So you want to get published? It's all about theory, context and data

Kevin D O'Gorman and Thomas J W Farrington

School of Management and Languages, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Corresponding author email: k.ogorman@hw.ac.uk

This paper offers guidance on writing for publication in peer-reviewed business and management journals. The approach outlined and illustrated within is the amalgamated result of many years of experience in academic writing, editing, and getting published. The paper is primarily aimed at doctoral students, tutors, and early career researchers, who will have plenty to gain from publication, but may be lacking in the relevant experience of submission and resubmission. The authors assert the importance of creating dedicated planning documents, subject to continual revision, with particular emphasis placed on articulating and addressing gaps in theory, method, context, and management practice.

Keywords: Theory, context, data, publishing, gap

Introduction

This paper is based on a talk given at the Academy of International Hospitality Research Conference 2014 at Stenden University, Leeuwarden, Netherlands. Ironically, it ignores most, if not all the advice offered during the talk; nonetheless, it is hoped that this attempt to represent as functional the largely unstructured ramblings and rhetoric heard at Stenden will be useful to doctoral candidates and early career researchers seeking publication. The paper suggests the sort of attributes an editor might reasonably expect a submission to clearly exhibit in order to be considered for publication. As such, we'll look at types of academic writing, articulating gaps and contributions, framing, language and reflexivity, and signposting, before offering a tried and tested structure. Whilst the applied presentation of these suggestions will vary significantly between papers, the overriding strategy here is quite simple: convince the reader that you know what needs to be done, how best to do it, and why doing it is important.

The following advice is based on a fairly simple and highly portable framework, to which those papers destined for publication typically conform. We offer examples of each section below, but before we get into deconstructing this framework further: a disclaimer. The guidelines herein are compiled from many years of experience publishing in business and management journals, and although following them should, in most cases, at least improve the chances of a paper being noticed for the right reasons, the only certainty in scholarship is that most submissions to worthwhile journals are swiftly and unceremoniously rejected. This is the inevitable consequence of submitting to top-ranked journals, so try not to let rejection lead to dejection. Instead, quietly perform the necessary rants/discussions with trusted colleagues, take any and all comments on board, revise the paper accordingly, and submit it again (perhaps elsewhere, depending upon the resolve of the rejection). But these are post-submission

concerns, and fairly dreary ones at that. Although it is important to maintain a realistic perspective on the submission process, the aim should always be to get the paper accepted first time around. It is hoped that the following insights from publications will be of use in articulating original research.

The aforementioned framework (illustrated in Table 1) is composed of clear articulations of theory, context, data collection, and data analysis, in that order. As shown in Table 1, even this overall framework is subject to a sensible selection process. A general review might not require the application of any particular theory, whilst a conceptual paper may not involve the collection and analysis of original data, but once you know what type of paper you are writing, you should be able to break it down using these four sections. Being able to explain your paper in relation to each of these sections is of great help when considering both the ways in which to frame the paper, and the gaps that your research addresses.

Bryce et al.'s (2013) exploration of the development of commercial hospitality in early modern Safavid Iran is here offered as an example of how to introduce a theoretical base in the opening paragraph of a paper:

> The theoretical aims of this paper are two-fold: to explore the development of an infrastructure of hospitality provision intended to facilitate commerce within the Islamic world, and to combine material culture research methods in an analytical framework. Material culture research analyses the physical world to infer meaning on human function. By exploring three key aspects of material culture, a fresh research perspective is offered (Bryce et al. 2013, 204–205).

Context duly follows in the second paragraph (and detailed in later sections):

> Contextually, this paper explores the place of hospitality in Safavid Iran during a period when a "capitalist" economy informed by Islamic propriety

