



Publish or perish: The proportion of articles versus additional sections in tourism and hospitality journals



Mehmet Ertaş^a, Metin Kozak^{b,*}

^a School of Tourism, Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey

^b School of Tourism, Dokuz Eylül University, Foça, Izmir, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Tourism journals
Hospitality journals
Publish or perish
Journal editors
Journal issues

ABSTRACT

In academia, there appears to be a “publish or perish” (PoP) risk, resulting in the repetition of identical studies. Publishers and/or editors of journals, on the supply side, have decided to exclude additional sections to meet the increasing demand of only full articles. The purpose of this study is to investigate how the number of journal issues, articles, research notes, book reviews, and conference notes published in tourism and hospitality journals has varied over the last two decades. As well as using bibliometric analysis, interviews were also conducted with the editors of various tourism journals. Results conclude that the number of journal issues and articles has increased significantly while the number of book reviews and conference notes has had a sharp decline. The study finally notes the implications for the literature and avenues for future research.

1. Introduction

The first modern publication of scientific journals in history emerged in France with the name of the *Le Journal des Sçavans* (1665). Since then, the number of scientific journals has increased steadily. Particularly, following the World War II, the “Big Science” period led to a dramatic increase in journals and articles (Jinha, 2010; Liñán & Fayolle, 2015; Mabe & Amin, 2001) as they are today (Mabe, 2003). The number of scientific journals has almost doubled (98%) between 1998 and 2012 (Gu & Blackmore, 2016). Accordingly, the number of publications and active authors have also been in an increase (Ataie-Ashtiani, 2017; Bornmann & Mutz, 2015; Jinha, 2010; Mabe, 2003; Michels & Schmoch, 2012; Pautasso, 2012), resulting in a competition among institutions in the world of international academia. The acceptance rate has decreased to 5% for top-tier journals on a regular basis (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2013). Similarly, there has been a significant increase in the number of tourism journals and articles particularly since early 2000s (McKercher & Tung, 2015).

Although not widely acceptable, the Impact Factor (IF) has been recognized as an influential criterion to evaluate the research outputs or assessments (Hall & Page, 2015). As a consequence, university administrations have in/directly forced the researchers to publish in top-tier journals due to the requirement of tenure, promotion, and job security (Daniel, 2005; Tian, Su, & Ru, 2016). This is how we call PoP and how it appears within the system (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2013; Angell, 1986;

Backes-Gellner & Schlinghoff, 2010; Harzing, 2010; Von Solms & Von Solms, 2016).

PoP causes researchers to concentrate on specific topics and to be estranged from original research, a decrease in qualified publications and ethical violations (Harzing, 2010). Publishing the same work in different forms (slicing), or adding the name of outstanding authors as co-authors are the common forms of examples to assume that the paper can easily be accepted. Also, researchers select a short-term certain study that brings rapid and positive results rather than long-term studies that can be more valuable (Angell, 1986).

Although PoP helps researchers publish their articles in top-tier journals and increase the position of their institutions in academic rankings (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2013), many studies have inferred that PoP may create a negative academic culture. For instance, Alvesson and Sandberg (2013) indicate that the number of academic publications has increased and research on certain subjects have intensified in the field of management. Tian et al. (2016) state that the Chinese academia has been under pressure to publish more and it has led to the PoP in recent years. Adler and Harzing (2009) note that academic publications in Australia and Canada have increased because this is the only criterion to evaluate academic performance. Backes-Gellner and Schlinghoff (2010) also state that the number of publications has increased to secure tenure and promotion in Germany and the USA. Ataie-Ashtiani (2017) infers that, although China and Iran are the fastest growing countries, they struggle with the emergence of low-quality publications.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: mehmetertas@pau.edu.tr (M. Ertaş), metin.kozak@deu.edu.tr (M. Kozak).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.03.001>

Received 22 September 2019; Received in revised form 29 February 2020; Accepted 3 March 2020

1447-6770/ © 2020 CAUTHE - COUNCIL FOR AUSTRALASIAN TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY EDUCATION. Published by Elsevier Ltd All rights reserved.

A considerable body of literature has appeared about the impact factor of journals (Garfield, 2006; Hall & Page, 2015; Ingwersen, 1998; Seglen, 1997; Verma, 2015), and citations (Garfield, 1972; Liñán & Fayolle, 2015; Robinson-Garcia, Jimenez-Contreras & Torres-Salinas, 2016; Waltman, 2016). However, there has been little research relating to the increasing number of journals and articles versus the inclusion of additional sections in recent years. Also, there are a few studies drawing attention to such an increase particularly in tourism (McKercher, 2018; McKercher & Tung, 2015, 2016). In this regard, this study aims to focus upon the investigation of the possible reasons as to the increasing number of articles in tourism and hospitality journals. Second, this study deals with understanding the reasons as to a sharp decline in publishing additional sections such as research notes, book reviews, conference notes, etc. Finally, this study looks at how being accepted into SSCI is likely to influence the number of journal issues, articles, research notes, book reviews, and conference notes.

