University of Massachusetts Amherst

ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

Travel and Tourism Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally

The Academy is like a Body Builder – Why don't we have new theories?

Linda Lowry
University of Massachusetts-Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttra

The Academy is like a Body Builder – Why don't we have new theories?

Introduction

The Academy is like a Body Builder, valuing prowess at all costs. Throughout this paper, the author uses the metaphorical representation of the embodied Academy (i.e., the knowledge building complex comprised of scholars, the knowledge they make, the journals that judge and house this knowledge, and competing institutions of higher learning in which the scholars earn their living) and the embodied practices used to build prowess (i.e., scientific rigor and worthiness). In addition, Discipline (known by contested names such as Fields of Study or Multi/Inter/Extra/Trans-Discipline) is not purported by this author as a confirmed 'discipline' in the traditional sense (see Tribe, 2004). Instead, it is used in this paper as a symbol of the embodied tourism focused knowledge building complex in the Academy. Moreover, this author takes a critical, interpretive, embodied and enmeshed, performative perspective, thus breaching the 4th historical moment of qualitative inquiry described by Denzen and Lincoln (2018, p, 9) and examined in tourism research by Wilson, Mura, Sharil, & Wijesinghe (2020).

That said, Disciplinary prowess is measured in various ways and the proliferation of bibliometric focused studies show how various authors, institutions, and countries outperform others (Mulet-Forteza, Genovart-Balaguer, Mauleon-Mendez, & Merigo, 2019). Other attributes of prowess are garnered from the impact factors generated to rank academic journals (Gursoy & Sandstrom, 2016), the number of journals associated with the discipline (Cheng, Li, Petrick, & O'Leary, 2011), and the degree to which journals in other disciplines cite tourism related journals (Wardle & Buckley, 2014) or find Discipline specific research useful (McCabe & Qiao, 2020). How or if we, as scholars in the Discipline, embrace these attributes of disciplinary prowess influence the regime we utilize for strength building through article placement (McKercher, 2015; Timothy, 2015), scholarly impact (Aguinis, Yu, & Tosun, 2021), and gamesmanship (Ertaş & Kozak, 2020; Hall, 2011) as well as the nature of knowledge that we build in the process.

This paper aims to increase theorizing in the Discipline by locating the needed prowess on a continuum, identifying current constraints, and suggesting a way forward. It begins by foregrounding theory development in the Discipline and framing the continuum from theorizing to theory development and testing. It then suggests methodological approaches for opening the possibilities for theory development and identifies the Discipline's preparedness, willingness and support for undertaking these types of methodologies. It foreshadows the mechanisms for achieving new theory development in the Discipline, thus achieving greater prowess, and concludes with contributions to the ways of knowing and knowledge making in the Academy.

Building Disciplinary Prowess for Theorizing & Theory Development - A Discipline Specific Perspective

Although the Discipline is showing prowess through the development of bodies of knowledge germane to its focus, it falls short of achieving a high level of prowess as it has not developed its own theories (Hadinejad, Noghan, Moyle, Scott, & Kralj, 2021; Khan, 2019). Instead, it borrows and manipulates theory from other disciplines (Lowry, Cartier, Back, & Delconte, 2015; Tasci, 2020). In other cases, the Discipline lacks "theoretical and methodological progress" in developing useful contributions to "industry and society" (Moyle, Moyle, Ruhanen, Weaver, & Hadinejad, 2021, p. 117).

The challenge then becomes – How does the Discipline achieve the prowess that is needed to develop its own theory or enhance its methodological routines? Collinge (2020) differentiates between theory and theorizing calling the latter a "neglected topic of inquiry" (p. 545) and offers a Deleuzian/Spinoza type of "theorizing-as expression" (p. 549). Koseoglu, Rahimi, Okumus, and Liu (2016) suggest that bibliometric studies can provide a heuristic for theory development and Harrington, Chathoth, Ottenbacher, and Altinay (2014, p. 800) suggest that scholars need to become "innovators rather than 'followers'." Khan (2019) provides a more concrete plan of action suggesting that both case studies and empirically based grounded theory studies can be used to develop theory yet he acknowledges that there are multiple definitions of theory. His own choices about what theory definitions to use and descriptions of how to 'do' grounded theory or build theory using case studies are indicative of his worldview although he states no positionality. Lowry et al. (2015) also suggest that grounded theory, specifically the constructivist version (Charmaz, 2006, 2014), is useful for theory development.