Table 1: A framework for publication

Typology	Theoretical base / Research approach	Context	Data collection	Data analysis	Source
General review		Evolution of the commercial hospitality industry in three epochs	Textual sources Historical artefacts Archaeological evidence.		O'Gorman (2009)
Conceptual	Bourdieu: Distinction Deleuze: Liquid times	TV chefs			Stringfellow, MacLaren, Maclean & O'Gorman (2013)
Research/ Conceptual	Material culture research methods	Development of urban areas in relation to commerce, hospitality, religious and imperial patronage (c. 17th century).	Archaeological – 27 site visits over three years to 14 caravanserai six bazaar complexes.	Created and applied a framework for material culture data analysis	Bryce, O'Gorman and Baxter (2013)
Research (Historical)	Orientalism	19th Century Islamic hospitality in the in the Middle East	Published diaries	Content analysis of hospitality scenes	Bryce, MacLaren & O'Gorman (2013)
Research	Empowerment Critical feminist theory	Hospitality provided by 'teahouse' owners in Nepal	Semi-structured interviews Observation	Template analysis	McMillan, O'Gorman & MacLaren (2011)
Research	Social exchange theory	The underpinning cultural code of the Afghan people: The Pashtunwali	Oral history interviews Netnography Published diaries	Thematic analysis	Coulson, MacLaren, McKenzie & O'Gorman (2014)
Research	Translation theory	Museum websites as a form of purposive tourism information designed to both inform and attract potential visitors	Corpus-based approach based two sets of English and Chinese museum websites based on five leading museums in each country	Three stage genre analysis: Textual space Socio-cognitive space Social space	Hogg, Liao and O'Gorman (2014)
Research	Authenticity Engagement Loyalty	Culturally specific setting of Japanese heritage sites.	Structured questionnaire included concepts of serious leisure, heritage related behaviours, self-connection and their effects over engagement – using formative and reflective scales	Partial Least Square – component-based approach suitable for both predictive applications and theory building	Bryce, Curran, O'Gorman & Taheri (2015)

had existed for almost 1,000 years in the region (Bryce et al. 2013, 205)

Data collection and analysis are explained in the methodology section:

A three-level methodological framework using archaeological, architectural and artifactual methods of data collection are used as a framework around which to construct material culture-based research. When applying material culture methods in a contemporary context to a populated and functioning business, the subjectivity of any study of this nature can be influenced by the human element of the organization.

After gaining site access and requisite permission, when appropriate, from the Iranian Cultural Heritage Organizations a three-stage research process took place. Data were collected over a three-year period, during 27 site visits in Iran, with 14 individual caravanserai and six bazaar complexes visited. Collaborative visits were also undertaken with local experts, where intensive debate complemented and refined the individual professional approach. Follow-up discussions took place to challenge the research method, assumptions and interpretations (Bryce et al. 2013, 211–214).

Stringfellow et al's conceptual paper (2013, 77) examines the celebrity of TV chefs through Bourdieusian theory, which is introduced as follows:

This paper seeks to advance understanding of tourism management from a conceptual viewpoint using Bourdieu's framework of taste formation, responding in part to Ryan's (2009) call for papers that offer

conceptual originality rather than technical ingenuity. Drawing on Tournier's (1970, 93) insight that 'if beautiful landscapes could be eaten they would be photographed much less often' (Maclean, 2003, 26), we explore the embodied, practical and physical elements of tourism as experienced through cuisine, building on previous conceptualizations of tourism as an abstracted and objectified gaze (Urry, 1990).

Note the early identification of theoretical gaps and contributions, the importance of which is discussed in more detail presently. The application of Bourdieu's theory is further explicated a paragraph later:

Many aspects of tourism draw on the notion of authenticity and tensions surrounding commodification. A Bourdieusian lens sheds light on legitimization and popularization, and how consumption constitutes a site for struggles over legitimate, middle-brow and popular culture. … In this paper, we outline how Bourdieu's theory sheds light on the shifting boundaries of the culinary field, and the role played by dominant agents who transgress these boundaries (Stringfellow et al., 2013, 78).

This leads towards the research context for this paper, being the celebrificaton of the culinary elite, which is introduced in relation to theory as follows:

Popularization and legitimization exist at opposing ends of the field of cultural production: popularization is defined by large-scale cultural production, where economic considerations are primary; legitimization is characterized by restricted production, where symbolic considerations come first (Bourdieu, 1985a). These two processes take place within all cultural fields, including the field of culinary production and consumption. On one side of the field, celebrities attempt to achieve legitimization by accumulating highly valued cultural capital and presenting a more esteemed, sought-after habitus. On the other side, the elite practice popularization by forsaking the pursuit of "disinterested" restricted production, for more mass-orientated activities (Stringfellow et al. 2013, 78).

