1. The state of research methods in tourism and hospitality
Robin Nunkoo

INTRODUCTION

The tourism and hospitality research landscape is constantly evolving and the field is growing in maturity. One of the features that dominates this evolution is the proliferation of academic journals. The number of tourism and hospitality journals has increased from less than ten before the 1980s to around 300 in 2017 (Shani and Uriely, 2017). Among the various knowledge dissemination channels that exist, academic journals play a leading position and serve several important functions. They play a central role in knowledge production and are considered key to knowledge advancement in any discipline (Xiao and Smith, 2007). Journals signify the existence of a scientific domain, niche discipline, or school of thought (Nie et al., 2009). The various tourism and hospitality journals constitute the main reservoir of knowledge for researchers, students, and practitioners alike. Interestingly, these journals have been in their own right, the focus of investigations, described by Figueroa-Domecq et al. (2015, p. 88) as "the scholarship on the scholarship" of tourism and hospitality research. Within these groups of studies feature fervent debates on research methodologies and related aspects. For example, Xiao and Smith (2006a) noted a rise in the number of articles published in *Annals of Tourism Research* that have as their main objective the dissemination of new concepts, models, and methods. Such an argument can also be extended to other journals in the field, where articles focusing on research paradigms and methods are common.

Early reviews on research methods focused primarily on assessing the use of quantitative research utilized in tourism and hospitality studies (e.g., Crawford-Welch and McCleary 1992; Dann et al., 1988). Such scholarship testified the methodological bias in favor of the positivistic paradigm that prevailed in tourism and hospitality studies since World War II (Decrop, 1999; Riley and Love, 2000; Walle, 1997). The prevalence of quantitative approaches could be explained by the fact that tourism and hospitality research draws widely upon concepts, ideas, and theories from more established fields such as sociology, marketing, and management, which are themselves highly influenced by the positivistic paradigm (Walle, 1997). In addition, qualitative research at that time was blamed "for missing the tenets of 'good' science" (Decrop, 1999, p. 157). Although recent reviews still indicate the dominance of quantitative approaches in tourism and hospitality studies, they suggest that researchers are now more receptive to other research approaches such as qualitative and mixed methods in their various forms and conceptualizations (Nunkoo et al., 2013a; Nunkoo et al., 2017; Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2009; Molina-Azorin and Font, 2016; Wilson et al., 2017). The trend toward a more pragmatic approach to tourism and hospitality research is attributed to the increased recognition of the legitimacy and benefits of qualitative and mixed methods research. Indeed, the last decade has seen a

proliferation in the number of books and articles advocating the use of qualitative and mixed methods approaches to advance tourism and hospitality research (e.g., Baggio and Klobas, 2017; Dwyer et al., 2012; Koc and Boz, 2014; Nunkoo et al., 2013b; Molina-Azorin and Font, 2016; Stumpf et al., 2016).

Other research design issues have also been the focus of a number of articles. For example, Tracy (2006) alerted readers to the fact that theory in research is under assault by hospitality academics and practitioners because it is often treated as being synonymous with the impractical. Tracy explained the importance of theory in advancing hospitality research, advocating its use by scholars. Likewise, Smith et al. (2013) examined how "theory," as a word, is used in three leading journals in each of hospitality, tourism, and leisure studies fields over a 20-year period. The article concluded that researchers have succeeded only in developing mutually incomprehensible languages and worldviews, failing to reach a consensus on the true meaning of the term "theory." Such a diversity in the conceptualization of the term "theory," Smith et al. (2013) argued, presents significant challenges to the advancement of the field.

Debates on the use of statistical techniques in tourism and hospitality research have also been fervent. For example, Crawford-Welch and McCleary (1992, p. 155) reviewed the statistical techniques used in five hospitality-related journals and concluded at that time that the field "is lacking in rigorous and sophisticated quantitative research." However, sufficient progress has been made in this respect since then. Nunkoo et al. (2013b) analyzed the range of statistical techniques used in studies on residents' attitudes toward tourism over a 26-year period. The study found that researchers utilized a diverse set of techniques, ranging from descriptive statistics to more complex techniques such as confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling (SEM). Adding to the debate, Nunkoo et al. (2013a) and do Valle and Assaker (2016) assessed the applications of covariance-based SEM and partial least squares SEM in tourism research, and found that their use has grown exponentially over the years. However, both reviews also alert readers to a number of misapplications of SEM by tourism researchers and propose a number of ways to improve their uses. Tourism researchers have also debated on other research design components such as sample size (e.g., Dolnicar et al., 2014; Khalilzadeh and Tasci, 2017), response bias (e.g., Yüksel, 2017), and unobserved heterogeneity (e.g., Assaf et al., 2016; Sarstedt et al., 2016). Such debates are useful as they pave the way towards the scientification of the field.

ABOUT THE *HANDBOOK*

Informed by the above debates, this volume contains discussions on various quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches, as well as other chapters on contemporary tourism and hospitality research that are common to both approaches. It raises wider methodological debates by drawing together the wealth of research methods experience gained by tourism and hospitality researchers in one volume. The *Handbook* comprises 43 chapters authored by 60 individuals from diverse educational and research back-grounds and geographical locations. The *Handbook* also has an adequate representation of female authors in the field. It is my hope that such a heterogeneity in the authors' characteristics has led to a volume that adequately reflects the diverse research methods

and methodologies used by tourism and hospitality scholars worldwide and the debates that abound.

The challenge I faced as an editor in putting this *Handbook* together was not to solicit and receive contributions from the various researchers per se, but to determine the fit of each chapter to a respective section of the book to ensure a rhetoric structure. Of course, this process as well as space limitations have meant that I was unable to accept a number of potentially relevant contributions from several colleagues. Although at the inception stage of this *Handbook* I had in mind a vague idea about how the volume would shape up, it was only after I received all the chapters that I was in a position to determine its exact structure. This has been no easy task, given the various conceptualizations and our divergent understanding of research methodologies and methods. While a certain research approach is considered subjective by some researchers, for others it is seen as objective or even falling under a mixed methodology. Here, I must acknowledge the advice and suggestions I received on the structure of the book from established research scholars (and of course friends), in particular, Mark Saunders and Michael Hall. The *Handbook* is divided into five parts: Part I on "Foundations of Tourism and Hospitality Research," Part II on "Qualitative Research Methods," Part III on "Quantitative Research Methods," Part IV on "Mixed Methods Research," and Part V on "Other Research Issues." Each part of the *Handbook* and their respective chapters have their own internal logic, but together, the volume serves as a "one-stop shop" for scholars wishing to engage in research.

Part I: Foundations of Tourism and Hospitality Research

This part of the volume should not be taken to refer to philosophical foundations only. By "foundation" I mean the paradigmic influences as well as the basic research issues such as the role of theory and meaning of theoretical contributions, and the conduct of fieldwork in tourism and hospitality research. Following this introductory chapter, Girish Prayag in Chapter 2 introduces positivism as a research philosophy that has long influenced tourism and hospitality studies. Positivism concentrates on positive data based on facts that can be verified through empirical testing. Falsification of facts is central to research informed by the positivistic paradigm (Tribe, 2001). Girish's chapter reviews some of the key underlying assumptions of positivism and the concept of 'objectivity'. As Girish argues, positivism has had a major influence on research in tourism and hospitality, but he joins other researchers (e.g., Song, 2017) to advocate for more rigorous applications of its principles. Despite the criticisms leveled against positivism (e.g., Plantenkamp and Botterill, 2013; Song, 2017), Girish concludes that it still has its place in the scientifica-tion of tourism research. Here, I cannot disagree with Girish that although there is a move toward post-positivistic research in tourism and hospitality such as interpretivism, constructionism, feminism, and pragmatism, knowledge will always be positively applied to progress research in the field.

Sometimes considered as an antithesis of positivism (Hibberd, 2001), constructionism is introduced and discussed by Tom Griffin in Chapter 3. As Tom argues, for social constructionists, claims to know reality are socially constructed expressions of power (Burr, 2003). In Tom's words, constructionism, simply speaking, is the view that an under-standing of social reality, and therefore all knowledge, is constructed through interaction, and is not an objective entity. The chapter discusses the ontological and epistemological

considerations of constructionism. Tom uses his own research on immigrants' experiences of visiting friends and relatives, and the role they played in their settlement and well-being, to explain the constructionist approach.

