Abstract:

The career prospects of tourism and hospitality academics have changed radically in the past 40 years, and this study examines how senior researchers, mid-career academics, and new and emerging scholars are negotiating the rapidly changing research, publishing, and ultimately career progression landscape. A total of 264 respondents were recruited via TRINET and CIRET. Respondents assessed their perceived pressures to adopt research and publishing approaches and provided career advice that were analyzed via content analysis. Collaboration, selection of journal, topic choice, and contribution to the field were highly ranked publishing advice from academics. Pressures to adopt authorship tactics were reported among new and emerging, and mid-career academics to maximize publication output. This study suggests academics may risk sacrificing longer-term career prospects for short-term survival as increased emphasis of performance metrics becomes more common, and considers the implications of shifting goal posts in research and publishing for the field.

Keywords: research; publishing; pressures; career; gamesmanship

1. Introduction

While the career aspirations of academics have not changed over time, almost everything else relating to the ability to achieve them has. Promotion, tenure and job security are now out of reach for many, due to a combination of the shift toward marketization of higher education, a record number of doctoral students vying for a declining share of full time jobs, and stagnant enrolments in many programmes (AAUP, 2015; Bexley, Richard, & Arkoudis, 2011; Harley, Muller-Camen, & Collin 2004; Weissmann, 2013). Moreover, academics are under unprecedented pressure to produce high impact research to comply with externally imposed research assessment exercises (Bexley et al., 2011; De Rond & Miller, 2005; Dubini, Galimberti, & Micheli, 2010).

Our field is not immune, as both the profile and career prospects of tourism and hospitality academics have changed radically in the past 40 years (McKercher & Prideaux 2014). First generation of tourism academics who began to explore this field in the 1970s and 1980s studied tourism as a side interest of their home discipline (Nash, 1979). Second generation academics rode the wave of expansion of dedicated tourism programmes in the 1990s and early 2000s. Many came from industry, earned their doctorates while taking up academic posts, and benefited from being able to learn their craft over time in a relatively non-competitive environment. Today's third generation tourism academics face a much tougher environment, though, as high supply and diminishing job opportunities mean that many candidates must hold a doctoral qualification and have an extensive publication record just to qualify for an interview. Assuming they are fortunate enough to find a full-time job, they are expected to produce research at or above the level of more experienced academics or risk having their careers stall, or worse still, finding themselves unemployed.

Perceptions of what is required to develop successful careers, successful tactics, and attitudes to various research and publications' practices used to enhance research output are likely to differ among academics at different career stages. Experiences of senior academics may no longer be applicable to prospective academics who are completing doctoral studies as well as emerging and mid career scholars. Instead, they may feel pressured to behave differently to respond to the changing university environment. In this regard, this study examines the question of how senior researchers (SR), mid-career researchers (MCR), and new and emerging scholars

(NES) in tourism and hospitality are negotiating the rapidly changing research and publishing landscape. What insights do they have for other tourism and hospitality academics who are looking to develop a successful career in the field?

2. Career progression in tourism and hospitality

It is becoming increasingly more difficult to develop a career in academia, with some studies suggesting that less than 0.5% of doctoral students in the hard sciences eventually become full professors (Royal Society, 2010). As a result, studies have sought to provide insights for future academics by identifying the factors that may affect career progression. For example, tourism and hospitality academics who have had success in their careers had past industry experience and were willing to be mobile (Ladkin & Weber, 2009; Phelan, Mejia, & Hertzman, 2013). Others also had articulated career plans, and demonstrated passion and commitment to excellence in their work (Bagilhole & White, 2013; Castle & Schultz, 2002; dgrasso, 2014; Smith, 2011).

Career progression in today's academic environment, including appointment and promotion decisions, however, is increasingly based predominantly on one's research track record (De Rond & Miller, 2005; Law & Chon, 2007). This form of industrialization of academic research could hinder the development of many academics (Pain, 2015; Walsh & Lee, 2015). Traditionally junior scientists were trained under a craft model where they were regarded more as apprentices working under an experienced mentor to learn the full array of tasks involved in conceiving, operationalizing, and presenting research (Walsh & Lee, 2015). They became fully proficient at the skills of the trade over time and were then able to lead research independently (Pain, 2015). Today, though, research is far more likely to be conducted by large teams where junior researchers perform specialist tasks, potentially becoming expert in one area but deficient in others. A real risk exists that this model produces sub-scientists who rely on others to fill their skill gaps (Pain, 2015; Walsh & Lee, 2015). Wyatt (2012) also observed that the increasing division of responsibilities among authors is one reason for the downward trend in individual creativity in physics research, while Fisher et al. (1998) cautioned that too much collaboration could make projects less innovative.

There is evidence that career progression in our field is closely mapping this global trend, and concerns have been raised on the pressures on tourism and hospitality academics to produce research outputs, particularly for those on contracts who are seeking tenure (Ladkin & Weber, 2009). While a significant number of tourism and hospitality academics cited passion for teaching and passing on knowledge to the next generation for choosing an academic career, research performance remains closely tied to recruitment and promotion decisions as the ranking of tourism and hospitality programs is largely based on research output (Severt, Tesone, Bottorff, & Carpenter, 2009). University program heads in tourism and hospitality oftentimes evaluate research performance based a narrow set of items, such as the volume of papers published in first- and second-tier journals, single authorship, and supervision of doctoral students, despite calls for more holistic and comprehensive approaches to assess research quality as well as the impact of an academic (Hall, 2011; Law & Chon, 2007). Consequently, new academics are expected to be fully research active while established academics must produce at much higher levels than their predecessors to be promoted (De Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Walsh & Lee, 2015).

2.1. Pressures to adopt research and publishing approaches

The aforementioned changes in pressures to produce research output could impact research and publishing approaches undertaken by tourism and hospitality academics in a number of ways. Studies have pointed to an increased level of gamesmanship and unethical behaviour among academics in other fields in order to reach performance targets (Bennett & Taylor, 2003; Boff, 2012, de Rond & Miller, 2005, Dighe & Berquist, 2011; Kwok, 2005). Fanelli (2010) noted the publish or perish culture may conflict with the objectivity and integrity of research, forcing scientists to produce publishable results at any costs, including biasing studies to ensure "positive" results that support research hypotheses are found.

Additionally, 'salami slicing' of a larger research project into smallest publishable units that will yield a paper could become common (Boff, 2012; McKercher & Tung, 2015). Yet, how much of this represents new knowledge and how much is either derivative, repetitive or the product of salami slicing is unknown. Concerns have been raised that the intellectual development of our field is stalling, while much of the research into specific subject areas such

as social impacts of tourism seems to be largely derivative (Deery, Jago, & Fredline, 2012; Mazanec, 2009).