2. Literature review

Sharing the results of studies is an essential academic activity for the researchers (McGrail, Rickard, & Jones, 2006). Such activity can be undertaken in various ways such as publishing in journals, attending conferences and/or lecturing in classes. The academic works usually include a manuscript of academic journals, working papers, research reports, book reviews, Ph.D. thesis, and conference papers (Björk & Hedlund, 2004). Researchers usually publish their research outputs in academic journals, conference proceedings, and books. Obviously, they desire their research to be traced, followed, read and cited (Von Solms & Von Solms, 2016). However, due to the low impact of academic publications according to the system of university rankings, the researchers tend to focus more on articles that bring more credits (Adler & Harzing, 2009; Benckendorff & Shu, 2019; Daniel, 2005; Hall & Page, 2015).

Study findings reveal that researchers need to publish a number of articles in order to extend the limits of their tenure (Tian et al., 2016; Von Solms & Von Solms, 2016). However, it is no longer enough for researchers to publish their work because the impact factor is also expected to be effective. Also, under pressure for publication, researchers become less likely to spend time on activities that are less relevant to publishing practices, including education (McKercher, 2018; Melguizo & Strober, 2007; Tian et al., 2016; Tung & McKercher, 2017). The majority of researchers aim to publish their articles in high impact factor journals to obtain their promotion easier and make more money (Von Solms & Von Solms, 2016). Also, they believe that publishing in top-tier journals may survive from the pressure of tenure and promotion (Hall & Page, 2015; Tian et al., 2016). Researchers are widely aware that the simple publication is not enough and it is waste of time and energy (Nyamnjoh, 2004); as a result, scientific journals need to raise the impact factor as well (Zietman, 2017). As a result, the objective presentation, accessibility, and quality of articles make the concession (Lawrence, 2003).

PoP offers both benefits and drawbacks. Some of the researchers find it to be helpful because the articles are published quickly. Although the article has limited/no contribution to the literature, it may immediately come out in any journal. Therefore, the flow of knowledge continues in the world of academia. In addition, the capable researchers who are slow in their positions are able to be motivated to publish quickly (Angell, 1986; Tian, Su, & Ru). Researchers publish more articles to yield more financial incentives and easily secure a tenure position. University administrations provide the researcher with an essential promotion to obtain higher rankings (Angell, 1986). As the financial incentives also encourage to publish more (Jenkins, Mitra, Gupta, & Shaw, 1998), institutions try to maximize their research activities by paying more attention to monetary rewards (Backes-Gellner & Schlinghoff, 2010). Moreover, researchers in a need for promotion and tenure make more efforts of publishing articles in high impact

factor journals (Harzing, 2010).

On the other hand, PoP causes problems that do not produce better quality publications and effective studies due to time pressure. Academics are familiar with the maxim: publish or perish. However, some have published only to perish (Nyamnjoh, 2004). In addition, instead of risking new applications with specific results to increase the efficiency, they tend to work on the same norms in their methods on similar topics (Tian et al., 2016). While evaluating the performance indicators, in general, the number of studies is important rather than their length. Researchers carry out short and uncomplicated research to produce more publications (Fox, Paine, & Sauterey, 2016). However, this causes an increase in the number of articles with many drawbacks. It creates fragmented, repetitive and same formation publications which cause trivial literature with much larger volumes. It is also difficult to say that this does not lead to plagiarism and major fraud (Angell, 1986).

The impact factor is an indicator of how the articles published in the years of x and y have performed by the sum of citations gained in a subsequent year of z . As the number of citations increases, the impact factor increases naturally. The impact factor was initially considered as a bibliometric assessment tool for publishers and librarians. However, this concept has changed recently (Garfield, 2006; Moustafa, 2015). The impact factor has become an important factor in terms of quality by creating an influential pressure on authors, editors, stakeholders, and funders (Brembs, Button, & Munafo, 2013). The articles considered to be exciting and essential are published in high impact journals. It is undoubtedly essential that researchers can make their own decisions as to where they publish their articles. Based on the assumption that the impact factor reflects the scientific quality, the empirical evidence does not support this hypothesis although the impact factor produces a widespread impression of prestige and reputation (Brembs, Button, & Munafo, 2013). Between 1990 and 2005, only 0.5% of 38 million articles received at least 200 citations, half did not have any citation, and one fourth did not offer any important outcomes of original research designs (Garfield, 2006).

On the other hand, the academic community does not stand on only the presence of articles, but rather it is nourished by the additional materials such as conferences, books and in-progress research subjects etc. A conference note is a summary of debates about the presentations and keynote speeches. A book review presents a critical assessment of a book's content indicating how it may be of contribution to the field and if suggested for reading. A research note aims to advance a new idea by harmonizing it with a theoretical perspective. As the journals are the right platforms for housing such cutting edge information, in addition to the inclusion of full articles, the importance of publications such as research notes, book reviews and conference notes should also be noted in order to maintain the continuity of academic activities and publications and demonstrate the wisdom of the field for the benefit of future generations.