We have entered an age of postmodernity. There is hardly any field of scientific study that has not been influenced by postmodernism (Docherty, 2014). Postmodernism has left its traces in every discipline, from architecture to zoology and from forestry to the literature and the arts. Tourism is no exception. Philip Feifan Xie takes readers through postmodermism in tourism research in Chapter 4. Philip situates the evolution of postmodermism in tourism which, he argues, is an area emanating from modernism. He elaborates on the characteristics of postmodern tourism, stressing on its multidisciplinarity. Philip goes on to argue that research methods applied to postmodern tourism research relate to qualitative, quantitative, as well as mixed methods approaches. His discussion focuses particularly on the de-terrritorialization concept derived from postmodern theories. Using the case of Westergasfabriek in Amsterdam, Philip explains how he applied critical discourse analysis and in-depth interviews to deconstruct modernity in tourism development, and in so doing, he sets the base for new approaches for researching tourism in the postmodern era.

During recent years, tourism research has been shaped by a "critical turn" as part of a wider trend affecting the social sciences (Ateljevic et al., 2005; Bianchi, 2009; Ren et al., 2010; Tribe, 2008). Critical perspectives challenge existing theories, ideas, and societal practices. Criticalists are therefore those researchers who question models, measures, and analytical practices in order to ensure equity when describing experiences. In Chapter 5, Heather Mair discusses the role of critical inquiry in informing research methods in tourism studies. Critical inquiry, as Heather argues, is not a research method per se. Rather, it refers to those research approaches that are able to reveal patterns of inequalities and contribute to positive changes in society through political and social actions. Heather explains critical inquiry through six principles: (1) asking critical questions; (2) critical inquiry as a state of mind; (3) exposing and challenging power relations; (4) rejecting an absolute truth; (5) the researcher's role in raising awareness; and (6) critical does not mean cynical. She goes on to discuss the foundations and practical considerations of critical inquiry in tourism research. She draws on examples from her doctoral research on rural development policies and tourism development to illustrate the application of critical inquiry.

The field of tourism and hospitality has experienced an upsurge of phenomenological research (e.g., Berdychevsky and Gibson, 2015; Goolaup et al., 2018). Phenomenology is the study of essence: the essence of perception or the essence of consciousness. Phenomenology distinguishes itself from other scientific forms of inquiry by its emphasis on subjective experiences (Cohen, 1979; Li, 2000; Mannell and Iso-Ahola, 1987; Goolaup et al., 2018). Sandhiya Goolaup and Cecilia Solér describe the application of phenomenological research methods in tourism in Chapter 6. In particular, they distinguish between the Husserlian and Heideggerian phenomenology and advocate for a merger between those two approaches; what they call existential-phenomenology. The chapter takes the reader through the plurality of phenomenological approaches in tourism research. It exposes readers to the principles of interviewing and data analysis in a phenomenological study, emphasizing the capturing of experience throughout this process.

All knowledge is theory laden, while all methods are theory driven. Theorizing is central to research. Every top-tier journal in tourism and hospitality requires that a

manuscript makes a significant theoretical contribution to be considered for publication. For example, the author guidelines of *Annals of Tourism Research* state that for an article to be publishable, it should make "a significant or substantial contribution to theory . . . in tourism and is likely to become a primary point of reference in tourism research." However, the terms "theory" and "theoretical contribution" are grossly misunderstood by research scholars, and are sometimes loosely defined (Smith et al., 2013). The number of journal editorials and articles discussing the nature of theory and what constitutes theoretical contribution testifies to the depth of academic debate on the topic (e.g., Corley and Gioia, 2011; Cortina, 2016; Crane et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2013; Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2012; Whetten, 1989). Ekaterina Sorokina and Youcheng Wang join this discussion in Chapter 7. The contributors throw light on the diverse types of theory and elaborate on its component. The chapter distinguishes among three different types of theories: (1) formal, grand, or broad-range theories; (2) middle-range or meso theories; and (3) substantive, situation-specific or local/micro theories. The authors then move on to define theoretical contribution and provide some guidelines for preparing manuscripts for journal submission. Ekaterina and Youcheng extend their discussion on theory in Chapter 8, where they emphasize theory building and evaluation in tourism research. The chapter discusses the different paradigms, methodological approaches, methods, and strategies of theory building, distinguishing between positivism and constructivism. The authors also propose a theory evaluation framework in this chapter.

Research is the study of reality, that is, how things work in the real world. Therefore, researchers often engage in fieldwork to uncover contextual elements and to explore unknown territory or culture to support their arguments and assertions about how reality works (Liang and Lu, 2006). Fieldwork is defined as the process of data collection using different methods such as participant observation and unstructured interviews (Burgess, 1984; Johnson, 1975). Although commonly associated with qualitative research methods, fieldwork can also be used to collect quantitative data (Babbie, 2004; Bernard, 1988; Burgess, 1984; Hall, 2011). Fieldwork is invaluable to our understanding of tourism and hospitality phenomenon, but presents significant methodological, ethical, philosophical, and personal challenges for researchers. C. Michael Hall explores some of these issues in Chapter 9, through a discussion on managing the spatialities of fieldwork in tourism. In the opening discussion, Michael conceptualizes fieldwork in tourism research, noting that it is that part of the research process that is regarded as a form of escape from classrooms, universities, and the home environment. From this perspective, he argues that fieldwork can be regarded as a form of leisure or play, but which is characterized by numerous challenges. Michael identifies six different types of interrelated spaces of fieldwork: temporal space, physical space, regulatory/political space, ethical space, social space, and theoretical/methodological space, noting that these spaces are not mutually exclusive and, instead, overlap and interact with one another over time.

Part II: Qualitative Research Methods

As the limitations of the positivist paradigm have become evident, as in other fields, tourism and hospitality researchers are increasingly making use of diverse subjective and interpretive methodologies and methods, more commonly referred to as qualitative approaches. This part of the book discusses some of these approaches as they are used

by tourism and hospitality researchers. Here, I use the word "qualitative" to encompass discussions on qualitative research methods (for example, ethnographic, grounded theory, and so on), qualitative methods of data collection (for example, interviews, analysis of documents, and so on), and qualitative methods of analysis (Nunkoo et al., 2017; Nunkoo et al., 2013b).

Tourism is a social phenomenon that embeds people's experiences that are shaped by diverse social and cultural factors. In this case, ethnography is a valuable approach to study such experiences as it facilitates an understanding of human behavior and the ways in which individuals construct meanings of the world and their lives (Hammersley, 2016; LeCompte and Schensul, 2010). Ethnographic research studies people's behavior in an everyday context and is less technical in character than quantitative approaches, and is therefore useful for researching tourism and hospitality issues which are inherently experiential. In Chapter 10, Nicholas Wise discusses the relevance of ethnography as a method for researching tourism and hospitality phenomenon. Nicholas takes readers through the theoretical principles of ethnographic research and discusses its applications. He urges researchers to be reflective in their interpretation of results by interrogating the truth to produce place-specific knowledge and findings.

For good reasons, theoretical advancement lies at the heart of scholarly research activities. The maturity of a discipline is to a large extent determined by the extent of theoretical advancements in the form of the scientific usefulness of the contribution. In many cases, this relates to the more wide-ranging implications of the research contributions. In the words of Ågerfalk (2014, p. 594), theoretical advancement in a field is determined by the "extent the new understanding prompts further theoretical elaboration beyond the current research context." However, tourism and hospitality is often criticized for lacking endemic theoretical developments. Such is the argument that T.S. Stumpf and Christopher Califf advance in Chapter 11. Tyler and Christopher provide a number of reasons to explain the deficiency in theory development that characterizes tourism and hospitality research. These contributors, like several other researchers (e.g., Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2016), advocate the use of the grounded theory methodology to advance theoretical development. Tyler and Christopher's chapter provides an overview of the grounded theory methodology and discusses the principles of theoretical sensitivity and theoretical engagement. The discussion then delves into the use of meta-theory in grounded investigations.

Alain Decrop and Julie Masset further the discussion on grounded theory in Chapter 12. While the preceding discussion by Tyler and Christopher focuses on the use of meta-theory in grounded theory investigations, Alain and Julie make a comparison between the Glaserian and Straussian schools of thought on grounded theory. The contributors then use the specific context of vacation decision-making to illustrate the main activities and tools involved in the grounded theory approach (that is, coding, memoing, integrative diagrams, and computer assistance). By way of conclusion, the methodological aspects of a grounded theory investigation are discussed. In Chapter 13, Vern Biaett uses participant observation with socially constructed grounded theory to explore visitor behaviors. The chapter does not report the findings of the study per se, but discusses the application of what Vern termed an "imaginative research method." The chapter explores the research design implications to study the physical, emotional, social, and intellectual connections of guests and visitors. Issues of ontology, epistemology, and methodology are discussed.

Vern then provides guidance on fieldwork, highlighting the ethical issues and the best practices for collecting data in grounded theory investigations. Vern also provides guidelines on data analysis, focusing on the different levels of coding involved.