Having introduced the theoretical and contextual backgrounds (the subjects of the sections that immediately follow), the following research question and corresponding approach both confirm the contributions of the study and provide a neat overall summary:

We ask: what is the role played by these processes of popularization and legitimization in the long-term shifts in field-level capital configurations, especially in the positions of dominant agents? To answer this question, we use Bourdieu's theory of distinction and apply it to culinary elites to develop a model that illustrates modifications or transitions in habitus. This model can be applied to any cultural context within the tourism industry to illustrate the impacts of competing processes of taste, including museums, cultural heritage, culinary tourism and destination positioning. We explore shifting dispositions and narratives of social change in cultural contexts, extending Bourdieu's theorization of habitus by

appreciating the role of field dynamics (Stringfellow et al. 2013, 78).

An example from Hogg, Liao and O'Gorman (2014) helps to further illustrate the introduction of theory as informing the research approach – in this case the theory of translation:

In this paper we use translation theory to explore this theoretical gap in tourism research by examining the translations contained within websites of internationally renowned museums in China and the UK. Museum websites provide a useful context for this research as they are universal, easily accessed and designed to both inform and attract potential visitors. We argue that no matter how accurate a translation may be, if the norms of the target community have been ignored it is a poor translation, and may even have a detrimental effect on the tourist experience (Hogg, Liao and O'Gorman 2014, 157).

The context, data collection and analysis of the study are appropriately interrelated, and summarised as follows:

In order to assess the quality of translations we compare websites with genres in the same language. To this end we compiled two sets of English and Chinese museum websites based on five leading museums. We used the websites of the Victoria & Albert Museum, London and the Capital Museum, Beijing subdivided into four distinct groups: the English source text of the Victoria & Albert Museum (VAM-ST) and its Chinese translation (VAM-TT), the Chinese source text of the Beijing Capital Museum, (BCM-ST) and its English translation (BCM-TT). In addition we compiled a comparable English museum corpus (EMT) and a Chinese museum corpus (CMT) (Hogg et al. 2014, 159).

Coulson, MacLaren, McKenzie, and O'Gorman (2014) employ social exchange theory (SET) to examine the *Pashtunwali*, being the underpinning cultural code of the Afghan people. This context is immediately outlined (more on this paper below), before theory is introduced through critical insight:

SET cannot adequately frame some cultural exchange practices thus our theoretical contribution is to offer a hybrid framework for negotiated and reciprocal exchange. The study considers two key research questions, namely: how is social exchange characterised through the Pashtunwali? And, does the code preclude the commercialization of Pashtun culture for tourism development? In addressing these the study attempts to extend SET and its framing of cultural practices through the developed hybrid model (Coulson et al. 2014, 134).

A thematic analysis was deemed an appropriate method for this study, with data collection and analysis techniques detailed in the methodology section. Little is known about the social exchange facilitated through Pashtun culture, as the tribe and wider region are overlooked areas of research interest, therefore we adopt a three-stage mixed methods, sequential explanatory design, approach. … Supporting interviews, as the initial mode of enquiry, are soldiers' weblogs and testimonial narratives in the form of diaries.

Themes arising from the Pashtunwali are developed from the three central modes of enquiry alongside

analysis of theoretical and cultural literature, though special attention was given for allowance of the Pashtun people to categorise their own constituents of culture (Coulson et al. 2014, 136, 137).

It is hoped that the selection of examples above will offer varied insights into the construction (and indeed deconstruction) of published papers. It is also hoped that, along with the other studies cited in Table 1, there might now be some inclination in the reader to find and read these papers! After all, every good author is first a good reader. With the above framework in mind, we now offer a step-by-step approach to getting published, beginning with a look at types of academic writing.

