

Scientific progress on strategic management in hospitality and tourism: a state-of-the-art

Fevzi Okumus, Mehmet Ali Köseoglu, Alfonso Morvillo and Mehmet Altin

Abstract

Purpose – *The main purpose of this study is to offer a critical review of studies of scientific progress of strategic management (SM) research in the hospitality and tourism field (H&T).*

Design/methodology/approach – *This study was conducted through a critical literature review based on three dimensions: intellectual, conceptual and social structures of SM research.*

Findings – *The boundaries of SM under the three dimensions (intellectual, conceptual and social structure) are addressed. Based on these three components, SM in hospitality and tourism realm shows a discursive structure. There are few studies assessing the evolution of SM research in the H&T industry. However, all of these studies are review papers that explored the boundaries of SM research in H&T by using limited keywords to find SM papers, and generally considered papers which are published in a few leading H&T journals.*

Research limitations/implications – *This study focused on only H&T journals to elaborate the boundaries of SM in H&T. The findings of this study can help researchers (re)design research agendas to contribute to both mainstream and H&T industry SM literature and to enhance the essential elements of theory development in SM research related to H&T industry.*

Originality/value – *This is one of the first studies assessing the development of SM research related to hospitality and tourism by considering the boundaries of SM in three issues: intellectual, conceptual and social structure.*

Keywords *Tourism, Hospitality, Intellectual structure, Conceptual structure, Strategic management, State of art, Social structure*

Paper type *Research paper*

Fevzi Okumus is Professor at the Rosen College of Hospitality Management, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida, USA. Mehmet Ali Köseoglu is Assistant Professor at the School of Hotel and Tourism Management, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong. Alfonso Morvillo is Director at the Institute for Research on Innovation and Development Services, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Napoli, Italy. Mehmet Altin is Assistant Professor at the Rosen College of Hospitality Management, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida, USA.

1. Introduction

Strategic management (SM) as a pragmatic perspective, initially focused more on why there are differences in industries or organizations' profits since the 1960s. To explain these differences, several theories were proposed based on North American organizations by Chandler (1962), Andrews (1965), Ansoff (1965), Hatten *et al.* (1978), Mintzberg (1978), Quinn (1980), Porter (1980, 1981, 1985, 1991) and Barney (1991). Initial developments during the 1960s started shifting SM from an earlier deterministic approach to a contingency approach. However, this period was mainly normative and prescriptive with researchers using case studies to focus on managers and best practices (Furrer *et al.*, 2008; Hoskisson *et al.*, 1999).

On the other hand, research studies in the 1970s moved toward industrial organization (IO) economics where a firm's performance was considered a function of its environment (Porter, 1980, 1981), using a structural approach and the structure conduct performance (S-C-P) paradigm. Studies in the 1980s started shifting the focus from external to internal aspects of firms (resources and capabilities), using mainly transaction cost economics

Received 19 March 2017
Revised 24 May 2017
Accepted 5 June 2017

(TCE) and agency theory (Hoskisson *et al.*, 1999; Ramos-Rodriguez and Ruiz-Navarro, 2004). This was especially the case for development and advancement of resource-based theory (Barney 1991). Research in the past decades has particularly emphasized the role of new technologies and knowledge creation and diffusion in SM (Durand *et al.*, 2017). Research studies have been dedicated especially to a knowledge-based view as well as knowledge transfer as a source of competitive advantage (Grant, 1996; Krylova *et al.*, 2016; Shaw and Williams, 2009; Szulanski *et al.*, 2016).

As for empirical research, questions and hypotheses have been developed to test, support or further develop the above theories to shift the legitimacy of SM's theories from a pragmatic status to a full scientific discipline. This goal has also helped managers and practitioners (re)solve problems or maximize organizational outputs. By nature, SM shows multidisciplinary characteristics of research and practices because it has borrowed theories from other disciplines and fields (Kenworthy and Verbeke, 2015; Durand *et al.*, 2017). Hence, its theories, assumptions and practices have been embedded into the center of applications of companies in any industry, as well as the research agendas of industry-oriented researchers. As for the specific case of hospitality and tourism (H&T) firms, they share many characteristics with other industries. However, different characteristics of H&T industry, attributable to its heavy focus on service, might require different approaches from a strategic perspective. In this respect, SM research focusing on H&T industry has been growing and evolving in the mainstream management or specifically H&T literature (Harrington *et al.*, 2014; Okumus, 2002; Okumus and Wong, 2005; Olsen and Roper, 1998). However, more studies are needed to understand the boundaries of this growth or evolution for the incremental advancement of our field and to create applicable methods for practitioners. Therefore, this study aims to address the research of scientific progress on SM research in H&T industry by comparing the advances in mainstream SM literature.

The paper proceeds as follows. First, we elaborate on the structure and evolution of the SM field by identifying the boundaries related to the intellectual, conceptual and social structures. Second, the methodology used for this study is explained. Subsequently, the intellectual, conceptual and social domain of SM research in H&T is discussed based on the evolution of mainstream SM research. Finally, future research topics and methods are discussed.

