



Out for the count: some methodological questions in 'publications counting' literature

Erwin Losekoot^a, Constantinos S. Verginis^b, Roy C. Wood^{a,*}

^a *The Scottish Hotel School, University of Strathclyde, 94 Cathedral Street, Glasgow, Scotland G4 0LG, UK*

^b *The Alpine Center, Palmyra Beach Hotel, 70 Possidonos Avenue, GR-166 75 Glyfada, Greece*

Abstract

This paper considers 'publications counting' literature, that literature which seeks to establish league tables of the published output of academics. Often justified on the grounds of benchmarking for supporting tenure and appointment decisions, publications counting literature is revealed to be methodologically flawed. This paper focuses on the major limitations of this kind of study, presenting a conceptual critique of existing 'publications counting' processes, and argues that the methods of such studies are neither reasonable nor consistent. This is particularly clear in areas such as the choice of journals to be sampled, the time frame established in sampling procedures, and various arithmetic procedures employed in calculating output measures. The paper concludes with discussion of possible alternative means of achieving goals of benchmarking hospitality scholarship while suggesting that publications counting should be abandoned as a sole means of determining research excellence. © 2001 Published by Elsevier Science Ltd.

Keywords: Hospitality research; Journal status; Measurement of research output

1. Introduction

Measurement of the publications output of academics as a means of eliciting some assessment of individual and institutional productivity and equality is not a new phenomenon, although in the hospitality and tourism context it is thus far principally a US one. A number of studies focusing on the tourism and hospitality areas have appeared in the last dozen years or so (Weaver and McCleary, 1989;

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +44-141-548-3945; fax: +44-141-552-2870.

E-mail address: r.c.wood@strath.ac.uk (R.C. Wood).

1 Weaver et al., 1990; Rutherford and Samenfink, 1992; Samenfink and Rutherford,
2 1996). Related studies have been undertaken on faculty selection and review criteria
3 (Sheldon and Collinson, 1990; Schmidgall and Woods, 1992); trends in the
4 authorship and content of published articles in hospitality (Chon et al., 1989;
5 Roberts, 1998); the rating of different kinds of publications output (Schmidgall and
6 Woods, 1993); the rating of journals in the hospitality and tourism fields (Ferreira
7 et al., 1994, 1998); and perceptions of the value of single, co-authored and multiple
8 authored articles in hospitality (Woods, 1998). The ‘publications counting’ literature
9 has been further extended by citation analysis of published hospitality research
10 (Woods and Schmidgall, 1995; Howey et al., 1999).

11 Although, ostensibly, the purpose of the research studies described above has been
12 to investigate the most productive and influential scholars in the fields concerned,
13 precise research objectives are noticeable by their absence although there are passing
14 references to the benefits of benchmarking (Rutherford and Samenfink, 1992) and
15 to the usefulness of such research in terms of “tenure, promotion, and salary
16 issues...recruiting purposes and for promotional reasons...for placement or
17 relocation purposes” (Woods and Schmidgall, 1995, p. 33). Perhaps more
18 remarkable has been the lack of apparent critique of the methodologies of these
19 studies or their general tenor. In an early and still important paper Smith (1983), by
20 the way of outlining approaches to the production of academic articles, charted
21 much of the political context and terrain attendant on such activity. More recently,
22 Seaton (1996) has commented upon the claustrophobic nature of the refereeing
23 process in tourism journals and Wood (1995) has examined some of the conceptual
24 and methodological problems raised by the hospitality ‘publications counting’
25 literature. These contributions, while valuable, are characterised by brevity and leave
26 considerable scope for further reflection on a range of issues, issues that this
27 paper seeks to address.