Pressure to publish poses an additional challenge for junior researchers, non-native English speakers, and those resident in emerging economies to publish in journals with questionable reputations. The exponential growth in tourism and hospitality journals worldwide, from fewer than 30 before 1990 to more 330 today, also reflects the growth of pay-to-publish predatory journals (Xia, Harmin, Connolly, Donelly, Anderson, & Howard, 2015). Publishing in such journals may come at a long term costs as authors may find their careers blocked when review panels recognize the lack of credibility of these outlets (Kearney, 2015)

A range of authorship tactics could also be adopted by academics to reach performance targets. In general, the number of authors per paper has doubled in recent years in many fields (Boff, 2012; Endersby, 1996; Inkpen & Beamish, 1994; Maina & Napoli, 2011; Wyatt, 2012), including tourism (McKercher & Tung, 2015). Yet, there has been no increase in mean productivity per individual author; instead, individual productivity, as measured on a pro rata basis, has declined (McKercher & Tung, 2016). While there may be valid reasons in some cases (Bennett & Taylor, 2003; Moore & Griffin, 2006), in many other instances, authors' names are added in expectation of some reciprocal benefit or as the result of pressure placed by more senior staff on junior staff and doctoral students. Gift authorship occurs when an author's name is 'gifted' to a paper, usually in exchange for some future benefit, such as being 'gifted' on their papers in return (Boff, 2012; Dighe & Berquist, 2011; Macfarlane, 2015; Strange, 2008). In extreme cases, gifting represents a premeditated agreement between peers, whereby each agrees to include the other as an author to give the appearance of higher productivity, even though that person has played no part in the project (Strange, 2008). Guest or honorary authorships (Bennett & Taylor, 2003; Dighe & Berquist, 2011) occur when a senior academic's name is included on a paper with the hope that the person's reputation will enhance the paper's chance of success.

Finally, pressure to adopt research and publishing approaches are not limited to junior academics. In the medical field, senior academics have demanded junior researchers to involve them in projects to mask their own research shortcomings or for personal ambition, vanity, desire for fame, greed and direct financial gain. They also ensured that their names were included on papers in the prestigious position of first author. These individuals have been labeled 'white bulls' or white bullies (Kwok, 2005). These tactics may represent a clear form of corruption if

they are done with the expectation of getting something in return, or may represent opportunistic abuses of cultural norms that are both expected and accepted in certain cultures but not tolerated in others (Salita, 2010).

3. Method

3.1. Measurement instrument and sample

This study seeks to determine if academics at different career stages express similar or divergent views on a range of issues relating to research, publishing, and ultimately career development. A questionnaire with both closed and open-ended questions was first developed and pre-tested among academic staff and doctoral students at two universities. Respondents were asked to provide feedback on the clarity of the questions as well as comment on the coverage and length of the questionnaire.

The closed-ended questions sought information on how respondents perceived pressures to publish, including sources of pressure (e.g., imposed by the self, institution, peers or supervisors) and their likelihood of adopting a number of research and publishing approaches in response to pressures as identified in the literature, such as salami slicing, authorship tactics, and submitting papers to pay-to-publish journals, (e.g., on a four-point scale: strong disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree).

Closed-ended questions were also used to assess respondents' perceptions of factors that could influence career success, such as: job hopping for promotions/staying in one institution; publishing as part of a team/publishing independently; and prior industry experience/progressing straight to doctoral studies. These questions were presented in a five-point semantic differential format with the midpoint reflecting both items as equally important rather than in a Likert-scale to contrast the four-point scale items on perceived pressures to adopt research and publishing approaches. By incorporating multiple scale formats in the questionnaire, the study sought to minimize the effects of common method bias (Podsakaoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Other questions that were formatted as semantic differential were good luck/hard work, and focus on teaching/focus on research. While the anchors for these items are not exact antonyms, the study decided to retain semantic differential for these questions to minimize potential response bias; for example, if these questions were written as Likert-scale questions, academics

would likely agree on the need to focus on both teaching and research as good teaching and research (and also service) are socially desirable traits in tourism academia (Airey, Tribe, Benckendorff, & Xiao, 2015). In practice, however, academics are constrained by time, workload, and expectations, and could feel pressured to optimize one area of focus over another, despite acknowledgement of the importance of all areas (Fennell, 2013). The semantic differential format (e.g., focus on teaching versus focus on research) sought to reflect, at least partially but certainly not perfectly, this potential tradeoff.

Finally, open-ended questions sought further elaboration on these issues by asking respondents, for example, to identify successful research and publishing tactics that worked for them, and to offer career and non-career advice they would give to aspiring academics. Demographic questions were also collected, including gender, years of industry experience, and type of academic department the respondent is residing in (e.g., standalone hospitality and tourism department, tourism and hospitality major in multi-disciplinary department, and non-tourism and hospitality affiliation).

After the pre-test, an online questionnaire was finalized to learn about the personal experiences of tourism and hospitality academics as well as how they have developed, are developing, or are planning to develop their research careers. Respondents were recruited through the TRINET and the CIRET databases between May and September 2015. The sample of respondents was divided into three cohorts: New and Emerging Scholars (NES), including doctoral students nearing the end of their studies and early career researchers with less than five years of full time experience and who are employed below the level of associate professor; Mid-Career Researchers (MCR), including assistant professors with more than five years of academic experience or associate professors with less than 10 years of experience; and Senior Researchers (SR), consisting of academics at the substantive rank of professor or above, or associate professors with 10 or more years work experience. A total of 502 individuals responded; however, 238 surveys had to be discarded because they were largely incomplete, leaving a usable sample of 264 cases.

3.2. Data analysis

Quantitative data from the closed-ended questions were analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics were used to obtain summaries for demographic variables. Responses to

perceived pressures to adopt research and publishing approaches that were measured on a four-point scale were recoded into a binary scale (agree or disagree) in recognition of cultural differences when responding to scale questions (Ap, 2000). Chi-square tests were used to assess respondents' substantive levels (NES, MCR, and SR) with their (dis)agreement on each research and publishing approach.

Content analysis was used to interpret qualitative data from the open-ended responses. This process involved three steps (Lo & McKercher, 2015). First, the authors read the written responses independently to familiarize themselves to the cases. Second, responses were divided into sections for analysis, and each author coded the open-ended responses independently to identify key thematic domains. Third, the authors compared their codes to look for similarities and differences, resolved discrepancies through discussion, and established a final set of themes.

