Evaluating Research Performance in Tourism and Hospitality: The Perspective of University Program Heads

Submitted to *Tourism Management*

Rob Law and Kaye Chon

School of Hotel & Tourism Management,
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University,
Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Contact person: Rob Law

E-mail: hmroblaw@polyu.edu.hk

Acknowledgement:

The authors are grateful to the constructive comments offered by the anonymous reviewers. In addition, the authors would like to thank Professors Haiyan Song, Bob McKercher, and Cathy Hsu for providing information about research evaluations in the U.K. and Australia, and participated in the pilot test. This project was supported by a research grant funded by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (under contract #: G-U132).

Evaluating Research Performance in Tourism and Hospitality: The Perspective of University Program Heads

Abstract

In spite of the consensus on the importance of research and its close relationship to academic promotion and tenure, the existing tourism and hospitality literature has no published article that examine the importance of various research-related activities. While counting published articles in selected journals or citation frequency can serve as a proxy for research achievement, these methods are subject to bias and incomplete definition. Specifically, these counting methods do not consider the effort that academic staff have devoted to input, service, and other output types that are also an essential part of academic research. To bridge this gap, this paper reports on the findings of a study that investigated the perceived importance of 31 research-related items from the perspective of university program heads in tourism and hospitality departments. Empirical findings from the respondents of 78 universities around the world show that only seven items were viewed as important or very important.

Keywords: Research Performance, University Program Heads, Perception of Research.

Introduction

The academic community in tourism and hospitality has long recognised the importance of research. Such ongoing recognition is evident from the large array of published articles. Academic staff conduct research to contribute to areas like knowledge progress and advancement, self evaluation of research capability, career progress, job requirements, work recognition, personal satisfaction, and reputation enhancement (Cobanoglu and Moreo, 2004; Khan and Olsen, 1998; Sheldon and Collision, 1990; Woods, 1998). Collision and Sheldon (1991) further stated that tourism and hospitality academics spent more time on research when they moved up in their career. This clearly shows that the responsibility of university academics goes beyond teaching students. Academics also have to conduct research, and analyse, interpret, discuss and publish their findings through various channels.

Good performance in research is also advantageous to institutions, as this tends to help them receive more funding from their government and/or the related industry. Research output generated by academics can also enhance the public image of an institute as a centre for the generation of new knowledge (Page, 2003). Hence most, if not all, universities highly emphasise the importance of academic research.

In spite of the consensus on the importance of research, the existing literature in hospitality and tourism research does not contain any commonly agreed upon ways of evaluating research performance. The most frequently used proxy for assessing research performance is authorship and institution analyses by counting the number of published articles in selected research journals (Jogaratnam, McCleary, Mena, and Yoo, 2005; Malhotra and Kher, 1996; Sheldon, 1991; Weaver, McCleary, and Farrar, 1990; Zhao and Ritchie, 2006).

While counting the number of published articles in selected journals may be simple to perform and interpret, this approach is subject to many methodological problems. Wood (1995), as well as Losekoot, Verginis, and Wood (2001), argued that counting publications in selected journals as an indicator of academic productivity is too narrow and geographically-based. Similarly, Ryan (2005) and Hall (2005) stated that focusing on publications in research journals would exclude many research-related activities such as writing books, supervising postgraduate students, and taking on leadership roles in the international academic community. Likewise, the conjecture which this paper makes is that using the number of published articles in selected tourism and hospitality journals as an indicator of research performance is an incomplete, if not biased approach, as other research-related activities are simply excluded from consideration. Such a statement is made on the basis that many established academics do not publish in the selected journals. In addition, in order to obtain a more comprehensive measurement of research performance, other scholarly activities such as participation in research projects, editorship of research journals, membership of editorial boards and conference committees, participation in international conferences, and memberships of international/national organisations should also be incorporated into the overall evaluation process.

In response to the absence of prior studies on determining research performance for tourism and hospitality academics in a comprehensive way, this exploratory study makes an attempt to fill the void by investigating the perception of university program heads on the importance of different research-related activities. Program heads are the academics who assume key responsibilities in academic departments or divisions. Examples of these key responsibilities include research leadership and evaluations (Wikipedia, 2006). Findings are thus anticipated to lead to

further insights on research performance evaluation, which in turn help academics appropriately set their own career development plans.

Having discussed the research ground, the remaining sections of this paper are organised as follows. The next section reviews published articles that are related to research performance evaluations. The section after that describes the methodology used in this study. A section on findings and discussion is then presented. The last section in this paper summarises the study, and offers implications and suggestions for future research.

