role, especially with respect to the REF (Research Excellence Framework; See www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/ for further details*).* However, the responsibility for the future lies not only with the CHME but also requires the commitment and cooperation of individual Hospitality researchers, their institutions, managers and mentors, and Hospitality journal editors and their reviewers.

References

Adler, N.J. and Harzing, A. W. K. (2009) When Knowledge Wins: Transcending the Sense and Nonsense of Academic Rankings, Academy *of Management Learning & Education*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 72–95.

(The) Association of Business Schools (ABS) (2010) Harvey, C., Kelly, A., Morris, H. and Rowlinson, M. (Eds.) *Academic Journal Quality Guide* Version 4, March. http://www.the-abs.org.uk/?id=257 [accessed 10th December 2010].

Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) (2010) Journals Rating List, http://www.abdc.edu.au/3.43.0.0.1.0.htm [accessed 11th April 2011].

Baum, T. (2008, June 26). Strathclyde University. https://listserv.heanet.ie/cgi-bin/wa?A2¼DIT-TSM-HOSP-IRL;1D8O%2FQ;20080626084110%2B0100 [retrieved 16th July 2009].

Bell, D. (2007). The hospitable city: Social relations in commercial settings. *Progress in Human Geography,* Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 7–22.

Botterill, D. (2010). A position paper on research in the Hospitality, leisure, sport & tourism subjects and the research excellence framework, July, London, Higher Education Academy/Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Network.

Brotherton, B. (1999) Towards a definitive view of the nature of Hospitality and Hospitality management, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 11, No.4, pp. 163-173.

Brown, H. (2007). How impact factors changed medical publishing—and science, *British Medical Journal,* Vol. 334, pp. 561–564.

Cassée, E. and Reuland, R. (1983) Introduction. In E. Cassée. and R. Reuland, (Eds.) *The Management of Hospitality*, pp. 143-163, Pergamon, Oxford.

Centre for Leisure Management Research (2006) *Tourism Management Journal Ratings: A Report of an Examination of the Perceptions of Journal Quality by Tourism Management Academics,* Deakin University, Melbourne, December.

ESSEC Business School Centre de Recherche (2009-10). Classification des revues *Ranking of Journals, http://econtent.essec.fr/mediabanks/ESSEC-PDF/Enseignement%20et%20Recherche/Recherche/Classification_revues_us.pdf* [accessed 5th January 2011].

Frechtling, D. C. (2004). Assessment of tourism/Hospitality journals' role in knowledge transfer: An exploratory study, *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 43, pp. 100-107.

Germann Molz, J. and Gibson, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Mobilizing hospitality: The ethics of social relations in a mobile world,* Ashgate, Aldershot, UK..

Gomez, M., Gupta, S., and McLaughlin, E. (2007) Guest Satisfaction and Restaurant Performance, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 48, No. 3, pp 284-298.

Harvey, C., Morris, H. & Kelly, A. (eds.) (2008). The Association of Business Schools: Academic Journal Quality Guide – Journals Classified by Field and Quality Rank, www.the-ABS.org.uk [accessed 15th December 2010].

Harzing, A. W. K. (2002). Are our referencing errors undermining our scholarship and credibility? The case of expatriate failure rates, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 23, pp. 127–148.

Harzing, A. W. K. (2010) *Journal Quality List* [online] Available from http://www.harzing.com/jql.htm [accessed 3rd December 2010].

HEFCE (2011) www.hefce.ac.uk [accessed April 23rd 2011].

Hemmington, N. (2008). Council for Hospitality Management Education (CHME), CHME Executive and Research Committee, *Comments on the Association of Business Schools (ABS) 2008 journal quality grading guide with reference to tourism and Hospitality journals,* CHME.

Howey, R., Savage, K., Verbeeten, M. and Van Hoof, H. (1999) Tourism and Hospitality Research Journals: Cross-citations Among Research Communities, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 20, pp. 133-139.

http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/editors.editors/biblio [accessed 25th November 2010].

Impact Factor (2009) from JCR Social Science Edition, SCOPUS at http://info.scopus.com/journalmetrics/sjr.html [accessed 15th December 2010].

Jamal, T., Smith, B. and Watson, E. (2008) Ranking, Rating and Scoring of Tourism Journals: Interdisciplinary Challenges and Innovations, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 29, No.1, pp. 66-78.

Jogoratnam, G., Chon, K., McLeary, K., Mena, M. and Yoo, J. (2005). An Analysis of Institutional Contributors to Three Major Academic Tourism Journals: 1992-2001, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 26, pp. 641-648.