This study recognizes that knowledge from qualitative content analysis is based on the authors' constructions, and reflexive awareness is required to reflect the subjectivity of the researchers in shaping the interpretations of the findings (Wilson & Hollinshead, 2015). The personal experiences of the authors helped informed the study results. The lead author is a junior academic who is just starting his career, while the second author is a senior academic nearing the end of his career. The lead author is receptive of the increasing pressures to research and publish in today's academic environment and conscious of the expectations to be fully research active at the onset. The second author understands that newer academics in particular, have to negotiate the minefield of publishing and is concerned that pressure to publish may lead academics to adopt questionable approaches to achieve short-term gains at the cost of long-term career stagnation. Taken together, the interpretation of the open-ended responses reflects to a certain extent, a mutual understanding and reconciliation of the viewpoints between the two authors who are at very different stages of their academic careers.

4. Results

4.1. Respondent profile

The majority of the respondents were NES (n = 137), followed by SRs (n = 86) and MCRs (n = 41) (see Table 1). Overall gender-balance was largely represented (48.8% female and 51.2% male) but a gap was observed in SRs with 27.2% female and 72.8% male, corroborating earlier observations by Munar et al. (2015) of a significant gender bias in many

tourism programmes. However, females accounted for the majority of MCRs (61.5% female and 38.5% male) and NES (58.5% female and 41.5% male). Slightly over 70% of respondents are working or worked in either standalone tourism and hospitality departments or in multi-disciplinary departments that offered majors in this area. Interestingly, NES and MCRs reported almost six years of industry experiences while SRs reported a slightly lower average of five years of industry experience prior to joining academia.

A good geographic spread of respondents from all continents participated in this study. Respondents represented a number of countries and regions in Europe (e.g., France, Iceland, and UK), North America (e.g., Canada and US), Oceania (e.g., Australia and New Zealand), and Asia (e.g., China, Macao, and Thailand) despite relatively fewer respondents from South America (e.g., Brazil and Ecuador) and Africa (e.g., Botswana and Tanzania). This is a limitation of the study that could be a reflection of coverage from TRINET and CIRET, among other factors. There was also broad distribution by substantive rank; NES were well distributed, with 22.1% from Asia and other regions, 23.9% from Oceania, 24.8% from North America, and 29.2% from Europe. MCRs had the highest concentration in Europe at 41% while SRs were largely based in North America (38.7%).

Insert Table 1 about here.

4.2. Perceived pressures to adopt research and publishing approaches

Perceived pressures to adopt research and publishing approaches as identified in the literature are shown in Table 2. These approaches are classified under four categories: project choice, journal choice, research teams, and authorships. In project choice, half or more of NES and MCRs reported pressure to choose projects that could be completed quickly instead of long-term research projects (NES = 53.1% and MCR = 50%) and to salami slice works (NES = 58.5% and MCR = 62.5%) compared to SRs (30.5% and 38.4%, respectively). NES were also more tempted to choose projects that would lead to easily publishable papers (43.1%) compared to MCRs (37.5%) and SRs (23.3%). In journal choice, MCRs, in particular, felt the need to target journals with fast turnaround times (60%). The majority of respondents, regardless of substantive rank (NES = 73.8%, MCR = 71.5%, and SR = 61.0%), felt pressure to submit papers

to top tier journals or to journals on approved lists. Even so, more than one-third of NES and almost one-quarter of MCRs also felt compelled to target journals that they considered easier to get into. On a positive note, less than 10% of respondents across each cohort reported pressure to submit papers to pay-per publish journals.

There was, however, some evidence of gamesmanship among a sizable minority of younger and mid-career scholars, as up to half felt pressured to join research teams in the belief that the name recognitions of senior staff and/or well-known authors would help get a paper accepted (NES = 53.8% and MCR = 40%). About one-third of NES and MCR also felt pressure to join large research teams with the hope of being included as a co-author on most publications.

Under authorship tactics, approximately 25.5% and 36.2% of NES reported pressure to add gift or guest authors, respectively. Interestingly, NES were also less likely to expand the list of authors to include research assistants and the like (43.8%) when compared to MCRs (62.5%) and SRs (58.5%). Within NES, about 30% of late-term doctoral students encountered pressure to change the author order, while 21% felt pressured to remove author names. Here, some evidence of bullying among this group is apparent in the open-ended comments in the questionnaire, as respondents commented: "[I was] pressured to include authors who never got involved in the research" (Respondent: full-time doctoral student in Europe), and "[I was asked] to put my supervisor's name above my name in an article!" (Respondent: full-time doctoral student in Asia). In an extreme case, one full-time doctoral student in Europe commented, "if I want to publish and ask opinions from some lectures, after few comments she adds her name as the first author."

While it is almost impossible to quantify the pervasiveness of gamesmanship in all its forms, the authors of this study analyzed, as a follow-up to the above, the Scopus database for journal articles published in the last 10 years to assess the potential extensiveness of academics who have been involved in or was a victim of some form of gamesmanship. Scopus maintains detailed publications' records on some 60 tourism and hospitality journals, and the results suggests that NES and MCRs who published frequently could be involved in or were victims of some form of gamesmanship. During the period from 2006 to 2015, some 782 NES or MCR authored or co-authored seven or more papers in these journals. For 316 people, at least two thirds of their papers had a minimum of three authors, including 177 where 80% or more of their total output involved papers with three or more authors. By contrast, only 29 individuals were

identified who wrote either single or dual authors papers exclusively. Likewise, 312 authors were identified who appear as the lead author on less than 40% of the works they are affiliated with, and 181 are listed as the lead author in less than 20% of the publications. Indeed, 48 authors have never appeared as lead author.

These figures differ dramatically from observed publication practices between 1996 and 2005. During this time frame, 108 NES or MCRs were identified who published at least seven papers. Only 11 (10.2%) were identified where at least two-thirds their papers had three or more authors. Again, only 17 (15.7%) appeared as the lead author in 40% or less of their output, while most (56.5%) were the lead author on at least 70% of their work.

In other words, a substantial number of academics today rarely if ever publish on their own or with one other colleague and when they do, take a subservient authorship role. This observation comes with a number of caveats, though, for papers with large numbers of authors and low lead authorship rates do not provide definitive evidence of either author stacking or bullying. Some topic areas have a long tradition of multi-authored papers, while a high degree of collaboration is the cultural norm in many Asian economies. But, the differences noted between authorship practices in the most recent decade compared to an earlier decade indicate something is happening, and gamesmanship is a possible reason.