Types of writing

Just as a to-do list may be distinguished from a political manifesto, so there are various types of academic writing, from general reviews to theory-building empirical research papers, and it helps to know which one you're trying to write before you write it. It also helps to know who is going to read it, but we'll get to that. While all of these should conform to the highest standards of the language in which it is written, different types of academic writing have different demands in terms of style, structure, and scope, which vary further from journal to journal. By style we don't just mean formatting: as you may have gathered, certain types of writing allow the authors to be considerably less formal than others. The simplest way to establish the best approach for your paper is by looking at a few examples from your target journal of the type of article you are aiming to write. Whilst you obviously can't steal content, you are certainly encouraged to recognise and use as examples the formal characteristics that distinguish the different types of writing within journals.

The clear articulation of framing and gaps early on in the paper stands as something of a fortification against the standard (but typically justified) criticisms of the relevance and usefulness of the research, so let's shift focus to that now.

Mind the gap!

In an ideal world you should be aiming to fill the following four gaps:
• Theoretical gap
• Methodological gap
• Contextual gap
• Management practice gap.

If you want to hit a top ranked journal then you need a clearly articulated theoretical gap, whatever the subject of your research. It's not your thing, it's your theory that matters! By this point it is hoped you will have done the majority of your background reading, and be familiar with the theoretical lenses and methodological approaches through which your chosen topic has already been studied, and the contexts in which the topic has been explored. You should also be thinking about why this abstract academic chattering should absolutely be of significant applied interest to the relevant industry professionals. Flippant as that may sound, research that ultimately offers practical suggestions for managers distinguishes itself from the rest by demonstrating the critical self-awareness that most claim, but few enact.

So, imagine an audience with a very limited knowledge of business and management and, in one or two sentences, tell them what has been done, and what still needs to be done. Next, explain your particular theory, how it is different from those you've encountered, and how it thus helps you do what needs to be done. Having explained your theory and why it's useful, now explain the way in which this furthers/augments/extends understanding of your topic. The theoretical contribution of this study is … what? It may take several attempts, and will likely be subject to further revision, but in doing this you have identified and articulated both your theoretical gap and your contribution to theory. Published examples of this are offered above. The processes for articulating your methodological, contextual, and management practice gaps and contributions are largely the same, roughly corresponding to the how (method), the where (context), and the who cares (what are the insights for managers?) of your research, with a very important why being asked of each. For example, Bryce, et al. (2013) offer a clear articulation of their methodological contributions as follows:

The importance of this paper is therefore three-fold; it demonstrates engagement with new qualitative methods from different disciplines. Second, it enhances our understanding of the development of commercial hospitality and trade through the adoption of alternative methodologies and perspectives. Third, it offers a methodological framework for future research. In offering a new and explicit methodological framework for using material culture as a means of enquiry, this paper answers the question: How can data from material culture be used to strengthen hospitality and tourism research methods? Exploring and discussing archaeological, architectural and artifactual data collection methods, from a material culture perspective, creates a three-level framework (Bryce et al. 2013, 205).

The *Pashtunwali* paper articulates its contextual contribution as follows:

Contextually, this is the first study that employs a code of hospitality as its unit of analysis, studied through a social exchange lens to explore potential tourism development (Coulson et al. 2014, 135).

Hogg et al. (2014) here provide an example of a contribution to management practice:

As well as filling this theoretical gap, a further aim of this paper is to allow practitioners to ensure that their translations are accurate and fluent, but vitally also considerate of the target culture (Hogg et al. 2014, 157).

Once we've (at least) drafted our gaps, we can move on to the questions that help frame the paper.

Framing

Critical to any publication success is the idea of learning how to frame the paper. Framing is identifying the specific debate or conversation that the paper best contributes towards. The advice typically given is that the framing takes place within the introduction. So editors want to see the following on the first page:
• What is the paper about?

• Why is it important?
• What are the gaps (i.e. what is the contribution)?
• What are the research question(s)?
• Is it theory building or theory testing? (specify which theory)
• What is the dependent variable? (yes, even qualitative studies should include this)
• What is the unit of analysis?

It's worth keeping a separate working document that first addresses your gaps, and then offers an answer to each of the above, again, in one or two sentences. This is particularly useful to establish as a central reference point when beginning a co-authored paper. These answers are likely to become more focused as the paper comes together, and it is quite possible to finish up with an entirely different document to that started. With any luck, this will look something like progress!