Journal Citation Reports (JCR) (2011). http://thomsonreuters.com/products_services/science/science_products/a-z/journal_citation_reports/ [accessed 15th December 2010].

Lashley, C. (2000). In search of Hospitality: Towards a theoretical framework, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 19, No.1, pp. 3-15.

Lashley, C. (2007). Discovering Hospitality: Observations from Recent Research, *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 214-226.

Lashley, C. (2000). In search of hospitality: Towards a theoretical framework, *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 3–15.

Lashley, C. (2008). Studying Hospitality: Insights from social sciences, *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 69–84.

Lashley, C., Lynch, P. and Morrison, A. (eds.) (2007). *Hospitality: A social lens,* Elsevier, Oxford.

Law, R. and van der Veen, R. (2008). The Popularity of Prestigious Hospitality Journals: A Google Scholar Approach, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 113-125.

Litteljohn, D. (2004). The UK research assessment exercise 2001: An analysis for hospitality research, *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 25–38.

Lugosi, P. and Lugosi, K. (2008). Guerrilla hospitality: Urban decay, entrepreneurship and the 'ruin' bars of Budapest, *The Hospitality Review,* Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 36–44.

Lugosi, P., Lynch, P. and Morrison, A. (2009). Critical Hospitality Management Research, *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 10, pp. 1465-1478.

Lynch, P. Germann Molz, J. McIntosh, A., Lugosi P. and Lashley, C. (2010). *Theorising Hospitality,* Unpublished paper.

Macdonald, S. and Kam, J. (2007). Ring a ring o'Roses: Quality journals and gamesmanship in management studies, *Journal of Management Studies,* Vol. 44, No.4, pp. 640–655.

Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) (2010). *Information on Journal Quality Assessment Systems* [e-mail] from the research librarian, June 2001.

McKercher, B (2005). A case for ranking tourism journals, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 649-651.

McKercher, B., Law, R and Lam, T (2006). Rating tourism and Hospitality journals, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 27, No. 6, pp. 1235-1252.

Morrison, A. (2004). *Hospitality Research: Work Research Smart,* Keynote Presentation at CHME Research Conference, University of Wales, Cardiff, 14-16 April.

Nkomo, S. (2009). The Seductive Power of Academic Journal Rankings: Challenges of Searching for the Otherwise, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp.106–112.

Park, K., Phillips, W.J., Canter, D.D. and Abbott, J. (2011). Hospitality and Tourism Research Rankings by Author, University, and Country using Six Major Journals: The First Decade of the New Millennium, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research* http://jht.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/03/12/1096348011400743 [accessed March 20th 2011].

Pechlaner, H., Zehrer, A., Matzler, K. and Abfalter, D. (2004). A Ranking of International Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 42, No. 4, pp. 328-332.

Ottenbacher, M., Harrington, R., and Parsa, H.G. (2009). Defining the Hospitality discipline: A discussion of pedagogical and research implications, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, Vol. 33, No. 3, pp. 263-283.

Pizam, A. (2008). Advances in hospitality research: From Rodney Dangerfield to Aretha Franklin, Keynote presentation given at the CHME Research Conference, Glasgow, UK: University of Strathclyde.

Polonsky, M.J. and Whitelaw, P. (2005). What are we measuring when we evaluate journals? *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 27, pp. 189-201.

Ritchie, J and Spencer, L. (1994). Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In A. Bryman and R. Burgess (eds.) *Analysing Qualitative Data,* pp. 173-194, Routledge, London,

Rivera, M.A. and Upchurch, R. (2008). The role of research in the hospitality industry: A content analysis of the IJHM between 2000 and 2005, *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* Vol. 27, No.4, pp. 632–640.

Ryan, C. (2005). The ranking and rating of academics and journals in tourism research, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 657-662

Science Citation Index (SCI) (2010). http://science.thomsonreuters.com/mjl/ [accessed 3rd December 2010].

SCImago Journal Rank (SJR)(2010) from SCOPUS at http://info.scopus.com/journalmetrics/display2.php [accessed 3rd December 2010].

SCOPUS (2011) at http://www.info.sciverse.com/resource-library. [accessed 3rd December 2010].

Scott, J. and Lugosi, P. (2005). Spreading the net, *Anthropology Today,* Vol. 21, No.5, pp. 22–23.

Smith, R. (2006). Commentary: The power of the unrelenting impact factor—Is it a force for good or harm? *International Journal of Epidemiology,* Vol. 35, pp.1129–1130.