3. Methodology

This study provides an application of the mixed method. The study used the bibliometric analysis (quantitative) and a structured interview (qualitative) as a single method is sometimes not enough to solve the problem (Patton, 2002). In addition, data were collected and analyzed on the basis of the “reliability model” consisting of Guba's (1981) criterion of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

The study focuses on the number of journal issues, articles, book reviews, research notes and conference notes of the 22 tourism and hospitality journals published between 2000 and 2018 and indexed by SSCI (see Table 1). Bibliometric analysis is an analysis technique used for quantitative research and has been extensively used in recent years to analyze the number of published articles (Ellegaard & Wallin, 2015). The current study used bibliometric analysis technique in order to examine the number of issues, the number of articles, the number of book

Table 1
List of SSCI-indexed tourism and hospitality journals included in the study.

Journals	First Publication Year	Australian Business Dean Council List	SCIMAGO
Annals of Tourism Research	1973	A*	Q1
Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research	1996	A	Q1
Cornell Hospitality Quarterly	1960	A	Q1
Current Issues in Tourism	1998	A	Q1
International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management	1989	A	Q1
International Journal of Hospitality Management	1982	A*	Q1
International Journal of Tourism Research	1999	A	Q1
Journal of Destination Marketing & Management	2012	A	Q1
Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management	2006	A	Q1
Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research	1976	A	Q1
Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management	1992	A	Q1
Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education	2012	B	Q2
Journal of Sustainable Tourism	1993	A*	Q1
Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing	1992	A	Q1
Journal of Travel Research	1968	A*	Q1
Journal of Vacation Marketing	1994	A	Q1
Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality & Tourism	2001	A	Q1
Tourism Economics	1995	A	Q2
Tourism Geographies	1999	A	Q1
Tourism Management Perspectives	2012	A	Q1
Tourism Management	1982	A*	Q1
Tourist Studies	2001	B	Q2

reviews, the number of research notes and the number of conference notes. The study reveals the real numbers of articles, book reviews, research notes, and conference notes by examining the issues on the webpage.

This study also focuses on the opinions of the editors of journals under investigation about the reasons of the increasing number of articles and the decreasing number of book reviews, research notes and conference notes in recent years. Also, the study investigates whether the impact factor may have been an influential factor for the journal editors. The editors were emailed a structured questionnaire form with four open-ended questions from 26 October to 20 December 2018. The questions used in the interview were based on the results of bibliometric analysis. In this respect, the questions are listed as follows:

1. What do you think about the increase in the number of articles published in SSCI-indexed tourism and hospitality journals in recent years?
2. We recognize that the proportion of research notes, book reviews, and conference notes have dramatically decreased in SSCI-indexed tourism and hospitality journals in recent years. What do you think about the reasons for such a decline? Do you think if these parts need to be published or not?
3. Is the impact factor of your journal important to you? What are you doing to raise this? Does it put pressure on you?

A total of 11 editors returned their answers subsequently and each editor was labeled from E1 to E11. Table 2 shows that the process of content analysis.

The authors followed the principle of open coding through content analysis. Open coding is the first step of analyzing the data obtained. At this stage, the data is encoded unlimitedly. In addition, open coding

Table 2
The process of content analysis.

Categories	Sub-Categories	Reference
Increase in the number of articles	Reliability Prestige	<i>Researchers are more likely to publish these journals because SSCI journals are more reliable and prestigious. (P2)</i>
Decrease in the number of other parts	Not have enough credit	<i>These have dramatically decreased, and this is simply because most universities do not give enough credit for research notes or book chapters. (P9)</i>
Importance of the impact factor (IF)	Focus on quality Pressure	<i>"The reality is different in that impact factors drive the number and quality of submissions" (P4) "I don't feel pressure from the impact factor, but perhaps I would if it was declining." (P6)</i>

refers to the analysis of the data by identifying the distinct categories obtained from the data and the theoretical possibilities of these categories (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Strauss, 2003). In the content analysis, all answers arrived first were brought together according to their questions. While examining the responses, each researcher examined the data independently several times, took a personal note and used a color scale to separate the written responses into the relevant themes. Then, the authors cross-checked the responses by coming together, re-reading the responses and reaching a consensus on the themes discussed. Finally, the data coding resulted in the main three categories and 30 sub-categories.

4. Results

This part is structured in order to illustrate the distribution of publications of the journals according to the years and to explore the opinions of journal editors. The first step details the number of journals, issues, articles, research notes, book reviews, conference notes, articles per issues and pages per articles. The second step introduces the content analysis of the data collected from the journal editors and its interpretation. According to Table 3, the highest increase is observed in the number of articles (3.42 times). The number of articles has increased dramatically from 2000 to 2018. The number of issues has also increased steadily from 2000 to 2018 (2.0 times). The number of research notes has increased regularly from 2000 to 2018 (3.10 times). On the other hand, the highest decrease is in the conference notes (−3.82 times). Commencing from 2015, the journals has not accommodated any conference notes. Also, the number of book reviews has decreased steadily from 2000 to 2018 (−2.32 times). The majority of those journals under investigation were indexed by SSCI in 2009–2010. This is the reference period when the number of issues and articles increased.

Table 3
The distribution of departments in tourism and hospitality journals by years.