Literature Review

The increasing financial constraints that are faced by higher education institutes and the associated demands from society for improved faculty productivity and accountability have intensified in recent years. Tourism and hospitality faculty members have to perform well for career development in general, and particularly in academic research. Academic research largely involves the process of producing different tangible products such as publications (books, papers, and articles), training new researchers, and conducting service for industry and society (Boaden and Cilliers, 2001; Bowen, 2005). Seemingly, governments' intervention in academic research performance has increased in recent years. This is evident by the increasing amount of government grants given to institutions which perform better in research (Boaden and Cilliers, 2001; Geuna and Martin, 2003). As a consequence, universities and academics have been, and very likely will be, devoting their valuable time and effort to strive for a higher level of research productivity. Rowland (1996) stated that research is often given a higher status and priority than teaching, albeit academics believe that both teaching and research are equally valuable.

Although some researchers have stated the need for formalising research performance evaluations with multiple criteria (Korhonen, Tanio, and Wallenius, 1998; Ng and Li, 2000), many prior studies have shown that the assessment of journal quality and hence, counting publications in selected journals, was the most widely used indicator of research performance for institutes and individuals (McDermott and Wayland, 1994). As previously stated, such a counting approach is, unfortunately, subject to many drawbacks as the numbers can be manipulated. As an example, the 5th ranked institute in the Jogaratnam *et al*. (2005) study in terms of publications can also be interpreted as the 15th ranked institute in productivity based on a list of 22 universities. Another example is that the number of visiting professors in an institute can largely influence the number of publications that the institute produces. Wood (1995) criticised that assessing publications in journals as an indicator of academic productivity as being dubious and subjective, and the process of counting publications can thus lead to the issue of quality assurance. Seaton (1996) made a similar criticism, saying that some academics published for the sake of publication but not because they had some important research findings to share with readers. Likewise, Taylor (2001) found that Australian academics focused on increasing the number of publications produced from their research, leading to the phenomena of producing shorter articles and finding recognised outlets in which it is easier to get their papers published.

Moreover, in hospitality and tourism, a discipline that places a high degree of emphasis on industrial applications, the connection between new knowledge and practice is of paramount importance to academic researchers (Brownell, 2003; Walsh, 2003). Van Scottor and Culligan (2003), as well as Piccoli and Wagner (2003), advocated the necessity for hospitality and tourism academics to demonstrate their research findings to help industrial practitioners solve managerial or operational

problems. Regardless of the ongoing effort of academic researchers in hospitality and tourism to bridge the gap between academic (and frequently theoretical) findings and industrial applications, practitioners and academics still hold different views on the importance and use of research results (Cobanoglu, Moreo, and Wood, 2003; Jones and Phillips, 2003). Cobanoglu *et al*. (2003) further found significant differences in the perceptions held by academics and practitioners of industrial magazines and academic journals. Similarly, among the 16 journals/periodicals that Kay (2001) used in her survey of industrial professionals, all academic research journals were rated less useful than professional periodicals. Apparently, using publications in academic journals as a sole proxy for research performance is unacceptable to industrial practitioners.

A less frequently used proxy for evaluating research performance is the use of impact factors or citation analyses for individual authors (Schmidgall and Woods, 1997/1998). Citation analyses are used to determine how other researchers rate specific publications, which are often measured by counting how many times the papers have been referred to by others. This method, however, is also subject to bias as specialised journals like tourism and hospitality journals often have a lower citation rate than mainstream business journals. Vokurka (1996), as well as Joseph and Hoey (1999), commented that the numeric figures used to calculate a journal's impact factor can be easily inflated, and that citation counts tend to favour older journals and those that publish more papers. Linde (1998) made a similar claim, stating that it is inappropriate to use impact factors to represent an author's contribution to knowledge development.

Since queries about the validity of counting publications and citations have been raised (Bannister, 1991; Vokurka, 1996), some researchers have advocated the

necessity of using a combination of indicators to better evaluate research performance. For instance, Ramsden (1994), as well as Dundar and Lewis (1998), stated that structural factors like leadership and culture in institutes and academic departments, together with personal variables such as intrinsic interest and innate ability, could be used to determine the level of research productivity. Also, Boaden and Cilliers (2001) argued that a suitable framework for performance objectives should be developed that includes both the products and service aspects of the output.