Those who acknowledge the influence of the broader context are faced with the question of how best to investigate the impact of the changing social, cultural, historical, and political conditions on people's lives and their identities. Narrative analysis is increasingly considered useful for examining the ways in which people construct meaning of their lives within changing conditions (Phinney, 2000). Narrative analysis refers to a family of approaches that focuses on the study of narratives in storied form (Mura and Sharif, 2017; Reissman, 1993). Research interests in narrative analysis represent the narrative turn in human sciences fostered by a movement away from positivist approaches to social inquiry; the "memoir boom" in literature and popular culture; and researchers' interests in the exploration of personal lives across various contexts. In Chapter 14, Tom Griffin positions narrative analysis as a valuable methodology for tourism research. Tom introduces readers to the inherent characteristics of narrative analysis and discusses the importance of narratives to understand social life, distinguishing between "small" and "big" narratives. He then contextualizes his discussion of narrative analysis to tourism research, applying his own research on the experiences of immigrants with their hosting of friends and relatives to explain the research process. Tom urges researchers to consider narrative analysis to better understand the lived realities of individuals.

Senses are central to the tourism experiences (Pan and Ryan, 2009; Urry, 2002). The study of human senses in tourism and hospitality dates back to the early sixteenth century and has evolved both theoretically and methodologically. There are now various conceptualizations of the term which have been applied in various contexts to study experiences of travelers (e.g., Kim and Fesenmaier, 2017; Martins et al., 2017). In Chapter 15, Alfred Ogle introduces readers to the Sensory Quasi-Q-Sort (SQQS). As an approach rarely used by tourism researchers (Stergiou and Airey, 2011), Alfred explains how it can be used to enrich qualitative research in hospitality and tourism via the capture of human senses. He argues that SQQS has the potential to offer new insights into research on customer perceptions of service products. Adding to the debate on the benefits of subjective methodologies, in Chapter 16, Martin Trandberg Jensen discusses the analytic prospects of audio research methods in tourism. Critiquing textual modes of expression and contributing to the existing discourses on the use of sounds in research (e.g., Jensen et al., 2015; Lwin and Wee, 1999; Scarles, 2010), Martin alerts readers to the paucity of research that uses sound clips, audio music, and noise recording to deconstruct tourism experiences. Using a number of illustrations and examples, he provides a sonic manifesto for tourism and hospitality research.

Widely used in clinical trial and psychological assessments, projective techniques have gained acceptance since World War II (Bellak, 1992; Piotrowski, 2015). However, tourism and hospitality researchers have yet to make use of such techniques to their full potential. In Chapter 17, Ann Hindley and Xavier Font explain how projective techniques are useful to circumvent socially desirable responses or reveal the subconscious in researching travelers' behavior. The chapter introduces readers to five types of projective techniques: collage, list of values, word association, photo elicitation, and scenarios. The authors explain each of them, drawing from their own experiences and from various research contexts. Despite the extensive criticisms levied against projective techniques (see Piotrowski,

2015 for a comprehensive review of projective techniques usage worldwide), the chapter concludes that they have huge potential for advancing psychologically grounded investigations in tourism and hospitality.

On the connection of photographs to memory, Berger (1992, p. 192) noted that "the thrill found in a photograph comes from the onrush of memory. This is obvious when it is a picture of something we once knew. That house we lived in. Mother when young." Indeed, for decades, photographs have been used as research evidence, as stimuli to generate further data, and as a way of eliciting affect and reflections from research participants (Dockett et al., 2017; Knowles and Sweetman, 2004; Rose, 2016). Building on one of the projective techniques discussed by Ann and Xavier in the previous chapter, in Chapter 18, Bill Gregorash examines gastronomic experiences of tourists using auto-driven photo elicitation. Drawing on the work of Berger (1992) and Harper (2002), Bill defines the photo elicitation technique as the insertion of photographs into a research interview. Drawing from his research on gastronomic food experiences of tourists, he discusses the advantages of and the mechanics of using photo elicitation as a research technique. Bill explains how the photo elicitation technique brought new dimensions to his research and cleared some of the misunderstanding he had as a chef about the gastronomic experiences of individuals.

Destination image features among the most documented research areas in tourism (Pike, 2002; Zhang et al., 2014). The majority of the studies have, however, been informed by the positivistic paradigm, and have thus relied on quantitative methods of data collection and analysis. Adopting an opposing approach to the positivistic school of thought in Chapter 19, Steven Pike advocates the use of the repertory test technique (also known as the repertory grid analysis and Kelly's triads) for eliciting destination image attributes. Having its theoretical basis in the personal construct theory (Kelly, 1955) that "focuses on how individuals make sense of the experiences, events, and people in their world" (Caputi et al., 2009, p. 501), the repertory test technique, Steven argues, is alluring to tourism researchers. He notes that it is unfortunate that tourism and hospitality scholars have rarely made use of this approach. Using his own research on destination image, Steven describes the repertory grid technique and the resulting implications for sampling methods, data interpretation, and research validity.

Furthering the discussion on qualitative approaches, Susann Power advocates the use of archival research in tourism and hospitality in Chapter 20. Archival records can be defined as "documents made or received and accumulated by a person or organization in the course of the conduct of affairs and preserved because of their continuing value" (Ellis, 1993, p. 2). With the exception of a few studies such as those by Nagy and Carr (2017) and Quinn (2006), archival research is an under-utilized qualitative research method in tourism and hospitality. Such is the argument Susann makes in this chapter. She presents the theoretical underpinnings of the archival research method and warns researchers about the potential pitfalls of archival research. She also proposes a number of solutions to overcome these limitations. She draws from a research project that has as its objective to assess the best practices in sustainable tourism, to explain the archival research method.

The digital and information age, and the accompanying revolution in Internet technology, have brought about new opportunities for doing research. Social media and other similar computer-mediated technologies have become valuable sources of research data.

Social groups on such platforms "have a 'real' existence for their participants and thus have consequential effects on many aspects of behavior, including consumer behavior" (Kozinets, 1998, p. 366). This technique is therefore potentially alluring for tourism and hospitality researchers. In Chapter 21, Jing (Bill) Xu and Mao-Ying Wu present netnography as a "new" research method in tourism studies. Jing and Mao-Ying situate netnography in the context of the Web 2.0 era and describe the research steps involved in a netnographic study. Based on a review of tourism and hospitality studies that utilized the netnography approach, the contributors discuss the best practices in a netnographic study, focusing on the role of the researcher and the ethical issues involved.

Part III: Quantitative Research Methods

The contributions of quantitative approaches informed by the positivistic paradigm to tourism and hospitality research cannot be disputed. Quantitative research is a process of inquiry based on testing a theory composed of variables, and analyzed using numbers. Studies based on quantitative approaches have historically been dominant in tourism and hospitality studies (Decrop, 1999; Dolnicar, 2015; Nunkoo et al., 2013a; Nunkoo et al., 2013b; Nunkoo et al., 2017; Riley and Love, 2000; Walle, 1997). Statistical techniques are inherent to quantitative research and they allow for the discovery of multivariate relationships among variables that explain a certain phenomenon (Palmer et al., 2005). Quantitative research methods and their associated tools therefore merit a discussion in this volume. While the philosophical and underlying principles of quantitative research are presented in Part I of this volume, the chapters presented in Part III deal with quantitative methods of data collection (for example, surveys), quantitative data analysis techniques (conjoint analysis, regression analysis, partial least squares), and other methods associated with quantitative work.

A vast majority of research in the field of tourism and hospitality is based on data collected from surveys using structured questionnaires. In tourism and hospitality, surveys are used to gather opinions, perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors of individuals. However, the survey method has been under scrutiny by a number of research scholars (e.g., Biemer, 2010; Dolnicar et al., 2009; Groves and Lyberg, 2010; Lee et al., 2012; Hulland et al., 2017). In particular, the sources of error in survey research have been the subject of fervent debates. In Chapter 22, Antonino Mario Oliveri applies the total survey error (TSE) paradigm to discuss the sources of error in tourism surveys. While new technologies have induced changes in the ways we collect data,, Antonino argues in this chapter that face-to-face surveys still have a prominent role in tourism research. He presents the TSE paradigm and discusses the various sources of non-sampling error such as validity, measurement, coverage, and non-response bias. He then situates the role of the interviewer and the interviewee in the TSE paradigm and discusses ways to alleviate non-sampling errors in survey research.

Researchers rely on truthful responses from research participants to be able to draw up useful and meaningful conclusions in a study (van de Mortel, 2008). Social desirability response bias (SDRB) is the tendency for study participants to respond in ways that present a favorable image of themselves, denying undesirable traits and behaviors, even if this means "faking" the answers they provide. SDRB provides an "untrue" picture of reality and therefore impairs survey results and policy making (Randall and Fernandes, 1991).