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2018	22	156	1671	10,7	14,9	90	50	–
2017	22	155	1570	10,1	14,8	98	60	–
2016	22	151	1396	9,2	15,6	114	93	–
2015	22	137	1238	9	15,4	64	88	1
2014	22	125	1125	9	14,9	70	81	1
2013	22	113	1107	9,8	15,1	84	95	2
2012	22	109	1049	9,6	15,0	70	100	1
2011	19	101	925	9,1	15,1	57	105	1
2010	19	93	803	8,6	15,5	57	94	3
2009	19	92	716	7,7	15,2	54	83	4
2008	19	91	747	8,2	15,2	33	118	4
2007	19	89	704	7,9	15,4	44	139	5
2006	19	83	647	7,8	14,8	49	133	3
2005	18	88	595	6,7	15,5	33	103	11
2004	18	89	603	6,7	14,6	27	93	9
2003	18	84	571	6,7	13,9	23	121	10
2002	18	85	547	6,4	14,3	33	148	21
2001	18	80	519	6,4	13,8	33	147	38
2000	16	76	489	6,4	14,1	29	116	42

Column (1) The number of journals.

Column (2) The number of issues.

Column (3) The number of articles.

Column (4) Average number of articles per issue.

Column (5) Average number of pages per article.

Column (6) The number of research notes.

Column (7) The number of book reviews.

Column (8) The number of conference notes.

Table 4 shows the distribution of sections in selected journals. Reaching up to 18, the most essential change in terms of the number of issues is observed in *Current Issues in Tourism*. *Tourism Management* is the journal where the most significant increase in the number of articles is observed – publishing 202 articles only in 2018. The majority of journals have lessened their motivations to publish research notes from 2011 to 2018. Although not stable, only four journals kept their patience in publishing research notes on a regular basis and increased their numbers compared to the year of 2000: *Annals of Tourism Research*, *Tourism Management*, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, and *Current Issues in Tourism*. A similar decrease appears in the number of books reviews and conference notes in recent years. Almost none of the journals has accommodated a conference note since 2010. Likewise, only two journals accommodated book reviews, namely *Annals of Tourism Research* and *Tourism Management*.

According to the results of content analysis (see Table 5), the essential category is increased as the number of journals. All journal editors as the participants agree that the number of articles has intensively increased in recent years. The reason for such an increase is that the institutions put pressures on their staff, the researchers' fears of appointment and the desire to receive more incentives. There is also a consensus that these journals are more prestigious so that the editors argue that the researchers are more eager to publish in these journals:

This is totally artificial and caused by the requirements of tenure, promotion and merit increases - not by a genuine interest in advancing knowledge in our field. The result is an increase in the number of poor quality articles. (P3)

The pressure from universities and the requirements for tenure are definitely doing the damage here. It is also a shame that when reviewing tenure cases most Faculty are first counting the number of publications in top journals before even reading the papers. Other more established fields such as management and marketing have, in my opinion, more respect for quality. (P9)

The editors emphasize that there has been more emphasis on quantity than quality, as a result of the increase in the number of

articles. The editors think that the increasing number of articles leads to decrease in the quality of publications. Also, publishing fast-track articles leads to accumulating the amount of literature without any added value. In addition, the editors state that the researchers had avoided their responsibilities such as teaching as a consequence of the pressure to publish. The editors' comments in this respect are noted as follows:

It is hard to judge whether the number of quality papers has increased, but they are certainly spread across more journals, which makes it harder to find the good quality papers. The impression, therefore, is that the quality of tourism has gone down. (P6)

This question is very open and I'm not sure if you're asking sentiments or factual information. In any case, I think there are too many journals and that the credibility of some papers that are published are questionable. I don't know if anything of what we're doing is relevant, and I think that we're wasting a lot of time and effort in producing so much knowledge that isn't effectively consumed. (P10)

Observations indicate a reverse relationship between the attention paid to publishing articles and additional materials accommodated in a journal issue. Although the number of articles has increased in recent years, it is observed that the number of research notes, book reviews, and conference notes has decreased. The vast majority of editors state that they are unlikely to leave any space for such sections due to their low possibility of being cited. As a result, more emphasis is paid to articles. Also, the editors note that the authors have a perception that publishing in such sections brings no credits to themselves in appointments and incentives appear to be a distraction. The editors report that:

They [publishers] want to use pages more carefully in the journal. Therefore, the research notes, book reviews, and conference notes are not important for both the journals and the authors. (P2)

The main reason is new public management aspects such as 'publication points' for academics; that articles count – and research notes, book reviews, and conference notes do not. However, we have seen a rise in book reviews recently and we still receive some research notes, partly as shortenings of papers that have not been accepted as full articles. (P8)

As a result of the increase in the number of SSCI tourism and hospitality journals, IF has become an essential issue. The editors think that IF is an indicator of quality meaning that the higher IF the higher prestige for the journal. Also, the authors are more likely to publish mostly in SSCI journals with higher IF scores. This is the case where the editors have also a consensus. As such, the impact factor is thought to be an element of pressure on both editors and researchers:

Absolutely, it puts pressure. Not only to the editor but to the publisher as well. Make sure that the articles accepted have a significant potential for numerous citations. (P3)

To some degree, the impact factor is important. It should preferably be and as authors in some countries/institutions are supposed not to publish in journals with a lower impact factor. (P8)

Alternatively, the editors suggest that it has become an essential issue to keep the IF as much high as possible. For this reason, the editors are keen more on publishing exciting, emerging and previously untried topics that are expected to bring more credits in terms of citations. Even the editors are likely to invite more prolific authors whose works can obtain more citations once published in a certain journal:

Yes, of course, it is important. We are continuously working on that. We introduced this year several special issues focusing on some exciting and emerging topics. We are also inviting well-cited authors to write "commentary" papers on some popular research topics. (P9)

Yes, it is. Because people now take the journal more seriously. I'm not doing anything to raise it, I just focus on doing a good job that makes sense to me. I promote good scholars who may not be seen because of

Table 4
The distribution of departments in tourism and hospitality journals by years.