28 The rationale for what follows does not simply emanate from the nature of the
29 studies concerned. In many countries higher education is subject to increasing public
30 and political scrutiny in the name of fiscal accountability and cost efficiency. The
31 workings of the contemporary university in particular are constantly subjected to
32 new tests of social, business and community ‘relevance’. In America, where
33 publication has always had a central role in individual and institutional politics in
34 higher education, these and additional pressures are reflected in semi-public critical
35 discourse on the intellectual practices of higher seats of learning (Sykes, 1988;
36 Hughes, 1994; Paglia, 1993, 1994). Fears about the quality of academic research
37 recur, as is most recently seen in the controversy over Alan Sokal’s duping of a social
38 science journal, where the latter published a ‘phoney’ article by the physicist
39 purporting to deconstruct theories of quantum gravity (Sokal and Bricmont, 1998).
40 These and other pressures have led to a measure of defensiveness on the part of the
41 higher education sector. More important, perhaps, are the mechanisms that some
42 governments have introduced to place checks on quality. In the last 10–15 years in
43 the UK both teaching and research have come to be periodically peer-assessed, the
44 latter every five years in a ‘Research Assessment Exercise’ (RAE) with resultant
45 ratings in subject areas being widely published (a similar exercise is undertaken in

1 Hong Kong). The circulation of such information and the competitiveness it creates
2 means that measures such as publications counting and citation analysis, when they
3 come from academic scholars, are particularly important as they might exert
4 influence on external assessments. Thus, the main objective of this paper is to offer a
5 conceptual critique of existing studies of ‘publications counting’ in the hospitality
6 field.

9 **2. Conceptual critique of ‘publications counting’**

11 Within the hospitality field, publications counting research is, as already
12 intimated, an ethnocentric affair, the majority of published work emanating from
13 the USA. Of the literature cited earlier, Rutherford and Samenfink (1992) remains
14 the seminal template for the field, a point noted by Wood (1995) who illustrates his
15 own discussion with examples from this study. A similar approach is undertaken
16 here, but examples are drawn from a slightly larger number of sources. The main
17 areas for consideration are:

- 19 ● choice and relative status of journals included in studies of publications counting;
- 20 ● the timeframe employed for analysis of published journal contributions relative to
21 journal selection; and
- 22 ● the arithmetic procedures employed in calculating outcome hierarchies.

23 *2.1. The choice and relative status of journals*

25 The enormous expansion of academic journals in both tourism and hospitality
26 management in the last 10 years (the latter especially so in the USA) means that there
27 are logistical as well as methodological obstacles to any census of publications
28 output in these fields, especially when the time factor is taken into account (although
29 many journals are of recent origin, several of the more established ones have long
30 back runs). Authors of publication counting studies are therefore selective in their
31 choice of journals to analyse. As Wood (1995) has noted in the context of the
32 Rutherford and Samenfink (1992) paper, the rationale for such selection is not
33 always clear. Indeed, Wood (1995) levels a number of accusations against these
34 authors’ choice, arguing that it is ethnocentric (three of the four journals chosen are
35 US-based and, Wood argues, biased); partial (two of the American journals selected
36 are closely identified with their host institutions, i.e. their publishers); and
37 unrepresentative (because they exclude, in particular, tourism journals that publish
38 ‘hospitality’ articles). A limitation of this critique is that Rutherford and Samenfink
39 (1992) are following in a tradition of selecting those journals which are available and
40 conform to broadly established characteristics of academic journals in other fields.
41 Put another way, as early as 1986, Kent and Rutherford employed these titles, as
42 noted by Chon et al. (1989, p. 483) who, however, in also focusing on the four
43 publications suggest they are “the most important hospitality management journals”
44 as opposed to (at the time) the only ones!