There are different ways of evaluating research performance. In countries with a formal research assessment exercise (RAE), research performance is often evaluated by a set of criteria. In the U.K., as an example, the data submitted for research assessment include research output, research students and studentships, research income, and textual descriptions about the research environment and indicators of esteem (Page, 2003; Research Assessment Exercise, 2006). In other countries, research performance has been assessed by counting publications in selected research journals. Such a way of counting could be incomplete, if not erroneous, to academic research. This paper shows the limitations, and more importantly the deficiencies, of the existing publications counting method. For this reason, there is an emerging need for a more comprehensive approach of evaluating research performance for academics in general, and for tourism and hospitality in particular. The next section presents the methodology that was used in this study to investigate the perception of research performance evaluations from the perspective of university program heads.

Methodology

A structured questionnaire was developed by adapting the suggested categories in prior studies on research indicators (Bannister, 1991; Korhonen, Tanio,

and Wallenius, 1998; McDermott and Wayland, 1994; Sheldon and Collision, 1990). In addition, questions on research grants, editorial/professional services, supervision of students, and authorship ordering were incorporated into the questionnaire in order to have a more inclusive coverage of research-related activities. The questionnaire aimed to cover research input and output, as well as service to the research community. The final version of the questionnaire consisted of three parts. Part 1 comprised 31 items which were grouped into seven dimensions. These dimensions were publications in books and monographs, publications in refereed journals, editorial and professional services, publications and presentations in conferences, research grants, authorship ordering, and supervision of students. Respondents were requested to provide their perception on the importance of each of these items when research performance was evaluated in their institutes. A 7-point Likert scale was used for these 31 items which ranged from: 7=Very important, 6=Important, 5=Somewhat important, 4=Neither important nor unimportant, 3=Somewhat unimportant, 2=Unimportant, to 1=Very unimportant. In addition to the 31 items, respondents could also specify additional items in each dimension. Part 2 of the questionnaire had four open-ended questions which sough respondents' views on the definitions and evaluations of research, and Part 3 was used to collect demographic data.

The established questionnaire was pilot tested by three senior academics and associate heads in university tourism and hospitality programs who were responsible for research performance evaluations and supervision of academic affairs like hiring, promotion, and tenure. Other than a couple of suggestions regarding minor wording changes, no major problems were found. The revised questionnaire was then sent by mail to the tourism and hospitality program heads in 409 worldwide tertiary institutes

in late 2005. The list of program heads was compiled based on the membership lists of Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education (CHRIE), Asia Pacific Tourism Association (APTA), the database of a recent study on journals rating (McKercher, Law, and Lam, 2006), and personal contacts of the authors. The authors, however, would like to acknowledge that these 409 institutes represented only a portion of the thousand of worldwide institutes that are involved in tourism/hospitality research. Further work is hence recommended to expand the sample size in future studies. In general, program heads are often involved in policy formulation and decision making in research related activities. These program heads can carry the academic titles of heads, directors, deans, and chairs of hospitality and tourism schools, departments, and divisions. Most, if not all, of these program heads are also experienced researchers. Their input can therefore accurately reflect the common practice at universities. As of mid-April 2006, 79 completed questionnaires were received, representing a 19% response rate. One returned questionnaire was discarded as the "institution has no formal support or policy for encouraging research". Findings of the usable questionnaires are presented in the next section.

Findings and Analysis

Demographics

Table 1 shows the demographic profile of the respondents. Among these 78 institutes, 59% had a formal evaluation system for research performance (based on the third open-ended question). Also, 81.58% of the respondents were responsible for evaluating research performance. Most of the respondents (87.01%) were doctoral degree holders, and were mainly affiliated with universities in North America (40.26%) and the Asia Pacific region, including Australia and New Zealand (40.26%).

These institutes were concentrated on travel & tourism (35.71%), and hotel & hospitality management (35.71). About two-thirds of these institutes were staffed with no more than 25 full-time academic staff members. Many of these institutes (68%) also had no more than 10 part-time academic staff. Lastly, most of these institutes offered Bachelors' degree (N=71) and Masters' degree (N=60) programs.

***** Please place Table 1 here *****

Perceived Importance of Different Research Activities

In terms of the perceived importance of publications in books and monographs, respondents perceived research books as important (mean = 6.0), albeit European respondents rated this significantly lower than other respondents. In contrast to textbooks, research books are scholarly pieces of work with a high level of research component, which are primarily written for senior undergraduate and post-graduate students, as well as academic researchers. Publications in other channels were rated as somewhat important, with mean values ranging from 4.96 to 5.51. Table 2 presents the findings of publications in books and monographs.