Year	Annals of Tourism Research					Tourism Management					Current Issues in Tourism				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2018	6	59	27	10	–	6	202	14	17	–	18	102	1	–	–
2017	6	72	22	18	–	6	228	12	33	–	16	84	3	2	–
2016	6	62	54	35	–	6	186	8	30	–	14	66	6	–	–
2015	6	54	22	34	–	6	182	7	31	–	12	63	2	1	–
2014	6	76	25	22	–	6	139	6	29	–	10	41	5	4	–
2013	4	74	22	28	–	6	138	16	32	–	8	37	–	5	–
2012	4	89	25	41	–	6	147	8	34	–	8	39	1	–	–
2011	4	71	15	37	–	6	140	11	44	–	8	41	2	–	–
2010	4	52	8	29	–	6	93	2	33	–	6	32	–	8	–
2009	4	29	8	24	–	6	90	–	33	–	6	29	–	7	–
2008	4	47	3	31	–	6	96	5	45	1	6	28	–	8	–
2007	4	51	7	32	–	6	119	6	58	1	6	25	–	3	–
2006	4	52	9	25	–	6	108	4	54	–	6	26	–	3	–
2005	4	51	11	19	3	6	77	3	31	–	6	28	–	6	–
2004	4	48	7	15	1	6	63	5	29	4	6	24	–	3	–
2003	4	46	8	23	–	6	55	2	28	3	6	21	–	5	–
2002	4	52	13	36	6	6	48	7	22	5	6	31	–	2	–
2001	4	45	13	34	8	6	53	2	30	5	6	21	–	1	–
2000	4	45	8	17	11	6	45	2	24	6	4	16	–	–	–

Year	Journal of Travel Research					International Journal of Hospitality Management					International Journal of Tourism Research				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2018	8	76	–	–	–	8	126	7	–	–	6	76	–	–	–
2017	8	74	–	–	–	8	100	2	–	–	6	66	–	–	–
2016	8	77	–	–	–	8	109	5	–	–	6	60	–	–	–
2015	6	63	–	–	–	8	128	4	–	–	6	58	–	–	–
2014	6	57	–	–	–	8	137	8	–	–	6	60	–	–	1
2013	6	59	–	–	–	4	160	9	–	–	6	43	1	–	–
2012	6	61	–	–	–	4	139	5	–	–	6	40	2	–	–
2011	6	51	–	–	–	4	111	3	–	–	6	39	1	1	1
2010	4	38	1	–	–	4	80	7	–	–	6	57	4	–	1
2009	4	38	–	–	–	4	70	9	–	–	6	37	5	1	1
2008	4	44	–	–	–	4	65	–	–	–	6	44	1	4	–
2007	4	41	–	–	–	4	64	6	–	–	6	34	1	2	1
2006	4	48	–	–	–	4	35	9	1	–	6	32	2	10	–
2005	4	41	1	8	–	4	33	1	–	–	6	25	–	1	1
2004	4	41	3	9	–	5	33	–	2	1	6	31	2	18	1
2003	4	42	–	6	2	4	26	5	4	–	6	27	2	30	–
2002	4	39	6	3	2	4	30	3	9	–	6	29	2	35	3
2001	4	41	7	12	2	4	22	4	2	–	6	29	–	24	18
2000	4	37	6	21	4	4	26	4	6	–	6	22	–	15	8

Column (1) The number of issues.
 Column (2) The number of articles.
 Column (3) The number of research notes.
 Column (4) The number of book review.
 Column (5) The number of conference notes.

their limited resources (copy-editing, language, etc), and I promote work that is new, work that has relevance. Having an impact factor doesn't put pressure on me but I know it does to other editors. (P10),

As an additional note, we should emphasize the fact that the study has considered only those journals in SSCI. However, with their less impact on the academic community in tourism, there are several other listings that have become central for ranking the journals in general by having a different criterion for ranking. Among these are Scopus, ABDC and ABC. In addition, several journals do provide opportunities for short communications, response to editors or commentaries but the authors are often reluctant to take up this opportunity, indeed several journal editors would probably welcome it as a way of reducing page pressures or their workloads.

5. Conclusion and implications

According to the results of the bibliometric analysis, the issues and

articles published in tourism and hospitality journals have increased rapidly in recent years. Several lines of previous research reached a similar conclusion that the number of issues and articles increased (e.g. Jinha, 2010; Liñán & Fayolle, 2015; McKercher, 2018; McKercher & Tung, 2015; McKercher & Tung, 2016). It is obvious that there are several reasons for such an increase in issues and articles such as online versus written publishing opportunities (Gu & Blackmore, 2016), increase in the number of researchers (Ataie-Ashtiani, 2017; Tung & McKercher, 2017), assignment of researchers and the desire to obtain more incentives (Tian et al., 2016), and pressure to increase the position of institutions in league tables (Von Solms & Von Solms, 2016).