1 Selection of journals for inclusion as bases for publications counting studies is
 2 intimately bound up with the perceived status of such journals. Mindful of the
 3 limited range of titles extant at the time of the Rutherford and Samenfink study,
 4 the choice of the *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*,
 5 the *Hospitality Research Journal* (now the *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*
 6 *Research*), the *International Journal of Hospitality Management* and the *Florida*
 7 *International University Hospitality Review* seems unavoidable, although it excludes
 8 those tourism journals of the time that published ‘hospitality’ articles, journals
 9 which might reasonably be included in any count. Much has changed since the
 10 beginning of the 1990s however. There is now some information on how various
 11 (usually academic) audiences view the status of journals in the field. Two influential
 12 studies by Ferreira et al. (1994, 1998) identified the ‘leading’ journals as shown in
 13 Table 1.

14 Both these studies were predominantly American in orientation and sample.
 15 Nevertheless the UK-based *International Journal of Hospitality Management*
 16 performed well as did *Annals of Tourism Research* and the *Journal of Travel*
 17 *Research*, both long-established and respectable publishing outlets and both clearly
 18 tourism-orientated. An interesting question thus arises. Does the proliferation of
 19 journals in hospitality since 1994 explain the diminution in status of tourism-created
 20 journals (i.e. does the 1994 status of *Annals of Tourism Research* and the *Journal of*
 21 *Travel Research* reflect a view of quality based on the relative scarcity of hospitality
 22 journals)?

23 Such a question brings us neatly to the topic of the relative status of journals.
 24 However, this is not simply a matter of academics’ perceptions of such status. In
 25 established disciplines and subject areas, collegial consensus as to journal status
 26 develops over time. In relatively new areas with limited and short research traditions
 27 perceived status of journals can arguably be influenced by a much wider range of
 28 variables over the, by definition, relative short term. For example, in an academic
 29 culture which is increasingly driven by encouragement to ‘publish or perish’, the
 30 availability of new journals (which, after all, often operate on market principles
 31

33

34 Table 1
 35 Leading hospitality and tourism journals after Ferreira et al. (1994, 1998)

1994	1998
International Journal of Hospitality Management	Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly
Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly	Hospitality Research Journal
Hospitality Research Journal	International Journal of Hospitality Management
Journal of Travel Research	Hospitality and Tourism Educator
Annals of Tourism Research	Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing
	Annals of Tourism Research (6)
	Journal of Travel Research (8)

45

1 which means they require copy) may lead academics publishing in these journals to
2 have a not unreasonably heightened perception of their quality. This, put crudely, is
3 the *cogito ergo sum* approach: I am a good academic, I publish, therefore I publish in
4 good journals and journals in which I am published are good journals. Other factors
5 that may influence the relative status of journals include editorships and editorial
6 board memberships. This can work in two ways. A respected editor (and their
7 associates) can confer equal (and sometimes spurious) respectability on a journal.
8 Membership of an editorial board can flatter to deceive (or at least encourage self-
9 deception) as picking up such baubles is part of the currency of academic life (Sykes,
10 1988; Seaton, 1996). Cultural differences can also play a role, with regionally based
11 journals enjoying a high status in their region of origin or operation and individual
12 academic credibility dependent on publication in such journals.

13 The pre-eminence of the *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*
14 (CHRAQ) in Ferreira et al.'s (1994, 1998) surveys provides an ironic inflection of the
15 above observations. The CHRAQ is the longest-established journal in the hospitality
16 field, published out of one of the World's leading hotel schools which is itself part of
17 one of America's 'ivy league' universities. It is frequently cited as one of the most
18 important journals in the US hospitality academy over a variety of criteria. Yet in
19 the UK many in both the hospitality and wider business education community
20 would look upon the CHRAQ with suspicion and probably regard it as being at the
21 margins of status as an *academic* journal (the phenomenon is not entirely confined to
22 the UK, a recent well-regarded survey of hospitality management education included
23 an analysis by Chacko (1999), which placed the CHRAQ firmly in the second tier of
24 hospitality journals). There are a number of reasons for this. First is the composition
25 of the journal which constitutes a mixture of news, current affairs and 'scholarly
26 papers' which make it more of a professional rather than academic publication.
27 Then there is the close association with Cornell itself: the CHRAQ is published
28 very much as a corporate work (as of the December 1998 issue, some 17 (41%)
29 of 41 board members were Cornell graduates). Perhaps significant is that CHRAQs
30 main US-based competitor, the *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*
31 has recently ceased to be published by its sponsoring organisation (the Council
32 on Hospitality and Restaurant Industry Education, CHRIE) and is now under the
33 wing of distinguished academic publishers Sage. Finally, there is the question of how
34 a refereed journal like the CHRAQ can contrive to publish a disproportionate
35 number of papers by its own Faculty. In preparing this article, the authors did a
36 'spot check' and found that between the February 1995 and December 1998 issues,
37 some 24 in all, some 210 papers were published of which 51 were Cornell authored
38 and 17 Cornell co-authored. Thus, nearly one-third of all papers published during
39 this period had a Cornell Faculty or student author, a statistical distortion of some
40 magnitude.