Contributing to the debate on how to minimize errors in survey research, in Chapter 23, Sheree-Ann Adams, Davina Stanford, and Xavier Font discuss SDRB in ethical consumer decision making and present conjoint analysis as a way of minimizing SDRB. Using cruise tourist behaviors as the study context, the contributors describe at length conjoint analysis and its application as well as the benefits and limitations of this method.

Images and pictures are sources of data that are often used in qualitative tourism and hospitality research (e.g. Chalfen, 1979; Fairweather and Swaffield, 2001; Govers and Go, 2004; Li et al., 2016; see also Chapter 18 by Bill Gregorash on the use of auto-driven photo elicitation technique to examine gastronomic experiences of tourists). In Chapter 24, Eerang Park takes a different and somewhat unique approach to the use of photographs in tourism research. The chapter presents the digital image processing method, informed by the histogram-based image classification approach, to analyze the promotional images posted on the website of the Hong Kong Tourism Board. Eerang grounds his discussion on the red, green, and blue (RGB) color model to explain the analysis of destination images. The chapter describes the experiment and the resulting implications for study design and sample selection. Eerang concludes the chapter by urging tourism researchers to consider digital image processing and color research as methods to advance the field of tourism marketing.

The influence of norms on behavior has been the subject of various research (e.g., Chen et al., 2017; Miller and Prentice, 2016; Nook et al., 2016; Sparkman and Walton, 2017). Norms have considerable potential to foster those types of behavioral changes that promote sustainability. In Chapter 25, Robert Manning explains the potential of normative theory and methods to inform management of resources in the context of recreation and tourism. The chapter first reviews normative theory and discusses its adaption to tourism and recreational contexts. Using the examples of the Yosemite National Park and the Olympic National Park in the United States, the discussion then delves into explaining to readers the measurement of norms. Finally, a discussion on the theoretical and methodological issues that can inform research on norms in tourism and recreation contexts is presented.

Benchmarking is a popular tool utilized by tourism and hospitality researchers to understand best practices (e.g., Lai, 2016; Önder et al., 2017; Teng et al., 2017). In Chapter 26, Elke Hermans explains the technique of benchmarking and its accompanying methodology. The opening discussion of the chapter presents an overview of benchmarking, following which Elke outlines its process. The contributor then elaborates on the different benchmarking techniques available, such as ratio analysis or comparison of mean, data envelopment analysis, and the composite index technique. Elaborating on the latter, Elke analyzes its advantages and presents the steps for researchers to consider when developing composite indicators. Finally, the chapter reviews the different benchmarking techniques that have been applied to the field of tourism and hospitality.

Experimental design is commonly used to examine causal relationships among variables (Kline, 2011). This method draws from the belief that the most significant type of evidence is derived from randomized control trials. This involves an experimental research method with a strict random assignment of research subjects to groups and tight controls over other variables (Hafer and Bègue, 2005; White, 1997). The biggest advantage of experimental research is that it ensures high internal validity in terms of how well researchers can rule out rival explanations for their results (Schulz, 1999). Experimental

research has been used in some studies in tourism and hospitality (e.g., Fong et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2010) and, interestingly, it is becoming a popular approach among tourism and hospitality researchers (Fong et al., 2016). Furthering the debate on this topic, Eugene Thomlinson discusses the application of experimental research in tourism in Chapter 27. After discussing the meaning and nature of an experimental design, Eugene looks at the key consideration for experimental research and alerts researchers to potential errors that may arise in the process. He then applies an online experimental design to study changes in destination perception. He concludes the chapter with a discussion on the potential of this technique for advancing tourism research.

In recent decades, tourism and hospitality research has become increasingly reliant on secondary data (e.g., Knežević Cvelbar et al., 2016; Dogru et al., 2017; Li et al., 2017; Zhang and Kulendran, 2017). At the most basic level, "secondary data analysis involves the analysis of an existing dataset, which had previously been collected by another researcher, usually for a different research question" (Heaton, 2003, p. 285). Regression analysis, in its various forms and conceptualization, is a popular statistical technique for analyzing secondary data. It helps researchers to test hypotheses and make predictions (Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2012). In Chapter 28, Boopen Seetanah introduces readers to the regression technique as a tool for analyzing secondary data. Using a tourism demand function, he explains model building and specification, distinguishing between a simple regression equation and a multivariate regression equation. Boopen then explains the key statistics for evaluating regression models, before delving into more complex analysis such as time series, cross-sectional, pooled time series, and panel regressions.

Theory testing is an important exercise in advancing scientific research in any discipline. A theory usually contains a number of variables acting together to predict a phenomenon. Testing a theory therefore requires multivariate statistical techniques. In this context, SEM is particularly useful (Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2012; Nunkoo et al., 2013a). For many researchers, SEM is usually equated with covariance-based SEM (CB-SEM). However, partial least squares SEM (PLS-SEM) is another method of testing a structural model. Although it is generally far less popular than CB-SEM, PLS-SEM is gaining some popularity in tourism and hospitality studies (e.g., Kim et al., 2012; Loureiro, 2014; Prayag et al., 2013; Rezaei et al., 2016). In Chapter 29, Faizan Ali, Woody Kim, and Cihan Cobanoglu explain the PLS-SEM technique. The contributors situate PLS-SEM in the general debate on SEM and advocate its use to advance hospitality and tourism research. The discussion makes an explicit distinction between PLS-SEM and CB-SEM and provides readers with the rule of thumb for selecting the former over the latter. The technical issues inherent to PLS-SEM and the reporting guidelines are then discussed. Finally, the contributors test a structural model that links service experience and emotions to customer satisfaction, to demonstrate the operationalization of PLS-SEM to readers.

Part IV: Mixed Methods Research

The past decades have witnessed fervent debates on the use and benefits of qualitative and quantitative approaches in the social sciences (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Onwuegbuzie and Leech, 2005), including tourism (Molina-Azorin and Font, 2016). Quantitative approaches are based on the principle that social science inquiry should be objective, where the research is free from bias and the researchers remain emotionally

detached and uninvolved with the subjects of a study. Qualitative purists, on the other hand, reject objectivism, positing that multiple realities abound and that it is neither possible nor desirable to study reality objectively (Harris, 2000; Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Onwuegbuzie and Leech, 2005; Venkatesh et al., 2013). Debates on their use have been so fervent and polarized that some researchers, especially students, are led to believe in the "incompatibility thesis" (Howe, 1988), which suggests that combining qualitative and quantitative approach is not appropriate. This is far from being true, because qualitative and quantitative approaches have more similarities than differences (Onwuegbuzie and Leech, 2005). In fact, researchers are encouraged to become pragmatic by moving "beyond quantitative versus qualitative research arguments because, as recognized by mixed-methods research, both quantitative and qualitative research are important and useful" (Venkatesh et al., 2013, p. 14). Mixed methods is an approach that combines qualitative and quantitative research methods in the same inquiry. The contributions falling under this section of the volume relate to the philosophical assumptions, research design issues, and the applications of mixed methods in tourism and hospitality. Tools relevant to both qualitative and quantitative approaches such as content analysis and case study methods are also discussed in this section.

Philosophical assumptions are probably one of the most difficult areas for students and researchers to understand and master. Researchers often mistake epistemology as methods, and treat these concepts as synonymous (Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie, 2003). However, this is far from being the case. In Chapter 30, Girish Prayag reviews the underlying principles of mixed methods research and reviews the method versus paradigm debate surrounding this research approach. The opening section of the chapter investigates whether mixed methods is a method or a methodology. The discussion then delves into the philosophical assumptions of mixed methods research. Girish then makes a case for mixed methods investigations and discusses the implications for research design. Adding to this debate, in Chapter 31, Leanne White examines the application of semiotics, structuralism, and content analysis in the context of qualitative and quantitative tourism research. Leanne refers to the combined use of qualitative and quantitative data in a single study as triangulation. She then explains the use of semiotics (which refers to the study of signs, codes, and culture, and a methodology for reading soft data) and structuralism (the theory that culture is understood as a result of the formal structures that operate below the surface) in tourism research, and presents content analysis as a tool that can be effectively utilized in mixed methods research.

José Molina-Azorin, Xavier Font, María López-Gamero, Jorge Pereira-Moliner, Eva Pertusa-Ortega, and Juan Tarí further the discussion on mixed methods approaches in Chapter 32. The contributors position themselves as a group of researchers who use mixed methods research to understand competitive strategy and sustainability practices, examining relationships with some management systems, such as quality management and environmental management. In this chapter, Jose Molina-Azorin and colleagues describe mixed methods research and present the research design issues underlying such an approach. They distinguish between four groups and nine types of mixed methods designs. Interestingly, these contributors relate their experiences in using mixed methods by drawing from two research projects that they undertook: on competitive strategy in the hotel industry, and on communicating sustainability practices. In each of these projects, they adopted a different mixed methods design, which they explain to readers. Like other

researchers (e.g., French et al., 2017; Heimtun and Morgan, 2012; Molina-Azorin and Font, 2016; Nunkoo et al., 2013a), Jose and colleagues advocate the use of mixed methods research in tourism and hospitality studies, and discuss its benefits.

