Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research

http://jht.sagepub.com/

An Analysis of Academic Leadership in Hospitality and Tourism Journals

Rob Law, Rosanna Leung and Dimitrios Buhalis

Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research 2010 34: 455 originally published online 23 July 2010
DOI: 10.1177/1096348010370866

The online version of this article can be found at:
http://jht.sagepub.com/content/34/4/455

Published by:
SAGE
http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:
International Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education

AN ANALYSIS OF ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP IN HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM JOURNALS

Rob Law
Rosanna Leung
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong SAR
Dimitrios Buhalis
Bournemouth University, Dorset, UK

Despite the wide recognition of the importance of research in the academic community, the existing hospitality and tourism literature contains no published articles on the academic leadership of editors, associate editors, and editorial board members. This article presents the findings of a study that analyzed regional and institutional contributions to major research journals in the hospitality and tourism field. The empirical findings show that North America, and in particular the United States, has the largest regional and national share of editors, associate editors, and editorial board members, demonstrating the country's clear academic leadership. When individual institutes are considered, it is evident that very few universities in the world can demonstrate leadership and that those that do are naturally universities that have a major specialization in tourism and hospitality.

KEYWORDS: journal; academic leadership; editor; associate editor; editorial board member

INTRODUCTION

The existing hospitality and tourism literature contains a plethora of publications that emphasize the importance of academic research (McKercher, 2008; Ryan, 2005; Schmidgall & Woods, 1997/1998; Sheldon & Collison, 1990). Hospitality and tourism scholars conduct research for professional development,

Authors' Note: The authors would like to thank the three anonymous reviewers for offering constructive comments on the earlier versions of this article. In addition, Mr. Cowoo Chen's assistance with the data collection is acknowledged. The study was partly supported by a research grant from The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, Vol. 34, No. 4, November 2010, 455-477
DOI: 10.1177/1096348010370866

to share research output, to meet job requirements, and at times for direct financial gain (Law & Chon, 2007).

Good performance in research is often determined by quality rather than quantity (Jogaratnam, Chon, McCleary, Mena, & Yoo, 2005; Powers, Swan, Bos, & Patton, 1998). An intrinsic problem with academic quality is the difficulty in measuring it objectively. Kaufman (1984) argued that it is necessary to use one or more indicators of quality, such as the publications of faculty members and students, the starting salaries of graduates, and ranking by peers. Jauch and Glueck (1975) further stated that research performance should comprise multiple dimensions, such as publication productivity measures, qualitative indices of publications and the success rate of grant proposals, eminence measures for serving on journal boards, honors and awards, and peer or self-evaluation. Other researchers have made a similar claim that different criteria should be used to measure research performance (Inkpen & Beamish, 1994; Law & Chon, 2007; McKercher, 2008; Schmidgall, Woods, & Hardigree, 2007). Some of the suggested criteria for quality research include publication in refereed journals, books, and book chapters; a strong research impact as measured by the number of citations received; the training of young scholars; and being active in the academic community, such as through membership of editorial boards (EBs) and program committees or conference organization.

Academic leadership is one of the key factors that contribute to knowledge development. Zhao and Ritchie (2007, p. 487) defined leadership in academic tourism research as the "superior capability of tourism scholars to communicate their research works in accredited tourism journals," but their evaluation was based solely on eight selected tourism journals, and their results are thus limited in scope, if not actually biased.

This study focused on a different aspect of academic quality, namely, the demonstration of academic leadership through involvement in hospitality and tourism journals. Academic leaders in this sense broadly include the chief editors (hereafter known as editors), associate editors, and editorial board (EB) members of hospitality and tourism journals. Academic leadership in the research process is operationalized as the representation of academic leaders in the editorial staff of tourism and hospitality journals. The contributions that are made by such academic leaders are generally known, but the issue has been largely overlooked by hospitality and tourism researchers.

Using academic leadership in research journals as a proxy for quality research is supported by several previous studies. For instance, Gibbons (1990) stated that EB membership can serve as an indicator of quality, as EB members can influence the decision to accept or reject a manuscript. More important, EB members are selected because they are well known and knowledgeable in their research areas and have gained the respect of their peers. Similarly, both Chan and Fok (2003) and Mittermaier (1991) highlighted that manuscripts authored by researchers are assessed for publication suitability by editors and EB members, who are scholars trusted by their peers to make the journals successful. As such, the appointment of editors and EB membership is an honor that indicates

an expert's standing in an academic discipline (Kaufman, 1984). As the names and affiliated universities of the editor and EB members are prominently shown in each issue of a journal, they provide continuous exposure for the universities involved, and as the researchers appointed to editorial positions are held in high recognition, their affiliated universities also receive credit. Arguably, analyzing universities or geographical regions in terms of the number of editorships and EB memberships held by their members or residents serves as a proxy for the influence of those universities or regions on knowledge development. The more faculty members there are in a university who serve as academic leaders in journals, the greater the perceived academic leadership of that university is. This statement is based on the principle that a high-quality research process on the part of academic leaders generates high-quality research output. Furthermore, faculty members who are recognized as leaders in their field through appointments to EBs are more likely to demonstrate leadership in their home institutions and lead significant research efforts.

Motivated by the importance of academic leadership in research journals and the very limited number of previous studies on the issue in the hospitality and tourism field, this study made an attempt to analyze the institutional and regional distributions of academic leadership in hospitality and tourism journals. In a previous study in 2002, Mason and Cameron (2006) identified the number of EB members in 20 hospitality journals. Although their study is of limited use, because only hospitality journals were included, it appears to be the only study in the literature to analyze EB membership in the hospitality field.

