



Newsletter

WELCOME!

Welcome to the second ATHE newsletter, which on this occasion focuses on the Annual Conference 2003 at the Doncaster Earth Centre on the 4th and 5th December 2003. As so many of the issues which were discussed by the Executive throughout 2003 were important to everyone involved in Tourism in Higher Education (HE) at this time, it was deemed to be appropriate to use this medium to disseminate the conference's key issues in this manner. Also, ATHE's response to the Roberts Review is included, reflecting the Associations' continuing commitment to voice the views of its members on all matter's concerning Tourism in HE in the appropriate arenas.

Remember, if you feel that there are issues that the newsletter could usefully include, please do not hesitate to contact me. The newsletters will include a number of standing items, including **Key Issues** (as discussed at Executive Committee Meetings), **Special Reports** (which will offer further details about these issues, **Future Diary Dates** and **Reminders**.

For full details of ATHE's activities and of the current elected and co-opted Executive Committee members please go to our website : www.athe.org.uk

For the year 2003-04 there are 34 paid up members of ATHE, and we hope to continue to increase membership levels in the next year. It is hoped that issues raised and discussed at the Executive Committees meetings (which are held 6 times a year) reflect these objectives and the interests of all member institutions

Dr. Marion Stuart-Hoyle
Communications Officer.
Email: m.stuart@cant.ac.uk

Survival- Is Your Institution Tough Enough to survive the Tourism Jungle?: Conference Report: Doncaster Castle View Conference Centre: Earth Centre: 4-5th December 2003

ATHE's Annual Conference for 2003 took place for the second year at the Doncaster Earth Centre. The previous year's conference had included 'ice-breaking' activities such as climbing walls and zip wires as well as the academic businesses. This year's agenda had a broad range of issues to address and, therefore, passed on the opportunity to involve members in these fairly hazardous (yet amusing) activities! The conference was designed to offer all delegates with an overview of the key issues which are critical to Tourism' future development and health in Higher Education, focusing on the quality issues surrounding curriculum and research strategies. The two days were divided into 'Missions':

Mission 1: Learning and Teaching

Mission 2: Research and Scholarship

Mission 3: Knowledge Expansion and Transfer

The three 'missions' collectively covered just about every issue that Tourism academics are likely to be facing within our institutions and more broadly, as an academic community. Attendance at the conference was encouraging and it was particularly pleasing to see representatives from institutions that were relatively new members of ATHE. Feedback after the conference has been wholly positive and thanks go to all those who gave presentations and to those who helped in organising the event. The following 'resumes' offer an overview of the key issues discussed and debated and may well form the basis of future discussions at ATHE Executive Meetings and conferences.

Critical Incidents in Tourism Studies

Dr. Marion Stuart-Hoyle-Canterbury Christ Church University College (CCCUC)

For the last ten years the National Liaison Group for Tourism in Higher Education (NLG) and now ATHE have campaigned to ensure that the key issues facing the subject are aired and debated in the national arena. Tourism has developed against a backdrop of continual change in higher education. The Guidelines series (1-11) have tracked many of the challenges that Tourism has faced and the key purpose of this presentation was to bring together all these issues and challenges and to offer a personal reflection on those that had exercised the minds of the tourism academic community in recent years. The presentation opened by highlighting the nature of the contented, committed Tourism academic community, for the most part, coping with the implications of policy change at institutional and national level. In addition, the community has, through ATHE and NLG, responded to the call for consultation over key policies such as the most recent RAE (see Special Report-Roberts Review) and the White Paper on Higher Education. We might not always feel that consultation has resulted in us making a positive difference when key policy making is taking place in HE, but ATHE has felt it important to take up these opportunities to make the views of the subject community heard.