Content analysis dates back to the eighteenth century and has since then become a popular technique to analyse communications and texts (Holsti, 1969). This research approach has gained more prominence as a result of the proliferation of electronic data (Stepchenkova et al., 2009). Content analysis can be effectively used as a tool for qualitative as well as quantitative research (Graneheim and Lundman, 2004). Content analysis in tourism and hospitality has been applied to a variety of data and to various depths of interpretation (e.g., Chang and Katrichis, 2016; Cheng and Edwards, 2017; Mohammed et al., 2015; Van Rheenen et al., 2017). Content analysis as a tool for qualitative and quantitative research is discussed by C. Michael Hall in Chapter 33. Michael discusses the evolution and uses of content analysis. He argues that although content analysis is often framed as a qualitative research tool, it is also a common technique in multi-methods studies to increase the validity of research results. He then reviews the various tourism and hospitality contexts in which content analysis has been applied. Michael then discusses qualitative and quantitative content analysis, and explains how it is also used in systematic reviews and meta-analysis.

The case study method is common in many disciplines and areas, including tourism and hospitality (e.g., Andersson, 2016; Hede, 2005; Simón et al., 2004; Timur and Timur, 2016). Although it has long been criticized as weak and simplistic, the case study method possesses certain characteristics that support its use as a valid methodological tool in tourism research (Beeton, 2005; Xiao and Smith, 2006b). Xiao and Smith (2006b) illustrate how this approach can suitably be used as a tool for mixed methods research. In this *Handbook*, the application of the case study method in tourism research is explained by Sandra De Urioste-Stone, William McLaughlin, John Daigle, and Jessica Fefer in Chapter 34. The chapter presents the case study method and its different components, and delves into its origin. The contributors then present the various contexts and conditions in which a case study method can be appropriately used, and review cases in tourism that lend themselves to such an approach. Sandra and her colleagues use a three-staged framework to describe the methodology and how it is used in travel and tourism research, relating their own experiences to the discussion.

In Chapter 35, Elizabeth Coberly and Susan Slocum investigate research methodology choice in serious leisure in Renaissance festival tourism. The chapter presents the most frequently chosen research methods in serious leisure research: ethnography, experience sampling modeling (ESM), grounded theory, and the Serious Leisure Inventory and Measure (SLIM) questionnaire. The nature of serious leisure in the context of the Renaissance festival is first discussed. Elizabeth and Susan argue that both qualitative and quantitative methods have been used to research serious leisure in tourism. The SLIM and ESM techniques are presented as the most utilized quantitative approaches in serious leisure research. As for the qualitative approaches adopted in this area of research, the contributors consider grounded theory and ethnography as the most popular techniques. These approaches are discussed and their advantages to study serious leisure are highlighted.

Climate change is probably one of the biggest concerns for proponents of sustainable tourism. It has therefore emerged as an important area of research in the tourism

literature (e.g., Michailidou et al., 2016; Moyle et al., 2017; Rogerson, 2016; Scott et al., 2016). Research on climate change will benefit from a mixed methods approach. Such is the argument advanced by Gijsbert Hoogendoorn and Jennifer Fitchett in Chapter 36. The contributors investigate the prospects and obstacles for mixed methods research in South Africa. Gijsbert and Jennifer then highlight the link between tourism and climate change, arguing that research in this area can be improved by the production of scientifically robust data gathered through mixed methods approaches. They argue that mixed methods climate change research is particularly important for countries such as South Africa because of the poor, incomplete, and sometimes erroneous data that exist. Gijsbert and Jennifer propose three research approaches to advance research in this area: tourism climate indices; digital elevation models; and interviews with tourism stakeholders, government, and tourists regarding tourism and climate change. Each of these techniques is discussed at length, and their contributions to climate change research in tourism are outlined.

Another application of mixed methods research is described by Dean Hristov and Haywantee Ramkissoon in Chapter 37. Arguing that the existing literature on destination and tourism management has primarily focused on marketing, management, and governance at the neglect of research on destination leadership (Hristov and Zehrer, 2015; Pechlaner et al., 2014), Dean and Haywantee propose a methodological framework for researching leadership in destination management organizations. They advocate a mixed methods approach that requires three phases of data collection and analysis. Phase one involves the collection of qualitative data through observation, personal interviews, and document reviews. In phase two, the contributors propose the use of a survey on the social network to investigate the processes and practices related to the enactment and practice of destination leadership in destination marketing organizations. Phase three involves another round of qualitative data collection to capture the insider and outsider perspectives on leadership. Dean and Haywantee argue that these research phases are complementary, and note that the proposed methodological framework facilitates an in-depth investigation into the organization and its operational context. A similar mixed methods approach is adopted by Irma Booyens in Chapter 38. Irma discusses how research on innovation in tourism can benefit from a mixed methods approach. She uses the context of the Western Cape, South Africa, to measure innovation using the survey method and a series of in-depth interviews.

Part V: Other Research Issues

The final part of the *Handbook* comprises other considerations in a research investigation such as sampling design, methodological issues in cross-cultural studies, and research ethics. A researcher needs facts to substantiate the claims made in a study. Consequently, most research will involve sampling of some kind. Sample selection is therefore an integral part of the research process (Smith, 2017). But sampling design has been, in its own right, a subject of academic debate in the field of tourism and hospitality (e.g., Dolnicar et al., 2014; Liu, 2017; Loomis, 2007). Viraiyan Teeroovengadum and Robin Nunkoo present the various sampling designs commonly utilized by tourism and hospitality researchers in Chapter 39. The contributors explain the sampling process which comprises the following: defining the target population; selecting the sampling frame; determining

the sampling technique; determining the sample size; and executing the sampling plan. Drawing from existing studies in tourism and hospitality, Viraiyan and Robin explain the different sampling techniques before discussing sample size determination in quantitative and qualitative research.

Tourism is a phenomenon characterized by multiculturality, necessitating cross-cultural research. Therefore, determining the extent to which concepts, theories, and findings are relevant across different cultures has been an important area of investigation in tourism and hospitality (e.g., Besbes et al., 2016; Chen and Huang, 2017; Kim, 2013; Kim and Ritchie, 2014). However, cross-cultural studies have unique methodological challenges that may not be present in a mono-culture investigation. As Hult et al. (2008, p. 1027) argue, "because of cultural differences, elements of research designs (such as survey items) cannot simply be exchanged in original form between cultures." This idea is further developed and discussed by Frederic Dimanche and Lidia Andrades in Chapter 40. The chapter has as its main objective to alert readers to the methodological risks and difficulties inherent to cross-cultural research and provide guidelines to minimize errors. According to the contributors, equivalence is the main concern in cross-cultural research. The various dimensions of equivalence – construct equivalence, operationalization equivalence, contextual equivalence, linguistic equivalence, and sample equivalence – are discussed. The chapter also provides a set of techniques to improve research design in cross-cultural research.

Ethical considerations are inherent to any kind of investigations and they influence the way in which a research is carried out (Behi and Nolan, 1995). The researcher, the scientific community, institutions, funding bodies, and the society at large should consider ethical issues. Discussions of ethical issues in tourism are limited to tourist and host behaviors, while very little attention has been paid to research ethics in the writings of tourism academics. Such is the argument that Gianna Moscardo makes in Chapter 41. Gianna presents the nature of research ethics in tourism, and five principles for ethical research decisions: beneficence, respect, justice, truthfulness, and research quality. The ethical issues present at different stages of the research process and in different research contexts are then discussed. Gianna concludes the chapter by providing a number of guidelines for ethical tourism research.

In Chapter 42, Antonia Canosa, Anne Graham, and Erica Wilson expand the debate on research ethics by considering the methodological opportunities and ethical challenges in child-centered approaches in tourism and hospitality research. Their discussion reflects the growing research on children as a subject of study in tourism and hospitality (e.g., Gössling et al., 2004; Gram, 2007; Turley, 2001). Antonia, Anne, and Erica explain the need for involving children in tourism studies, and elaborate on the methodological opportunities available to researchers. Issues of ontology, epistemology, and methodology are discussed. Like other researchers (Canosa and Graham, 2016; Feng and Li, 2016; Poria and Timothy, 2014), the contributors alert readers to the ethical challenges facing research that involves children. In particular, they outline seven ethical commitments that researchers studying children should adhere to: (1) ethics in research involving children is everyone's responsibility; (2) respecting the dignity of children is core to ethical research; (3) research involving children must be just and equitable; (4) ethical research benefits children; (5) children should never be harmed by their participation in research; (6) research must always obtain children's informed and ongoing consent; and (7) ethical research requires ongoing reflection.