Assuming you have already articulated the gaps, the answers to questions one to four should be fairly easy to construct, however simplistic they initially appear. Indeed, provided the research is actually saying something original and useful, simplicity of explanation should be a primary objective for scholarship at any level. Remember, you are trying to communicate information and disseminate knowledge to *other people*, and you are hoping that these other people will be suitably engaged by your writing as to offer responses, however critical. Language (more on this in a moment) that makes it difficult for the reader to grasp what the paper is about and why it is important within the first page or so will lead to frustration in readers and their responses. Keep it simple. For example, Coulson, MacLaren, McKenzie and O'Gorman (2014) answer most of the above questions in their opening paragraph:

> Drawing upon insights from military personnel, intelligence operatives, journalists and other aid workers, we apply Social Exchange Theory (SET) to explore problems with tourism development. The customs and practices of the Pashtun tribe of Afghanistan are enshrined in their cultural code: the Pashtunwali. The Pashtunwali contains an implicit exchange based on three tenets: honour (nang), revenge (badal) and hospitality (melmastia), none of which is economically driven. Codes of hospitality (O'Gorman, 2009, 2010b) highlight both possibilities and problems for tourism development as part of the regeneration of war-torn regions. … Understanding cultural practices of hospitality provide opportunities, both theoretically and practically, for tourism development, therefore the potential for the region following conflict is improved (Coulson et al. 2014, 134).

At the early stages of writing, it may be a little trickier to maintain simplicity when answering question five, as it is generally expected that research published in top-ranked journals is theory building rather than theory testing. An editor will look for a sentence or two that explains the way in which the research builds upon the established literature to offer an original theoretical contribution. This may prove difficult to express neatly at first, but a good look at your theoretical gap will certainly help. Are you combining established theoretical approaches, and/or balancing what you find to be their complementary features? What is it about your particular study that requires a fresh theoretical

perspective, and how does this way of looking at the topic contribute to the field? You may have noticed that there is considerable crossover both within and between your answers to the framing questions and the sentences explaining your gaps. This apparent sense of déjà vu is no glitch; rather it is intended to prompt a continuous cycle of revision that should (*should!*) keep the often unwieldy processes of writing original research grounded in the fundamental principles of research.

Speaking of which, the answers to questions six and seven should, at the most basic level, explain the response you are measuring, the variations measured, and the outcome of this measurement. These answers are likely to be more immediately obvious in quantitative research, which should produce some set of differentiated numerical results. If engaged in qualitative research, then you may need to think a little harder and look a little deeper to find your dependent variable and unit of analysis. For example, in Coulson et al. (2014, 137), the unit of analysis 'is neither the Pashtun people nor military personnel; rather it is the social exchange developed through the Pashtunwali'. It may help to think of only the conceptual terms that might be left floating through the air following a sudden rendezvous between your newly created document and a wood-chipper. Consumer perceptions of…? Responses to…?

Once you've assembled the first draft of these gaps and the answers to the framing questions, you are in a much stronger position from which to begin the actual writing of your paper. We'll now take a brief look at the sort of language you might use in doing so, specifically the somewhat contentious issue of personal pronouns, and how and when to acknowledge the role of the person or people behind them.

Personal pronouns and reflexivity

So, should you use personal pronouns in academic writing? As you may expect by now, it depends upon what you're writing, but usually, no. Given the often restrictive word limit of journals (this varies, but aim for about 7 000 words as a general rule), there is unlikely to be a great deal of space for self-reflexivity in most research papers. As such, unless there is a very good reason for representing the role or influence of the authors, or the piece adopts an informal tone for rhetorical purposes(!), personal pronouns are usually avoided. Indeed, using personal pronouns in the wrong context can foster suspicion in the reader, in much the same way as an author eschewing cautious language and making very strong claims as to the generalisability of results. Of course, whilst cautious language is likely to be appropriate in business and management research, again, there should be no doubt in the mind of the editor as to what the paper is doing, how and where (i.e. in what context) this is being done, why doing this is important, and who the findings might interest.