Differentiation is not a trivial issue just as prowess defined by an Olympic heavy weight champion and an Olympic gymnast would have different regimes and outcomes. In other words, how theory is defined and evaluated and how both case studies and grounded theory studies are designed, analyzed, discussed, and evaluated depend on which metatheoretical assumptions underpin the research process (Lowry & Cartier, 2016). In order to facilitate the building of theory in the Discipline, this paper uses the heuristic of a continuum (see Weick, 1995) to differentiate between theorizing and theory and the embedded metatheoretical assumptions associated with both.

Framing the Continuum - Theorizing to Theory and Theory Testing

Two perspectives, one from Business (Delbridge & Fiss, 2013) and the other from Sociology (Swedberg, 2012), are used to frame the discussion of this continuum from theorizing to theory and theory testing. Delbridge and Fiss (2013, p. 327) capture the continuum aspects of theorizing by indicating that the two most prevalent forms found in *Academy of Management Review* articles are nomological networks delimiting casual linkages and narrative reasoning showcasing patterns and broad connections. Styles of writing, use of propositions (or not), and methodological preferences are foregrounded by different ontological and epistemological viewpoints. In addition, they say that the narrative reasoning type of theorizing is better equipped to "develop broad arguments that at times seed novel research programs" as well as to address paradox and the highly complex and uncontrollable nature of experience and social life (Delbridge & Fiss, 2013, p. 327).

Swedberg (2012, p. 3) captures the continuum by suggesting that theory is a product and theorizing is the process used to produce theory and suggests that one provides the "context of justification" and the other the "context of discovery." He further notes that more emphasis is placed on theory and justification than on theorizing and discovery and as a result, theorizing is neglected and not taught. A key reason for ignoring theorizing and discovery is based on ontological and epistemological assumptions about what is possible to study with scientific rigor (Swedberg, 2012, p. 4). In order to move past these barriers, Swedberg, (2012) emphatically says that "creativity" is paramount when theory is devised and "scientific logic and rigor" is paramount in theory testing and that "to theorize well, one needs inspiration, and to get inspiration one can proceed in whatever way that leads to something interesting – and that means *any way*" (p. 6). He further clarifies the continuum by saying that theorizing is open-ended, playful and dynamic and that theory is fixed into "written language or a symbolic language such as mathematics" (Swedberg, 2012, p. 15). As metatheoretical perspectives have significant impact on theorizing, Figure 1 provides a framing of

the continuum of metatheoretical perspectives based on the historical moments of qualitative inquiry (Denzen & Lincoln, 2018) and Lowry and Cartier's (2016) comparison of metatheoretical assumptions in the four most prevalent research paradigms in the social sciences. An overview of these 'Moments' of inquiry are beyond the scope of this paper (see Wilson et al., 2020). In addition, Body Builder architypes visualized by this author are embodied and enmeshed in these metatheoretical perspectives.

Figure 1: Framing the Continuum - Historical Moments of Inquiry with Metatheoretical Perspectives and Archetypical Body Builders

1 & 2nd Moments	3rd Moment	4th Moment & Beyond
Body Builder as Olympic Weight Lifter		**Body Builder as Olympic Gymnast**
Olympic Weightlifter _ 1		US JO Gymnast of the Year_ 2
The World is Real and Knowable	⟷	**Worldmaking is Co-created through Interaction - Realities are Multiple**
"Hard" Science	⟷	**"Soft" Science**
Knowledge Creation is Value Neutral	⟷	**Knowledge Creation Never Neutral**
Purpose of Research – Delimiting Causal Relationships	⟷	**Purpose of Research–Making Visible Patterns and Connections & Making Change**
Criteria for Quality - Internal/External Validity, Generalizability, Reliability	⟷	**Criteria for Quality- Varied and Contextual – Based on Method(s) Used**
Quantitative Methods – Limited Choices	⟷	**Qualitative Methods – Many Choices**
Writing Style Constrained – Operates in the Background	⟷	**Writing Style Open, Fluid, Visual - Operates in the Foreground**
Univocal	⟷	**Multivocal**
Rigid	⟷	**Flexible and Reflexive**
Researchers (objective & detached)	⟷	**Performers (embedded & embodied)**

Both Delbridge and Fiss (2013) and Swedberg (2012) frame the differing metatheoretical perspectives in their consideration of theorizing and theory and suggest that both worldviews and methodological choice constrain or promote the discovery of new theories and both say that particular attention to methods is imperative. While narrative reasoning is suggested by Delbridge and Fiss (2013), Swedberg (2012, pp. 23-28) suggests the use of analogies and metaphors as ways to build out theory and he provides considerable insight on the 'how to' aspects of theorizing.