Universities have a prominent role in knowledge transfer that supports innovation and economic development (Bekkers and Freitas, 2008; Bercovitz and Feldman, 2006; Brescia et al., 2016; Hong, 2008). However, several tourism researchers have expressed concern about the missing link between research production and its utilization by the industry (Cooper et al., 2002; Cooper, 2006; Frechtling, 2004; Xiao and Smith, 2007). As noted by Ritchie and Ritchie (2002, p. 451), "a great deal of research is being conducted in tourism, but is inefficiently used and rarely exploited to its full potential." Furthering this debate in Chapter 43, Lisa Ruhanen and Chris Cooper define the knowledge concept and explain how knowledge transfer occurs between universities and industry. The discussion then moves into the various channels for knowledge transfer between universities and industry, such as patents, copyright, and licensing, spin-offs and start-ups, research publications, mobility of students, consultancy and contract research agreements, joint research agreements, personal mobility, and meetings and conferences. The nature of knowledge transfer under each of these channels is discussed. Finally, the contributors elaborate on the various barriers to tourism knowledge transfer between universities and the industry.

REFERENCES

Ågerfalk, P.J. (2014). Insufficient theoretical contribution: A conclusive rationale for rejection?. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 23, 593–599.

Andersson, G. (2016). An analysis model of tourism academic networks: A Swedish case study triangulated with an EU research project. *Journal of Teaching in Travel and Tourism*, 16(3), 195–212.

Assaf, A.G., Oh, H., and Tsionas, M.G. (2016). Unobserved heterogeneity in hospitality and tourism research. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(6), 774–788.

Ateljevic, I., Harris, C., Wilson, E., and Collins, F.L. (2005). Getting "entangled": Reflexivity and the "critical turn" in tourism studies. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 30(2), 9–21.

Babbie, E. (2004). *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.

Baggio, R., and Klobas, J. (2017). *Quantitative Methods in Tourism: A Handbook*. Bristol: Channel View publications.

Beeton, S. (2005). The case study in tourism research: A multi-method case study approach. In B.W. Ritchie, P. Barnes, and C. Palmer (eds), *Tourism Research Methods: Integrating Theory with Practice* (pp. 37–48), Wallingford: CABI.

Behi, R., and Nolan, M. (1995). Ethical issues in research. *British Journal of Nursing*, 4(12), 712–716.

Bekkers, R., and Freitas, I.M.B. (2008). Analysing knowledge transfer channels between universities and industry: To what degree do sectors also matter?. *Research Policy*, 37(10), 1837–1853.

Bellak, L. (1992). Projective techniques in the computer age. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 58(3), 445–453.

Bercovitz, J., and Feldman, M. (2006). Entprepenerial universities and technology transfer: A conceptual framework for understanding knowledge-based economic development. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31(1), 175–188.

Berdychevsky, L., and Gibson, H.J. (2015). Phenomenology of young women's sexual risk-taking in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 46, 299–310.

Berger, J. (1992). *Keeping a Rendezvous*. New York: Vintage International.

Bernard, H.R. (1988). *Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

Besbes, A., Legohérel, P., Kucukusta, D., and Law, R. (2016). A cross-cultural validation of the Tourism Web Acceptance Model (T-WAM) in different cultural contexts. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 28(3), 211–226.

Bianchi, R. (2009). The "critical turn" in tourism studies: A radical critique. *Tourism Geographies*, 11(4), 484–504.

Biemer, P.P. (2010). Total survey error: Design, implementation, and evaluation. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74(5), 817–848.

Brescia, F., Colombo, G., and Landoni, P. (2016). Organizational structures of Knowledge Transfer Offices: an analysis of the world's top-ranked universities. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 41(1), 132–151.

Burgess, R.G. (1984). *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Burr, V. (2003). *Social Constructionism*, 2nd edition. London: Routledge.

Canosa, A., and Graham, A. (2016). Ethical tourism research involving children. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 61, 219–221.

Caputi, P., Hunter, M.G., and Tan, F.B. (2009). Personal construct theory. In Y.K. Dwivedi, B. Lal, M.D. Williams, S.L. Schneberger, and M. Wade (eds), *Handbook of Research on Contemporary Theoretical Models in Information Systems* (pp. 496–515), Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Chalfen, R.M. (1979). Photograph's role in tourism: Some unexplored relationships. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 435–447.

Chang, W.J., and Katrichis, J.M. (2016). A literature review of tourism management (1990–2013): A content analysis perspective. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 19(8), 791–823.

Chen, G., and Huang, S.S. (2017). Toward a theory of backpacker personal development: Cross-cultural validation of the BPD scale. *Tourism Management*, 59, 630–639.

Chen, G., Liu, J., and Wang, Y. (2017). Governance dilemma for tourism supply chain collaborative innovation: contract or relational norms?. *Tourism Tribune*, 32(8), 48–58.

Cheng, M., and Edwards, D. (2017). A comparative automated content analysis approach on the review of the sharing economy discourse in tourism and hospitality. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1–15.

Cohen, E. (1979). A phenomenology of tourist experiences. *Sociology*, 13(2), 179–201.

Cooper, C. (2006). Knowledge management and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(1), 47–64.

Cooper, C., Prideaux, B., Ruhanen, L., Mules, T., and Carson, D. (2002). *Development of a Destination Management Framework*. Brisbane: CRCST.

Corley, K.G., and Gioia, D.A. (2011). Building theory about theory building: What constitutes a theoretical contribution?. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(1), 12–32.

Cortina, J.M. (2016). Defining and operationalizing theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(8), 1142–1149.

Crane, A., Henriques, I., Husted, B.W., and Matten, D. (2016). What constitutes a theoretical contribution in the business and society field?. *Business and Society*, 55(6), 783–791.

Crawford-Welch, S., and McCleary, K.W. (1992). An identification of the subject areas and research techniques used in five hospitality-related journals. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 11(2), 155–167.

Dann, G., Nash, D., and Pearce, P. (1988). Methodology in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(1), 1–28.

Decrop, A. (1999). Triangulation in qualitative tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 20(1), 157–161.

do Valle, P.O., and Assaker, G. (2016). Using partial least squares structural equation modeling in tourism research: A review of past research and recommendations for future applications. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(6), 695–708.

Docherty, T. (2014). *Postmodernism: A Reader*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Dockett, S., Einarsdottir, J., and Perry, B. (2017). Photo elicitation: Reflecting on multiple sites of meaning. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 25(3), 225–240.

Dogru, T., Sirakaya-Turk, E., and Crouch, G.I. (2017). Remodeling international tourism demand: Old theory and new evidence. *Tourism Management*, 60, 47–55.

Dolnicar, S. (2015). In future, I would love to see . . . a reflection on the state of quantitative tourism research. *Tourism Review*, 70(4), 259–263.

Dolnicar, S., Grün, B., Leisch, F., and Schmidt, K. (2014). Required sample sizes for data-driven market segmentation analyses in tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(3), 296–306.

Dolnicar, S., Laesser, C., and Matus, K. (2009). Online versus paper: Format effects in tourism surveys. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(3), 295–316.

Dwyer, L., Gill, A., and Seetaram, N. (eds) (2012). *Handbook of Research Methods in Tourism: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Ellis, J. (ed.) (1993). *Keeping Archives*, 2nd editon. Melbourne: D.W. Thorpe.

Fairweather, J.R., and Swaffield, S.R. (2001). Visitor experiences of Kaikoura, New Zealand: An interpretative study using photographs of landscapes and Q method. *Tourism Management*, 22(3), 219–228.

Feng, X., and Li, M. (2016). Children tourism: A literature review. *Tourism Tribune*, 31(9), 61–71.

Figueroa-Domecq, C., Pritchard, A., Segovia-Pérez, M., Morgan, N., and Villacé-Molinero, T. (2015). Tourism gender research: A critical accounting. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 52, 87–103.

Fong, L.H.N., Law, R., Tang, C.M.F., and Yap, M.H.T. (2016). Experimental research in hospitality and tourism: A critical review. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(2), 246–266.

Frechtling, D. (2004). Assessment of the tourism/hospitality journals' role in knowledge transfer: An exploratory study. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(2), 100–107.

French, A.M., Luo, X.R., and Bose, R. (2017). Toward a holistic understanding of continued use of social networking tourism: A mixed-methods approach. *Information and Management*, 54(6), 802–813.