41 The difficulties attendant on the status and ranking of journals in general and the
42 CHRAQ in particular can be further illustrated by consideration of the findings of a
43 limited research probe undertaken for this and a related research project. No more is
44 claimed for this illustration than its suggestiveness. A mail shot to 300 randomly
45 chosen US CHRIE members in 1999 yielded a meagre 26 responses (8.6%).

1 Respondents were asked to rank over 30 hospitality and tourism journals in terms of
 3 their research value (respondents were also allowed to insert and nominate any titles
 5 not included on this list). The top five journals thus nominated are shown in Table 2.
 7 The results, though not in any sense capable of generalisation, do suggest a possible
 9 congruence with those of Ferreira et al. (1994, 1998). More interestingly, because the
 11 research value ranking is transparent for each of the first five positions, by applying a
 13 reverse scale (i.e. ranked first scores 5 points, ranked second scores 4 points and so
 on) it is possible to assign a crude weighting to each rank. On this basis the 'final'
 rank order is the CHRAQ, followed by the JTHR, ATR, IJHM and finally JTR
 (see Table 2 for legend). It does therefore appear that some consensus is emerging
 as to the 'best' journals, notwithstanding the issues attendant on the status of
 the CHRAQ. What uses such consensus can be put to will be revisited later in this
 paper.

To the issue of the relative status of journals, mention should also be made of the
 role of non-hospitality journals in publication counts. Some hospitality academics at
 least publish in tourism journals, others in both mainstream and specialist journals
 of other disciplines. To define 'most frequent contributors to the hospitality
 literature' purely in terms of hospitality journals seems even more absurd when
 considering the diversity of researchers' publishing interests and aspirations: such a
 strategy certainly has the potential to distort outcomes to the extent of rendering
 them meaningless.

The point of the above discussion is a simple one. It is that a whole range of
 variables and influences remain to be thought through before it is possible to
 produce a remotely credible international framework for conducting 'publications
 counts' or indeed a range of related research. To dignify existing commentaries as
 ethnocentric is to understate the degree of American parochialism in evidence. More
 important perhaps is that, given the relatively small number of authors recently
 engaged in research in the hospitality field, it seems remarkable that some
 methodologically detailed consensus has not been established among those with a
 clear commitment to the field.

Table 2
 CHRIE members leading research journals, 1999 ($n = 26$)^a

Rank/journal	1	2	3	4	5	Mentions in top five	Total mentions and as a percentage ($x/26$), and rank
ATR	6	2	5	1	0	14	17 65% 4
CHRAQ	6	5	2	3	0	16	24 92% 1
IJHM	2	2	4	3	4	15	20 77% 3
JTHR	3	9	2	4	3	19	23 88% 2
JTR	3	3	1	1	0	8	15 58% 5

^aATR, Annals of Tourism Research; CHRAQ, Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly; IJHM, International Journal of Hospitality Management; JTHR, Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research; JTR, Journal of Travel Research.