With its novel approach, this study should therefore offer new information to hospitality and tourism researchers, educators, and postgraduate students to help them understand the distribution of journal editors, associate editors, and EB members. This may influence individual researchers, and especially junior researchers, in deciding which universities to join (or collaborate with) for their doctoral studies, future research, and career development. University senior executives can also use the findings to better determine the research performance of individual staff members and departments.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research Performance Evaluation

Both the general literature and the hospitality and tourism literature in particular contain a large number of published articles that examine the issue of research performance and scientific impact. Broadly speaking, the most common ways of measuring research performance are to count published articles by individual scholars (Morrison & Inkpen, 1991; Ryan, 2005; Zhao & Ritchie, 2007) and institutions (Jogaratnam, Chon, et al., 2005; Jogaratnam, McCleary, Mena, & Yoo, 2005; Mason & Cameron, 2006; Malhotra & Kher, 1996) or citation counts for individuals (Chandy & Williams, 1994; McKercher, 2008; Schmidgall et al., 2007; Schmidgall & Woods, 1997/1998). Often, these counts are based on publications in selected output channels. Collison and Sheldon

(1991) found that research activity in tourism and hospitality mainly comprised publications in academic journals, trade journals, and conference proceedings.

Counting publications generated by a university department may not be a proper indicator, because the numbers can easily be manipulated. For instance, the 5th-ranked institute based on number of occurrences in a list of 22 universities can also be interpreted as the 15th ranked based on research productivity (Jogaratnam, McCleary, et al., 2005). This approach is clearly subject to methodological bias, yet most research performance assessment systems are still largely output oriented (Law & Chon, 2007). For example, the research assessment exercise, or any similar system, that is currently used in many countries is almost completely output oriented. Page (2003) argued that such systems discourage collaboration and teamwork by researchers within the same department, and Geuna and Martin (2003) stated that counting publications promotes publication inflation because researchers may publish for the sake of publishing, rather than for knowledge development. The major advantage of counting publications, however, is that this method offers strong incentive to improve individual and institutional performance and offers an objective way of calculating output.

Counting the number of citations is sometimes used as an alternative means of research performance evaluation but is similarly subject to problems. Law and van der Veen (2008) stated the problems of citation counts to be that they are disadvantageous to specialized journals, the number of citations may be increased by self-citation, and the citations may be criticism of the poor quality of the cited articles. Furthermore, citation counts can also be artificially increased by "friends" citing each others' articles. As such, large numbers of citations do not necessarily signal a good-quality article, merely that the author or authors are well known in the scientific community. A further problem is that citations outside of the journals researched are not counted, which may change the distribution of the citation count.

A holistic and commonly agreeable way of assessing research impact performance is needed. Counting publications or citations in selected channels is subject to narrow definition, if not misleading. Many scholars who do not appear in the list of research "stars" have contributed to research development in other ways. For example, serving as an academic leader for a research journal may require a similar or greater amount of effort and time than writing a journal article.

Journal Editors, Associate Editors, and Editorial Board Members

Journal editors are ultimately responsible for the content of their journals and strategic and operational planning (Ray, 2002). Based on the findings of a survey of 88 editors of 90 nursing journals, Kearney and Freda (2006) found that the most important aspects of the editor's role are to maintain scientific and editorial quality and provide vision and direction. The study further revealed that the major benefits of serving as an editor are helping young researchers to become authors and influencing knowledge and practice in one's domain. In contrast, the worst aspects are the large time demand and the shortage of good writing. Balster

(2005) stated that the goal of moving the profession forward through mentoring perfectly matches the principle of leadership. Editors also need to provide managerial and mechanical services, such as contacting knowledgeable reviewers, respecting their advice, helping authors address the concerns of reviewers, and maintaining confidentiality. As the financial incentives are often minimal, the rewards for journal editors come mainly from leading the world of scholarly authorship and influencing the discipline in a constructive way. However, editors also experience stress because of time pressures, the editorial burden of weak manuscripts from contributors, and unpleasant interpersonal communications with authors and reviewers. To summarize, editorship indicates that a scholar has chosen to take on leadership responsibilities, such as setting a direction, goals, standards and ensuring that the quality of a journal is at the appropriate level, for the benefit of the profession, rather than to enhance their personal reputation or for financial reward (McFadden & Souba, 2008; Ray, 2002).

Some of the functions of the editor can be shared by associate editors or editorial assistants. Depending on the journal, these functions may be spread around the EB or kept centralized with the editor. Many research journals have a few associate editors who are senior members of the editorial team, and although the position can be given different names, in general, an associate editor assists the editor directly in managing the journal in a specific discipline or in certain geographical regions that the journal covers (Baron, 2007). In many cases, associate editors provide advisory recommendations for the journal's strategic development and also serve as reviewers, sometimes even being responsible for special issues or sections of the journal.

In addition to associate editors, editors often rely on EB members, and at times other reviewers, to evaluate the appropriateness and scientific quality of manuscripts (Ray, 2002). McFadden and Souba (2008) suggested that EB membership initially lasts for 3 years, with the possibility of extension for a second term. However, in some journals EB membership is for life. In others, EB members take turns to perform the role of editor. EB members regularly review manuscripts in their areas of expertise for adequacy, relevance, and accuracy and then make recommendations to the editor about the manuscripts. EB members may also make suggestions for improving a journal's strategic direction, operational management, and promotion. As the position is perceived to be important, studies have analyzed EB membership representation in statistics journals (Gibbons, 1990), finance journals (Chan & Fok, 2003; Kaufman, 1984), international business journals (Chan, Fung, & Lai, 2005), accounting journals (Mittermaier, 1991), marketing journals (Hult, Neese, & Bashaw, 1997), and economics journals (Gibbons & Fish, 1991).

In the specific context of hospitality and tourism, Law (2008) argued that the quality and reputation of a journal largely relies on the EB members, as experts in the field, evaluating the suitability of manuscripts for the journal. Reviewers voluntarily use their valuable time to read and evaluate manuscripts carefully and provide suggestions for their improvement. Law and Chon (2007) found that the heads of university hospitality and tourism departments consider serving

as chief editors to be an important research activity and that serving as EB members is held to be somewhat important for faculty appointments and promotions. They argued that senior university executives are likely to share this view.