Finally, on a positive note, few respondents (e.g., only 12.7% of NES, 7.7% of MCRs, and 5.1% of SRs) indicated that they felt pressured to engage in what they personally considered as unethical research and publication practices.

Insert Table 2 about here

Where does pressure come from to engage in these practices? Is the pressure self-imposed, or is it imposed externally by the system itself, university or departmental culture, or from more senior academics? Insights to these issues came from answers to the open-ended question. Respondents indicated that pressure came from a number of sources, overtly and covertly, as shown in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

Self-imposed pressure was the most common single answer offered across all cohorts (NES = 27.4%, MCR = 38.9%, and SR = 48.1%). SRs were more likely to express this view than others; one senior academic from North America explained: “I have my own career ambition, and am trained to be a motivated researcher”, while another SR from Europe bluntly stated: “I put pressure on myself.” NES and MCRs also identified self-motivation; an assistant professor in Asia noted: “I feel I need to seek and obtain esteem and recognition”, while an associate professor wrote: “actually I am publishing for my own personal development and for my own research interests.”

Other factors were also important, though, for NES and MCRs. While compliance with externally imposed research assessment exercises was cited by only 12.4% of respondents, a large percentage of respondents highlighted three different types of institutionally-imposed pressure to perform: the institutional culture at the university-level; the departmental culture; and the need to achieve publications’ thresholds for retention and/or promotion. In many instances, all three are inter-related, with one junior academic in Oceania noting pressure: “comes from the central administration down through the faculty (college) to the department heads.” In other cases, respondents explained that pressure came from the Dean or head of departments through work allocation models, implementation of research outcome models, and the introduction of publication thresholds. Of course, these actions are also tied into tenure and promotion as a scholar from Europe explained: “the boss tells us if you don't publish 5 journal articles in the next 2 years you will lose your job”, while an emerging scholar from Asia added: “usually in China, it is the institution that applies pressure to both young scholars and doctoral students, because publication is the only threshold or criteria to evaluate the expertise or excellence of a young scholar.”

A high level of dissatisfaction with such an approach or how it is implemented is evident among some respondents. An associate professor based in Asia noted that the Vice Chancellor mentioned five staff at risk. The comment was, “In a way it was public shaming. This is to me institutionally sanctioned bullying... Horrific!” A junior scholar from Asia commented that pressure from top management to publish in top tier journals has “killed my motivation as a researcher. The main role of an academic is lost as we chase the KPIs (key performance index) based on number of top journals and citations”, while another from Oceania noted “institutions create metrics that can actually be an inhibitor to true academic inquiry.”

4.3. Publishing Advice

Respondents were further asked to provide advice for publishing and this open-ended question generated 717 responses that reflected 27 different themes. Table 4 presents a rank order list of themes that were mentioned by at least 10% of participants in each cohort.

Insert Table 4 about here

Collaboration and co-authorship, careful selection of the most appropriate journal, quality writing ability and perseverance were ranked highly by all respondents. Doctoral students commented on the benefits of collaborating with the supervisors and senior staff who were willing to mentor them. NES wrote about the benefits of finding collaborators who complemented their skills or alternately working with more senior researchers who can lead projects. MCRs noted the benefits of working with senior colleagues, and also highlight the need to collaborate with colleagues from other institutions. SRs made similar comments, but also recognized their obligations as mentors to both doctoral students and those working their way up the career ladder.

Targeting the appropriate journal is critical, as well. SR endorsed a fit-for-purpose strategy by "selecting a journal that appears to meet my research", and "selecting the right journal for the paper." NES and MCRs, though, seem somewhat conflicted about the best approach. On the one hand, MCR suggest targeting lower tier journals to gain experience before aiming higher and commented on the benefit of "sending articles to the right journals." On the other hand, some suggested that requirements to satisfy performance criteria pressured them to target "top tier journals or only 'approved' journals on my institution's list of journals" or by "selecting journals with fast turnaround time." This also compelled some to "tailor the paper for the journal" instead of "targeting journals that best fit my research."

While MCRs and SRs felt innovative research that answers the "so what" question to contribute to the field as increasingly important, it is of lesser importance to NES. Instead, NES focused on the depth of individual papers, seeking feedback from peers to ensure papers were conceptually strong, current, and methodologically rigorous. Interestingly, these concerns relating to method and rigor did not appear as important for either MCRs or SRs, and seeking

feedback was neither highly ranked among MCRs nor did not even appear among the top 11 items among SRs.

The identification of some other items, though, may reflect either a level of naiveté or attempts at gamesmanship. Almost one in five NES endorsed gift and guest authorship practices, by offering such comments as "including authors because they know the editor, although their actual contribution to the paper was limited to 2-3 rounds of comments" (Respondent: NES in Oceania), and "invite professor or push/offer him/her up to lead authorship without contribution" (Respondent: NES at undisclosed location). A small minority (about 7 percent) also endorsed salami slicing work and targeting journals with low acceptance thresholds. MCRs felt that getting to know the editors of journals, in general, and especially getting to know editors of special editions of journals was as almost important a tactic as the choice of topic.

4.4. Career advice

The final part of the survey included both closed and open-ended questions that sought insights into how to develop a successful career. Closed-ended questions were used to assess respondents' perceptions of factors that they felt could influence career success, such as: job hopping for promotions/staying in one institution; publishing as part of a team/publishing independently; and prior industry experience/progressing straight to doctoral studies. Open-ended questions asked respondents for career and life advice based on lessons they have learned.

No statistically significant differences were noted among cohorts in their responses to questions related to the balance of teaching and research, job-hopping, and teamwork. Approximately half of all respondents (50.6%) leaned towards focusing on research while a small number suggested focusing on teaching (8.5%). Another 40.9% suggested both teaching and research were equally important. Some respondents reminded the authors that the balance between research and teaching depends on the nature of the institution although the pressures behind the following comment were typical: "the message we get from the University - all focus on research, not on teaching" (Respondent: NES from Europe). Other respondents suggested the two are complementary as research can inform teaching and visa versa.

Half of all respondents stated working both independently and as part of a team are equally important while one-quarter each supported either independent or teamwork. A clear majority (58%) advocated job-hopping, with one SR in North America advising: "moving

between institutions enhances your career and networks hugely." Half of NES (51.2%) and almost half of SRs (44.3%) felt industry experience was beneficial. MCRs again differed in their views, for only about one-third (32.5%) felt industry experience was beneficial.