***** Please place Table 2 here *****

Among all dimensions, publications in refereed journals received the widest range of perceived importance values (Table 3). Specifically, full papers in first-tier journals received the highest mean value among all attributes in the questionnaire. Significant differences were found among geographical regions and responsibilities for staff evaluations. Full papers in second-tier journals were also highly rated by the respondents (mean = 6.38). Other publications in research journals, however, were only moderately rated. In particular, full papers in other journals, and research notes in all journals were rated as somewhat important (mean values from 4.82 to 5.69). Book reviews, rejoinders, and reports were viewed as neither important nor

unimportant (mean = 4.32). The respondents from the programs that offered PhD degrees exhibited significant differences in three attributes of this dimension.

***** Please place Table 3 here *****

Table 4 lists the perception of editorial and professional services. Among the six attributes included in this dimension, serving as the chief editor was perceived as important (mean = 6.17). Serving as guest editors, reviewers and editorial board members, editorship of conference proceedings, membership of scholarly organisations, and reviewers for conferences were rated as somewhat important with mean values ranging from 5.60 to 4.78. Additionally, significant differences were found for the programs that offered PhD degrees, the respondents' responsibilities for staff evaluation, and the existence of a formal evaluation system for research performance.

***** Please place Table 4 here *****

As indicated in Table 5, all but one item in publications and presentations in conferences were generally perceived as somewhat important (mean values from 4.90 to 5.78). Publications of non-refereed conference papers were, however, rated as neither important nor unimportant (mean = 4.38). Differences by origin, availability of PhD programs, and the existence of a formal evaluation system lead to significant differences in perception of most attributes.

***** Please place Table 5 here *****

The importance of research input is shown in Table 6. There were only two attributes in this dimension. Winning external grants was rated as very important (mean = 6.63), whereas winning internal grants was rated as important (mean = 5.7). In addition, European respondents rated winning internal grants significantly lower than those in other geographical regions.

***** Please place Table 6 here *****

Table 7 shows the findings of authorship ordering. Respondents viewed sole authorship and first authorship as important (mean values = 6.22 and 5.91) but second authorship and other authorship were only rated as somewhat important (mean values =5.44 and 5.16). Additionally, European respondents rated first authorship and other authorship significantly lower than other respondents.

***** Please place Table7 here *****

Finally, the perceived importance of supervision is listed in Table 8. Among the three attributes in this dimension, supervision of doctoral students were rated as important (mean = 6.33). Supervision of masters' students and other students were only rated as somewhat important (mean values =5.79 and 5.02), and European respondents rated these two attributes significantly lower than other respondents.

***** Please place Table 8 here *****

Perceived Research Definitions and Evaluations in the Open-ended Questions

As mentioned, Section 2 of the questionnaire comprised four open-ended questions on research definitions and evaluations. Most respondents were able to provide brief answers to these questions.

Question 1 asked the respondents how good research is defined in their institutes. In case there was no formal definition of good research in their institutes, respondents were invited to provide their personal opinion of what good research is. The next question sought the procedure of how research performance of academic staff was evaluated. After that, there was a question which asked the respondents about the existence of a formal research performance evaluation system. The last question in this section was to ask the respondents how systematic and consistent the evaluation method for research performance was implemented in their

departments/schools. That is, the question sought respondents' view on whether the evaluation was conducted by using the same principle and in an orderly manner.

Different views were provided by the respondents when answering the open-ended questions. In relation to the definition of good research, respondents commented that good research should be characterised by an academic's ability to publish in top, well-respected, first-tier, or Social Science Citation Indexed international journals, and that the publications have to be peer reviewed. An academic's ability to secure external funds or winning research grants was also commented as being important. Other views about good research included: i) the evidence of contribution to, and impact on, the industry, as well as the fact that the publications have been frequently cited by others; ii) the contribution to knowledge or theory development; iii) the contribution of having an up-to-date theme, providing a relevant issue, and reflecting the latest trends in the field; and iv) having a good research question, clearly defined focus, sound methodology, possessing innovative and original ideas, garnering peer esteem, and being interdisciplinary. Interestingly, respondents from the countries with a research assessment exercise (RAE) and a similar system had official definitions of what constituted good research. These universities would simply follow the assessment system as stipulated by the official source. A respondent even listed the publication requirements for promotion and tenure, which were used to determine good research.

A wide range of views was offered on the evaluation of research performance for academic staff members. The research performance evaluation was normally conducted as part of the formal appraisal system, which was administered by the program head, or an internal or external review committee. The most commonly used evaluation criteria included publications and research grants. When publications were

considered, universities seemed to place a high emphasis on quality of papers and journals. Some respondents also took into account the factors of publisher, relevance, citation, editorship, and quantity, as well as authorship. Securing research grants in which the staff member serves as principal investigator and whether the source of funding is from an external source was also viewed as important during the evaluation process. Other evaluation factors included supervision of students, contributions to the discipline, and how research could be related to teaching/education. The evaluation was performed for different reasons such as the regular research reporting exercise, promotion and tenure consideration, personal development review, and comparison among faculty of the same workload.