In summary, the literature in general, and the hospitality and tourism literature in particular, offers different ways of measuring research performance. The limitations of each of these methods, along with the general agreement on the importance of holistically examining research activities and the importance of journal editors, associate editors, and EB members, strongly indicate the need to develop new approaches to research evaluation. In response to this pressing need, this study investigated academic leadership in hospitality and tourism journals, operationalized as the representation of editors, associate editors, and EB members.

METHOD AND FINDINGS

This study used an objective counting technique based on publicly available information about the leaders of hospitality and tourism journals. Unfortunately, a complete list of hospitality and tourism journals and their EB members does not seem to exist. This may be because the publications in this field have undergone many changes, including name changes, the phasing out of "unpopular" journals, and the addition of new journals. In 2004, McKercher, Law, and Lam (2006) conducted a global survey of 40 tourism journals and 30 hospitality journals. Some of the included journals had an extremely low awareness rate, which was quantified as the percentage of respondents who were aware of a specific journal. For instance, only 8.9% and 6.8% of worldwide researchers were aware of *Problems of Tourism* and *Journal of Nutrition for the Elderly*. Clearly, some journals have a minimal influence on the international academic community. Additionally, quite a few journals have changed name and editor or EB members since their study. It was therefore necessary to use an updated list of major hospitality and tourism journals for the analysis.

The journals used in this study were adopted from the list published in the *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education* in 2007 by Arendt, Ravichandran, and Brown (2007). This is seemingly the most comprehensive list of journals to date. All but two of the journals listed by Arendt et al. (2007) were included in this study. These two journals, *Consortium Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management* and *Journal of Foodservice Management and Education*, were excluded because no information about them could be found on the Internet, and they are not included in the study of McKercher et al. (2006). It was presumed that their exclusion would not have a major impact on the findings. Table 1 presents the names of the 57 journals included for analysis in this study.

The data on journal leadership were collected between March and May 2008, and the data set was updated in September 2008. With the help of a research assistant, the authors searched the Internet for information on the editors, associate editors, and EB members of the included journals. If information for a journal was not available online, then the authors checked the latest issues of the

Table 1
Journals Included in This Study (in Alphabetic Order of Journal Names)

1. *Acta Turistica*
2. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*
3. *Annals of Tourism Research*
4. *ASEAN Journal on Hospitality & Tourism*
5. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*
6. *China Tourism Research*
7. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*
8. *Current Issues In Tourism*
9. *European Journal of Tourism Research*
10. *Event Management*
11. *FIU Hospitality Review*
12. *Information Technology & Tourism*
13. *Information Technology in Hospitality*
14. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*
15. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*
16. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*
17. *International Journal of Tourism Research*
18. *International Travel Law Journal*
19. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*
20. *Journal of Ecotourism*
21. *Journal of Foodservice*
22. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*
23. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*
24. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*
25. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*
26. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management*
27. *Journal of Hospitality & Marketing Management*
28. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sports & Tourism Education*
29. *Journal of Hospitality, Tourism, Leisure Science*
30. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*
31. *Journal of Leisure Research*
32. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*
33. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*
34. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*
35. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*
36. *Journal of Tourism & Cultural Change*
37. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*
38. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Research*
39. *Journal of Travel Research*
40. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*
41. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality & Tourism*
42. *The Journal of Hospitality Financial Management*
43. *Tourism Analysis*
44. *Tourism & Hospitality Research*
45. *Tourism & Hospitality: Planning and Development*
46. *Tourism Culture & Communication*
47. *Tourism Economics*
48. *Tourism Geographies*
49. *Tourism in Marine Environments*

(continued)

Table 1 (continued)

50. *Tourism Management*
51. *Tourism Recreation Research*
52. *Tourism Review*
53. *Tourism Review International*
54. *Tourism Today*
55. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*
56. *Tourist Studies*
57. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*

Note: Journals excluded: *Consortium Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management* and *Journal of Foodservice Management & Education*.

printed copy of the journal through different sources. It is possible that some of the journals' Web sites are not updated regularly, and thus the information available may not have been the most up-to-date.

During the data collection stage, the journals were found to use a wide variety of titles for editors, associate editors, and EB members. Table 2 presents the groupings of the terms used for titles of these three types of journal leaders.

Table 3 illustrates the regional distribution of editors, associate editors, and EB members in individual countries and special administrative regions.

Table 3 shows the number of occurrences (O) and individual scholars (I) affiliated with different journals. It is possible for a journal to have two editors (e.g., the *International Journal of Tourism Research*), and equally one person may serve as the editor for more than one journal (e.g., Dr. Kaye Chon of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University). The same principles apply to associate editors and EB members.

Table 3 shows that the United States led with 749 occurrences and 433 individuals of journal leadership. The United Kingdom ranked second with 297 occurrences and 191 individuals. Australia, Hong Kong, Canada, New Zealand, Turkey, and the Netherlands ranked from third to eighth in terms of occurrences. With their many research institutes, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia were, unsurprisingly, the leading countries for academic leadership in hospitality and tourism journals. More surprisingly, Hong Kong, as a special administrative region of China and with only several universities, ranked fourth. Fifteen influential individual scholars were identified, each of whom served on at least 10 journals. Among these 15 scholars, 4 were affiliated with The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

In terms of the regional distribution of journal leaders, North America (O = 41.39% of the total) and Europe (O = 32.77%), being the traditional regions for research and knowledge development, had the highest number of occurrences and individuals. This was followed by Asia (O = 11.93%) and Australia and New Zealand (O = 11.44%). These rankings are similar to those in a study counting authorship in leading tourism journals (Jogaratnam, Chon, et al., 2005).