Career and life advice were canvassed through open-ended questions. More than 780 comments were made, which could be grouped into 18 thematic domains. Table 5 summarizes those themes that were mentioned by at least 10% of respondents from each cohort.

Insert Table 5 about here

The importance of collaboration and finding a good mentor were identified as the single greatest piece of advice by all groups. Earlier in the survey, all respondents, except doctoral students, were asked about the quality of mentorship in their first full-time academic position, and NES and MCR participants were asked to comment on the quality of supervision they received in their doctoral studies. Overall, the experiences were mixed. Almost half (45.9%) felt they received little or no useful mentorship in their first academic post, while only about one third (34.3%) expressed positive opinions. More positive comments were made about the quality of doctoral supervision: 61% felt it was good compared to 22% who felt it was poor. Once again, though, the MCR cohort expressed the poorest experiences of all groups. More than one-third (37.1%) had poor experiences as doctoral students with more than half (53.8%) having poor mentorship experiences in their first jobs.

Passion, hard work and publishing frequently also emerged as key factors that helped advance academic careers. Comments that reflected these views included "publish early and often" (Respondent: NES from North America) and "follow your passion…in the end it is hard work so if you are not passionate it will wear you down" (Respondent: SR from Europe).

The need for work-life balance was an aspirational goal for many. It was mentioned more often than hard work by NES (29.1% vs. 20.4%), MCR (37.1% vs. 22.9%), and SRs (51.4% vs. 27.8%). One SR from North America said he "found it difficult to find a good balance between work and non-work life until I realized balance doesn't necessarily come in a day or a week. It comes over time, and you have to give yourself permission to check-out every now and then to re-charge your batteries." A MCR from Europe added: "It is not about the goal, it is about the journey. Life is a process: live it, enjoy it, explore it." Others, especially those who are beginning

their careers or who hope for promotion, though saw it more as an aspirational rather than an achievable goal, noting, “it takes effort… It takes strength of character to say 'no' sometimes. There is undoubtedly pressure though for some tenure and promotion requirements are ridiculous.” Other emerging scholars commented on the need to be prepared to work seven days a week and in one extreme case to “be occupied with your work, leave behind family and be less social” (Respondent: NES from North America). The MCR group stood out as expressing substantially different views than members of the other two cohorts. For example, they provided fewer comments on the need for strong personal ethics, balance teaching and research, and set clear career goals, but provided more comments on the need to upgrade their skills and endorsed more emphasis on research than teaching. SRs from North America commented on the need to “treat both teaching and research with the respect they [deserve]” and to “match your research to your teaching”, while some MCRs suggested “remember that teaching counts for little; ‘publish or perish’ is worse than ever” and to “spend as little time on teaching as possible” (Respondent from Europe). One senior scholar from Europe also noted: “you are lucky to have this job. Enjoy it!” It also seems that some MCRs are more jaded than others and felt differently, making such comments as “professorship isn't any longer the dream job it used to be” (Respondent from Europe), and advising people to “manipulate so the university works for you, not the other way around” (Respondent from Oceania).

5. Discussion

This study investigated how SRs, MCRs, and NES in tourism and hospitality are negotiating the rapidly changing research and publishing landscape. The findings provide insight into what tourism and hospitality academics view as important for developing a successful academic career and the pressures that academics at different career stages are facing towards adopting various research and publication practices used to enhance research output.

The authors of this paper are at different stages of their careers, and therefore, have differing interpretations of the implications for both individual career progression and the long-term health of the field of study as a whole. The lead author is a junior academic who is just starting his career, while the second author is a senior academic nearing the end of his career.

Rather than presenting a single discussion, the authors thought more discussion would be generated by presenting their views separately.

5.1. A New Academic's Comment

We are entering a new era in tourism and hospitality research. There has been a nine-fold expansion in the absolute number of authors from the early 1990s, and almost a doubling of published papers every five-year period from the beginning of 2000 to the present (McKercher & Tung, 2015). This drive towards an ever-increasing expansion of output requirement is reflected in the endorsement of journal lists to satisfy the needs of research assessment exercises as well as the proliferation of tourism and hospitality league tables (e.g., Chang & McAleer 2012; Gursoy & Sandstrom, 2016; Park, Philips, Canter, & Abbott, 2011). Together, tremendous pressure is placed on NES to produce within the golden time for junior academics; that is, the five-year period for junior academics to establish themselves by demonstrating research relevance and productivity prior to application for tenure promotion on the sixth year.

Indeed, the study findings provide support for this observation, showing that NES perceived greater pressure to adopt a number of different research and publishing approaches compared to MCRs and SRs to maximize output. It is important, however, to consider the implications of these approaches on one's academic career. For example, NES reported pressure to adopt authorship tactics to boost research output. While gift and guest authorship strategies could potentially increase publication count in the short term, they could also dilute recognition for personal achievements. Other scholars may also question a NES' ability to publish without the support of other researchers, who may be seen as elevating manuscripts to acceptable journal standards. This perspective, particularly from department heads, could have detrimental impacts on career progression when a doctoral student applies for an academic position or when a junior academic applies for tenure.

The study findings also highlight the pressures for NES to join research teams. NES have to consider their roles within research teams wisely as teams could be developed on an ad-hoc basis or formed to work on projects, oftentimes with a longer-term and international focus (Pearce, 2014). Research teams could be beneficial to long-term career development if they allow NES to share common interests, develop their expertise in that subject area, and cross-fertilize their ideas with peers who can best appreciate the implications of their research

programme (Lee & Bozeman, 2005). Conversely, research teams could be less favorable if they relegate NES to sub-scientists who only perform specialist tasks within the project without an opportunity to gain a broader perspective.

NES should also consider this publishing advice from MCRs and SRs: focus on topic choice and contribution to the field by doing innovate research. While the findings suggest that NES are opting for easier projects, salami slicing, and darting from project to project, these approaches could damage the reputation of the field as the end result is the production of trivial scholarship where the primary motives are convenience, ease of publication, and need to meet publication requirements as opposed to the more desired goals of intellectual curiosity and valuable reporting (Boff, 2012).

It is encouraging that only 12.7% of NES reported pressure to engage in what they considered as unethical research and publication practices. Trustworthiness is especially important in today's academic research environment, which is marked by interdisciplinary, cross-functional, and geographically distributed teams (Zolin et al., 2004). Indeed, tourism is a small field with a tightly-knit network; someone knows everyone else, or knows another person who knows everyone else (Smith, 2011).