Methodological Prowess Exhibited by the Discipline

If specific types of methodological prowess are critical for theory development, then how well is the Discipline prepared to meet the challenge of theory development through the process of theorizing? Current research findings are not promising. Instead, research design aimed at theory development along with relevant methodology have significantly declined as have case studies and grounded theory research with qualitative researchers shifting their focus to content analysis and quantitatively focused researchers still focusing on surveys (Strandberg, Nath, Hemmatdar, & Jahwash, 2018). Narrative analysis, a multivocal type of inquiry, is also infrequently used, with qualitative researchers tending to select thematic content analysis (Mura & Pahlevan Sharif 2017). Moreover, qualitative researchers still employ traditional methods such as interviews and, to a lesser extent, observations and text-based analysis (Wilson et al., 2020). More importantly, scholars in the Discipline rarely move into or beyond Denzen and Lincoln's (2018) 4th Moment of inquiry (Bao, Chen, & Ma, 2014; Mura & Pahlevan Sharif, 2017; Wilson et al., 2020), even though calls for the use of more creative types of qualitative methodology as well as new ways to think about the role of researchers have been made for more than 20 years (Franklin & Crang, 2001; Hollinshead, 1996, 2004; Jamal & Hollinshead, 2001; Wilson & Hollinshead, 2015). In other words, the Discipline is methodologically ill prepared to engage in theorizing and is stuck in the "context of justification" rather than the "context of discovery" described by Swedberg (2012).

Numerous constraints converge to impede the Discipline's prowess development (i.e., the development of its own theories), and are, for the most part, associated with the positivist/post-positivist worldview that dominates every aspect of the Discipline. For example, Wilson et al. (2020, p. 807) found that qualitative researchers stay in acceptable methodological "safe spaces." They also suggest that another constraint to more adventuresome forms of inquiry may be the traditional paper structure dictated by academic journals and muse about the possibility of this change of paper structure occurring (p. 805). Mura and Pahlevan Sharif (2017, p. 205) suggest that more research is needed to identify why scholars are discouraged from engaging in non-positivist types of research.

Sadly, the dominate Body Builder from the Positivist/Post-Positivist Paradigm (1 & 2nd Moments) is still large and in charge (doing 'reps' rather than risky creative leaps of flight); privileging both theory testing and the quantitative methods used to do the testing as well as the scientific rigor used as the defining measure of prowess. Diverse ways of knowing and creating knowledge are deemed less worthy and the unmeasurable messy process of discovery inherent in theorizing is silenced or strongly discouraged. Politics of evidence, commodification of knowledge and neoliberalism in the Academy work in tandem to keep positivist's ontology, epistemology, and methodology in a privileged position pitting scholars, journals, and institutions against each other in a race for a higher index score or ranking of worth (Denzin & Giardina, 2015).

What are the knowledge consequences that will occur if qualitative researchers do not or feel that they cannot move into and past the 4th Moment of inquiry where they might engage in creative theorizing? The Discipline will not have new theories and will continue to borrow theories from other disciplines. Hopefully those who choose to borrow and test theories from other disciplines will at least find new ones to use instead of reusing the same ones ad nauseam. Tourism research will continue to lag behind more innovative research in the social sciences (Wilson et al. 2020, p. 800) or in parent disciplines (Cai & McKenna, 2021, p. 913). Lastly, scholars, from time to time, will lament that the Discipline still needs its own theories and will suggest that scholars need to do something to create them and the Academy with continue to repress and delegitimize untraditional ways of knowing and knowledge creation. It was true in 1989 and is still true today –

> Theory cannot be improved until we improve the theorizing process, and we cannot improve the theorizing process until we describe it more explicitly, operate it more self-consciously, and decouple it from validation more deliberately (Weick, 1989, p. 516).

Mechanisms for Achieving New Theory Development in the Discipline, Thus Achieving Greater Prowess.