The 50 leading universities worldwide with the most number of leaders in hospitality and tourism journals are listed in Table 4. In terms of the total number

Table 2
Title Groupings

Grouping	Title	
Editor[a]	Chair of the Editorial Board	Chief Editor
	Chief Editor and Founding Editor	Coeditor
	Editor	Editor-in-Chief
	Editors-in-Chief	Executive Editor
	Executive Editor/Editor-in-Chief	Journal Editor
Associate Editor[b]	Advisory Editor	Assistant Editor
	Associate and Reviews Editor	Associate Editor
	Associate Editor—Education	Associate Editor—Conventions, Meetings
	Associate Editor—Food and Beverage	Associate Editor—Leisure, Recreation and Sports
	Associate Editor—Lodging	Associate Editor—North America
	Associate Editor—Tourism	Associate Editor for Asia-Pacific
	Associate Editor for Europe	Associate Editor for Mediterranean, Middle East and Africa
	Associate Editor—Anthropology	Associate Editor—Economics and Management
	Associate Editor—Geography	Associate Editor—History
	Associate Editor—Hospitality	Associate Editor—Leisure/ Recreation
	Associate Editor—Political Science	Associate Editor—Psychology
	Associate Editor—Regional Planning	Associate Editor—Sociology
	Book Review Editor	CAUTHE Representative
	Calendar and Index Editor	Commentary Editor
	Commentary/Research Notes Editor	Consulting Editor
	Consulting Editor-in-Chief	Contributing Editor
	Critical Reviews Editor	Deputy Editor
	Division Editor	Editor Emeritus
	Editorial Advisory Board[c]	Emeritus Resource Editor
	Founder	Field Editor
	Founding Editor and Consulting Editor	Founding Editor
	Hon. Editor-in-chief	HLST Network Representative
	Hospitality Subject Editor	Hospitality Editor
	Internet Editor	Industry Editor
	Literature Review Editor	Leisure Subject Editor
	Operational Editor	Managing Editor
	Publication Editor	Practice Section Editor
	Regional Editor	Publisher
	Regional Editor—Americas and Europe	Regional Editor—Africa and Middle East
	Regional Editor—Australia and Asia	Regional Editor—Asia Pacific

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Grouping	Title	
	Regional Editor—China	Regional Editor—Central and Eastern Europe
	Regional Editor—Western Europe	Regional Editor—North America
	Research Notes Editor	Report Editor
	Reviews Editor	Resource Reviews Editor
	Special Adviser	Senior Editor of Industry Practices
	Tourism Editor	Sport Subject Editor
Editorial Board Members	Academic Members	Advisory Board
	Advisory Committee	Board Members
	Editorial Advisory Board	Editorial Board
	Editorial Committee	Editorial Policy Board
	Editorial Review Board	Executive Advisory Committee
	Industry Members	International Editorial Board
	Resource Editors	Review Board

a. The executive editor of *Tourism Recreation Research* is classified as an associate editor because the journal already has a chief editor.
b. The associate editors of the *Journal of Leisure Research* and the consulting editors of the *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education* are classed as editorial board members because neither journal has editorial board members, but both have many associate editors and consulting editors.
c. *Tourism Review* has both an Editorial Advisory Board and an Editorial Review Board.

of occurrences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University ranked first, followed by the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, and then the University of Surrey in the United Kingdom. Purdue University and the University of Central Florida ranked equal fourth. Pennsylvania State University was sixth on the list, and Michigan State University and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University ranked joint seventh.

Data on the number of full-time faculty members in the tourism and hospitality management programs of the universities (see Table 4) were collected from the Internet in November 2008 to establish a productivity index. For consistency, only full-time faculty members at the rank of lecturer or above were included. Junior academic staff members, such as instructors or tutors, were excluded because they are primarily teaching oriented. Additionally, adjunct or visiting faculty members were not counted, as they are committed to other institutes or organizations. As shown in Table 4, the University of Calgary ranked first in terms of productivity rating. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University and the University of Waikato were second. Other institutes with a productivity rating of at least 2.00 were Washington State University, University of Surrey, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and James Cook University. Using a productivity rating to determine academic leadership, however, may not

Table 3
List of Countries (in Descending Order of Occurrences)

Region	Country/Special Administrative Region	Chief Editors (O/I)	Associate Editors (O/I)	Editorial Board (O/I)	Total (O/I)
Asia	Hong Kong	4/3	9/4	80/29	93/29
	Mainland China	0/0	4/3	26/22	30/24
	South Korea	0/0	2/2	21/16	23/17
	Israel	0/0	2/2	21/11	23/11
	Singapore	0/0	2/2	11/9	13/10
	Indonesia	1/1	0/0	9/9	10/10
	Japan	0/0	1/1	9/8	10/8
	India	1/1	0/0	9/5	10/5
	Taiwan	0/0	0/0	9/8	9/8
	Thailand	0/0	0/0	6/6	6/6
	United Arab Emirates	0/0	0/0	4/4	4/4
	Malaysia	0/0	0/0	3/3	3/3
	Macau	0/0	0/0	2/2	2/2
	Sultanate of Oman	0/0	1/1	0/0	1/1
	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Iran	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Lebanon	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Philippines	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Subtotal	6/5	21/15	214/126	241/142
	Percentage of grand total				11.93/11.55
Australia and New Zealand	Australia	6/6	13/11	157/78	176/86
	New Zealand	4/4	8/7	43/19	55/21
	Subtotal	10/10	21/18	200/97	231/107
	Percentage of grand total				11.44/8.71