The most frequently mentioned career and life advice among NES, MCRs, and SRs is to find a mentor. Here, NES could broaden their views by considering a number of different mentors instead of a single mentor. The traditional model of relying on a single mentor throughout one's career is no longer realistic, as increased mobility, globalization, and job insecurity at early stages means that one will likely develop many mentors and peer networks (De Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). NES could look towards a multi-mentor network model to receive different types of mentorship (De Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). For example, just as individuals can have different levels of expertise across research, teaching, and service, some senior academics may be more suitable to provide certain types of mentorship. Johnson et al. (2010) in their study of innovative programs to train health sciences researchers, suggest differentiating a career mentor from a research mentor. Career mentors can provide guidance in terms of advancement and promotion, while research mentors can provide guidance on research and publishing, and act as a liaison to connect NES to appropriate collaborative opportunities.

Perhaps more importantly, academics should always remember what drew them to academia in the first place. Is it the opportunity for intellectually stimulating work? Is it the

genuine passion for the chosen field of study? As one respondent reminded us, "the lifespan of academics is longer than other careers. It is important to realize the nature of academia and not to feel too much pressure on short-term performance and outcome."

5.2. A Senior Researcher's Perspective

Clearly, the goal posts have shifted. One can argue about how fair or unfair the system is, but that is to little avail. This is how universities operate now and will operate for the foreseeable future. But, one must wonder if these changes are working in favor of or against the best interests of both staff and the field of study itself. The introduction of performance thresholds and 'quality' research targets is designed to enhance research productivity and impact. Yet, the irony is that any system that adopts such a metric-based approach also endorses explicitly or implicitly the high level of gamesmanship that is associated with it as staff work to manipulate the system to their best advantage. The illusion of greater 'quality' and productivity may be just that, an illusion. Plume and van Weijen (2014) conducted a detailed study of publications' trends data on the Scopus database over a 10-year period. They determined that even though individual authors may appear on more papers, in reality, there was no apparent increase in overall productivity per active author. In fact, rather than enhancing research performance, one unintended consequence may be that the performance bar may actually be lowered for many academics as they can be seen to meet performance thresholds by piggy-backing on the expertise rather than demonstrating the skills themselves. Worse still, the longer such a system endures, the more likely some staff are to forget the skills needed to produce high-end research, or never learn these skills in the first place.

All parties are complicit in this practice. Some, not all, senior researchers can maintain their highly prolific publishing profile by engaging junior staff and doctoral students as sub-scientists to complete certain tasks while they focus on producing a quality end result. Junior staff gets the benefit of working with, and hopefully, learning from senior researchers, plus have the added bonus of building a credible looking publication's record. Some NES and MCRs can create symbiotic relationships through team building by finding partners who complement their strengths and overcome their weaknesses. And of course, unscrupulous staff can continue to bully younger and more vulnerable colleagues and students.

In the end, though, not every one can win. Senior researchers and early career researchers seem best positioned, while mid career researchers and late term doctoral students face greater challenges. Senior researchers have already demonstrated their abilities; otherwise they would not have risen to this level. Early career researchers have found employment in a very tight labor market and know what the performance criteria are from the outset. The simple task for late term doctoral students is to find employment, while one is left with the impression that many mid career researchers are most at risk of having their careers stall. Many were employed before the new systems were implemented fully and, therefore, believed they had time to learn their craft just as the senior researchers ahead of them. They now need to produce at high levels, but as the answers to the open-ended questions suggest, their skill sets may not be developed fully as yet. They are struggling as senior researchers continue to occupy posts and as hungry, well-qualified early career researchers may out perform them. In many ways, they are in a race against time to save their careers.

6. A Concluding Thought

The academic landscape has changed dramatically. NES, as well as MCRs are facing unprecedented challenges as the number of new jobs and opportunities for promotion among existing staff are shrinking. At the same time, the rules for promotion and retention keep changing due to the creeping impact of metrification and the need to be seen to produce high impact research. Academics must now make pragmatic decisions that may involve short-term tradeoffs in exchange for job security. The key issue, though, is whether this short termism is actually working for or against the better long-term interests of both individual staff members and the field as a whole? Only time will tell.

References

AAUP. (2015, September 10). Background facts on contingent faculty. *American Association of University Professors.* Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts

Airey, D., Tribe, J., Benckendorff, P., & Xiao, H. (2015). The managerial gaze the long tail of tourism education and research. *Journal of Travel Research*, *54*(2), 139-151.

Ap, J. (2000). Understanding the Asian respondent when conducting tourism research: Some challenges, pitfalls and tips. In *31st Annual Conference Proceedings, Travel and Tourism Research Association* (pp. 282-290). San Fernando Valley, CA: Travel and Tourism Research Association.

Bagilhole, B., & White, K. (2013). *Generation and gender in academia*. Palgrave Macmillan: UK.

Bennett, D. M., & Taylor, D. M. (2003). Unethical practices in authorship of scientific papers. *Emergency Medicine*, *15*(3), 263-270.

Bexley, E., James, R. & Arkoudis, S. (2011). The Australian academic profession in transition: Addressing the challenge of reconceptualising academic work and regenerating the academic workforce. Retrieved from http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/people/bexley_docs/The_Academic_Profession_in_Transition_Sept2011.pdf

Boff, G. (2012). Ethics among scholars in academic publishing. In *2012 Proceedings of the Information Systems Educators Conference* (pp. 1-9). New Orleans, Louisiana: EDSIG (Education Special Interest Group of the AITP.

Castle, J. B., & Schutz, A. (2013). Voices at the top: Learning from full Professors. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, *28*(1), 79 – 101.

Chang, C., & McAleer, M. (2012). Citations and impact of ISI tourism and hospitality journals. Tourism Management Perspectives, 1, 2-8.

Deery, M., Jago, L., & Fredline, L. (2012). Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: A new research agenda. *Tourism Management, 33*(1), 64-73.

De Rond, M., & Miller, A. N. (2005). Publish or Perish Bane or Boon of Academic Life? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *14*(4), 321-329.

De Janasz, S. C., & Sullivan, S. E. (2004). Multiple mentoring in academe: Developing the professorial network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *64*(2), 263-283.

dgrasso. (2014, June 24). Ten tips to a successful academic career. *Society of Clinical Psychology*. Retrieved from https://www.div12.org/ten-tips-to-a-successful-academic-career/

Dighe, M. K., & Berquist, T. H. (2011). Education in authorship ethics: Should it be compulsory? *American Journal of Roentgenology*, *196*(2), 235-236.