The presentation reminded delegates of the well-documented growth of the Tourism programmes in the last ten years, mirrored by increasing number of PhD completions and Tourism journals. At the same time, it was noted that each institution offering Tourism now has to compete more keenly for a decreasing pool of applicants, raising concerns about the quality of undergraduates. The three key external or 'system-wide' factors which were developed during the presentation as having had a key influence on Tourism's development were Subject Benchmarks, Subject Review, and the RAE. Discussion then moved to what were described as the 'new vocational subject' influences, that is to say, those that were indicative of relatively new subjects like Tourism. This focused on the nature of the committed subject community, its willingness, and even keenness to teach across a broad range of courses, the almost immediate impact of research on teaching and the tendency for the community to try to, or even have to defend the subject at an institutional or disciplinary level. The presentation concluded that the tourism academic community perhaps needs to pull together during the next few years, to ensure that it continues to be heard at a national level on policy issues and to maintain control over how exactly the subject develops at curriculum level.

(This presentation formed the basis of Guideline No 12 '1993-2003: Critical Incidents: Tourism in Higher Education')

Mission 1 – Learning and Teaching

Issues in Teaching and Learning

Cliff Allan-Director LTSN

Dr. Marion Stuart-Hoyle - CCCUC

Cliff Allen opened this first mission, outlining the national teaching and learning agenda and the associated implications for Tourism. Dr. Marion Stuart-Hoyle followed with some of the key curriculum development issues facing tourism in 2003, commencing with the 'stretching' of the Tourism curriculum as the subject is now delivered from GCSE to PhD level and the associated implications for depth and breadth of study. The GCSE Travel and Tourism curriculum was looked at briefly, with questions raised about the nature of the undergraduate curriculum, faced with the fact that some undergraduates are now joining our institutions with four years of Tourism studies already completed. She went on to look at the obvious benefits of research influencing teaching, set against the increasing difficulties faced by academics who might want to pursue research for research's sake, rather than for RAE purposes. The reality facing the majority of Tourism lecturers is that even where tourism research is completed, whether for RAE or other reasons, more often than not, pressures on time from within institutions means it is often impossible to find the time to relate research to teaching. The final issue raised was

that of the 'compete or collaborate' debate.

There is a tendency to view all collaboration as a 'good thing', that it can only really result in benefits for those concerned, for example in bidding for funding for research and/or consultancy. The focus here, however, was on the issue of collaborating, rather than competing with other higher education institutions in developing Tourism programmes. Some institutions, for example, are reticent to work with Further Education institutions (FEIs) in the development and delivery of Foundation Degrees, due to the possible quality assurance concerns. If, however, careful consideration is given at the outset of planning, to key issues such as institutional responsibilities and expectations with regards to such development, many of those quality concerns can be avoided. The Foundation Degree in Management of Tourism and Hospitality developed jointly between Canterbury Christ Church University College and its FE partner, Canterbury College, was the result of many months of consultation and 'mapping' exercises, to make sure that all quality issues were put to bed even before the task of designing the structure and content of the curriculum began. This approach, developed against the backdrop of the launch of the Kent Tourism Academy (KTAc) a new public-private sector collaborative organisation for all quality, education and skills issues for Kent's tourism, illustrates that collaboration can work well, if sufficient attention is afforded at the planning stages. The key challenge for the future is to find out how this successful recipe can be replicated across our subject community, for the benefit of all key stakeholders.

Mission 1

Tourism Studies: HE in FE

Professor David Botterill-University of Wales Institute, Cardiff

This presentation reported a study undertaken for LTSN HLST by Professor David Botterill, Dr Eleri Jones, Dr Claire Haven and Sara Black. During the launch of LTSN HLST it transpired that there were high levels of interest from FEI staff but it was felt that the network should concentrate on higher education in HEIs for the initial three years of the network. Insufficient level of awareness of HE in FE was recognised by the Steering Committee of LTSN HLST in respect of a number of issues: low awareness of FEI issues by HEI staff; potential for poor student progression FE to HE; low awareness of scale of HE in FE; anticipation of Foundation Degrees; FEIs being good at non-traditional recruitment; differences in student experience and quality assurance issues. When the opportunity to access additional resources for a study of HE in FE became available, therefore, LTSN HLST through UWIC, submitted a proposal that was accepted along with 2 other subject networks, Built Environment and Engineering. This study sought to address a number of aims. Firstly, it sought to identify the current scale of HE provision in the subject areas of hospitality, leisure, sport and tourism within FEIs in England. Secondly, it aimed to establish information on resources, learning and teaching, recruitment, retention and progression. Thirdly, it set out to explore 'Equivalence' through the identification of FEI staff perceptions of HE. Fourthly, it hoped to provide examples of current practice from FEIs delivering HE and lastly, to provide recommendations on the role of the LTSN HLST in progressing communication within the subjects and across sectors.