1 2.2. Timeframe employed for analysis of published journal contributions relative to
journal selection

3

5 The final point of the preceding section is brought home with a vengeance when
7 considering certain details of the methodology of publications counting studies. The
9 first of these was alluded too earlier, and concerns timeframes of analysis. As
11 previously noted, the growth in number of hospitality-related journals in the 1990s
13 means that as a population, there is now a range of publications, many with different
15 dates of commencement. These include the long-standing *Cornell Hotel and
17 Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, in excess of 40 years old, to journals of a few
19 years' standing. The problem for any 'publications counting' research in terms of
attaining some degree of meaningful outcome is one of sampling. A census of all
journals regardless of period covered is likely to be costly and useful only as a
historical exercise. Since the objective of most research of this type is precisely a
snapshot in time of 'the best' (i.e. most frequently cited authors or journals) the
weight of methodological logic is thrown behind what might be called the 'least
inconvenient starting point' or, alternatively, the most contemporaneous period
that is likely to yield meaningful results. Both are, in effect, forms of convenience
sample.

21 The least inconvenient starting point method is employed in the Rutherford and
23 Samenfink (1992, p. 25) study which uses "...the publication date of the first HRJ
25 [*Hospitality Research Journal*] in 1976 as its departure point. Although begun in
27 1960, the CHRAQ [*Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*] is only
29 analysed from 1976 to maintain consistency. The debut issues of IJHM [*International
31 Journal of Hospitality Management*] and FIUHR [*Florida International University
33 Hospitality Review*] in 1982 and 1983, respectively, became the departure point for
35 the analysis of those periodicals". The advantage of this approach is that it allows
37 some historical perspective but a bias is built into the survey by the longer runs of the
39 first two named journals. This lends a high probability to the presence in any league
41 table of longer-established scholars who have published in the longer-established
43 journals, favouring the time-served over newcomers. The only adequate means of
establishing a contemporary picture of leading scholar publishers is to standardise to
a common time period for all journals—anything else is literally 'none sense'. This
is the 'most contemporaneous period' method, and entails analysing a publications
period likely to yield meaningful results and ensuring a selection of journals that are
available for the full duration of the period of study. This approach has the added
advantage of eliminating new or recently established journals whose reputation and
longevity remain to be demonstrated or whose configuration may change (for
example, the journal *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality* established in 1995 ceased
publication in 1998 to be replaced by two journals, the *International Journal of
Tourism Research* and *Tourism and Hospitality Research: The Surrey Quarterly
Review*. Following this line addresses several of the issues raised in the earlier
discussion concerning the relative status of journals.

45 Such an approach nevertheless remains essentially based on convenience sampling
and some thought needs to be given to increasing the degree of randomness in a

1 revised methodological approach. Given that it is the contemporaneous nature of
3 this type of research which lends it any practical or policy value, year starting points
5 should be selected randomly from a delimited range and an adequate sampling
7 period determined. Journals now publish anything from 3 to 10 issues per year,
9 introducing a further requirement for standardisation into any methodological
11 procedure. If the problem of overrepresentation is to be avoided, then periodicity has
13 to be tempered by adoption of common frequencies. This can be problematic for
15 more than methodological reasons as it may mean eliminating from any sample
17 journals of undoubted repute, journals that should necessarily be included in any
19 sample for reasons of credibility.

2.3. *The arithmetic procedures employed in calculating outcome hierarchies*

13 The simplest, but nevertheless modestly important point to be addressed here
15 relates to the treatment of co-authored papers. In Rutherford and Samenfink (1992)
17 the paper is treated as 1 and divided by the number of authors to achieve an outcome
19 (i.e. two authors yields 0.5 publication for each author). While this has a surface
21 logic it of course does nothing to reveal the actual contribution of each author.
23 Indeed, the issue is a controversial one (and not only in this field). Woods (1998)
25 surveyed CHRIE members at four-year institutions in the US and a general, if
27 contentious, conclusion was that co- and multiple-authored papers should not
29 'count' in terms of kudos as much as single-authored papers. This response might be
31 contrasted with the natural sciences where much experimental work is teamwork and
33 multiple-authored papers more common, if not actually the norm.