Source Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP)(2010) from SCOPUS at http://info.scopus.com/journalmetrics/display2.php [accessed 3rd December 2010].

Social Science Citation Index (SSCI)(2010). from http://science.thomsonreuters.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jloptions.cgi?PC=J [accessed 3rd December 2010].

Slattery, P. (2002). Finding the Hospitality industry, *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 19-28.

Ulrich's Web (2010). *Global serials' directory* http://www.ulrich.sweb.com/ulrichsweb/ulrichsweb_news/uu/newTitles.asp?uuMonthly

File=uu201004/new_titles.txt&Letter=P&navPage=9& [accessed 3rd December 2010]

Zehrer (2007). The Justification of Journal Rankings - A Pilot Study, *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp.139-156

Website

AACSB (The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business), http://www.aacsb.edu/ [accessed 4th April 2011].

Appendix A - Development of interview questions

Literature	Question Area(s)
	Main question in **bold**-*secondary included*
## Current position of Hospitality	
One of the problems with the current state of Hospitality studies is that different disciplines and sectors frame Hospitality in quite distinct ways. Scholars and practitioners are approaching Hospitality from very different perspectives and with very different objectives. Hospitality is framed quite differently in the social sciences than it is in the managerial sciences (Lynch et al., 2010, p.1).	**In your opinion, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the social and managerial science perspectives in Hospitality research?**
Hospitality studies research has been a constant but understated dimension of the Hospitality subject (Lashley, 2008a). It is broadly concerned with exploring the social, cultural, political and ethical dimensions of Hospitality and is theory oriented, seeking to build and interlink with wider theoretical arguments and propositions for the advancement of knowledge for its own sake (Lashley et al., 2007). Moreover, Hospitality studies have attempted to use Hospitality to understand a wide range of social processes and have thus sought to advance other disciplinary knowledge (cf. Bell, 2007; Germann Molz & Gibson, 2007; Lugosi & Lugosi, 2008, Cited in Lugosi et al., 2009, p.1469).	**How do you (and your HEI) see the framing of Hospitality in future research?**
These social and political connotations seem a far cry from the definitions that emerge in the commercial realm, where the study of Hospitality is articulated in business and managerial terms. In this context, Hospitality is defined as the provision of the 'holy trinity': food, drink, accommodation (see Brotherton 1999). Take for example, Cassée and Reuland's (1983: 144) definition of organisational Hospitality: 'a harmonious mixture of food, beverage, and/or shelter, a physical environment, and behaviour of staff', (Lynch et al., 2010, p.2).	
Hospitality management research that has dominated the Hospitality subject to date is conceived of as essentially pro-business, preoccupied with managerial practice and issues of industry importance (Lashley, 2000; Slattery, 2002, Cited in Lugosi et al., 2009, pp.1468-9).	
### Affiliation & Audiencing *The vast majority of publications on Hospitality emerge from the business and managerial sector, the definition that tends to dominate public and academic discourse on the topic is one based on organisational practices and the provision of food, drink and accommodation (Lynch et al., 2010, p.2).*	**What is your position on publishing outside Hospitality focused journals?**
A growing numbers of academics outside Hospitality management departments are beginning to engage with the concept of Hospitality (Bell, 2007; Germann Molz & Gibson, 2007; Lashley et al., 2007). This engagement raises serious questions about where Hospitality management researchers will find new networks of intellectual camaraderie, and whether emerging Hospitality research feeds into broader debates in the disciplines of geography, sociology and anthropology, but does	*Does this weaken the discipline?* *What effect do you believe publishing in other disciplines has on the current and future status of Hospitality research?*