158 FEIs are delivering Tourism, Leisure, Sport and Tourism HE programmes in FEIs in England. Nineteen FEIs offered all four HLST subjects, 46 offered three HLST subjects, 53 offered two HLST subjects, and 40 offered one subject. Five models of provision expressing different combinations of funding source, validation body and partnership arrangements were found. It is estimated that across HLST subjects there are 24000 f/t and p/t HE students who are alongside 930000 f/t and p/t FE students. As far as staff are concerned, it is estimated that 1300 f/t permanent 300 fractional permanent staff and 500 hourly-paid staff are involved in HE delivery. Using these figures a 'guestimate' of the numbers specifically in tourism are 6000 HE students of Tourism in FEIs in England.

FE staff perceive FEIs stronger with regards to a number of issues, such as their response to government's widening access agenda, their development of workplace skills for students and the support offered for individual learning needs. However, FE staff perceive HEIs to be stronger in relation to student recruitment, library and learning resources, time for research and research activity and the overall culture for HE delivery. FEI staff satisfaction levels with partner HEIs indicated low levels of satisfaction in many areas of partnership, the exceptions being support for HE assessment processes and support for student progression to higher qualifications.

There are 2 principle questions to emerge from this study for the subject community. Given the burgeoning scale of provision of HE subject study in FEIs (including tourism), the low satisfaction levels with HEI interventions, the perceived differences in provision across the sectors (culture of institution, staff conditions, and student experience), how can equivalence in student learning in HE be promoted? This is the suggested agenda for interventions by LTSN HLST. For ATHE, the implications of the surprising scale of HE in FE prior to an expansion of Foundation degrees in England conjoined with provision in Scotland, Wales and NI presents a major challenge for the tourism community to think more inclusively about HE in Tourism Studies in the UK. The ATHE executive needs to invoke processes that recognise and involve the entire subject community and not just those in ATHE member HEIs. This might be affected through closer working with the LTSN through FDTL5 projects and regional workshops.

Mission 2 – Research and Scholarship

Mike Crang- (University of Durham) Editor of Tourist Studies

The presentation commenced with the reasons behind the launch of the journal 'Tourist Studies'. It emerged that the journal had grown out of dissatisfaction with existing tourism journals that perhaps focused too much on the 'management' aspect of the subject. Tourist Studies was launched to offer a home for different types of research outputs, such as photo essays and translated pieces.

This presentation continued with some observations about Tourism's relative invisibility in the last two RAEs. The key concern then turned to how Tourism might fair during the next Exercise, based upon information to date about the exercise's structure and approach. The publication lead-time for the next exercise was reported to be about a year, so any work not underway at this point in time would not be involved. With regards to exactly what should and could be submitted, it is still a case of awaiting the outcome of the Roberts Review. Some concerns were voiced with regards to

to the structure of the relevant panels, and it was felt that concerns about the appropriateness of those panels were as yet, unresolved. Journal articles would remain the key focus of submissions for the next exercise and the focus would also be clearly international.

At an institutional level it was not felt that Tourism would figure in Durham University's submission to the next Exercise as it would be unlikely to reap reward for the institution. Mike's prognosis for Tourism's fate in the next Exercise was one which featured the concept of continued invisibility, based upon the information circulating to date regarding the structure and process proposed.

Mission 2

University Research Strategies

Rory McClellan-University of Strathclyde: Tourism Research within the Scottish Hotel School

The presentation focused on where Tourism fits into the research strategy for the Scottish Hotel School. Five core issues were central to the discussion:

- location of tourism studies in university research groupings: business and management; social sciences; sport?
- rating of Hospitality and Tourism Journals
- uncertainty over the next RAE
- current research strategies at Strathclyde
- fragmentation of tourism & hospitality research

The background context influencing the location of tourism was three fold; first the configuration of research units of assessment in the next RAE; second, the University of Strathclyde research strategy; and third, the Strathclyde Business School research strategy.