Extant literature makes it abundantly clear that if neither scholars nor journals begin to address the need to engage in and make explicit the theorizing process that leads to the development of theory, then few new theories will be developed. Three challenges must be addressed in order to foreground theorizing: (1) The initial challenge is to convince journal editors to consider longer papers containing rich descriptions of the complex theorizing processes itself as well as specific examples of theorizing to theory development. Both of these rich descriptions are needed as the first makes the theorizing process explicit and demonstrates its importance and utility and the second demonstrates and makes explicit a specific theorizing process related to a well-defined phenomenon that leads to specific theory development about that phenomenon, thus showing how the theorizing process actuality works (i.e., the pragmatics of theorizing). This cultural shift would also entail the use of non-traditional paper structure format. (2) The second challenge is to convince reviewers that the explicit mental exercise of theorizing is both important and useful in and of itself. (3) The third challenge is paradigmatic in nature and has to do with the nature of theorizing and the choice made by individuals and collective groups of scholars to engage in the process. Swedberg (2012, p. 16) reminds us that "one becomes good at theorizing through practice" and that "the project of theorizing can truly flourish only if theorizing becomes a communal and co-operative enterprise among all kinds of social scientists, linked to each other as well as to people around the world" (p. 35). Wilson et al. (2020, p. 807) also believe that the community of scholars needs "support for nontraditional ways of knowing and doing, not a "backlash."

Collinge's (2020) work serves as an example that the first half of challenge (1) can effectively be addressed as he eloquently articulated and modeled the possibility of "theorizing-as-expression" by intertwining the theoretical perspectives of Deleuze, Guattari, and Spinoza in an innovative way to envision theorizing. The second half of this challenge becomes more problematic as the processes he envisioned (by necessity) are complex, nuanced, and multilayered and require enmeshment in the foregrounding works of Deleuze, Guattari, and Spinoza which might limit the accessibility of this type of theorizing in practice. In other words, what would the act or expression of theorizing itself, not a conceptual paper about theorizing, look like? How could/would journal editors or reviewers view a theorizing to theory develop paper about a particular phenomena?

Would it be viewed as prescience, a story, nothing worth printing until it is more fully formed into something that might be testable or just plain crazy?

Ren (2021) also envisions how scholars can move past binaries, managerial perspectives, and critical constructionism into "affective engagement" and "more-than-human and earthly connections of tourism" and calls for "monstrous and ghostly stories" (p. 136). The becoming yet not arriving aspects of her conceptual paper is also foregrounded by the work of Deleuze and Guattari. Yet what would these actual "monstrous and ghostly stories" look like or count as or not count at all? Said another way, editors and reviewers understand and some even value conceptual papers "about" new ways of thinking about theorizing or "about" tourism perceived as human and non-human entwined and becoming together. When confronted with papers that purport to "do" these types of becoming or irreverent ramblings, will editors also understand and value these written submissions? Perhaps it will depend on the NAME recognition of the author who submitted it. The journal review process is never neutral.

New writing styles (St. Pierre, 2018) and ways to conceive of method or unmethod (St. Pierre, Jackson, & Mazzei, 2016) are needed in order to engage in the Deleuzian notion of becoming or writing that is rhizome method (Honan, 2007). Specifically, St. Pierre et al, (2016, p. 105) say "the 'new' ushers in … a re-imagining of what method might *do*, rather than what it *is* or *how to do it*" and that "the doer" and "the deed" are co-produced. This type of embodiment and enmeshment is currently trendy and inherently freeing and frustrating as well as fastidious, fleeting and fascinating. However, this paper advances theorizing through narrative and interactive metaphor; heuristics used occasionally in the field of Management to theorize and build theory and rarely used in Tourism for that purpose.

The Academy is Like a Body Builder, Valuing Prowess at All Costs - Using Metaphorical Representation as a Heuristic for Theorizing

Metaphors are traditional linguistic devices emanating from the field of rhetoric and have been used extensively to convey meaning to complex ideas and theory – for example *the Rhizome* of Deleuze and Guattari (1987). However, some scholars view metaphors as the language of "politicians and poets" and not the language of science, others view it as "an essential characteristic of the creativity of language" (Ortony, 1993, p. 2) or as an instrumental source of imagination in the development of new theory (Boxenbaum and Rouleau (2011). In addition, there are many types of metaphors and a full discussion is beyond the scope of this paper (see Black, 1962, 1993; Cornelissen, 2005, Hawes, 1975; Stambovsky, 1988). That said, the most familiar type of metaphor is the traditional Aristotelian "comparison" type that uses metaphors as substitutes for literal comparisons. An example from the tourism literature would be *destinations are like products*. They can be consumed, etc. is implied but not explicitly stated.