35 The application of equalising fractions in publications counting for the purpose
37 of establishing league tables of scholars' research output cannot be regarded as a
39 safe methodology. It underestimates the human element that is involved in the
41 production of publications. To illustrate this point it is necessary to consider only
43 two (not entirely hypothetical) alternatives. First are those research and writing
45 teams who for whatever reasons agree on an alphabetical listing of names on
published output regardless of the nature of the contribution (the present paper is a
perfect case in point). Second is the team that is perhaps generating a number of
papers from a single research project and agrees to a 'rotation' of first named author
on paper outputs.

A ready alternative to the equalising fractions approach is not immediately evident
as to include the qualifications noted above would require perfect knowledge, which
to put it mildly is not likely to be attainable.

3. Some ways forward?

41 This paper has sought to unravel by means of a critique some of the assumptions
43 underlying 'publications counting' literature in hospitality. On the basis of the
45 foregoing discussion it would be tempting to suggest clear recommendations as to
future methodological procedures for 'publications counting' research. Such a

1 strategy would, however, be flawed. Much of the literature alluded to in this paper
2 evidences, as the critique offered suggests, many methodological flaws and problems,
3 some of them so simple that it is hard to credit that such literature has found itself
4 into the public domain. For every refinement one makes to research design, a
5 boundary problem arises: which journals to search; what length of time period to
6 employ; how to account for multiple- and co-authorship? It is not a prerequisite of
7 this or any research that a consensus be established for progress to be
8 made—methodological pluralism is always to be welcomed. However, if research
9 of this kind is to have, or has, any policy implications, then there must be concern
10 that it is a very blunt instrument indeed.

11 In point of fact, much of the publications counting literature evidences the
12 preoccupation with crude positivism that Taylor and Edgar (1996, 1999) have, in two
13 influential papers, identified as typical if limiting of hospitality research approaches.
14 There are two main indicators of this approach. First is the preoccupation with
15 quantitative methodology, which often disguises crude methodological assumptions.
16 In respect of publications counting we can cite the boundary issues noted earlier as
17 well as simpler methodological strategies such as fractional apportionment of credit
18 for multiple-authored papers.

19 Secondly, there is evidence in hospitality research of an often implicit and shallow
20 pragmatism directed towards informing policy outcomes in what Taylor and Edgar
21 (1996, p. 222) term a ‘tyranny of relevance’ (the publications counting literature
22 succumbs to this approach all too readily). Thus, in Rutherford and Samenfink’s
23 (1982) paper the objective is to provide publications benchmarking that might be
24 useful in tenure and promotion decisions. For Taylor and Edgar (1996, p. 222) the
25 principal difficulty of such an approach is the propensity for ‘conceptual
26 malnutrition’ that means that a ‘field’s actual research focus can be subsumed by
27 its techniques or instruments’. This ‘conceptual malnutrition’, is a failure to align
28 robust concepts with the focus of research while promoting the ‘instruments’ of
29 research to a largely unsustainable status. In publications counting this is reflected in
30 the (what must be regarded as) false confidence with which quantitative methods are
31 applied with little regard for prior conceptual refinement with the consequences we
32 have seen for the ‘generalisability’ of these methods.

33 Any way forward for ‘publications counting’ must begin with this conceptual
34 refinement and establish the purpose of this style of research. Let us accept for the
35 sake of argument that our main goal, following Rutherford and Samenfink (1982) is
36 benchmarking research output. There is a general (although by no means persuasive)
37 view that articles published in refereed journals constitute the apex of such output,
38 the alpha case. However, measurement of this output by individuals, for reasons
39 explored in this paper, is beset by methodological problems and in any case,
40 primarily plays to issues of quantity. The focus on individuals also detracts from
41 issues of research culture local to institutions as opposed to the research culture that
42 might be regarded as a possession of the discipline or field.