Dubini, P., Galimberti, P., & Micheli, M. R. (2010). Authors publication strategies in scholarly. In *Publishing in the Networked World: Transforming the Nature of Communication 14th International Conference on Electronic Publishing.* Helsinki, Finland.

Endersby, J. W. (1996). Collaborative research in the social sciences: Multiple authorship and publication credit. *Social Science Quarterly*, 77(2), 375-392.

Fanelli, D. (2010). Do pressures to publish increase scientists' bias? An empirical support from US States Data. *PloS ONE*, *5*(4), e10271.

Fennell, D. (2013). The ethics of excellence in tourism research. *Journal of Travel Research*, *52*(4), 417-425.

Fisher, B. S., Cobane, C. T., Vander Ven, T. M., & Cullen, F. T. (1998). How many authors does it take to publish an article? Trends and patterns in political science. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *31*(04), 847-856.

Gursoy, D., & Sandstrom, J. K. (2016). An Updated Ranking of Hospitality and Tourism Journals. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *40*(1), 3-18.

Harley, S., Muller-Camen, M., & Collin, A. (2004). From academic communities to managed organisations: The implications for academic careers in UK and German universities. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *64*(2), 329-345.

Inkpen, A. C., & Beamish, P. W. (1994). An analysis of twenty-five years of research in the Journal of International Business Studies. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 703-713.

Hall, C. M. (2011). Publish and perish? Bibliometric analysis, journal ranking and the assessment of research quality in tourism. *Tourism Management*, *32*(1), 16-27.

Johnson, M. O., Subak, L. L., Brown, J. S., Lee, K. A., & Feldman, M. D. (2010). An innovative program to train health sciences researchers to be effective clinical and translational-research mentors. *Academic medicine: journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, *85*(3), 484.

Kearney, M. H. (2015). Predatory publishing: What authors need to know. *Research in Nursing & Health*, *38*(1), 1-3.

Kwok, L. S. (2005). The White Bull effect: Abusive coauthorship and publication parasitism. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, *31*(9), 554-556.

Ladkin, A., & Weber, K. (2009). Tourism and hospitality academics: Career profiles and strategies. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, *8*(4), 373-393.

Law, R., & Chon, K. (2007). Evaluating research performance in tourism and hospitality: The perspective of university program heads. *Tourism Management*, *28*(5), 1203-1211.

Lee, S., & Bozeman, B. (2005). The impact of research collaboration on scientific productivity. *Social Studies of Science*, *35*(5), 673-702.

Lo, I. S., & McKercher, B. (2015). Ideal image in process: Online tourist photography and impression management. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *52*, 104-116.

Macfarlane, B. (2015). The ethics of multiple authorship: power, performativity and the gift economy. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1-17.

Maina, S., & Di Napoli, M. (2011). How many authors are needed to write a review? *Reviews in Health Care*, *2*(2), 83-86.

Mazanec, J. A. (2009). Unravelling myths in tourism research. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *34*(3), 319-323.

McKercher, B., & Prideaux, B. (2014). Academic myths of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *46*, 16-28.

McKercher, B., & Tung, V. (2015). Publishing in tourism and hospitality journals: Is the past a prelude to the future? *Tourism Management*, *50*, 306-315.

Moore, M. T., & Griffin, B. W. (2006). Identification of factors that influence authorship name placement and decisions to collaborate in peer-reviewed, education-related publications. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *32*(2), 125-135.

Munar, A. M., Biran, A., Budeanu, A., Caton, K., Chambers, D., Dredge, D., et al. (2015). The Gender Gap in Tourism Academy: Statistics and Indicators of Gender Equality.

Nash, D. (1979). Tourism as an anthropological subject. *Current Anthropology*, *22*(5), 461-481.

Pain, E. (2015, December 3). As research teams grow, academic career prospects may shrink. *Science Careers*. Retrieved from http://sciencecareers.sciencemag.org/career_magazine/previous_issues/articles/2015_08_06/caredit.a1500196

Park, K., Philips, W., Canter, D., & 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 and Tourism Research*, 35(3), 381-416.

Pearce, D. G. (2014). The internationalization of tourism research. *Journal of Travel Research*, *53*(3), 267-280.

Phelan, K. V., Mejia, C., & Hertzman, J. (2013). The industry experience gap: Hospitality faculty perceptions of the importance of faculty industry experience. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, *25*(3), 123-130.

Plume, A. & van Weijen, D. (2014, September). Publish or perish? The rise of the fractional author. *Research Trends.* Retrieved from https://www.researchtrends.com/issue-38-september-2014/publish-or-perish-the-rise-of-the-fractional-author/

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879.

Royal Society. (2010) *The scientific century: Securing our future prosperity*. London: Royal Society.

Salita, J. T. (2010). Authorship practices in Asian cultures. *The Write Stuff*, *19*(1), 36-38.

Severt, D. E., Tesone, D. V., Bottorff, T. J., & Carpenter, M. L. (2009). A world ranking of the top 100 hospitality and tourism programs. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *33*(4), 451-470.

Smith, S. L. (2011). Becoming a tourism scholar. *Tourism Geographies*, *13*(3), 480-494.

Strange, K. (2008). Authorship: why not just toss a coin? *American Journal of Physiology-Cell Physiology*, *295*(3), 567-575.

Walsh, J. P., & Lee, Y. N. (2015). The bureaucratization of science. *Research Policy*, *44*(8), 1584-1600.

Weissmann, J. (2013, April 10). The ever-shrinking role of tenured college professors. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/04/the-ever-shrinking-role-of-tenured-college-professors-in-1-chart/274849/

Wilson, E., & Hollinshead, K. (2015). Qualitative tourism research: Opportunities in the emergent soft sciences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *54*, 30-47.

Wyatt, P. J. (2012). Commentary: too many authors, too few creators. *Physics Today*, *65*(4), 9.

Xia, J., Harmin, J., Connolly K., Donelly, R., Anderson, M. & Howard, H. (2015). Who publishes in "predatory" journals? *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology,* 66(7), 1406-1407.

Zolin, R., Hinds, P. J., Fruchter, R., & Levitt, R. E. (2004). Interpersonal trust in cross-functional, geographically distributed work: A longitudinal study. *Information and organization*, *14*(1), 1-26.