Metaphorical representation of the embodied Academy and practices used to build prowess is both a narrative type of theorizing (see Shepherd & Suddaby, 2017) as well as an example of the "interaction" type of metaphor (Black, 1962, 1993; Hawes, 1975) which is a useful heuristic for theorizing (Cornelissen, 2005, Weick, 1989) and analogical reasoning (Cornelissen & Durand, 2014; Ketokivi, Mantere, & Cornelissen, 2017). Interaction types of metaphors combine ideas, symbols, or concepts previously thought to be unrelated and the metaphor creates the similarities that result in a new idea or way to think about a phenomena. In addition, the particular metaphor of *The Academy is Like a Body Builder* is an anthropomorphizing metaphor in that it imbues non-

human (yet human made and maintained) institutions, journals, ranking schemes, etc. with human characteristics. Shepherd and Suddaby (2017, p. 73) say that anthropomorphizing metaphors are particularly useful for providing insights about organizations and nonhuman entities or processes and that it can "be an effective theorizing tool when the theorist uses his or her understanding of himself or herself and other people" to provide these insights.

Contributions to the Ways of Knowing and Knowledge Making in the Academy

Through a critical, interpretive, embodied and enmeshed, performative perspective, this paper contextualizes and illuminates the substantive differences between theorizing towards theory development and theory and theory testing as well as the unique prowess that is needed to engage in the creative and reflexive process inherent in theorizing. It does so by performing narrative (see Langellier & Peterson, 2004) which means "to do something in and with discourse" (Langellier & Peterson, 2004, p. 24) that also includes the visual. Said more explicitly, it uses the metaphorical representation of the embodied Academy with archetypical Body Builders and their representative types of prowess – in text and with stereotypical pictures of Olympians - to defamiliarize the familiar (Viktor Shklovskij's 1914 Defamiliarization Theory – see Crawford, 1984) in order to position the visual as a mechanism for affording new understandings (Mannay, 2015, p. 6). More specifically, to enable the embodied Academy to envision the process of theorizing and its role in that process "with new eyes" (DiMaggio, 1995, p. 392). This new contextualization and illumination, in turn, contributes to a better understanding of the process of theorizing which the author hopes will increase theorizing and new theory development in the Discipline.

The paper also contributes to knowledge making in several substantive ways: (1) It shows how to use analogy as both a heuristic devise and as a methodological tool that can foreground contexts and embodied performance. This is important as Ketokivi et al. (2017) say that "many influential theories of the organization rest on analogical foundations" (p. 637) and that analogies are more than a heuristic device for theorizing and theory development (p. 639) in that they are methodological tools used in organizational research (p. 654). (2) It exemplifies an abductive type of reasoning that moves back and forth and in and out; problematizing diverse threads of prior knowledge and understandings, imagining possibilities, and creating new connections (Charmaz, 2014, p. 202). (3) It fills gaps identified in the literature such as the need for "other methods that can be used for theory building" (Khan, 2019, p. 631), studies showing methodologies suited to the study of tourism as embodied practice (de Souza Bispo, , 2016, p. 177), and "contextual aspects of narratives" (Mura & Pahlevan Sharif 2017, p. 203). It also responds to the call for doing more scholarly work that moves into and beyond Dinzen and Lincoln's (2018) 4th Moment of inquiry (Wilson et al., 2020) in that it embodies scholarship enmeshed in the Performative Turn. (4) It exemplifies a different writing style and traditional paper structure –a second risky move - indicative of 4th Moment and Beyond performance based research. (5). Lastly, it is a theorizing paper akin to the "Narrative-Based Style of Theorizing" (a processual style) that "lays out a set of mechanisms explaining events and outcomes" described by Cornelissen (2017, p. 3) as well as a methods paper that attempts to show how theorizing is done.