With this in mind, it is crucial to provide adequate guidance for the reader as she works her way through the paper. The importance of linking sections and explaining the relevance of each to the answering of the overall research questions will no doubt be remembered from undergraduate essays and dissertations. Unfortunately this is all too easily forgotten when ensconced in the disciplinary specialisms of postgraduate or postdoctoral circles, where everyone nods and

smiles and everything seems to be immediately understood. The truth is that a very clear understanding of what is being communicated matters a lot more to the editor of a top-ranked journal than it does to a tired colleague with no particular scholarly investment in your work. One particularly helpful tactic to indicate this guidance early on in the paper is a good signposting paragraph, to which we now turn.

Signposting

The signposting paragraph is important for two reasons: first, it tells the editor what you're going to do and how you're going to do it, and second, it tells *you* what you're going to do and how you're going to do it. This gives both editors and authors the opportunity to follow and critique the structure of the paper at a glance. And this is something to bear in mind throughout; editors are busy people. The easier you can make it for an editor to understand what your paper does and why this matters, the more likely it is that the paper will go out for review. This may sound obvious, but it's a general principle that can get lost when in the midst of detail work. The signposting paragraph guides the editor through those stages he or she should expect to encounter. In a business and/or management research paper these are likely to be theory, context, data collection, and data analysis. As demonstrated by the examples below, data analysis should lead the editor naturally through results, discussion, findings, implications, limitations, and opportunities for further research.

Of course, the rest of the paper needs to reflect this paragraph, or the paragraph needs to reflect the rest of the paper, depending upon your particular approach to editing the paper for what may in fact be the thirtieth time. Whilst the signposting paragraph should tell a story of structure so clear and logical as to appear to be the only sensible option, in many (if not most) cases some time will have been spent shuffling and reshuffling this order. Indeed, a careful read through your signposting paragraph should be one of your final checks prior to submission. Although exact structures will differ from paper to paper, it is hoped that the following examples of signposting paragraphs are useful as templates:

[Conceptual Paper] *This paper now splits into five sections. We begin by briefly describing tourism and life in late modernity. Then, in section two, we present Bourdieu's theoretical perspective focusing on the formation of taste. Bourdieu's theory is then contextualized using the example of tastemakers in the culinary world. In section four we explore the celebrification of the field and present our model of 'Changing Dynamics of Culinary Taste' to illustrate the shifting habitus and the implications of the resultant narrowing of the field of production. Finally, we draw together the threads of our argument and present avenues for further research, before offering implica-tions for the industry (*Stringfellow et al. 2013).

[Empirical Paper] *This paper now divides into four sections. In section one we review the origins and developments of SET in order to articulate a theoret-ical gap whilst also summarizing previous studies exploring codes of hospitality exchange. There follows a section on data collection methods and analysis. The next section is empirical, where the results*

Table 2: Potential structure of an academic paper

Structural heading	Purpose	Approximate word count	Suggested approach
Introduction	Introductory	400	Always write the introduction first as it will help to focus thinking and keep one on the right path for the rest of the paper. Answer the 7 framing questions about and clearly articulate your gaps
	Signposting	200	This is often written last and takes the reader through the rest of the paper
Literature review	Theoretical review	1 500	This is the theoretical literature review. The intention is to show how this paper fills a gap in theory. It should, where possible, be generic and not make reference to the context of the study
	Contextual review	500	This section supplies the context to the study and, for example, if the paper was focussed on a hospitality and tourism issue, it should use as many as possible of the references in the last 10 years from top HTM journals.
Methodology	Research approach	200	Clearly outline your research approach and / or philosophical underpinnings.
	Data collection technique	500	How you are collecting your data, for example, interviews, observations, focus groups, etc.
	Data analysis tool(s)	200	How are you analysing your data. Qualitative papers are often let down by this section, as the data analysis tool is either missing or not clearly articulated or applied.
Empirical material	Presentation of data	600	This section should clearly present what has been collected as part of the research project, making reference to the data collection techniques being used.
	Analysis	600	The collected data should be analysed using the tool discussed in the previous section.
	Findings	400	A summary of the findings.
Discussion	Discussion	1 000	The findings should be combined with the theoretical and contextual literature reviews to highlight what new discoveries have been made by the research.
	Theory development	400	This is a clear articulation of how the theory has been developed or applied to a new context.
Conclusions	Contribution	500	There must be emphasis on advice for industry and management implications

espouse the research subjects' difficulty in learning and engaging with the code as it neither appeared to govern a strictly negotiated exchange nor an implicit social phenomenon. In the final section of the paper we draw together the threads of our argument, consider the theoretical limitations of our approach and point to avenues for future research (Coulson et al. 2014).