As a result of interviews with the editors, similar reasons occurred as to the reasons in increasing the number of articles such as the increase in the number of researchers, the incentives of institutions, the pressure of assignment, the desire of researchers to receive more incentives and the pressure inflated by institutions. In addition, the authors think that SSCI journals are more reliable; as a consequence, these journals become their priority as a means of prestige. Both the

Table 5
Results of content analysis.

Categories	Sub-Categories	
Increase in the number of articles	Reliability	
	Prestige	
	Requirements of tenure	
	Promotion	
	Merit Increases	
	Increase in the number of authors	
	Publisher's desire to make more money	
	Publish and perish	
	Quantity vs quality	
	Pressure from universities	
	Wasting a lot of time and effort	
	Decrease in the number of other parts	Diminished importance for the author
		Increase in the number of journal pages
		Editors do not want to bother with anything except full papers
Focus on a research paper only.		
Increase in the number of articles		
No promotion		
Reduce the willingness		
Not encourage young academics		
New public management aspects		
Not have enough credit		
Not counted as relevant		
Importance of the impact factor (IF)		Focus on quality
		Pressure
		Publishers desire more IF
	Ensure that publish the best articles	
	Authors do not want to publish lower IF	
	The accepted article should be significant	
	Focus on some exciting and emerging topics	
	Inviting well-cited authors	
	Promote good scholars to write	

governments and institutions give more incentives for those who have articles in SSCI journals. [Backes-Gellner and Schlinghoff \(2010\)](#), likewise, argue that the authors set direct publishing behavior as a response to monetary rewards due to economic incentives and career movements.

Journals also would like to be followed by more people. Even if the article is less likely to be read, it is enough to download. Because the publishers receive a certain amount of fees for each article downloaded by the home library. The more the download, the more money earned. The fact that the article has been read or not is not relevant to the publisher. As a result, journals with open access policies have turned into a global industry driven by the author-based publication fees rather than applying the traditional subscription policies.

It is indisputable for the authors to publish their research findings or to disappear as a researcher ([Von Solms & Von Solms, 2016](#)). The authors, who do not want to disappear, produce articles that do not matter how. This situation leads to a decrease in the quality of articles and to produce more articles in line with the fear of PoP. The fact that most articles not read by anyone are understood to have been written only to publish. In parallel with the increase in the number of articles, ethical problems also increase. [Harzing \(2010\)](#) believes that more ethical problems arise as a result of the increasing number of articles. The editors state that quantity is more prominent than quality. They also think that the vast majority of research focuses on similar topics, that they are not original issues, and that researchers are focusing on research that they think will be more cited. As a result, a large capacity of literature but without any positive impact on the society has appeared (ceremonial empiricism).

The pressure on the authors inflated by the institutions also causes ethical considerations. The pressure to write more articles also distracts the authors from undertaking their responsibilities of teaching. This is perceived as insignificant and workload by many authors. [Angell \(1986\)](#) states that, as long as there are pressure elements such as

promotion and encouragement on academics, the pressure to publish will continue. [Alvesson and Sandberg \(2013\)](#) demonstrate that the policies implemented in recruitment and promotion increase the number of articles and lead to the emergence of articles written with the fear of PoP – that is far from originality. The reduction of such pressures may not lead to any reduction in the number of articles, but may lead to a reduction in the ethical incentives and to increase the quality of articles.

The study also conveys practical recommendations for tourism scholars, regardless of their junior, senior or mature characteristics. An increase in the number of articles and journals in recent years is unlikely leading to an increase in the quality of outputs. With the PoP culture, there is a working environment focused only on publishing articles. In tourism, as in the entire academic community, the focus is the quantity only. Several researchers state that there has been a considerable increase in the number of tourism-focused journals and articles in recent years while this does not help to better understand tourism, and its practical and theoretical implications (e.g. [Benckendorff & Shu, 2019](#); [Huang & Chen, 2016](#); [McKercher, 2018](#)). As a result, future research should focus more on quality than quantity that delivers messages that would be of significant both for the academia and practice. In this context, all groups may continue contributing to the field through the submission of their research notes, conference notes, and book reviews etc in order to help the researchers become much more aware of the additional activities and publications in their field and, most importantly, help the institutionalisation of the field.

Although the results of the bibliometric analysis indicate that there are no significant changes in the number of pages on average, some journals have reduced their page limits in order to accommodate more articles. In some journals, there is a word limit with 6000–8000 words. [Fox et al. \(2016\)](#) state that such limits are likely to create pressure on editors to publish more articles. However, in our case, the editors appear to have a lower intention to publish more articles in each issue and lower number of pages per an article in the future.

As the traditional outlets, the journals are intended to share the results of scientific research with the national or international academic world. The main problem appears to be that journals or their editors/publishers have started to move away from the principles of existence in order to be included in the SSCI group. Although it is not important how many people read an article, it has become sufficient for those who are interested in the subject to read and benefit from their research. Several authors suggest that academic studies include full articles, research notes, book reviews, conference notes, Ph.D. thesis, and other publications ([Björk & Hedlund, 2004](#); [Von Solms & Von Solms, 2016](#)). As a result, the journal publishers and editors should be more curious in paying more attention to accommodate more of these texts to play a connecting role between the past and the future of academic studies.