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Region	Country/Special Administrative Region	Chief Editors (O/I)	Associate Editors (O/I)	Editorial Board (O/I)	Total (O/I)
Europe	United Kingdom	18/17	36/35	242/168	296/192
	Turkey	2/2	0/0	38/27	40/27
	Netherlands	0/0	1/1	34/22	35/22
	Croatia	1/1	1/1	32/31	34/32
	Austria	1/1	5/3	25/14	31/15
	Norway	2/2	4/4	18/18	24/22
	Greece	0/0	1/1	23/9	24/9
	France	0/0	3/3	18/12	21/14
	Germany	0/0	4/4	16/14	20/18
	Switzerland	2/2	1/1	15/12	18/14
	Spain	0/0	1/1	16/12	17/13
	Sweden	0/0	3/3	11/9	14/11
	Finland	0/0	6/6	4/4	10/8
	Cyprus	1/1	2/2	6/6	9/8
	Italy	0/0	0/0	9/8	9/8
	Bulgaria	1/1	2/2	5/5	8/7
	Denmark	0/0	3/3	4/4	7/7
	Belgium	0/0	3/3	4/3	7/5
	Poland	0/0	0/0	7/4	7/4
	Ireland	0/0	0/0	6/6	6/6
	Portugal	0/0	1/1	5/2	6/3
	Slovenia	0/0	0/0	6/3	6/3
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0/0	0/0	2/2	2/2
	Hungary	0/0	0/0	2/2	2/2
	Macedonia	0/0	0/0	2/1	2/1
	Slovakia	0/0	0/0	2/1	2/1
	Russia	0/0	1/1	0/0	1/1

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Region	Country/Special Administrative Region	Chief Editors (O/I)	Associate Editors (O/I)	Editorial Board (O/I)	Total (O/I)
	Bratislava	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Czech Republic	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Iceland	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Lithuania	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Subtotal	28/27	78/75	556/403	662/459
	Percentage of grand total				32.77/37.35
North America	United States	27/27	54/49	672/395	753/433
	Canada	1/1	9/8	73/41	83/44
	Subtotal	28/28	63/57	745/436	836/477
	Percentage of grand total				41.39/38.81
Other	Not stated	0/0	9/9	8/8	17/17
	South Africa	0/0	2/2	8/6	10/7
	Brazil	0/0	0/0	6/6	6/6
	Argentina	0/0	1/1	3/3	4/3
	Barbados	0/0	0/0	2/2	2/2
	Egypt	0/0	1/1	1/1	2/1
	Fiji Islands	0/0	1/1	1/1	2/1
	Jamaica	0/0	0/0	2/2	2/2
	Ecuador	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Free State	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Kenya	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Mauritius	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Trinidad and Tobago	0/0	0/0	1/1	1/1
	Subtotal	0/0	14/14	36/34	50/44
	Percentage of grand total				2.47/3.58
	Grand total	72/69	197/178	1751/1096	2020/1229
	Percentage of grand total				100

Note: O = Number of occurrences; I = number of individuals.

Table 4
Top 50 Universities by Number of Total Occurrences

Rank	University	Chief Editors (O/I)	Associate Editors (O/I)	Editorial Board (O/I)	Total (O/I)	No. of RoA	Productivity Rating[a]
1	The Hong Kong Polytechnic University	4/3	9/4	69/19	82/19	39	2.13
2	University of Nevada at Las Vegas	3/3	7/6	46/27	56/30	56	1.00
3	University of Surrey	2/1	7/7	26/13	35/15	17	2.06
4	Purdue University	1/1	2/1	29/13	32/13	17	1.88
4	University of Central Florida	2/2	1/1	31/10	32/10	37	0.86
6	Pennsylvania State University	3/3	1/1	25/15	29/17	19	1.53
7	Michigan State University	0/0	2/1	22/10	24/11	13	1.85
7	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	1/1	0/0	23/11	24/11	12	2.00
9	Bournemouth University	3/3	2/2	18/9	23/10	61	0.38
9	University of South Carolina	1/1	3/3	19/9	23/12	12	1.92
11	Cornell University	2/2	0/0	20/15	22/15	57	0.39
11	University of Strathclyde	0/0	1/1	21/8	22/8	13	1.69
13	Victoria University	2/2	5/3	14/5	21/6	29	0.72
13	Washington State University	1/1	1/1	19/8	21/9	10	2.10
15	James Cook University	0/0	1/1	19/7	20/7	10	2.00
15	University of Calgary	0/0	1/1	19/3	20/3	5	4.00
17	Griffith University	0/0	2/2	17/10	19/11	36	0.53
17	Temple University	1/1	3/3	15/4	19/5	16	1.19
17	University of the Aegean	0/0	1/1	18/5	19/5	21	0.90
17	University of Waterloo	0/0	3/2	16/7	19/7	37	0.51
21	Southern Cross University	1/1	1/1	16/7	18/9	28	0.64
21	Texas A&M University	0/0	0/0	18/9	18/9	28	0.64
23	Florida International University	1/1	3/3	13/10	17/13	22	0.77
23	University of Houston	0/0	0/0	17/8	17/8	30	0.57
23	University of Otago	1/1	4/4	12/7	17/8	12	1.42
23	University of Waikato	1/1	1/1	15/4	17/4	8	2.13
27	University of Illinois	1/1	0/0	15/11	16/12	18	0.89