Could the theorizing process depicted in this paper lead to The Body Builder Theory of Knowledge Making in the Academy? Who knows? More theorizing needs to occur in order to foreground all of the attributes of the theory in order to fix it in place and time as a theory that can be tested. Until such time, the practice of theorizing with narrative and metaphor will continue until the doer and

the deed resemble the Borg – human and non-human as one - or until a new, new, new, post, post perspective begins but never arrives - or something else…

> A theory is not so much a story as much as it is a proverb (e.g., "If you lie down with dogs, you'll wake up with fleas"). It is a condensed lesson of wisdom we formulate from our experiences that we pass along to other generations. Aesop's fables have morals; our research tales have theories. (Saldaña (2016, p. 278)

Perhaps, the proverb "if you're not careful in the gym, you could get crushed by a barbell" would be more appropriate.

References

Aguinis, H., Yu, L., & Tosun, C. (2021). How to enhance scholarly impact: Recommendations for university administrators, researchers and educators. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 0959-6119.

Bao, J., Chen, G., & Ma, L. (2014). Tourism research in China: Insights from insiders. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *45*, 167-181.

Black, M. (1962). *Models and metaphors*. Cornell University Press.

Black, M. (1993). More about metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed., pp. 19-41). Cambridge University Press.

Boxenbaum, E., & Rouleau, L. (2011). New knowledge products as bricolage: Metaphors and scripts in organizational theory. *Academy of Management Review*, *36*(2), 272-296.

Cai, W., & McKenna, B. (2021). Knowledge creation in information technology and tourism research *Journal of Travel Research*, *60*(4), 912-915.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. SAGE Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Cheng, C., Li, X., Petrick, J., & O'Leary, J. (2011). An examination of tourism journal development. *Tourism Management*, 32(1), 53-61.

Collinge, C. (2020). Theorizing, Deleuzian-style. *Cultural Geographies*, *27*(4), 545-560.

Cornelissen, J. P. (2005). Beyond compare: Metaphor in organization theory. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(4), 751-764.

Cornelissen, J. (2017). Editor's comments: Developing propositions, a process model, or a typology? Addressing the challenges of writing theory without a boilerplate. *Academy of Management Review, 42*(1), 1-9.

Cornelissen, J. P., & Durand, R. (2014). Moving forward: Developing theoretical contributions in management studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, *51*(6), 995-1022.

Crawford, L. (1984). Viktor Shklovskij: Différance in defamilarization. *Comparative Literature, 36*(3), 209-219.

de Souza Bispo, M. (2016). Tourism as practice. *Annals of Tourism Research, 61*, 170-179.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.

Denzin, N. K., & Giardina, M. D. (Eds.). (2015). *Qualitative inquiry and the politics of research*. Left Coast Press, Inc.

Denzen, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzen & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research (5ᵗʰed.)*, (pp. 1-26). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Delbridge, R., & Fiss, P. (2013). Styles of theorizing and the social organization of knowledge. *Academy of Management Review, 38*(3), 325-331.

DiMaggio, P. (1995). Comments on "What theory is not." *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*, 391-397.

Ertaş, M., & Kozak, M. (2020). Publish or perish: The proportion of articles versus additional sections in tourism and hospitality journals. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 43*, 149-156.

Franklin, A., & Crang, M. (2001). The trouble with tourism and travel theory? *Tourist Studies*, *1*(1), 5-22.

Gursoy, D., & Sandstrom, J. K. (2016). An updated ranking of hospitality and tourism journals. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 40*(1), 3-18.

Hadinejad, A., Noghan, N., Moyle, B. D., Scott, N., & Kralj, A. (2021). Future research on visitors' attitudes to tourism destinations. *Tourism Management, 83,* 104215.

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

Harrington, R. J., Chathoth, P. K., Ottenbacher, M., & Altinay, L. (2014). Strategic management research in hospitality and tourism: Past, present and future. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 26*(5), 778-808.

Hawes, L. C. (1975). *Pragmatics of analoguing: Theory and model construction in communication*. Addison-Wesly Publishing Company.

Hollinshead, K. (1996). The researcher as 'bricoleur'. *Tourism Analysis 1*(1), 67-74.

Hollinshead, K. (2004). A primer in ontological craft: The creative capture of people and places through qualitative research. In L. Goodson & J. Phillimore (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*, (pp. 63-82). London; UK: Routledge.

Honan, E. (2007). Writing a rhizome: An (im)plausible methodology. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *20*(5), 531-546.

Jamal, T., & Hollinshead, K. (2001). Tourism and the forbidden zone: The underserved power of qualitative inquiry. *Tourism Management, 22*(1), 63-82.