little or nothing to advance Hospitality management scholarship (Lugosi et al., 2009, pp.1471-72). *Litteljohn (2004) points to the potential weakening or dilution of Hospitality research, which may result from academics publishing in disciplinary-focused journals and by shifting emphasis from Hospitality specific to more generic management issues.*	***If we are to expand/develop the Hospitality discipline in future, how do you see this best being achieved?***
## Research Present and Future	
### Criticality *Criticality should be thought of partly as an intellectual exercise which challenges commonly accepted principles, but also as an ideological challenge to initiate change. Criticality here involves a willingness to be critical of the Hospitality academy and its existing traditions, as well as the need to remain critical of the practice of Hospitality in commercial settings (Lugosi et al., 2009, p.1470).* ### Institutions and institutional contexts *From the foregoing, it can be surmised that an important challenge will be the identity and distinctiveness of Hospitality management research within academic institutions. For example, a decision has been made recently to disband the Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management in Strathclyde University with 'Hospitality-related' academics being relocated to appropriate cognate groups within the Business School (Baum, 2008). Commentators have highlighted the challenges faced by social science-driven Hospitality and leisure researchers in business and management faculties (Lugosi, 2009; Scott & Lugosi, 2005). Researchers' affiliations to different disciplines, communities and institutions can create conflicts of interest and multidisciplinary contribution may be suppressed by the institutional discourses of business schools (Lugosi et al., 2009, pp.1472-73).* ### Scale, claims of legitimacy and research quality *Pizam (2008) and Rivera and Upchurch (2008) claimed that the use of complex statistical techniques was evidence that Hospitality management research had reached a level of credibility. Although the proposition is laudable, it implies that small-scale research and qualitative methods are not considered to be credible. This reflects and reinforces existing discourses of propriety in Hospitality management research as well as cultural preferences and traditions regarding research methods.* *Critical Hospitality Management Research will need to challenge criticism directed at credibility and legitimacy. Moreover, in demonstrating further the rich insights provided by alternative methods and methodologies, CHMR has to institutionalise a broader set of quality indicators that include reflexivity and the acknowledgement of the researcher's role in knowledge generation, epistemological transparency, a critical awareness of the ethical dimensions of research and practice, and engagement with a broader set of stakeholder interests (Lugosi et al., 2009, pp.1470-71).*	***What role do you believe criticality has to play in the future of Hospitality research?*** *How do you believe the issues of criticality are an important aspect of credibility with Hospitality research? Do we need to be more critical and rigorous to promote Hospitality more within the REF in the future?* ***How do you believe absorption of Hospitality within other faculties/department/schools in HEIs will affects future Hospitality management research?*** ***How important do you believe the use of complex statistical techniques are for the credibility of Hospitality management research?*** ***What role (if any) do qualitative techniques play in future development of Hospitality management research and the discipline?*** *What methodological approach have you favoured and why?* *Would you utilise multiple methods?* *What method have you predominantly used and why?*

Hospitality research did not perform well in the UK Research Assessment Exercise in 2004 (Jones, 2004; Litteljohn, 2004) (Lugosi et al., 2009, p.1473) *Hospitality journals have yet to reach a high level of international recognition in journal rankings (Lynch, 2008). (Lugosi et al., 2009, p.1473)*	***What are your views on the current position of Hospitality research within the REF?***

Appendix B - Interview questions

1. Firstly could you please define the subject area that you align yourself to?
i. Would it be Hospitality, tourism, events or any other?
ii. Would you consider yourself to be a mix of some – which?

2. Of your publications over the last 5 years, what proportion have addressed Hospitality topics and been published in Hospitality journals?

3. Hospitality management research is conceived of as essentially pro-business, preoccupied with managerial practice and issues of industry importance. How do you (and your HEI) see the framing of Hospitality in future research?

4. If we were to expand/develop the Hospitality subject in the future, how do you see this best being achieved?

5. In your opinion, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the managerial and social science perspectives in Hospitality research?

6. **What is your position on publishing outside Hospitality focused journals?**
i. Does this strengthen or weaken the position of Hospitality as a subject?
ii. What effect do you believe publishing in other subject areas and disciplines has on the current and future status of Hospitality research?

7. Do you believe there is the potential for the development of a global 'Hospitality-related' research network?
i. If so, how do you believe the development of a global 'Hospitality-related' research network can be best achieved?

8. Criticality involves a willingness to be critical of the Hospitality academy and its existing traditions and research practices. What role do you believe criticality has to play in the future of Hospitality research?
i. How do you believe the issues of criticality are an important aspect of credibility with Hospitality research?
ii. Do we need to be more critical and rigorous to promote Hospitality more within the REF in the future?

9. How do you believe the subsuming of Hospitality within other faculties/department/schools in HEIs has shaped or will shape future Hospitality management research?

10. How important do you believe the use of complex statistical techniques is for the credibility of Hospitality management research?

11. What role do qualitative techniques play in the future development of Hospitality management research and the discipline?

12. What methodological approach have you favoured and why?
i. Would you/do you utilise multiple (mixed) methods?
ii. What method have you used predominantly and why?