When answering the question about the existence of a formal research performance evaluation system, 59% (N = 46) of the respondents provided a positive reply. The systems ranged from complex ones like point/scoring systems that included all research-related activities to simple publication counts. Interestingly, the evaluation period varied from 6 months, annually, 3 years, to 5 years. The evaluations were generally used for promotion and tenure purposes. Some universities, however, used the evaluation to determine grant allocation for the next year or priority for sabbatical leave.

When answering the last open-ended question, 58 (74.4%) respondents indicated that the method of research evaluation is consistently and systematically implemented. In general, the review was regularly conducted using the same evaluation criteria. In contrast, 14 (17.9%) and 6 (7.7%) of the respondents provided neutral or negative responses to the question. The neutral responses were largely related to the changing official policies from the university or from the government.

Discussion

In parallel with teaching, research is considered as a vital part of academic work in tourism and hospitality (Ferreira, DeFranco, and Rappole, 1994). By researching new aspects of tourism and hospitality, and by active involvement in various categories of research including input, process, output, and service, academics can meet the needs of their personal development as well as university requirements. Moreover, in the countries, such as the U.K. and Australia, where there is no formal tenure, academics are often hired as permanent staff subject to a time period of probation. Still, their career development largely depends on their performance in research. In certain countries (like China, South Korea, and the Philippines), some universities even make available direct financial incentives or rewards for every paper published in a recognized research journal.

Despite the existence of many types of research activities as stipulated in this study, only a handful were determined as important by tourism and hospitality program heads (and very likely senior executives at universities). According to the findings, the important research activities that are related to output are full papers in first- and second-tier journals and research books which are single-authored. While full papers in highly regarded journals are expected to be important, single authorship arguably violates the basic principle of academic collaboration. In his study of prolific authors in tourism and hospitality, McKercher (2006) found the world's most prolific authors like to co-author. However, in the case of the RAE 2001 in the U.K., Page (2003) argued that the system did not encourage academic collaboration, which was counter-productive and lead to the situation in which each institute sought to protect its existing networks in an insular and inward way. In addition, the perceived important input and service-related activities are winning external research grants, serving as chief editors for research journals, and supervision of doctoral students.

Apparently, most of the input and service-related activities are directly linked to output. This, in turn, leads to the induced supposition that the foremost essential research activities that were "counted" are publications of full-length papers in first- and second-tier research journals, and which have single authorship.

Furthermore, research findings indicate that the respondents who were responsible for evaluating research performance rated certain items in refereed journal publications and editorial/professional service significantly higher than the others. Such a finding is likely due to the personal expectation of high standards in research. On the contrary, respondents from departments in Europe which have PhD programs, but have no formal research evaluation system rated certain items in most dimensions significantly lower. Those lower ratings could likely be due to the established formal requirements. While these findings could be of interest, the small sample size of respondents in this research makes it not possible to draw any general conclusions.

Universities and academic staff have attempted to make improvements in their research performance. The formal research assessment system, however, may not serve tourism and hospitality well. According to Page (2003), tourism research did not have a clear identity nor a strong position in the U.K.'s business schools. Likewise, Tribe (2003) stated that tourism research was on the periphery of research in the U.K., which was similar to the problems faced by peripheral tourism destinations. The weak position of tourism research is evident from the fact that among the many peer reviewed tourism journals, it is likely that only two or three could be recognised by the academic community at large (Page, 2003). Recent studies on rating tourism journals have indicated that the top-tier tourism journals are *Annals of Tourism Research*, *Tourism Management*, and *Journal of Travel Research* (McKercher *et al.*, 2006; Pechlaner *et al.*, 2004). A challenge for tourism academics is, therefore, to get

equal recognition in research assessment as their colleagues in mainstream academic disciplines.

Conclusions

Implications

This exploratory study has examined the importance of various research-related activities from the perspective of university program heads in hospitality and tourism departments. Empirical findings have clearly shown what are perceived as important (and less important) activities when academic staff members devote their valuable time to research. Findings of this study should, therefore, provide more insights for tourism and hospitality academics to realise the expectations of their program heads and their universities.