43 In the UK, periodic research assessment exercises of subject fields and disciplines
44 insisted upon by government for reasons of quality assurance but conducted under a
45 peer review system have avoided many of these pitfalls.

1 Here the focus is the subject group within individual institutions. For each subject
2 group, a university is required to determine the number from the total of academic
3 staff in the group who are 'research active'. Each person thus identified selects their
4 best four publications for the previous audit period (five years) and these are
5 submitted for consideration by a subject panel. For each institution and subject
6 group, compared to other institutions and subject groups a rating on a scale of 1–5
7 is determined, 5 being the highest. In reaching their grade decisions, the panels take
8 into account a wide variety of variables. These include, inter alia, the journals in
9 which articles are published; the number of 'research active' academic staff submitted
10 in an institution's subject group as a proportion of the total in that group; the level of
11 qualifications of faculty; the number of doctorates awarded; the number of doctoral
12 students registered in the subject group; and the research monies raised by the
13 subject group.

14 The research assessment exercise has been controversial in the UK, not least
15 because of concerns over transparency of the assessment processes. Nevertheless, the
16 system, however imperfect, embraces a variety of both quantitative and qualitative
17 criteria in an effort to reach a rounded judgement on research quality. More
18 important from the point of view of this discussion is that it recognises that research
19 capability and quality is not simply a property of individuals, or of a field of study,
20 but has important institutional facets. Compared to the individualised and
21 mechanistic publications counting approach, it is a relatively sophisticated and
22 collectivist process. Individual performance is recognised in this approach but placed
23 in a disciplinary and institutional context.

25

26 4. Conclusion

27

28 Somewhere between the two approaches described in the previous section lies,
29 probably, a means by which research in hospitality can be benchmarked in a fashion
30 that commands reasonable agreement. Some hope resides in the emergent consensus
31 concerning the 'best' journals in the field. For the reasons described earlier,
32 'bracketing' the *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* leaves *Annals*
33 *of Tourism Research*, the *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, the
34 *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, and the *Journal of Travel Research*.
35 It is not unreasonable to regard these publications as equivalent to the 'best' journals
36 in any other discipline. They are independent, long-established and figure in most
37 scholars' estimations of the preferred outlets for publication. Nevertheless, settling a
38 consensus around these titles leaves unresolved questions relating to the breadth of
39 scholarly publishing in journals outside the field (are four articles by a hospitality
40 academic published in *Administrative Science Quarterly* equivalent in 'value' to four
41 in the *International Journal of Hospitality Management*?) as well as many of the other
42 methodological issues raised in this article.

43 The critical problem is that in pointing to the weaknesses of the 'publications
44 counting' approach it rapidly becomes apparent that that approach cannot be
45 methodologically 'salvaged' in any meaningful way. Furthermore, questions of

1 'value' relate not only to the internal system of hospitality research and scholarship
 3 but also to the wider position of hospitality within the Academy. An abandonment
 5 of 'publications counting' is the first prerequisite to undertaking publications and
 7 research benchmarking if this is regarded as a legitimate enterprise. In its place is
 9 required some holistic methodology where quantitative and qualitative methods can
 produce profiles of institutions, departments and individuals, not in pursuit of some
 perverse academic beauty competition, but in an effort to establish and maintain
 standards and to promote the quality of research to colleagues in other fields and
 disciplines.