The research strategy at the university, then Business faculty levels were outlined with the overall target of, by 2007, achieving output equivalent to an RAE rating of 5 or above for all units being assessed. This goal was of a particular importance for business, unit 43, which dropped from a 5 to a 4 in the last RAE. The Scottish Hotel School, as a department within the Business Faculty shared these ambitious aims. A number of tactical management decisions had been made as part of this strategy that affected the nature of departmental priorities, in particular the workloads of academics. The research groupings within Business were configured to reflect the larger, stronger research departments with a tendency to gravitate towards established, generic business disciplines. Six groupings were based on four strong individual departments: 1-marketing, 2-economics, 3-management science and 4-accountancy and finance; and two combined groupings involving input from several departments: 5-entrepreneurship & international business and 6-management and organisations.

Thus, the tourism and hospitality research, and the individual researchers must 'find a home' in one of these categories. An alternative is to locate tourism research within The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, such as geography, sociology, government, politics etc. A small tourism sub-group is currently pursuing this. The above, effectively fragments tourism and hospitality research further exacerbating its 'invisibility' in academic research. This is compounded by the advice to reorient tourism researchers towards publication in generic journals partly to improve 'the fit' within the core research groupings, but also as tourism journals have relatively low ratings.

The presentation concluded by looking at tourism research and the influence of its location within university structures, the likely effects of RAE 2007 on tourism research in the UK and the relationship between tourism and associated academic disciplines.

Mission 2

Professor Peter Mason-University of Luton

Peter's presentation reviewed the 1996 and 2001 RAE submissions made by the University of Luton. In 2001, Luton entered 'Tourism' separately within UoA 43 'Business and Management' and was one of only three universities to adopt this strategy. The strategy paid off as Luton achieved a '4' rating.

Peter then discussed the pressures that have become evident since the 2001 RAE. A major factor was that despite scoring a '4' the government refusal to fund '5's and below adequately, meant that only approximately half of the anticipated money from HEFCE actually came to the University. He also discussed effects of the 2003 Government White Paper on HE, particularly in terms of the concentration of money in research departments of '5' and above, the desire for universities to collaborate, the need to find local sources of funding and the perceived split into 'research-focused' and 'teaching-led' universities. He indicated that Luton would find it very difficult to maintain the commitment to the type of research that had achieved the '4' rating. Peter concluded that there were a number of scenarios for the future of tourism research at Luton; at one extreme a real attempt to improve on the 2001 score and at the other the possibility of no entry at all in the next RAE.

Mission 3 – Knowledge Expansion and Transfer

Tourism Knowledge Scotland (TKS)

Rory McClellan – University of Strathclyde

This initiative began as an informal grouping of tourism researchers within higher education in Scotland. It has evolved, with the assistance of the Scottish Enterprise network and VisitScotland into an organisation with input from around 15 higher education institutions, with the core aim of communicating research knowledge to the tourism sector in Scotland. It represents a co-ordinated approach to add value to research activity and provide mechanisms to facilitate better collaboration and communication between institutions.

This co-operative approach can help make a real difference and significantly assist in achieving many of the goals outlined in the Tourism Framework for Action, 2002-2005 (Scottish Executive, 2002).

Building on a review of international models of best practice TKS has used others' experience to help build true international competitive advantage for tourism and tourism research in Scotland within an environmental and economic framework.

Although still in the early stages the members have developed several collaborative projects. TKS has an established presence on scotexchange.net (website of VisitScotland) and it has been instrumental in the organisation of the State of The Art II 2004 conference. In the longer run, TKS offers an unparalleled opportunity to use the extensive network of tourism academics residing in Scotland to foster collaborative research to the benefit of the tourism industry. This collective wisdom just needs a more supportive mechanism to focus its activities, and is seeking Scottish Executive assistance so that it can make a difference that will benefit all tourism in Scotland.