However, despite a significant increase in the number of articles, the proportion of additional materials has remained very low. In particular, once the journals were accepted into SSCI, there has been a significant increase in the number of issues and articles while the number of book reviews and conference notes has decreased significantly. Also, only a few journals have accommodated book reviews while conference notes have received much less attention in recent years. As suggested by [Adler and Harzing \(2009\)](#), the authors consider focusing on these additional materials as a waste of time as they are not counted by ranking systems, assignments and promotions.

The majority of authors have an enthusiasm in publishing in those journals that bring more credits in return as the IF has become central to the authors' choice of journals as publication outlets. IF is already considered to be an indicator of evaluating the journals' quality standards ([Brembs, Button and Munafo \(2013\)](#)), as suggested by the findings of this study on journal editors. Journals with a higher IF score are believed to receive more citations per article. This seems to be a critical issue for the editors who feel under pressure. Although the majority of editors do not consider the IF score as an indication of prestige, they

claim that the reputation of their journals will be negatively influenced if the IF score is likely to decline. As a result, the only solution seems to maintain their current position or accelerate their performance by inviting more prolific scholars to submit their papers with a possible higher citation impact. As a final remark, academia seems to be on a crossroad to make decision between quality or quantity.

The study also has several drawbacks to be taken as the avenues for future research. First, this study is based on the findings of only 22 SSCI tourism journals. There is still the potential to compare SSCI and non-SSCI tourism journals and also compare tourism and non-tourism journals. Second, not only the journal editors but also the authors can also be communicated to obtain feedback regarding their opinions of the reason for an increase in the number of articles and a dramatic decrease in other additional sections. Finally, the results of earlier studies suggest that longer articles are more cited than shorter articles (Fox et al., 2016; Leimu & Koricheva, 2005). This study concludes that the number of pages per issue decreased in various journals. However, the association between the number of pages per issue or per article and the number of citations received or impact factors do still need to be explored further.

McKercher and Tung (2016) reveal that studies such as articles and books with fractional co-authors have increased over the last few years. Despite its positive influence on maintaining the productivity and quality issues, its negative consequences may also be noted. As such, the increasing pressure to publish causes academics to lean towards an unethical behavior, particularly junior researchers who are desperate in obtaining their tenure positions quickly. As the vast majority of major universities open their doors for prolific junior academics (Benckendorff & Shu, 2019), they feel themselves under pressure to publish more. From this point of view, one may propose that there is a more challenging environment for junior academics because they must be more active and produce higher calibre research than those in their mid-class or senior careers. Senior and mid-class scholars can be regarded as the more fortunate academic groups in this regard as they may continue their publishing career actively and efficiently collaborating with younger staff and graduate students. Mid-class researchers also have the advantage of collaborating with senior researchers (Tung & McKercher, 2017). For this reason, publishing pressure is likely to be much higher for those who are new in their career, mainly in developing countries whose native language is not English. This practice causes to publish in unethical ways or prefer predatory journals. Despite this study does not focus on the career development of academics, it still provides some practical evidence for future studies.

References

Adler, N. J., & Harzing, A. W. (2009). When knowledge wins: Transcending the sense and nonsense of academic rankings. *The Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8(1), 72–95. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2009.37012181>.

Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2013). Has management studies lost its way? Ideas for more imaginative and innovative research. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(1), 128–152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01070>.

Angell, M. (1986). Publish or perish: A proposal. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 104(2), 261–262. <https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-104-2-261>.

Ataie-Ashtiani, B. (2017). Chinese and Iranian scientific publications: Fast growth and poor ethics. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 23(1), 317–319. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-016-9766-1>.

Backes-Gellner, U., & Schlinghoff, A. (2010). Career incentives and “publish or perish” in German and US universities. *European Education*, 42(3), 26–52. <https://doi.org/10.2753/EUE1056-4934420302>.

Benckendorff, P., & Shu, M. L. (2019). Research impact benchmarks for tourism, hospitality and events scholars in Australia and New Zealand. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 38, 184–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.04.005>.

Björk, B. C., & Hedlund, T. (2004). A formalised model of the scientific publication process. *Online Information Review*, 28(1), 8–21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14684520410522411>.

Bornmann, L., & Mutz, R. (2015). Growth rates of modern science: A bibliometric analysis based on the number of publications and cited references. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(11), 2215–2222. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23329>.

Brembs, B., Button, K., & Munafò, M. (2013). Deep impact: Unintended consequences of journal rank. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7(24), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00291>.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zfs0z-1990-0602>.

Daniel, H. D. (2005). Publications as a measure of scientific advancement and of scientists' productivity. *Learned Publishing*, 18(2), 143–148. <https://doi.org/10.1087/0953151053584939>.

Ellegaard, O., & Wallin, J. A. (2015). The bibliometric analysis of scholarly production: How great is the impact? *Scientometrics*, 105(3), 1809–1831. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1645-z>.