Goolaup, S., Solér, C., and Nunkoo, R. (2018). Developing a theory of surprise from travelers' extraordinary food experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(2), 218–231.

Gössling, S., Schumacher, K., Morelle, M., Berger, R., and Heck, N. (2004). Tourism and street children in Antananarivo, Madagascar. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 5(2), 131–149.

Govers, R., and Go, F.M. (2004). Projected destination image online: Website content analysis of pictures and text. *Information Technology and Tourism*, 7(2), 73–89.

Gram, M. (2007). Children as co-decision makers in the family? The case of family holidays. *Young Consumers*, 8(1), 19–28.

Graneheim, U.H., and Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24(2), 105–112.

Groves, R.M., and Lyberg, L. (2010). Total survey error: Past, present, and future. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74(5), 849–879.

Hafer, C.L., and Bègue, L. (2005). Experimental research on just-world theory: problems, developments, and future challenges. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 128.

Hair, J.F., Ringle, C.M., and Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139–152.

Hall, C.M. (ed.) (2011) *Fieldwork in Tourism: Methods, Issues and Reflections*, London: Routledge.

Hammersley, M. (2016). *Reading Ethnographic Research*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Harper, D. (2002). Talking about pictures: A case for photo elicitation. *Visual Studies*, 17(1), 13–26.

Harris, S. (2000). Reconciling positive and interpretative international management research: A native category approach. *International Business Review*, 9(6), 755–770.

Heaton, J. (2003). Secondary data analysis. In R. Miller and J. Brewer (eds), *The A–Z of Social Research* (pp. 285–288). London: SAGE.

Hede, A.M. (2005). Sports-events, tourism and destination marketing strategies: An Australian case study of Athens 2004 and its media telecast. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 10(3), 187–200.

Heimtun, B., and Morgan, N. (2012). Proposing paradigm peace: Mixed-methods in feminist tourism research. *Tourist Studies*, 12(3), 287–304.

Hibberd, F.J. (2001). Gergen's Social Constructionism, Logical Positivism and the Continuity of Error Part 1: Conventionalism. *Theory and Psychology*, 11(3), 297–321.

Holsti, O.R. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hong, W. (2008). Decline of the center: The decentralizing process of knowledge transfer of Chinese universities from 1985 to 2004. *Research Policy*, 37(4), 580–595.

Howe, K.R. (1988). Against the quantitative–qualitative incompatibility thesis or dogmas die hard. *Educational Researcher*, 17, 10–16.

Hristov, D., and Zehrer, A. (2015). The destination paradigm continuum revisited: DMOs serving as leadership networks. *Tourism Review*, 70(2), 116–131.

Hulland, J., Baumgartner, H., and Smith, K.M. (2017). Marketing survey research best practices: Evidence and recommendations from a review of JAMS articles. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 46(1), 92–108.

Hult, G.T.M., Ketchen, D.J., Griffith, D.A., et al. (2008). Data equivalence in cross-cultural international business research: assessment and guidelines. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39(6), 1027–1044.

Jensen, M.T., Scarles, C., and Cohen, S.A. (2015). A multisensory phenomenology of interrail mobilities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 53, 61–76.

Johnson, J.M. (1975). *Doing Field Research*. New York: Free Press.

Johnson, R.B., and Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004). Mixed-methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14–26.

Kelly, G.A. (1955). *The Psychology of Personal Constructs*. New York: Norton.

Khalilzadeh, J., and Tasci, A.D. (2017). Large sample size, significance level, and the effect size: Solutions to perils of using big data for academic research. *Tourism Management*, 62, 89–96.

Kim, D.Y., Wen, L., and Doh, K. (2010). Does cultural difference affect customer's response in a crowded restaurant environment? A comparison of American versus Chinese customers. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 34(1), 103–123.

Kim, J.H. (2013). A cross-cultural comparison of memorable tourism experiences of American and Taiwanese college students. *Anatolia*, 24(3), 337–351.

Kim, J.H., and Ritchie, J.B. (2014). Cross-cultural validation of a memorable tourism experience scale (MTES). *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(3), 323–335.

Kim, J.J., and Fesenmaier, D.R. (2017). Measuring human senses and the touristic experience: methods and applications. In Z. Xiang and D.R. Fesenmaier (eds), *Analytics in Smart Tourism Design* (pp. 47–63). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Kim, M.J., Chung, N., Lee, C.K., and Kim, J.M. (2012). Do loyalty groups differ in the role of trust in online tourism shopping? A process perspective. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 29(4), 352–368.

Kline, R.B. (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*, 3rd edition, New York: Guilford Press.

Knežević Cvelbar, L., Dwyer, L., Koman, M., and Mihalič, T. (2016). Drivers of destination competitiveness in tourism: A global investigation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(8), 1041–1050.

Knowles, C. and Sweetman, J. (2004). Introduction. In C. Knowles and J. Sweetman (eds), *Picturing the Social Landscape: Visual Methods and the Sociological Imagination* (pp. 1–17). London: Routledge.

Koc, E., and Boz, H. (2014). Triangulation in tourism research: A bibliometric study of top three tourism journals. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 12, 9–14.

Kozinets, R.V. (1998). On netnography: Initial reflections on consumer research investigations of cyberculture. In J. Alba and W. Hutchinson (eds), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 25 (pp. 366–371). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Lai, J.H. (2016). Energy use and maintenance costs of upmarket hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 56, 33–43.

LeCompte, M.D., and Schensul, J.J. (2010). *Designing and Conducting Ethnographic Research*. Lanham, MD: Rowman Altamira.

Lee, G., Benoit-Bryan, J., and Johnson, T.P. (2012). Survey research in public administration: Assessing mainstream journals with a total survey error framework. *Public Administration Review*, 72(1), 87–97.

Li, Q., Huang, Z.J., and Christianson, K. (2016). Visual attention toward tourism photographs with text: An eye-tracking study. *Tourism Management*, 54, 243–258.

Li, X., Pan, B., Law, R., and Huang, X. (2017). Forecasting tourism demand with composite search index. *Tourism Management*, 59, 57–66.

Li, Y. (2000). Geographical consciousness and tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(4), 863–883.

Liang, B., and Lu, H. (2006). Conducting fieldwork in China: Observations on collecting primary data regarding crime, law, and the criminal justice system. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 22(2), 157–172.

Liu, T.M. (2017). Testing on-site sampling correction in discrete choice experiments. *Tourism Management*, 60, 439–441.

Loomis, J. (2007). Correcting for on-site visitor sampling bias when estimating the regional economic effects of tourism. *Tourism Economics*, 13(1), 41–47.

Loureiro, S.M.C. (2014). The role of the rural tourism experience economy in place attachment and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 40, 1–9.

Lwin, M., and Wee, C.H. (1999). The effect of an audio stimulus: Accents in English language on cross-cultural consumer response to advertising. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 11(2), 5–37.

Mannell, R.C., and Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1987). Psychological nature of leisure and tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(3), 314–331.

Martins, J., Gonçalves, R., Branco, F., et al. (2017). A multisensory virtual experience model for thematic tourism: A Port wine tourism application proposal. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 6(2), 103–109.

Michailidou, A.V., Vlachokostas, C., and Moussiopoulos, N. (2016). Interactions between climate change and the tourism sector: Multiple-criteria decision analysis to assess mitigation and adaptation options in tourism areas. *Tourism Management*, 55, 1–12.

Miller, D.T., and Prentice, D.A. (2016). Changing norms to change behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67, 339–361.

Mohammed, I., Guillet, B.D., and Law, R. (2015). The contributions of economics to hospitality literature: A content analysis of hospitality and tourism journals. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 44, 99–110.

Molina-Azorín, J.F., and Font, X. (2016). Mixed-methods in sustainable tourism research: an analysis of prevalence, designs and application in JOST (2005–2014). *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(4), 549–573.

Moyle, C.L.J., Moyle, B.D., Chai, A., Hales, R., Banhalmi-Zakar, Z., and Bec, A. (2018). Have Australia's tourism strategies incorporated climate change?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(5), 703–721.

Mura, P., and Sharif, S.P. (2017). Narrative analysis in tourism: a critical review. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 17(2), 194–207.

Nagy, G., and Carr, N. (2017). Comfort and the tourism accommodation sector: A central, yet under-studied issue. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, in press.

Nie, K., Ma, T., and Nakamori, Y. (2009). An approach to aid understanding emerging research fields – the case of knowledge management. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 26(6), 629–643.

Nook, E.C., Ong, D.C., Morelli, S.A., Mitchell, J.P., and Zaki, J. (2016). Prosocial conformity: Prosocial norms generalize across behavior and empathy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42(8), 1045–1062.