13. **What are your views on the current position of Hospitality research within the REF?**

Appendix C

Table A 4.3.3a   Comparative published ratings and rankings of 'Hospitality-related' journals listed in > one of selected quality lists

Subgroup FoodNutDiet: Food, Nutrition, Dietetics (n=15)	SSCI /SCI 2010	SJR 2010	ABS 2010	SNIP 2010	Imp. Fac. 2010	ABCD 2010
British Food Journal	√	0.086	1	0.09	0.752	
Food and Foodways		0.030		0.041	0.521	
Food & Nutrition Research		0.071		0.03		
Food Control	√	*0.211*		*0.37*	*2.463*	
Food, Culture and Society		0.073		0.03		
Food Management		0		0		
Food Policy	√	0.413	2	0.23	1.606	
Food Quality and Preference	√	0.196		0.56	1.941	
Food Research International	√	*0.211*		*0.34*	*2.414*	
Journal of Culinary Science & Technology		0.071		0.02		
Journal of Food Products Marketing	√	0.071		0.02		
Journal of Food Safety	√	0.071		0.09	0.646	
Journal of Nutrition for the Elderly	√	0.071		0.02		
Journal of the American Dietetic Association	√	*0.317*		*0.18*	*3.128*	
Scandinavian Journal of Food and Nutrition		0		0.04		
Service (n=9)						
International Journal of Service Industry Management		0.071	2	0		B
International Journal of Services and Standards		0.071		0		
Journal of Food Service Business Research		0.073		0.02		
Journal of Service Management	√	0		0		
Journal of Services Marketing	√	0.082	2	0.17		B
Journal of Services Research			3			
Managing Service Quality		0.083	1	0.12		B
Service Industries Journal	√	0.081	2	0.11	0.283	B
Services Marketing Quarterly		0.071	-	0		B
Sport (n=13)						
International Journal of Sport Finance	√					
International Journal of Sport Psychology	√	0.071		0.04	0.959	
Journal of Applied Sport Psychology	√	0.071		0.08		
Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology	√	0.071		0.21	1.295	
Journal of Sport & Social Issues	√	0.071		0.17		
Journal of Sport Management	√	0.071	2	0.28	1.079	A
Journal of Sports Economics	√	0.078		0.07	0.628	
Psychology of Sport and Exercise	√	0.121		0.21	2.152	
Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport	√				1.103	
Sociology of Sport Journal	√	0.071		0.06		A
Sport Education and Society	√				0.625	
Sport Management Review		0.074		0.08		A
Sport Psychology	√					
PropFac: Property, Facilities (n=2)						
Facilities		0.076	1	0.07		
Property Management		0.072		0.03		

Table A4.3.3b   Comparative published ratings and rankings of other journals listed in > one of selected quality lists and in which 'Hospitality-related' articles have been published

Journal Title	SSCI 2010	SJR 2010	ABS 2010	SNIP 2010	Imp. Fac. 2010	ABCD 2010
(B&) General Business; Management (n=26)						
Asia Pacific Business Review√		0.071	2	0.07		C
Asia Pacific Journal of Management		0.103	2	0.29		B
Asia Pacific Management Review		0.071				
Asian Business & Management					0.174	
British Journal of Management	√	*0.096*	*4*	*0.25*	*1.448*	*A*
Critical Perspectives on International Business		0.082		0.19		
European Business Review		0.075	2	0.04		C
European Management Journal		0.095	2	0.25		C
Fortune		0.072		0.01		
Global Business Review		0.071				
Harvard Business Review	√	*0.108*	*4*	*0.2*	*1.655*	*A*
International Business Review		*0.090*	*3*	*0.25*	*1.062*	*A*
International Journal of Management Reviews	√	*0.126*	*3*	*0.42*	*2.286*	*A*
Journal of Asia-Pacific Business						C
Journal of Business Research	√	*0.1*	*3*	*0.39*	*1.293*	*A*
Journal of East West Business						C
Journal of European Studies		0.071		0		
Journal of International Business Studies	√	*0.109*	*4*	*0.55*	*3.766*	*A**
Journal of International Management	√	0.089	2	0.23	1.854	C
Journal of Management	√	*0.0152*	*4*	*0.61*	*4.429*	*A**
Latin American Business Review		0.071		0		
Management Decision	√	0.092		0.11	0.622	C
Management International Review	√	*0.071*	*3*	*0.13*		*A*
Measuring Business Excellence		0.071		0.02		
Multinational Business Review						C
Total Quality Management & Business Excellence (Online)		0.084	2	0.1	0.299	C
MarAdvBrCon :Marketing; Advertising; Brand; Consumer (n=21)						
European Journal of Marketing		0.082	3	0.15	0.756	B
International Journal of Research in Marketing	√	*0.097*	*3*	*0.24*	*1.873*	*A*
International Marketing Review		*0.1*	*3*	*0.34*		*A*
Journal of Advertising	√	0.071	3	0.15		C
Journal of Advertising Research	√	0.071	3	0.11		
Journal of Brand Management		0.071	1			B
Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing	√	0.085		0.23	0.676	B
Journal of Consumer Behaviour		0.086	2	0.06		B
Journal of Consumer Marketing	√	0.075	1	0.1		B
Journal of Consumer Research	√	*0.071*	*4*	*0.27*		*A**
Journal of Global Marketing		0.071		0.05		
Journal of International Consumer Marketing		0.071		0.14		C
Journal of International Marketing	√	0.131	3	0.64	1.590	C
Journal of Marketing	√	*0.14*	*4*	*0.77*	*3.779*	*A**
Journal of Marketing Communications		0.071	2	0.05		B