Ketokivi, M., Mantere, S., & Cornelissen, J. (2017). Reasoning by analogy and the progress of theory. *Academy of Management Review, 42*(4), 637-658.

Khan, M. A. (2019). Building theories for hospitality discipline: An attempt to describe and elaborate required processes and procedures. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 43*(5), 619-632.

Koseoglu, M. A., Rahimi, R., Okumus, F., & Liu, J. (2016). Bibliometric studies in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 61*, 180-198.

Langellier, K. M., & Peterson, E. E. (2004). *Storytelling in daily life: Performing narrative*. Temple University Press.

Lowry, L. L., & Cartier, E. A. (2016). Using the CMM Theoretical Lens to Deconstruct Problematic Discourse Regarding Quality and Rigor in Tourism Research: Can Transparency Bridge the Metatheoretical Divide? In Travel & Tourism Research Association, *47th Annual Conference Proceedings: Advancing Tourism Research Globally* (Paper 6) in Vail, Colorado – June 14-16, 2016. Accessed from http://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttra/2016/Qualitative_Research_Workshop/6

Lowry, L. L., Cartier, E. A., Back, R. M., Delconte, J. D. (2015). Addressing the need for new tourism theory: The utility of constructivist grounded theory methodology for theory development. In Travel & Tourism Research Association, *46th Annual Conference Proceedings: Tourism Insights into Actions – the Crucial Role of Tourism Research* in Portland, Oregon – June 15-17, 2015. Accessed from https://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttra/ttra2015/Qualitative_Research_Methods/14

Mannay, D. (2016). *Visual, narrative and creative research methods: Application, reflection and ethics.* Routledge.

McCabe, S., & Qiao, G. (2020). A review of research into social tourism: Launching the *Annals of Tourism Research* curated collection on social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 85*, 103103.

McKercher, B. (2015). Why and where to publish. *Tourism Management, 51*, 306-308.

Moyle, B., Moyle, C., Ruhanen, L., Weaver, D., & Hadinejad, A. (2021). Are we really progressing sustainable tourism research? A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 29*(1), 106-122.

Mulet-Forteza, C.; Genovart-Balaguer, J.; Mauleon-Mendez, E.; & Merigo, J. (2019). A bibliometric research in the tourism, leisure and hospitality fields. *Journal of Business Research*, *101*, 819-827.

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

Ortony, A. (1993). Metaphor, language, and thought. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 1-16). Cambridge University Press.

Ren, C. (2021). (Staying with) the trouble with tourism and travel theory? *Tourist Studies*, *21*(1), 133-140.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Shepherd, D. A., & Suddaby, R. (2017). Theory building: A review and integration. *Journal of Management*, *43*(1), 59-86.

St. Pierre, E. A. (2018). Writing post qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *24*(9), 603-608.

St. Pierre, E. A., Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2016). New empiricisms and new materialisms. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, *16*(2), 99-110.

Stambovsky, P. (1988). *The depictive image: Metaphor and literary experience.* University of Massachusetts Press.

Strandberg, C., Nath, A., Hemmatdar, H., & Jahwash, M. (2018). Tourism research in the new millennium: A bibliometric review of literature in tourism and hospitality research. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 18*(3), 269-285.

Swedberg, R. (2012). Theorizing in sociology and social science: Turning to the context of discovery. *Theory & Society, 41*(1), 1-40.

Tasci, A. D. A. (2020). Holistic theory development in tourism and hospitality: A perspective article. *Tourism Review, 75*(1), 37-40.

Timothy, D. J. (2015). Impact factors: Influencing careers, creativity and academic freedom. *Tourism Management, 51*, 313-315.

Tribe, J. (2004). Knowing about tourism: Epistemological issues. In L. Goodson & J. Phillimore (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*, (pp. 46-62). Routledge.

Wardle, C., & Buckley, R. (2014). Tourism citations in other disciplines. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *46*, 166-168.

Weick, K. E. (1989). Theory construction as disciplined imagination. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(4), 516-531.

Weick, K. E. (1995). What theory is not, theorizing is. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*, 385-390.

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

Wilson, E., Mura, P., Saeed, P. S., & Wijesinghe, S. N. R. (2020). Beyond the third moment? Mapping the state of qualitative tourism research. *Current Issues in Tourism, 23*(7), 795-810.