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

Rank	University	Chief Editors (O/I)	Associate Editors (O/I)	Editorial Board (O/I)	Total (O/I)	No. of RoA	Productivity Rating[a]
28	La Trobe University	1/1	0/0	14/7	15/7	23	0.65
28	Northern Arizona University	1/1	4/4	10/5	15/9	17	0.88
28	Sheffield Hallam University	2/2	0/0	13/7	15/7	15	1.00
28	University of Delaware	1/1	2/1	12/6	15/7	14	1.07
28	University of Queensland	1/1	1/1	13/5	15/6	18	0.83
33	Leeds Metropolitan University	1/1	4/4	8/7	13/10	10	1.30
33	University of New South Wales	0/0	2/2	11/2	13/3	30	0.43
33	University of Wisconsin	0/0	2/1	11/4	13/4	16	0.81
36	Oklahoma State University	1/1	0/0	11/5	12/5	10	1.30
36	University of Massachusetts	3/3	0/0	9/6	12/7	13	0.92
36	Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration	0/0	2/1	10/3	12/3	10	1.20
39	Arizona State University	0/0	0/0	11/7	11/7	19	0.58
39	Oxford Brookes University	0/0	0/0	11/7	11/7	30	0.37
39	University of Minnesota	0/0	2/1	9/2	11/2	37	0.30
42	Ben-Gurion University of the Negev	0/0	1/1	9/5	10/5	7	1.43
42	Brock University	1/1	0/2	7/5	10/6	12	0.83
42	Florida State University	0/0	0/0	10/6	10/6	8	1.25
42	London Metropolitan University	0/0	3/3	7/6	10/6	13	0.77
42	Ohio State University	0/0	1/1	9/4	10/4	27	0.37
42	University of Innsbruck	0/0	2/1	8/5	10/5	8	1.25
48	Brigham Young University	1/1	1/1	7/3	9/4	11	0.82
48	Erasmus University	0/0	0/0	9/6	9/6	7	1.29
48	Monash University	0/0	0/0	9/4	9/4	18	0.50

Note: O = number of occurrences; I = number of individuals; RoA = research-oriented academics, which includes all faculty members at the level of lecturer or above.
a. Productivity rating = Total number of occurrences/number of full-time research-oriented academics.

be as representative as using the total occurrences of editorial membership because some universities hire many part-time staff to teach classes, leaving senior academics, who are often the more experienced researchers, to concentrate on research activities.

The dominant countries among the top 50 universities in Table 4 were the United States, with 24 (48%) universities; Australia, with 8 (16%) universities; and the United Kingdom, with 7 (14%) universities. These countries are thus the most influential in hospitality and tourism journals. The other countries in Table 4 are Canada, with three universities; New Zealand and Austria, with two universities each; and Hong Kong, Greece, the Netherlands, and Israel, with one university each. The disproportionately large share of leaders in the United States is probably because of the large number of hospitality and tourism programs in the country and the consequently larger number of faculty members and senior researchers publishing in the journals.

As previously stated, several studies have been carried out recently on research contributions. In a study examining institutional contributors to three tourism journals between 1992 and 2001, Jogaratnam, Chon, et al. (2005) identified the world's top 20 universities in terms of repeat contributions by authors. In a similar study that examined institutional contributors to 11 hospitality and tourism journals between 1992 and 2001 (Jogaratnam, McCleary, et al., 2005), the authors listed the 22 universities with the most publications. Similarly, Zhao and Ritchie (2007) analyzed the most prolific researchers in eight tourism journals in 1985 to 2004, and identified 11 employers of leading scholars. Finally, Mason and Cameron (2006) analyzed the institutional contributions in terms of research output and EB membership of 20 hospitality journals in 2002 and listed the top 20 universities with the most publications and the 23 universities with five or more EB members. Apparently, there is a strong correlation between academic leadership in research journals and research output, which is confirmed by the fact that most of the leading eight universities in Table 4 also appear in these related studies. Specifically, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, the University of Surrey, the University of Central Florida, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University featured on all the lists of leading institutions in these previous studies. The University of Nevada at Las Vegas, Purdue University, and Pennsylvania State University were in all of the lists except that from the study of Zhao and Ritchie (2007). Michigan State University featured on the lists of Jogaratnam, McCleary, et al. (2005) and Mason and Cameron (2006). Table 5 summarizes the relationship between these related studies.

Table 6 lists the universities with chief editors. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University took the lead, with Bournemouth University, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Massachusetts, and the University of Nevada at Las Vegas ranked equal second. Five other universities had two occurrences each and were ranked fifth. These 10 universities also featured on the list of the top 50 universities in journal leadership (Table 4). Forty-six other universities had one chief editor each.

Table 5
Comparison of Ranking Among Studies

University	This Study	Jogaratnam, Chon, McCleary, Mena, and Yoo (2005)[a]	Jogaratnam, McCleary, Mena, and Yoo (2005)[b]	Zhao and Ritchie (2007)[c]	Mason and Cameron (2006)[d]
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University	1	√	4	4	2
University of Neveda at Las Vegas	2	√	5		3
University of Surrey	3	√	9	2	14
Purdue University	4	√	7		5
University of Central Florida	4	√	8	9	11
Pennsylvania State University	6	√	6		4
Michigan State University	7		2		13
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	7	√	3	8	6

a. Based on a list (in no particular order) of repeat contributions by authors at the top 20 universities between 1992 and 2001.
b. According to a list, ranked by instances, of the 22 leading universities in research contributions between 1992 and 2001.
c. According to a list, ranked by number of authors, of the leading employers of leading authors between 1985 and 2004.
d. Based on a list of the top 20 universities, ranked by output scores, in 2002.

DISCUSSION

Academic leaders who serve as journal editors, associate editors, and EB members are a valuable asset to their employers. These scholars contribute strongly to their universities through their active involvement in leadership and their commitment to establishing first-class research programs. More important, as journal leaders they ensure that the quality of publications matches, if not exceeds, the stipulated standard, which is often equivalent to that of other academic disciplines, thus contributing to the maturity of knowledge development in their field.