Journal Title	SSCI 2010	SJR 2010	ABS 2010	SNIP 2010	Imp. Fac. 2010	ABCD 2010
Journal of Marketing Education		0.079	2	0.28		B
Journal of Marketing Management			*3*			*A*
Journal of Marketing Research	√	*0.127*	*4*	*0.39*	*3.099*	*A**
Journal of Strategic Marketing		0.071	2	0.1		A
Journal of The Academy of Marketing Science	√	*0.088*	*3*	*0.3*		*A**
Marketing Management		0.071				
AccFinEconIS; Accounting; Finance Economics; OR; IT (n=18)						
Applied Economics	√					A
British Accounting Review		*0.08*	*3*	*0.13*		*A*
Australian Journal of Educational Technology					1.278	
Benchmarking: An International Journal		0.071		0.05		C
Competitiveness Review		0.087		0.18		
European Journal of Operational Research		*0.179*		*0.68*	*2.093*	*A*
Expert systems with applications		*0.120*		*0.34*	*2.908*	C
International Journal of Business Performance Management		0.071		0.05		C
International Journal of Electronic Commerce	√	0.071		0.15	1.60	A
International Journal of the Economics of Business		0.08		0.08		B
Journal of Accounting Research		*0.121*		*0.49*		*A**
Journal of Cultural Economics	√	0.077		0.08		
Journal of Productivity Analysis	√	0.10		0.18		A
Middle East Business and Economic Review		0.072				
The Accounting Review	√	*0.117*		*0.45*		*A**
The British Accounting Review		0.08		0.13		A
The European Accounting Review	√	0.071		0.1		A
The Journal of the Operational Research Society	√	0.106		0.2		A
HRIndRPsych: Human resources; Industrial relations; Psychology (n=15)						
Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources		0.071	2	0.03	0.775	C
British Journal of Industrial Relations		0.073		0.04		A
Employee Relations		0.075	2	0.07		B
Gender Work and Organisation	√				*0.982*	*A*
Human Resource Management Journal		*0.092*	*3*	*0.26*		*A*
Human Resource Management Review		0.112	2	0.26		B
Industrial Relations Journal			2			B
International Journal of Human Resource Management	√	*0.089*	*3*	*0.18*	*0.830*	*A*
International Journal of Selection and Assessment	√	*0.085*	*3*	*0.11*	*0.864*	*A*
Journal of Business and Psychology	√	0.09		0.18		B
Journal of European Industrial Training						C
Journal of Human Resources	√	*0.071*	*3*	*0.28*		*A**
Journal of Organisational Behaviour	√		4			
Personnel Review	√	0.091	2	0.1		B
Work Employment and Society	√					
Education; Training (n=9)						
Education and Training		0.075		0.13		
Higher Education Quarterly		0.082	2	0.05		B
Journal of Education and Work		0.077		0.18		
Journal of Higher Education	√	0.081	2	0.24	1.460	B
Journal of Marketing Education		0.079	2	0.28		B