Table 1

Respondent profile

	NES	MCR	SR
n	137	41	86
% female	58.5	61.5	27.2
Mean years in industry	5.9	5.8	4.8
Region (%)			
North America	24.8	12.8	38.7
Europe	29.2	41.0	34.7
Oceania	23.9	26.5	14.7
Asia and other regions	22.1	20.5	12.0
Type of academic department (%)			
Standalone hospitality and tourism department	37.6	30.6	38.4
Tourism major in multi-disciplinary department	36.8	41.7	27.4
Tourism minor in multi-disciplinary department	11.1	11.1	15.1
Non tourism affiliation	14.5	16.7	19.2

Table 2

Pressures to adopt research and publishing approaches

	NES	MCR	SR	Result (χ^2)
Project choice				
Choose research projects that can be completed quickly instead of long-term research projects	53.1	50.0	30.5	10.702, p = .005
Choose easy projects that will lead to easily publishable papers	43.1	37.5	23.3	8.744, p = .013
Slice a project into smaller papers instead of submitting one large, comprehensive paper	58.5	62.5	38.4	13.007, p = .001
Journal choice				
Target journals that are easy to get into	35.4	22.5	13.4	12.890, p = .002
Target journals with fast publication / turnaround times	48.8	60.0	30.5	11.385, p = .003
Submit papers to pay per publish journals	8.5	7.5	4.9	1.011, p = .603
Target top tier journals or only 'approved' journals on my institution's list of journals	73.8	71.5	61.0	5.81, p = .075
Resubmit a paper to another journal that has been rejected without revising it	26.2	20.0	15.9	3.220, p = .200
Research teams				
Join large research groups, with the hope of being included as a co-author on most publications	34.9	30.0	17.1	7.908, p = .019
Collaborate with senior staff and/or well-known authors in the belief that their name recognition will help get a paper accepted	53.8	40.0	12.2	37.063, p <.001
Authorships				
Include a 'gift' author – someone who made no real contribution, in exchange for being a gift author on that person's work	25.5	15.0	6.1	16.815, p <.001
Add a 'guest' author – usually senior staff, whose name recognition may enhance the prospects of acceptance	36.2	26.5	8.6	20.264, p <.001
Ask for my name to be included as an author, even if I did not make substantial enough contribution to warrant authorship	13.8	5.0	4.9	5.823, p = .054
Ask for my name to be moved up the author list	20.3	12.5	6.1	8.33, p = .016
Ask for other authors' names to be removed from papers	16.9	12.5	6.1	5.317, p = .070
Include the names of other authors such as research assistants and undergraduate students who worked on the paper	43.8	62.5	58.5	6.613, p = .037

Notes: numbers indicate percentage of respondents who indicated "agree or strongly agree"

Table 3

Sources of pressure

	NES	MCR	SR	All
n	73	36	52	161
		(% of responses)		
Self	27.4	38.9	48.1	36.6
Institutional – University	24.7	30.6	21.1	24.8
Institutional – Departmental	26.0	25.0	15.4	22.4
Institutional – Promotion/retention criteria	16.4	5.6	17.3	14.3
External – Research assessment exercises, etc.	15.1	8.3	11.5	12.4
Peers or supervisors	10.9	8.4	5.8	8.7

Table 4

Publishing Advice

NES	MCR	SR	All
(Frequency of mention (%) – open-ended questions; items received 10 of mentions or more)			
Collaborate with others (58.5)	Collaborate with others (55.1)	Collaborate with others (44.6)	Collaborate with others (52.7)
Journal selection (41.5)	Journal selection (37.8)	Topic choice (33.8)	Journal selection (37.6)
Seek feedback (28.7)	Project/time management (37.8)	Journal selection (32.4)	Topic choice (26.8)
Topic choice (26.6)	Contribute to the field / do innovative research (29.7)	Contribute to the field / do innovative research (31.1)	Well-written – clarity, readability (24.9)
Well-written – clarity, readability (22.3)	Persevere (27.0)	Well-written – clarity, readability (28.4)	Contribute to the field / do innovative research (24.4)
Depth of paper – conceptually, current, methodologically (21.3)	Respond to reviewer comments (27.0)	High quality research (17.6)	Seek feedback (21.0)
Persevere (18.1)	Seek feedback (24.3)	Persevere (17.6)	Persevere (19.5)
Gift or guest authors (17.6)	Well-written – clarity, readability (24.3)	Edit before submission (14.9)	Project/time management (15.6)
		Pursue other outlets (conferences, book chapters and non T&H journals) (13.5)	
Contribute to the field / do innovative research (17.6)	Research design/method (18.9)	Research design/method (12.8)	Respond to reviewer comments (15.1)
Respond to reviewer comments (13.8)	Edit before submission (13.5)	Respond to reviewer comments (10.8)	Research design/method (14.1)
Research design/method (13.8)	Topic Choice (13.6)	Project/time management (10.8)	Depth of paper – conceptually, current, methodologically (12.7)
Project/time management (10.6)	Talk to editors / get to know editors (10.8)		Pursue other outlets (conferences, book chapters and non-T&H journals) (10.2)

Table 5

Career and Life Advice

NES	MCR	SR	All
(Frequency of mention (%) – open ended question; items received 10 of mentions or more)			

Collaborate / find a mentor (64.1)	Collaborate / find a mentor (65.7)	Collaborate / find a mentor (59.7)	Collaborate / find a mentor (62.9)
Personal qualities (such as persevere, confidence) (43.7)	Skills upgrading (40.0)	Work life balance (51.4)	Work life balance (38.1)
Define career goals (41.7)	Work life balance (37.1)	Commitment to excellence (33.3)	Define career goals (36.1)
Publish frequently (32.0)	Publish frequently (31.4)	Define career goals (31.9)	Personal qualities (such as perseverance, confidence) (34.3)
Passion (30.1)	Passion (31.4)	Passion (30.6)	Passion (30.5)
Work life balance (29.1)	Define career goals (28.6)	Work hard (27.8)	Publish frequently (28.1)
Work hard (20.4)	Personal qualities (such as persevere, confidence) (25.7)	Personal qualities (such as persevere, confidence) (25.0)	Work hard (23.2)
Ethical behaviour (18.4)	Work hard (22.9)	Ethical behaviour (25.0)	Ethical behaviour (19.0)
Focus (general) (16.5)	Research over teaching (20.0)	Publish frequently (20.8)	Skills upgrading / updating (18.1)
Skills upgrading (13.6)	Commitment to excellence (14.3)	Skills upgrading (13.9)	Commitment to excellence (17.6)
Teaching and research balance (13.6)	Teaching and research balance (11.4)	Teaching and research balance (12.5)	Focus (13.3)
Work habits (10.7)	Life advice (often negative) (11.4)	Focus (12.5)	Balance teaching and research (12.9)
			Focus on research (over teaching) (11.0)