Publications in research journals need an extensive amount of work by authors in terms of conducting the research and writing the manuscripts. It is generally agreed that publications in research journals are significant contributions to knowledge development (Law, 2008). The anonymous reviewing system that is used by journals serves as an instrument for quality control, and it is only through the unselfish contributions of editors, associate editors, and EB

Table 6
Universities With Chief Editors (in Descending Order of Occurrences)

Rank	University/Affiliation	Chief Editors (O/I)
1	The Hong Kong Polytechnic University	4/3
2	Bournemouth University	3/3
2	Pennsylvania State University	3/3
2	University of Massachusetts	3/3
2	University of Nevada at Las Vegas	3/3
6	Cornell University	2/2
6	Sheffield Hallam University	2/2
6	University of Central Florida	2/2
6	University of Surrey	2/1
6	Victoria University	2/2
11	International Association of Scientific Experts in Tourism	1/1
11	Anadolu University	1/1
11	Aut University	1/1
11	Brigham Young University	1/1
11	Brock University	1/1
11	Canterbury Christ Church University	1/1
11	Centre For Tourism Research and Development, India	1/1
11	Clemson University	1/1
11	College of Tourism and Hotel Management, Cyprus	1/1
11	Florida International University	1/1
11	Institut Teknologi Bandung	1/1
11	Institute of Transport Economics, Norway	1/1
11	International University College, Bulgaria	1/1
11	La Trobe University	1/1
11	Leeds Metropolitan University	1/1
11	Mugla University	1/1
11	Northern Arizona University	1/1
11	Northumbria University	1/1
11	Nova Southeastern University	1/1
11	Oklahoma State University	1/1
11	Purdue University	1/1
11	Queen Margaret University College	1/1
11	Southern Cross University	1/1
11	Stephen Mason Solicitors	1/1
11	Temple University	1/1
11	University of Brighton	1/1
11	University of Canterbury	1/1
11	University of Central Lancashire	1/1
11	University of Delaware	1/1
11	University of Durham	1/1
11	University of Glasgow	1/1
11	University of Illinois	1/1
11	University of Limerick	1/1
11	University of New Hampshire	1/1
11	University of Nottingham	1/1
11	University of Otago	1/1
11	University of Queensland	1/1

(continued)

Table 6 (continued)

Rank	University/Affiliation	Chief Editors (O/I)
11	University of South Carolina	1/1
11	University of St. Gallen	1/1
11	University of Stavanger	1/1
11	University of Tasmania	1/1
11	University of Waikato	1/1
11	University of Zagreb	1/1
11	Vienna University of Technology	1/1
11	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	1/1
11	Washington State University	1/1
		72/70

Note: O = number of occurrences; I = number of individuals.

members that journals can maintain a high standard of research excellence. This study demonstrates the nature of academic leadership in the specific field of hospitality and tourism from a new aspect, identifying the geographical regions and academic institutions around the world with the most academic leaders and with the greatest volume and highest quality of research in tourism and hospitality journals.

Governments and universities usually allocate their limited resources to identified niche programs with clear evidence of academic excellence. Scholarships at all levels can also be influenced by the research leadership that specific institutions can demonstrate. In this case, university hospitality and tourism programs with strong journal leadership serve that purpose. However, department heads and senior university executives should go beyond the traditional publication counting method to assess the research performance of their faculty members, as editorship and EB membership also contribute to the research quality of the faculty, department, and university. Industry practitioners can use the findings of this study to identify the institutes that are likely to create innovation through research leadership and subsequently provide sponsorship for these institutes to develop products or services that fit their businesses. Funding authorities in different regions can also use the findings when considering grant applications. Hence, although this study may not break any ground, it does contribute new knowledge to the existing literature. It adds to the existing research performance evaluation process, in particular in countries where nationwide research assessment exercises are conducted regularly, as it provides decision makers with additional information with which to make their assessments.

CONCLUSION

Summary and Limitations

Although the findings of this study regarding academic leadership in terms of editorship, associate editorship, and EB membership are interesting, careful interpretation is required, as other unobserved factors may have affected the

results. For instance, a university- or association-sponsored journal is likely to include its own members on the EB. Similarly, cross-journal EB membership may have affected the findings, as often a small group of well-known scholars serve as editors or EB members for multiple journals, which leads to higher rankings for certain universities in terms of editor and EB representation. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University is a typical example of a university with a "critical mass" of editors and EB members. The duration of editorship or EB membership may also have influenced the results. Different journals have different policies regarding the duration of editorship and EB membership, with some journals maintaining stable EBs and others changing board members on a regular basis. In addition, as academics are mobile and frequently change institutions, the current positions of institutes need to be reevaluated frequently.

Very often, journal editors invite reviewers who are knowledgeable in the field but who are not EB members to review manuscripts. These occasional (or ad hoc) reviewers also contribute significantly to the success of a research journal. However, their names are not always disclosed to the public and are not reflected in the results of this research. Nevertheless, the great efforts of these academics could and should be acknowledged.

The authors also acknowledge the limitations to the study posed by changing journal names, transitional periods (e.g., changing journal editors), the potential exclusion of newly appointed EB members and newly launched journals, and the difficulty in treating the included journals equally. Moreover, the updating frequency of the university Web sites could affect the results of this study.

Future Research

Recently published articles have indicated that hospitality and tourism journals meet a wide range of the criteria commonly used to evaluate quality based on both subjective evaluation by experts (McKercher et al., 2006) and objective evaluation based on citation counts (Law & van der Veen, 2008). As an example, most, if not all, researchers would agree that membership of the EB of a top journal, such as the *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, is more prestigious than EB membership of a lower quality journal. Future work should thus take the relative impact (or quality) of different journals into consideration in assessing journal leadership.

Different universities have different goals. This means that comparing research-oriented universities with teaching-oriented universities may undermine the contributions of teaching universities. In addition, some academic leaders who are affiliated with hospitality and tourism programs serve on research journals that were not included this study, which may have affected the academic leadership ranking. Moreover, not all universities focus on hospitality and tourism. Therefore this ranking and productivity rating might not entirely reflect the real situation. Future research should take these limitations into consideration in evaluating academic leadership.