Journal Title	SSCI 2010	SJR 2010	ABS 2010	SNIP 2010	Imp. Fac. 2010	ABCD 2010
Quality Assurance in Education		0.077	1	0.18		
Studies in Higher Education	√	*0.071*	*3*	*0.15*		*A*
Teaching in Higher Education	√	0.071	2	0.09		
The Academy of Management Executive	√					
GeogHeritEn: Geography; Heritage; Environment (n=10)						
Applied Geography	√	0.091		0.2		
Environmental Management		0.118		0.16		A
International Journal of Heritage Studies		0.071	1	0.01		
International Journal of Sustainable Development		0.071		0.06		
Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology		0.071				
Journal of Rural Studies	√	*0.119*	*3*	*0.38*	*1.47*	
Progress in Human Geography		*0.126*		*0.47*	*3.59*	
Rural Society		0.071		0.19		
Urban Studies	√		*3*		*1.301*	*A*
Victorian Studies		0.071				
SmallBusEnt: Small business; Entrepreneurship (n=7)						
International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research		0.085	2	0.32		B
International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business		0.071		0.02		
International Journal of Globalisation and Small Business		0.071				
International Small Business Journal	√	0.104	3	0.27		B
Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development,		0.08		0.14		C
Journal of Small Business Management	√	*0.085*	*3*	*0.4*	*1.088*	*A*
Small Business Economics	√	*0.093*		*0.23*	*1.380*	*A*
AOther: Culture, Ethics, Health, History, Humanities, Language, Law, Philosophy, Politics, Sociology, Theology (n=17)						
Angelaki; Journal of Theoretical Humanities	√	*0.044*		*0.505*		
American Journal of Public Health					*4.371*	*A**
Business Ethics Quarterly	√	*0.075*	*3*	*0.03*	*1.615*	*A*
Business Ethics: A European review		0.097	2	0.27		B
Geoforum					1.574	
Journal of Business Ethics	√	*0.091*		*0.17*	*1.088*	*A*
Journal of Public Health Management and Practice	√	0.28		0.15		
Media, Culture and Society	√	0.076		0.13		
Mobilities	√	0.034				
Paragraph	√					
Policy Studies		0.071		0.05		B
Politics & Policy						A
Prose Studies		0.071				
Sociology	√	*0.085*	*3*	*0.23*		*A**
Space and Culture		0.071		0.07		
The Business History Review		0.071				
Theory, Culture and Society	√		3			

Key: Selected high ranked/rated journals in each group based on overall quality ratings/rankings examined

Appendix D   Framework for interview data analysis

Institutional drivers	Depends on departments strategy	Need for four star journals Limited journals available
	Nature of departments, nature of courses, background of staff.	Hospitality schools disappearing/disappeared Benefits of business schools
	Negative effects of politics	
(Personal) choices for publication	RAE/REF	
	International/national	
	Institutions	
	Journal grading	
	ABS rules	
	Audience match to topic – generic v. hospitality	
	Problems with having to aim for higher journal rankings	Lack of good quality Hospitality reviewers. Hospitality journals not ranked high enough Need to lobby for journal ranking
RAE/REF	Lack of political astuteness	
	Impact of RAE/REF	
	Problems of the RAE and where Hospitality sits	
	Need to lobby for Hospitality to go in with tourism, sports and events	
	Uncertainty as to place of Hospitality	
Criticisms of RAE/REF	Overlooked	
	Too limiting	
	Not good for Hospitality	Last RAE didn't do hospitality any good
	REF panels/members	Perceptions of panels
	Journal metrics	
	Low ranking from RAE compared to business and management	
Hospitality research	Definitions/strands of	
	Strengths	Theoretical underpinning Beyond management perspective, social sciences Publishing outside strengthens
	Weaknesses:	Theoretical underpinning Inward looking UK contributors focus on REF Too many journals and need to improve quality of few Publishing outside
	Future	Disappear and be subsumed within generic journals Needs clarity Needs industry support
	Effect of metrics	
	Layers of criticality:	Critical of research Undertake critical research Importance of rigorous reviewing
	Credibility	Undermined by overcomplicated statistics Challenges to credibility

	Industry influence / importance	Importance of research with industry
	Informing the audience	Academics Industry
	Opportunities for Hospitality research career	Limited if looking for career progression in research
	Strategic research partnerships	
	Strategy: improve ranking of Hospitality journals	
	Strategy: publish more in generic management	Aid career progressions
	National/international variations	
	Questionable quality	Better to have something published than nothing at all Easier to get into hospitality journals "hospitality become more and more diluted"
Global Community	Lack of global network/communication mechanism	"haven't been able to get our act together"
	I-CHRIE closest we have globally	
	Negative re: CHRIE and CHME	
	Fragmentation of subject area	
	Lessons to be learnt from TRINET	
	Funding and strategy	
	Value of: widen audience; widen cooperation	
	Needs a champion	"catalytic person" / "academic entrepreneur"
Restrictions of institutional structures	Effect on research community/focus of business school location	OK for teaching difficult for research
	Importance of department identity	Lack of hospitably identity, difficult for audience
	If in business school need to be credible in those areas	
	Shaped where need to publish, what we need to do and made it more difficult, competitive.	
	Flavour/shape teaching programmes	
	Off putting discouraging	Struggle to compete with, keep up with business researchers if in a business school
Research methods	Wider range of methods	Need for best fit of method
	Multi inter-disciplinary	
	Qualitative and quantitative methods	Using quantitative and statistical techniques doesn't give credibility Bias to quantitative methods
	Varying quality of reviewing for qualitative research	
	Cultural ambiguities (US view stats)	
	Methodology influenced by where you want to get it published – journals favour particular approaches	