A major contribution of this research is the confirmation of the conjecture that research performance evaluations, or more broadly the measurement of intellectual influence, should go beyond journal publications. To make this point clearer, the authors are not against the ranking or rating of institutes and authors based on appearances in selected journals. Such an approach of counting publications is, in fact, quite useful and easy to interpret. What the authors of this paper advocate is that a more holistic and comprehensive approach should be established in order to better reflect the real impact of a person or an institute. The need for research in universities is going to be a continuous process, and most, if not all, academics are expected to continuously participate in different kinds of research activities. Drawing on the findings of this study, academics can set up a more focused research plan for meeting the requirements of their current, and possibly future, career development.

Future Research

Two major limitations of this study are its small sample size and the low representation of universities outside North America and Asia Pacific. Further research is therefore recommended to expand the list of post-secondary institutes that are involved in tourism/hospitality research. Although it is uneasy to identify all these institutes, an approach to achieve this goal would be to extend the coverage scope to all tourism related fields such as sports and parks management, as well as food and beverage management.

While the number of completed questionnaires is not large in its absolute sense, it does represent the practice of research performance evaluations in 78 universities on different continents. A natural extension of this study is to expand the research in a few ways. First, it would be valuable to examine the views of more academic staff, especially research-active staff. Another future research possibility would be the inclusion of additional items in the evaluation process. For instance, working papers, while they may not have a significant value like journal publications, do have some merits on temporary outcomes or industrial applications. Moreover, the significance of research-related international awards or prizes could probably be greater than all items that have been covered in this study. The authors also acknowledge the potentially spurious precise descriptors in the Likert scale. For instance, the exact meaning of “somewhat important” could be fuzzy. Future work can certainly extend this exploratory study by investigating the issue in detail using other descriptors. Another limitation of this study is the absence of clear definitions for different tiers of journals, which surely deserves future research endeavours. Lastly, future research efforts could be devoted to answer questions of: What are the expectations for different ranks of academic staff members? How does research benefit the tourism and hospitality industries? The authors acknowledge the wide

diversity of cultural difference and university requirements, but more work on the issue of research would undoubtedly benefit the international academic community in tourism and hospitality from growing towards a mature academic discipline.

References

Bannister, B. (1991). Valuing Academic Research: Towards a Policy for Hong Kong's Future Universities. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education.* 16(3), 215-224.

Boaden, R.F. and Cilliers, F.F. (2001). Quality and the research assessment exercise. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 9(1), 5-13.

Bowen, J.T. (2005). Managing a research career. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management.* 17(7), 633-637.

Brownell, J. (2003). Applied Research in Managerial Communication: The Critical Link between Knowledge and Practice. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*. April, 39-49.

Cobanoglu, C. and Moreo, P.J. (2004). Hospitality Research: Educators' Perceptions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education.* 16(2), 9-20.

Cobanoglu, C., Moreo, P.J., and Wood, D.F. (2003). Hospitality Research: A Comparison of Industry Professional's Educators' Perceptions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education.* 15(4), 20-30.

Collision, F. M. and Sheldon, P.J. (1991). An Empirical Study of Employment Conditions for Tourism and Hospitality Faculty. *Journal of Travel Research*. 29(4), 40-46.

Dundar, H. and Lewis, D.R. (1998). Determinants of Research Productivity in Higher Education. *Research in Higher Education*. 39(6), 607-631.

Ferreira, R.R., DeFranco, A.L., and Rappole, C.L. (1994). Rating the hospitality journals. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 13(3), 209-218.

Geuna, A. and Martin, B.R. (2003). University research evaluation and funding: an international comparison. *Minerva*. 41, 277-304.

Hall, C.M. (2005). Systems of surveillance and control: commentary on 'An analysis of institutional contributions to three major academic tourism journals: 1992-2001'. *Tourism Management.* 26(5), 653-656.

Jogaratnam, G., McCleary, K.W., Mena, M.M., and Yoo, J.J.E. (2005). An analysis of hospitality and tourism research: Institutional Contributions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*. 29(3), 356-371.

Jones, P.A. and Phillips, D. (2003). What use is research anyway? Industry and academe's differing view? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. 15(5), 290-293.

Joseph, K.S. and Hoey, J. (1999). CMAJ's impact factor: room for recalculation. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*. 161(8), 977-978.

Kay, C. (2001). What Do Managers Read? A Survey of Journals and Periodicals Used by Lodging Managers in the Hospitality Industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education.* 13(3/4), 76-86.

Khan, M. A. and Olsen, M. D. (1988). An Overview of Research in Hospitality Education. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*. 29(2), 51-54.

Korhonen, P., Tanio, R., and Wallenius, J. (1998). *Value Efficiency Analysis of Academic Research.* Interim Report. International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis. Laxenburg, Austria.