[Empirical Paper] *In this paper we use translation theory to explore this theoretical gap in tourism research by examining the translations contained within websites of internationally renowned museums in China and the UK. Museum websites provide a useful context for this research as they are universal, easily accessed and designed to both inform and attract potential visitors. We argue that no matter how accurate a translation may be, if the norms of the target community have been ignored it is a poor translation, and may even have a detrimental effect on the tourist experience. As well as filling this theoretical gap, a further aim of this paper is to allow practitioners to ensure that their translations are accurate and fluent, but vitally also considerate of the target culture* (Hogg et al. 2014).

Now we have an understanding of a few good strategies by which to get a head start towards the actual writing process, it's time to think about how much to write and where it should go in the paper. Actually, the sequential implication there is not quite true. It's actually a good idea to be thinking about and sketching out potential structural outlines for presenting your research throughout the above processes, and by sketching we do mean sketching, on anything that comes to hand, whenever it comes to mind. Again, the details of the structure will vary from paper to paper, but it is hoped that the following section offers a helpful exemplar.

Structure

The outline that follows is designed only as a template for adaption to the particular study and target journal, giving an idea of the order in which to present sections and the approximate word counts of each. However useful this may be, please do remember that a good structure means very little when populated with poor research. The exemplar structure is deconstructed in Table 2. It should be noted that probably the most controversial thing in this paper, which may cause the most arguments, is the approximate word count per section for a 7 000 word mythical paper. This is illustrative and indicative, and there to be deviated from! It is never as simple as that, I know.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to give you a few insights into the process of writing for publication, principally by telling and showing you what editors are looking for in the first minute or two of receiving a submission. Theory, context, and data are what matters. Articulate clearly what your paper does, how and where it does this, and why it is important, and you will have answered many of the standard editorial questions before they've been asked. We hope this advice will be useful to students, tutors, early career researchers, and any others swamped in the daily processes of teaching and learning and in need of a swift refresher in writing for publication. Again, there is no guidance that can guarantee publication, and no approach or structure that cannot be compromised by careless writing and research methods. The reverse is also true, but it's a lot easier to fill a box once you've given it sides. It's also a lot easier to ask the questions than answer them. Good luck, and remember to keep it simple.

References

Bryce, D., MacLaren, A. C. & O'Gorman. K. D. (2013). Historicising hospitality and tourism consumption: Orientalist expectations of the Middle East. *Consumption Markets & Culture, 16*(1), 45–64. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10253866.2012.662830

Bryce, D., O'Gorman, K. D., & Baxter, I. (2013). Commerce, Empire and Faith in Safavid Iran: The Caravanserai of Isfahan. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 25*(2), 204–226. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09596111311301603

Coulson, A. B., MacLaren, A. C., McKenzie, S., & O'Gorman, K. D. (2014). Hospitality codes and Social Exchange Theory: The Pashtunwali and tourism in Afghanistan.. *Tourism Management, 45*, 134–141. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.03.019

Hogg, G., Liao, M. H., & O'Gorman, K. D. (2014). Reading between the lines: Multidimensional translation in tourism consumption. *Tourism Management, 42*, 157–164. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.10.005

O'Gorman, K. D. (2009). Origins of the commercial hospitality industry: From the fanciful to factual. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 21*(7), 777–790. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09596110910985287

Stringfellow, L., Maclaren, A. C., MacLean, M., & O'Gorman, K. D. (2013). Conceptualising taste: Food, culture and celebrities. *Tourism Management, 37*(1), 77–85. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.12.016