ATHE AGM: Chairs Report

MEETINGS 2003

17 th January	Canterbury Christ Church Uni. College
7 th March	UWIC
12 th May	Bournemouth University
11 th July	Buckinghamshire Chilterns Uni. College
26 th September	Strathclyde University
31 st October	University of Luton

ISSUES 2003

- Response to HEFCE: Joint Funding Bodies' Review of Research Assessment.
- 10th Anniversary of NLG/ATHE
- ATHE Newsletter – 3 per year planned
- Joint Subject Association Conference – UKSCLRS, CHME, LSA, BASES - May 2003
- Joint Subject Association Conference – UKSCLRS, CHME, LSA, BASES and LTSN– September 2003
- Financial support for postgraduate students presenting papers at 'State of the Art 2', 2004, Glasgow
- Financial support for 'State of the Art 2' Conference, 2004, Glasgow
- Website
- Membership
- ATHE Guidelines 11: Tourism Studies and the Research Assessment Exercise
- ATHE Guidelines 12: NLG/ATHE 1993-2003
- Joint ICOMOS/ATHE Conference
- Response to Joint Funding Bodies' Review of Research Assessment
- Response to White Paper 'The Future of Higher Education'
- Joined Tourism Alliance: Subscription £411.25
- Response to Tourism Statistics Improvement Initiative (TSII)
- Joint and ATHE Response to The Roberts Review
- ATHE Expenses - £250 per Executive Member
- New PO BOX

Dr Keith Wilkes, December 2003

GUIDELINES UPDATE:

Guideline No 12 '1993-2003: Critical Incidents: Tourism in Higher Education'

This publication, written by Executive Committee Member Marion Stuart-Hoyle, brings together all the issues and challenges faced by the field of Tourism Education and offers a personal reflection on those that have exercised the minds of the tourism academic community in recent years. (See page one for more details) The Guideline has now been printed and will be sent out very soon to all fully paid members of ATHE. If you need any other copies of this publication, please contact the ATHE executive secretary, Teri Vincent on teri.vincent@virgin.net.

Guidelines Compendium, no. 10 'Integrating Sustainability into the Undergraduate Curriculum: Leisure and Tourism', and No 11 'Tourism Studies and the Research Assessment Exercise 2001', are both still available to all fully paid members, please contact Teri Vincent.

Future Diary Dates

ATHE's Annual Conference 2004 ('Key Issues in Tourism and Leisure Higher Education') is to be a joint conference organised by The Association for Tourism in Higher Education (ATHE), The Leisure and Tourism Education Research Centre (LaTERC), BCUC, and The Leisure Tourism Support Network (LTSN) for Hospitality Leisure Tourism Sport and Tourism subjects. It is set for 2nd/3rd December 2004, to be held at Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, Missenden Abbey, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire.

Student retention, teaching disadvantaged students, widening participation, top-up-fees, e-learning – these are just some of the issues that concern everyone engaged in teaching and/or researching leisure and tourism related subjects in higher education today. The primary aim of the conference is to create an inter-disciplinary forum which will provide delegates with the opportunity to exchange research ideas and examples of good practice. The conference will be promoted as widely as possible to encourage attendance.

Future Executive Committee Meetings:

For your information, the next three meetings are as follows:

12th March 2004 – University of Gloucestershire

18th May 2004 – Leeds Metropolitan University

27th June 2004 – University of Strathclyde

Reminders

A brief reminder to those of you who have yet to pay your subscriptions for 2003-04! Teri will be sending out new invoices for 2004-05 very soon, so check your post. We are keen to encourage as many existing and new members as possible to join, to ensure that ATHE really is representative of the Tourism in HE Community across the UK.

Links

The Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism is an online journal which can be found at: www.hlst.ltsn.ac.uk/johlste

For full details of ATHE's activities and of current elected and co-opted Executive Committee members, please go to our website: www.athe.org.uk

Special Report - Roberts Review Response

ATHE felt it was important that the organisation respond directly to the Roberts Review of Research Assessment in 2003. ATHE responded as follows:

The ATHE invites the committee to test the impact of its proposals on tourism research and consider

- a) whether the proposed system will enable tourism research to develop or whether it will cause it to decline and
- b) if the latter, whether this is desirable for economic, social or academic advancement.