Linde, A. (1998). On the pitfalls of journal ranking by Impact Factor. *European Journal of Oral Sciences*. 106, 525-526.

Losekoot, E., Verginis, C.S., and Wood, R.C. (2001). Out for the count: some methodological questions in "publications counting' literature. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 20, 233-244.

Malhotra, M.J. and Kher, H.V. (1996). Institutional research productivity in production and operations management. *Journal of Operations Management.* 14, 55-77.

McDermott, D.R. and Wayland, J.P. (1994). Formalizing evaluation procedures for marketing faculty research performance. *Journal of Education for Business.* 70(1), 48-53.

McKercher, B. (2006). A study of prolific authors in 25 tourism and hospitality journals. *Proceedings of CATHE2006*, Melbourne, pp. 166-178.

McKecher, B., Law, R., and Lam, T. (2006). Rating Tourism and Hospitality Journals. *Tourism Management*. 27(6), 1235-1252.

Ng, Y.C. and Li, S.K. (2000). Measuring the Research Performance of Chinese Higher Education Institutions: An Application of Data Envelopment Analysis. *Education Economics*. 8(2), 139-156.

Page, S. (2003). Evaluating research performance in tourism: the UK experience. *Tourism Management.* 24, 607-622.

Pechlaner, H., Zehrer, A., Matzler, K., and Abfalter, D. (2004). The ranking of international tourism and hospitality journals. *Journal of Travel Research*. 42(2), 328-332.

Piccoli, G. and Wagner, E.L. (2003). The Value of Academic Research. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*. April, 29-38.

Ramsden, P. (1994). Describing and explaining research productivity. *Higher Education.* 28(2), 207-226.

Research Assessment Exercise (2006). *RAE 2008: Criteria and Assessment Issues*. Available online at: www.rae.ac.uk [Accessed on July 28, 2006].

Rowland, S. (1996). Relationships between Teaching and Research. *Teaching in Higher Education.* 1(1), 7-20.

Ryan, C. (2005). The ranking and rating of academics and journals in tourism research. *Tourism Management.* 26(5), 657-662.

Seaton, A.V. (1996). Blowing the whistle on tourism referees. *Tourism Management.* 17(6), 397-399.

Schmidgall, R.S. and Woods, R.H. (1997/1998). Rating the Influence Scholars Have on Their Field: A Citation Analysis of Hospitality Management Education, 1989-1996. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education.* 9(4), 74-79.

Sheldon, P.J. (1991). An Authorship Analysis of Tourism Research. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 18, 473-484.

Sheldon, P.J. and Collision, F.M. (1990). Faculty Review Criteria in Tourism and Hospitality. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 17, 556-567.

Taylor, J. (2001). The Impact of Performance Indicators on the Work of University Academics: Evidence from Australian Universities. *Higher Education Quarterly*. 55(1), 42-61.

Tribe, J. (2003). The RAE-ification of tourism research in the UK. *International Journal of Tourism Research*. 5(3), 225-234.

Van Scotter, J.R. and Culligan, P.E. (2003). The Value of Theoretical Research and Applied Research for the Hospitality Industry. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*. April, 14-27.

Vokurka, R.K. (1996). The relative importance of journals used in operations management research. *Journal of Operations Management*. 14, 345-355.

Walsh, K. (2003). Qualitative Research: Advancing the Science and Practice of Hospitality. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*. April, 66-74.

Weaver, P.A., McCleary, K.W., and Farrar, A. (1990). Academic Contributors to Four Major Hospitality Journals Revisited. *Hospitality & Tourism Educator*. 2(3), 30-32.

Wikipedia (2006). *Academic administration.* Available online at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_administrator. [Accessed on July 31, 2006].

Wood, R.C. (1995). Assessing publications output as an indicator of academic productivity. *Tourism Management*. 16(3), 171-173.

Woods, R.H. (1998). Single vs. Co-Authored and Multiple-Authored Articles: The Views of CHRIE Educators on Their Value. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*. 10(1), 53-55.

Zhao, W. and Ritchie, J.R.B. (2006). A supplementary investigation of academic leadership in tourism research: 1985-2004. *Tourism Management*. In Press.