Another future research avenue could be to identify the relationship among various research-related activities. For instance, a scientific model that measures the interrelationship among inputs, outputs, services, and supervision would surely be beneficial to academic researchers, university executives, official funding authorities, and postgraduate students. Such a model could also be used to inform the general public about the contributions that academics have made. After all, the major challenge for journal editors in the hospitality and tourism field is to achieve the same recognition for their journals in research assessments as is enjoyed by widely recognized journals in mainstream disciplines.

REFERENCES

Arendt, S. W., Ravichandran, S., & Brown, E. (2007). Hospitality and tourism journal matrix. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 19*, 44-50.

Balster, R. L. (2005). Editorial: Ian Stolerman service as editor for *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 78*, 111-112.

Baron, R. (2007). Editorial: Changes in the associate editors and editorial board of *Bone*. *Bone, 40*, 1189.

Chan, K. C., & Fok, R. C. W. (2003). Membership on editorial boards and finance department rankings. *Journal of Financial Research, XXVI*, 405-420.

Chan, K. C., Fung, H. G., & Lai, P. (2005). Membership of editorial boards and rankings of schools with international business orientation. *Journal of International Business Studies, 36*, 452-469.

Chandy, P. R., & Williams, T. G. E. (1994). The impact of journals and authors on international business research: A citational analysis of JIBS articles. *Journal of International Business Studies, 25*, 715-728.

Collison, F. M., & Sheldon, P. J. (1991). An empirical study of employment conditions for tourism and hospitality faculty. *Journal of Travel Research, 29*(4), 40-46.

Gibbons, J. D. (1990). U.S. institutional representation on editorial boards of U.S. statistics journals. *American Statistician, 44*, 210-213.

Gibbons, J. D., & Fish, M. (1991). Rankings of economics faculties and representation on editorial boards of top journals. *Journal of Economic Education, Fall*, 362-372.

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

Hult, G. T., Neese, W. T., & Bashaw, R. E. (1997). Faculty perceptions of marketing journals. *Journal of Marketing, Fall*, 37-52.

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, 25*, 703-713.

Jauch, L. R., & Glueck, W. F. (1975). Evaluation of university professors' research performance. *Management Science, 22*, 66-75.

Jogaratnam, G., Chon, K., McCleary, K., Mena, M., & Yoo, J. (2005). An analysis of institutional contributors to three major academic tourism journals: 1992-2001. *Tourism Management, 26*, 641-648.

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

Kaufman, G. G. (1984). Ranking of finance departments by faculty representation on editorial boards of professional journals: A note. *Journal of Finance, 39*, 1189-1197.
Kearney, M. H., & Freda, M. C. (2006). "Voice of the profession": Nurse editors as leaders. *Nursing Outlook, 54*, 263-267.
Law, R. (2008). Revising publishable journal articles. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism, 8*(4), 77-85.
Law, R., & Chon, K. (2007). Evaluating research performance in tourism and hospitality: The perspective of university program heads. *Tourism Management, 28*, 1203-1211.
Law, R., & van der Veen, R. (2008). The popularity of prestigious hospitality journals: A Google scholar approach. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 20*, 113-125.
Malhotra, M. K., & Kher, H. V. (1996). Institutional research productivity in production and operations management. *Journal of Operations Management, 14*, 55-77.
Mason, D. D. M., & Cameron, A. (2006). An analysis of refereed articles in hospitality and the role of editorial members. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 18*(1), 11-18.
McFadden, D., & Souba, W. W. (2008). Editorial: *The Journal of Surgical Research* editorial board—2008. *Journal of Surgical Research, 145*, 1-3.
McKercher, B. (2008). A citation analysis of tourism scholars. *Tourism Management, 29*, 1226-1232.
McKercher, B., Law, R., & Lam, T. (2006). Rating tourism and hospitality journals. *Tourism Management, 27*, 1235-1252.
Mittermaier, L. J. (1991). Representation on the editorial boards of academic accounting journals: An analysis of accounting faculties and doctoral programs. *Issues in Accounting Education, 6*, 221-238.
Morrison, A. J., & Inkpen, A. C. (1991). An analysis of significant contributions to the international business literature. *Journal of International Business Studies, 22*, 143-153.
Page, S. (2003). Evaluating research performance in tourism: The UK experience. *Tourism Management, 24*, 607-622.
Powers, T. L., Swan, J. E., Bos, T., & Patton, J. F. (1998). Career research productivity patterns of marketing academics. *Journal of Business Research, 42*, 75-86.
Ray, J. G. (2002). Editorial: Judging the judges: The role of journal editors. *QJM: An International Journal of Medicine, 95*, 769-774.
Ryan, C. (2005). The ranking and rating of academics and journals in tourism research. *Tourism Management, 26*, 657-662.
Schmidgall, R. S., & 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 and Tourism Education, 9*(4), 74-79.
Schmidgall, R., Woods, R. H., & Hardigree, C. (2007). Hospitality's most influential scholars: Fifteen years of citation analysis (1989-2004). *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 19*(2), 32-43.
Sheldon, P. J. & Collison, F. M. (1990). Faculty review criteria in tourism and hospitality. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*, 556-567.
Zhao, W., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2007). An investigation of academic leadership in tourism research: 1985-2004. *Tourism Management, 28*, 476-490.

Submitted July 5, 2008
Final Revision Submitted November 17, 2008
Accepted November 19, 2008
Refereed Anonymously

Rob Law, PhD (e-mail: hmroblaw@polyu.edu.hk), is a professor in the School of Hotel and Tourism Management and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong SAR). **Rosanna Leung** is a PhD student in the School of Hotel and Tourism Management and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong SAR). **Dimitrios Buhalis**, PhD (e-mail: dbuhalis@bournemouth.ac.uk), is an Established Chair in Tourism and Deputy Director at the International Centre for Tourism and Hospitality Research in the School of Service Management at Bournemouth University (Dorset House, Talbot Campus, Poole, Dorset, U.K.).