General comment

1. The Roberts Review appears to support increased research selectivity. This is understandable in medicine for example where it would clearly not be sensible to support research at 3 or 4 rated levels given the existence of 5*/6* rated research. But this assumption does not work for emerging areas of research such as tourism where current levels of research excellence rarely exceed 4. This also precludes collaboration with 5*/6* rated research centres.
2. Its approach appears to favour science and technology and well established research in traditional universities. Its scope does not seem to offer support for research in new fields or in new universities. Research for the services sector, including tourism, needs special consideration.
3. It over concentrates on the large, the powerful and the established at the expense of the new and emerging. A consequence of this is that it does not pay sufficient attention to the consequences of reduced / zero funding for those research groups, networks and communities, such as tourism, which will be adversely affected by its plans. For example, in tourism, the research community is also prominent in producing textbooks – this important link would be threatened. There is a growing cohort of PhD students in tourism (approximately 149 PhDs were awarded 1990-1999). The academics who supervise these students need to be located in, and legitimised by, the wider UK research community. Career aspirations and motivations are highly influenced by research activity, indeed academic identity is often formed by research activity.
4. It does not attempt to identify value for money of smaller, emerging research groups. Some kind of cost-benefit analysis of would be welcome as a basis for evidence-based policy.
5. Its emphasis is on Research Quality Assessment with some explanation of Research Capability Assessment. There are no proposals for “the separate approach for the least research intensive institutions” – so the needs of new and emerging areas of research have effectively been ignored.

Tourism

- “... is one of the largest industries in the UK (the fifth largest in England), worth £74 billion to the UK economy in 2001, about 4.5% of the GDP. It is a major employer in the UK: 2.1 million people have jobs in this sector, which

is 7% of the UK workforce. Some 10% of all new jobs created are in the tourism industry, which demonstrates the importance of this growing industry to the UK economy” (Source: The Culture, Media and Sport Committee of the House of Commons: Fourth Report, Jan 2003)

- Is an increasingly important activity in people’s lives shaping identities and communities
- Has been overlooked by policymakers as evidenced by the response to the Foot and Mouth crisis where agricultural interests were advanced at the expense of tourism. This demonstrates the lack of a research base on the economic impacts of tourism in comparison to agriculture.

Tourism research

- Has demonstrated a rising profile of research quality and outputs over previous RAEs
- Demonstrated glimmers of 5*, a limited number of 4 centres, but was mainly rated 3a / 3b in RAE 2001. In other words much tourism research is at least of national excellence.
- Is emerging and developing and needs to be designated as an emerging area with special funding for development
- Is characterised by small specialist research centres in less research research-intensive (and generally the “new”) universities.
- Has suffered a funding cut post RAE 2001
- Does not need huge sums of money to support it – a healthy amount of activity developed over the period 1996- 2002 with limited funding
- Is flourishing overseas (particularly in Australasia where a number of key UK academics now operate). UK research enjoys a high reputation internationally but this will be lost without continued support from funding councils.
- Supports a number of journals
- Supports a well established network of researchers who are key members of the tourism academic community in terms of curriculum development, internationalisation, and production of textbooks
- Was atomised by the last RAE since it fell between a number of panels
- Is not yet commensurate with enormous significance of tourism to the economy

What does tourism research need to prosper?

- A funding mechanism that will enable its critical mass to emerge and support its development into a research area of international excellence.
- The funding mechanism needs to address the following:
 - Cohesion: RAE 2001 meant that tourism research was split across a number of areas so that any critical mass was lost.
 - Visibility: The title tourism was not prominent in the RAE 2001 documentation
 - Advocacy: There were no experts representing tourism either in the design or the implementation of RAE 2001
 - Incubation: The special needs of a new and emerging area of research are different from those of established areas.
- If the new assessment regime fails to address these issues, research in the UK will ossify around those subject areas that happened by to be prominent

around the year 2000. New areas such as tourism will be unable to emerge, survive or develop in the highly selective recommendations proposed by Roberts.

Supporting documents:

The following documents are available in support of the ATHE submission:

Botterill, D., 2002, Tourism Studies and Research Quality Assessment in UK Universities, *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 1(2):71-74.

Botterill, D. and C. Haven, 2003, Tourism Studies and the Research Assessment Exercise 2001 (Guidelines No 11), Association for Tourism in Higher Education: Guildford.

Tribe, J., 2003, The RAE-ification of Tourism Research in the UK, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 5, pp. 225-234