Table 1: Demographic profile of respondents

Variable	Number	%
Have a formal evaluation system (N=78)		
Yes	46	58.97
No	32	41.03
Total	78	100.0
Responsible to evaluate research performance (N=76)		
Yes	62	81.58
No	14	18.42
Total	76	100.0
Education (N=77)		
PhD / Doctoral Degree	67	87.01
Bachelor / Master Degree	10	12.99
Total	77	100.0
Academic institute's geographic location (N=77)		
Asia Pacific	31	40.26
Europe	13	16.88
North America	31	40.26
Others	2	2.60
Total	77	100.0
Institutes' primary research focus (can have more than one selection) (N=140)		
Travel & Tourism	50	35.71
Hotel & Hospitality Management	50	35.71
Food Services	24	17.14
Leisure Services	16	11.43
Total	140	100.0
Number of full-time academic staff (N=73)		
1-25	50	68.49
26-50	13	17.81
51-75	7	9.59
76-100	2	2.74
100 or above	1	1.37
Total	73	100.0
Number of part-time academic staff (N=50)		
1-5	22	44.0
6-10	12	24.0
11-15	4	8.0
16-20	4	8.0
21 or above	8	16.0
Total	50	100.0
Program offered by department/school (can have more than one selection) (N=196)		
Sub-degree	24	12.24
Bachelors' Degree	71	36.22
Masters' Degree	60	30.61
PhD / Doctoral Degree	41	20.92
Total	196	100.0

Table 2: Publications in books/monographs

	N	Mean	s.t.d.	Differences by origin	Have a formal evaluation system
Research books	74	6.00	0.89	Europe rates lowest 5.50*	
Research Monographs	75	5.51	1.29		
Textbooks	76	5.09	1.48	Europe rates lowest 4.00*	No formal system rate lower 4.63*
Book Chapters	74	5.08	1.12		
Edited Books	75	4.96	1.19		

* Significant at $\propto = 0.05$.

Table 3: Publications in refereed journals

	N	Mean	s.t.d.	Differences by origin	Have a PhD program	Responsibility for staff evaluation
Full papers in first-tier Journals	78	6.94	0.29	Europe rates lowest 6.69*		Responsible for evaluation rates higher 6.98*
Full papers in second-tier Journals	78	6.38	0.65			
Full papers in other journals	77	5.69	0.94	Europe rates lowest 5.23*	Have PhD rates lower 5.45*	
Research notes in first-tier journals	78	5.68	1.06			
Research notes in second-tier journals	78	5.22	1.16			
Research notes in other journals	77	4.82	1.14		Have PhD rates lower 4.55*	
Book reviews, rejoinders, reports	76	4.32	1.28		Have PhD rates lower 3.95*	

* Significant at $\propto = 0.05$.

Table 4: Editorial / professional service

	N	Mean	s.t.d.	Have a PhD program	Responsibility for staff evaluation	Have a formal evaluation system
Chief editors	78	6.17	0.95			
Guest editors	78	5.60	1.06			
Reviewers, editorial board members for journals	78	5.40	0.98	Have PhD rates lower 5.17*	Responsible for evaluation rates higher 5.50*	
Editorship of conference proceedings	78	5.19	1.06		Responsible for evaluation rates higher 5.31*	No formal system rate lower 4.94*
Membership of scholarly organisations	78	4.81	1.50	Have PhD rates lower 4.37*		
Reviewers for conferences	77	4.78	1.14	Have PhD rates lower 4.38*	Responsible for evaluation rates higher 4.90*	

* Significant at $\propto = 0.05$.

Table 5: Publications / presentations in conferences

	N	Mean	s.t.d.	Differences by origin	Have a PhD program	Have a formal evaluation system
Conference papers – refereed	78	5.78	0.96			
Keynote presentations	76	5.70	1.01	Europe rates lowest 5.08*		
Organising conferences	77	4.90	1.31		Have PhD rates lower 4.63*	No formal system rate lower 4.59*
Conference papers – non refereed	78	4.38	1.44		Have PhD rates lower 4.00*	

* Significant at $\propto = 0.05$.

Table 6: Research grants

	N	Mean	s.t.d.	Differences by origin
Winning external research grants	78	6.63	0.70	
Winning internal research grants	77	5.70	1.08	Europe rates lowest 5.08*

* Significant at $\propto = 0.05$.

Table 7: Authorship ordering

	N	Mean	s.t.d.	Differences by origin
Sole authorship	77	6.22	1.22	
First authorship	78	5.91	1.42	Europe rates lowest 5.00*
Second authorship	78	5.44	1.23	
Other authorship	64	5.16	1.06	Europe rates lowest 4.75*

* Significant at $\propto = 0.05$.

Table 8: Supervision of students

	N	Mean	s.t.d.	Differences by origin
Doctoral students	64	6.33	0.89	
Masters students	72	5.79	1.14	Europe rates lowest 5.00*
Other students	65	5.02	1.44	Europe rates lowest 3.80*

* Significant at $\propto = 0.05$.