11

13 References

- 15 Chacko, H., 1999. Hospitality research and scholarship. In: Barrows, C.W., Bosselman, R.H. (Eds.),
 Hospitality Management Education. Haworth Press, New York, pp. 173–191.
- 17 Chon, K.-S., Evans, M.R., Sutherlin, D., 1989. Trends in hospitality management literature: a content
 analysis. *Hospitality Education and Research Journal* 13 (3), 483–491.
- 19 Ferreira, R.R., DeFranco, A.L., Rappole, C.L., 1994. Rating the hospitality journals. *International
 Journal of Hospitality Management* 13 (3), 209–218.
- 21 Ferreira, R.R., DeFranco, A.L., Rappole, C.L., 1998. Hospitality program directors ratings on hospitality
 journals. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education* 10 (1), 46–52.
- 23 Howey, R.M., Savage, K.S., Verbeeten, M.J., van Hoof, H.B., 1999. Tourism and hospitality research
 journals: cross-citations among research communities. *Tourism Management* 20, 133–139.
- 25 Hughes, R., 1994. *Culture of Complaint: the Fraying of America*. Harvill, London.
- 27 Paglia, C., 1993. *Sex, Art and American Culture: Essays*. Penguin, London.
- 29 Paglia, C., 1994. *Vamps and Tramps: New Essays*. Penguin, London.
- 31 Roberts, C., 1998. Academic authorship trends in hospitality and business journals. *Journal of Hospitality
 and Tourism Education* 10 (1), 56–61.
- 33 Rutherford, D.G., Samenfink, W., 1992. Most frequent contributors to the hospitality literature.
Hospitality Research Journal 16 (1), 23–29.
- 35 Samenfink, W.H., Rutherford, D.G., 1996. Academic contributors to the hospitality and tourism
 educator: Volume 1, No. 1 to Volume 7, No. 3. *Hospitality and Tourism Educator* 8 (1), 25–29.
- 37 Schmidgall, R.S., Woods, R.H., 1992. Hospitality faculty and administrator selection criteria. Part 1:
 desirable and required faculty characteristics. *Hospitality and Tourism Educator* 5 (1), 13–22.
- 39 Schmidgall, R.S., Woods, R.H., 1993. Rating of publishing channels by hospitality Faculty. *Hospitality
 Research Journal* 16 (3), 89–103.
- 41 Seaton, A., 1996. Blowing the whistle on tourism referees. *Tourism Management* 17 (6), 397–399.
- 43 Sheldon, P.J., Collinson, F.M., 1990. Faculty review criteria in tourism and hospitality. *Annals of Tourism
 Research* 17, 556–567.
- 45 Smith, S.L.J., 1983. Publishing in research journals: advice for hopeful authors. *Journal of Travel
 Research* 21 (3), 30–33.
- Sokal, A., Bricmont, J., 1998. *Intellectual Impostures*. Profile Books, London.
- Sykes, C.J., 1988. *Profscam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education*. St Martins Press, New York.
- Taylor, S., Edgar, D., 1996. Hospitality research: the emperors new clothes? *International Journal of
 Hospitality Management* 15 (3), 211–227.
- Taylor, S., Edgar, D., 1999. Lacuna or lost cause? Some reflections on hospitality management research.
 In: Brotherton, B. (Ed.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Hospitality Management Research*. Wiley,
 Chichester.
- Weaver, P.A., McCleary, K.W., 1989. Academic contributors: an analysis of academic contributors to
 four major hospitality journals. *Ohio Hospitality Journal* 2, 6–12.

- 1 Weaver, P.A., McCleary, K.W., Farrar, A., 1990. Academic contributors to four major hospitality
journals revisited. *Hospitality and Tourism Educator* 2 (3), 30–32.
- 3 Wood, R.C., 1995. Assessing publications output as an indicator of academic productivity: the case of
hospitality management. *Tourism Management* 16 (3), 171–173.
- 5 Woods, R.H., 1998. Single versus co-authored and multiple-authored articles: the views of CHRIE
Educators on their value. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education* 10 (1), 53–55.
- 7 Woods, R.H., Schmidgall, R.S., 1995. Hospitality's influential authors: using citation analysis to evaluate
the research and contributions of hospitality faculty and programs. *Hospitality and Tourism Educator*
7 (1), 33–39.

UNCORRECTED PROOF