Fox, C. W., Paine, C. T., & Sauterey, B. (2016). Citations increase with manuscript length, author number, and references cited in ecology journals. *Ecology and Evolution*, 6(21), 7717–7726. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2505>.

Garfield, E. (1972). Citation analysis as a tool in journal evaluation. *Science*, 178(4060), 471–479. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.178.4060.471>.

Garfield, E. (2006). The history and meaning of the journal impact factor. *Journal of American Medical Association*, 295(1), 90–93. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.295.1.90>.

Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Ectj*, 29(2), 75–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02766777>.

Gu, X., & Blackmore, K. L. (2016). Recent trends in academic journal growth. *Scientometrics*, 108(2), 693–716. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-1985-3>.

Hall, C. M., & Page, S. J. (2015). Following the impact factor: Utilitarianism or academic compliance? *Tourism Management*, 51, 309–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.05.013>.

Harzing, A. W. (2010). *The publish or perish book*. Australia: Tarma Software Research Pty Limited.

Huang, S., & Chen, G. (2016). Current state of tourism research in China. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 20, 10–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2016.06.002>.

Ingwersen, P. (1998). The calculation of web impact factors. *Journal of Documentation*, 54(2), 236–243. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM000000007167>.

Jenkins, G. D., Jr., Mitra, A., Gupta, N., & Shaw, J. D. (1998). Are financial incentives related to performance? A meta-analytic review of empirical research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(5), 777–787. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.5.777>.

Jinha, A. E. (2010). Article 50 million: An estimate of the number of scholarly articles in existence. *Learned Publishing*, 23(3), 258–263. <https://doi.org/10.1087/20100308>.

Lawrence, P. A. (2003). The politics of publication: Authors, reviewers, and editors must act to protect the quality of research. *Nature*, 422(March), 259–261. <https://doi.org/10.1038/422259a>.

Leimu, R., & Koricheva, J. (2005). What determines the citation frequency of ecological papers? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 20(1), 28–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2004.10.010>.

Liñán, F., & Fayolle, A. (2015). A systematic literature review on entrepreneurial intentions: Citation, thematic analyses, and research agenda. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 11(4), 907–933. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-015-0356-5>.

Mabe, M. (2003). The growth and number of journals. *Serials*, 16(2), 191–198. <https://doi.org/10.1629/16191>.

Mabe, M., & Amin, M. (2001). Growth dynamics of scholarly and scientific journals. *Scientometrics*, 51(1), 147–162. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010520913124>.

McGrail, M. R., Rickard, C. M., & Jones, R. (2006). Publish or perish: A systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 25(1), 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360500453053>.

McKercher, B. (2018). What is the state of hospitality and tourism research—2018? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(3), 1234–1244. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-12-2017-0809>.

McKercher, B., & Tung, V. (2015). Publishing in tourism and hospitality journals: Is the past a prelude to the future? *Tourism Management*, 50, 306–315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.03.008>.

McKercher, B., & Tung, V. (2016). The rise of fractional authors. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 61, 213–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2016.06.006>.

Melguizo, T., & Strober, M. H. (2007). Faculty salaries and the maximization of prestige. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(6), 633–668. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-006-9045-0>.

Michels, C., & Schmoch, U. (2012). The growth of science and database coverage. *Scientometrics*, 93(3), 831–846. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0732-7>.

Moustafa, K. (2015). The disaster of the impact factor. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 21(1), 139–142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-014-9517-0>.

Nyamnjoh, F. B. (2004). From publish or perish to publish and perish: What 'Africa's 100 best books' tell us about publishing Africa. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 39(5), 331–355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909604051185>.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). USA: Sage.

Pautasso, M. (2012). Publication growth in biological sub-fields: Patterns, predictability and sustainability. *Sustainability*, 4(12), 3234–3247. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su4123234>.

Robinson-García, N., Jiménez-Contreras, E., & Torres-Salinas, D. (2016). Analyzing data citation practices using the data citation index. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(12), 2964–2975. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23529>.

Seglen, P. O. (1997). Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research. *Bmj*, 314(7079), 498–513. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.314.7079.497>.

Strauss, A. L. (2003). *Qualitative analysis for social scientist*. UK: Cambridge University

- Press.
- Tian, M., Su, Y., & Ru, X. (2016). Perish or publish in China: Pressures on young Chinese scholars to publish in internationally indexed journals. *Publications, 4*(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications4020009>.
- Tung, V. W. S., & McKercher, B. (2017). Negotiating the rapidly changing research, publishing, and career landscape. *Tourism Management, 60*, 322–331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.12.013>.
- Verma, I. M. (2015). Impact, not impact factor. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 112*(26), 7875–7876. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1509912112>.
- Von Solms, R., & Von Solms, B. (2016). Publish or perish-but where? *South African Computer Journal, 28*(1), 44–58. <https://doi.org/10.18489/sacj.v28i1.394>.
- Waltman, L. (2016). A review of the literature on citation impact indicators. *Journal of Informetrics, 10*(2), 365–391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2016.02.007>.
- Zietman, A. L. (2017). The ethics of scientific publishing: Black, white, and “fifty shades of gray” *International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics, 99*(2), 275–279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2017.06.009>.