Appendix E   Further information on quality ratings and rankings

See listed websites for further details

http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/editors.editors/biblio [accessed 25th November 2010].

Social Science Citation Index (SSCI)/Science Citation Index (SCI) (2010) at
SSCI   http://science.thomsonreuters.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jloptions.cgi?PC=J
SCI   http://science.thomsonreuters.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jloptions.cgi?PC=J

SCImago Journal Rank (SJR)(2010) from SCOPUS at
http://info.scopus.com/journalmetrics/display2.php

SJR: Is weighted by the prestige of the journal, thereby 'levelling the playing field' among journals.
- Eliminates manipulation: the only way to raise the SJR ranking is to be published in more reputable journals.
- 'Shares' a journal's prestige equally over the total number of citations in that journal.
- Normalises for differences in citation behaviour between subject fields. (http://www.info.sciverse.com/documents/files/scopus-training/ resourcelibrary/pdf/journalmetrics_factsheet_web.pdf)

ABS (2010) Association of Business Schools Academic Journal Quality Guide March 2010 at http://www.the-abs.org.uk/?id=257

Quality categories:
4* A world elite journal
4 A top journal
3 A highly regarded journal
2 A well regarded journal
1 A recognised journal

Source Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP)(2010) from SCOPUS at
http://info.scopus.com/journalmetrics/display2.php

SNIP
- Measures contextual citation impact by 'normalising' citation values
- Takes a research field's citation frequency into account
- Considers immediacy - how quickly a paper is likely to have an impact in a given field
- Accounts for how well the field is covered by the underlying database
- Calculates without use of a journal's subject classification to avoid delimitation
- Counters any potential for editorial manipulation (http://www.info.sciverse.com/documents/files/scopus-training/ resourcelibrary/pdf/journalmetrics_factsheet_web.pdf)

Impact Factor (2010) from
http://thomsonreuters.com/products_services/science/free/essays/impact_factor/
For an explanation, see:
http://thomsonreuters.com/products_services/science/science_products/a-z/journal_citation_reports/

The Impact Factor is calculated as follows: If A is the total number of citations in 2010, B is the number of 2010 citations of articles published in 2008 and 2009 (a subset of A) and C is the total number of articles published in 2008 and 2000, then D = B/C = 2010 impact factor.

'The impact factor is useful in clarifying the significance of absolute (or total) citation frequencies. It eliminates some of the bias of such counts which favour large journals over small ones, or frequently issued journals over less frequently issued ones, and of older journals over newer ones. Particularly in the latter case such journals have a larger citable body of literature than smaller or younger journals. All things being equal, the larger the number of previously published articles, the more often a journal will be cited'.
(http://thomsonreuters.com/products_services/science/free/essays/impact_factor/)

ABDC (2010) Australian Business Deans Council Journal Rankings List February 2010 at http://www.abdc.edu.au/3.43.0.0.1.0.htm

Quality categories:
'A* Best or leading journal in its field - publishes outstanding, original and rigorous research that will shape the field. Acceptance rates are typically low and the editorial board is dominated by leading scholars in the field or subfield, including
from top institutions in the world. Where relevant to the field or subfield, the journal has the highest impact factors or other indices of high reputation.

A Highly regarded journal in the field or subfield - publishes excellent research in terms of originality, significance and rigour, has competitive submission and acceptance rates, excellent refereeing process and where relevant to the field or subfield, has higher than average impact factors. Not all highly regarded journals have high impact factors, especially those in niche areas.

B: Well regarded journal in the field or subfield - publishes research of a good standard in terms of originality, significance and rigour and papers are fully refereed according to good standards and practices but acceptance rates are higher than for Tiers A* and A. Depending on the field or sub-field, will have a modest impact factor and will be ISI listed.

C: A recognised journal - publishes research that is of a modest standard and/or is yet to establish its reputation because of its newness. This tier is more inclusive than the others but only includes refereed journals'.(Source: Harzing et al., 2010)