Nunkoo, R., and Ramkissoon, H. (2009). Applying the means-end chain theory and the laddering technique to the study of host attitudes to tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(3), 337–355.

Nunkoo, R., and Ramkissoon, H. (2012). Structural equation modelling and regression analysis in tourism research. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15(8), 777–802.

Nunkoo, R., and Ramkissoon, H. (2016). Stakeholders' views of enclave tourism: A grounded theory approach. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 40(5), 557–558.

Nunkoo, R., Gursoy, D., and Ramkissoon, H. (2013a). Developments in hospitality marketing and management: Social network analysis and research themes. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 22(3), 269–288.

Nunkoo, R., Hall, C.M., and Ladsawut, J. (2017). Gender and choice of methodology in tourism social science research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 63, 207–210.

Nunkoo, R., Smith, S.L., and Ramkissoon, H. (2013b). Residents' attitudes to tourism: A longitudinal study of 140 articles from 1984 to 2010. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(1), 5–25.

Önder, I., Wöber, K., and Zekan, B. (2017). Towards a sustainable urban tourism development in Europe: the role of benchmarking and tourism management information systems–A partial model of destination competitiveness. *Tourism Economics*, 23(2), 243–259.

Onwuegbuzie, A.J., and Leech, N.L. (2005). On becoming a pragmatic researcher: The importance of combining quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(5), 375–387.

Onwuegbuzie, A.J. and Teddlie, C. (2003). *A Framework for Analyzing Data in Mixed-Methods Research*. In A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie (eds), *Handbook of Mixed-Methods in Social and Behavioral Research* (pp. 351–383). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Palmer, A.L., Sesé, A., and Montaño, J.J. (2005). Tourism and statistics: Bibliometric study 1998–2002. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(1), 167–178.

Pan, S., and Ryan, C. (2009). Tourism sense-making: the role of the senses and travel journalism. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 26(7), 625–639.

Pechlaner, H., Kozak, M., and Volgger, M. (2014). Destination leadership: a new paradigm for tourist destinations?. *Tourism Review*, 69(1), 1–9.

Phinney, J.S. (2000). Identity formation across cultures: The interaction of personal, societal, and historical change. *Human Development*, 43(1), 27–31.

Pike, S. (2002). Destination image analysis: A review of 142 papers from 1973 to 2000. *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 541–549.

Piotrowski, C. (2015). Projective techniques usage worldwide: A review of applied settings 1995–2015. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 41(3), 9.

Platenkamp, V. and Botterill, D. (2013). Critical realism, rationality and tourism knowledge. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *41*, 110–129.

Poria, Y., and Timothy, D.J. (2014). Where are the children in tourism research?. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 47, 93–95.

Prayag, G., Hosany, S., Nunkoo, R., and Alders, T. (2013). London residents' support for the 2012 Olympic Games: The mediating effect of overall attitude. *Tourism Management*, 36, 629–640.

Quinn, B. (2006). Problematising "festival tourism": Arts festivals and sustainable development in Ireland. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(3), 288–306.

Randall, D.M., and Fernandes, M.F. (1991). The social desirability response bias in ethics research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10(11), 805–817.

Ren, C., Pritchard, A., and Morgan, N. (2010). Constructing tourism research: A critical inquiry. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(4), 885–904.

Rezaei, S., Ali, F., Amin, M., and Jayashree, S. (2016). Online impulse buying of tourism products: The role of web site personality, utilitarian and hedonic web browsing. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 7(1), 60–83.

Riessman, C.K. (1993). *Narrative Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

Riley, R.W. and Love, L.L. (2000). The state of qualitative tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(1), 164–187.

Ritchie, R.B., and Ritchie, B. (2002). A framework for an industry supported destination marketing information system. *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 439–454.

Rogerson, C.M. (2016). Climate change, tourism and local economic development in South Africa. *Local Economy*, 31(1–2), 322–331.

Rose, G. (2016). *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Researching with Visual Materials*, 4th edition. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C.M., and Gudergan, S.P. (2016). Guidelines for treating unobserved heterogeneity in tourism research: A comment on Marques and Reis (2015). *Annals of Tourism Research*, 57, 279–284.

Scarles, C. (2010). Where words fail, visuals ignite: Opportunities for visual autoethnography in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(4), 905–926.

Schulz, A.K.D. (1999). Experimental research method in a management accounting context. *Accounting and Finance*, 39(1), 29–51.

Scott, D., Hall, C.M., and Gössling, S. (2016). A report on the Paris Climate Change Agreement and its implications for tourism: Why we will always have Paris. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(7), 933–948.

Shani, A., and Uriely, N. (2017). Stand your ground: The case for publishing in hospitality and tourism journals. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 67, 72–74.

Simón, F.J.G., Narangajavana, Y., and Marqués, D.P. (2004). Carrying capacity in the tourism industry: a case study of Hengistbury Head. *Tourism Management*, 25(2), 275–283.

Smith, S.L.J. (2017). *Practical Tourism Research*. Wallingford: CABI.

Smith, S.L., Xiao, H., Nunkoo, R., and Tukamushaba, E.K. (2013). Theory in hospitality, tourism, and leisure studies. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 22(8), 875–894.

Song, Z. (2017). The debate between empirical and broader phenomenological approaches to research. *Tourism Management*, 58, 307–311.

Sparkman, G. and Walton, G.M. (2017). Dynamic norms promote sustainable behavior, even if it is counternormative. *Psychological Science*, 28(11), 1663–1674. DOI: 10.1177/0956797617719950.

Stepchenkova, S., Kirilenko, A.P., and Morrison, A.M. (2009). Facilitating content analysis in tourism research. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(4), 454–469.

Stergiou, D., and Airey, D. (2011). Q-methodology and tourism research. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(4), 311–322.

Stumpf, T.S., Sandstrom, J., and Swanger, N. (2016). Bridging the gap: grounded theory method, theory development, and sustainable tourism research. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(12), 1691–1708.

Teng, Z.R., Wu, C.Y., and Xu, Z.Z. (2017). New energy benchmarking model for budget hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 67, 62–71.

Timur, S., and Timur, A.T. (2016). Employee ownership and sustainable development in tourism: a case in North Cyprus. *Sustainable Development*, 24(2), 89–100.

Tracey, J. (2006). In defense of theory. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 47, 6–7.

Tribe, J. (2001). Research paradigms and the tourism curriculum. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(4), 442–448.

Tribe, J. (2008). Tourism: A critical business. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46, 245–255.

Turley, S.K. (2001). Children and the demand for recreational experiences: The case of zoos. *Leisure Studies*, 20(1), 1–18.

Urry, J. (2002). Mobility and proximity. *Sociology*, 36(2), 255–274.

Van de Mortel, T.F. (2008). Faking it: social desirability response bias in self-report research. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25(4), 40.

Van Rheenen, D., Cernaianu, S., and Sobry, C. (2017). Defining sport tourism: A content analysis of an evolving epistemology. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 21(2), 75–93.

Venkatesh, V., Brown, S.A., and Bala, H. (2013). Bridging the qualitative–quantitative divide: Guidelines for conducting mixed-methods research in information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 37(1), 21–54.

Walle, A.H. (1997). Quantitative versus qualitative tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3), 524–536.

Whetten, D.A. (1989). What constitutes a theoretical contribution?. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 490–495.

White, S.J. (1997). Evidence-based practice and nursing: the new panacea?. *British Journal of Nursing*, 6(3), 175–178.

Wilson, E., Mura, P., and Sharif, S.P. (2017). Beyond the third moment?: A systematic review of contemporary qualitative tourism research. In C. Lee, S. Filep, J.N. Albrecht, and W.J.L. Coetzee (eds), *CAUTHE 2017: Time For Big Ideas? Re-thinking the Field for Tomorrow* (pp. 602–606). Dunedin, New Zealand: Department of Tourism, University of Otago.

Xiao, H., and Smith, L. (2007). The use of research knowledge: Research propositions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(2), 310–331.

Xiao, H., and Smith, S.L. (2006a). The making of tourism research: Insights from a social sciences journal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 490–507.

Xiao, H., and Smith, S.L. (2006b). Case studies in tourism research: A state-of-the-art analysis. *Tourism Management*, 27(5), 738–749.

Yüksel, A. (2017). A critique of "response bias" in the tourism, travel and hospitality research. *Tourism Management*, 59, 376–384.

Zhang, H.Q., and Kulendran, N. (2017). The impact of climate variables on seasonal variation in Hong Kong inbound tourism demand. *Journal of Travel Research*, 56(1), 94–107.

Zhang, H., Fu, X., Cai, L.A., and Lu, L. (2014). Destination image and tourist loyalty: A meta-analysis. *Tourism Management*, 40, 213–223.