2. Boundaries of mainstream strategic management research

Boundaries of the disciplines may be discussed in three dimensions of SM: intellectual structure, conceptual structure and social structure of the field (Koseoglu *et al.*, 2016). Intellectual structure of SM refers to the identification of the most influential research topics, fundamental theories and disciplinary approaches that represent the foundations of the research field and upon which current research has to be carried out (Nerur *et al.*, 2008, 2015). Conceptual structure is represented by the most commonly used words related to the topic of SM, which are used to identify the main research themes related to SM. The social structure is a measure of collaboration of scientists and researchers in the field of SM. It allows us to identify the social network of scientists interested in the field-related themes and social ties (Zupic and Cater, 2015).

2.1 Intellectual structure of strategic management research

Intellectual structure or knowledge domain of SM has been comprehensively assessed and discussed in several previous studies. For example, Hoskisson *et al.* (1999) evaluated early stages of SM by focusing on existing theory and research in SM studies. They indicated that SM is strongly theory based. Some of the theories they identified include contingency perspective, IO economics, transaction costs, agency theory, resource-based view, dynamic capabilities, strategic leadership, strategic decision theory and knowledge-based

view. Methodologies used in SM research are sophisticated and include the collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data. [Hoskisson et al. \(1999\)](#) used the expression “swings of a pendulum” as a metaphor to explain a key feature within the development of the SM field. Indeed, in the 1960s, organizations looked at the internal environment as the key variable in formulating their strategies; later, they shifted their focus on the external environment, ultimately focusing again on internal resources and capabilities.

[Guerras-Martin et al. \(2014\)](#) took [Hoskisson et al.'s \(1999\)](#) study a step further to explain the evolution in SM. They use a “two swing pendulums” metaphor to explain a new research line that has emerged in recent years. This research is aimed at building micro foundations of SM by mainly vetting psychological and cognitive aspects along with other issues, including dynamic capabilities, human capital, product development, organizational identity, social capital and absorptive capacity. Hence, this research line at the individual level and the resource-based theory have respectively progressed in two research lines, such as micro foundations of strategy from an economic perspective and behavioral strategy from a psychological perspective ([Molina-Azorin, 2014](#)). Therefore, while one of the pendulums shows the internal and external environmental factors as macro-level sources of competitive advantage, the other illustrates micro foundations of strategy, depicting the relational view of strategy of the individual ([Guerras-Martin et al., 2014](#)).

Other researchers have used co-citation analysis as a bibliometric method to elucidate intellectual structures of SM ([Ramos-Rodriguez and Ruiz-Navarro, 2004](#); [Nerur et al., 2008, 2015](#); [Ferreira et al., 2016](#)). [Nerur et al. \(2008\)](#) highlighted five main streams of research related to SM: organization theory, IO, agency theory, concept of strategy and organizational decision-making. According to [Nerur et al. \(2015\)](#), while a practitioner orientation has been declining, the link between international business and entrepreneurship has been increasing. Additionally, the relation between finance and sociology has been well built in SM research. [Ferreira et al. \(2016\)](#) demonstrated separation between strategic entrepreneurship and corporate entrepreneurship and influence of strategic behavior. In addition to these perspectives, new streamlines like strategy as practice ([Jarzabkowski, 2004](#); [Jarzabkowski et al., 2007, 2016](#); [Whittington, 1996](#)), and a practice-based view of strategy ([Bromiley and Rau, 2014a, 2014b](#)) have arisen.

2.2 Conceptual structure of strategic management research

Several previous studies have assessed the conceptual structure of SM. For example, [Nag et al. \(2007\)](#) found that a conceptual definition of SM includes seven components: strategic initiatives, managers and owners, resources, internal organization, environment, firms and performance. Another group of researchers showed how the importance of keywords changed over time ([Furrer et al., 2008](#)). For example, while the importance of alliances, capabilities, restructuring, corporate, entry, financial, international, entrepreneurship and innovation are increasing, fit, decision, environment, planning, typologies and mission are decreasing. At the same time, the importance of other keywords (cognitive, competition, diversification, functional and growth) is consistent and stable. They also argued that some exogenous factors, including environmental challenges in the period following World War II, inflation and stagnation during 1970s, increased foreign competition and globalization, and dynamic changes in international environment during 1990s, might have contributed to these changes. In addition, they identified six main research topics:

1. strategy and its environment;
2. strategy process and top management;
3. corporate strategy and financial models;
4. growth and market entry;

5. industry and competition; and
6. the resource-based view of the firm.

Concepts such as strategy risk, the stakeholder analysis of SM, corporate reputation, and strategic concept are highlighted as highly attractive topics for researchers to study. Ronda-Pupo and Guerras-Martín (2010, p. 182) identified a definition for strategy: “the dynamics of the firm’s relation with its environment for which the necessary actions are taken to achieve its goals and/or to increase performance by means of the rational use of resources”. These findings demonstrate the increasing coherence of internal dynamics of clusters in the core line of SM research (Ronda-Pupo, 2015). Future SM research will most likely focus more on concepts such as knowledge capture, transfer and creation from a knowledge-based view (Tan and Ding, 2015), and individual and group behavior from a behavioral strategy perspective (Guerras-Martín *et al.*, 2014).

2.3 Social structure of strategic management research

SM is an important emerging discipline for researchers, managers and consultants because strategy and SM practices are one of the main components of business, academia and business education. Associations, conferences and academic journals are expected to generate, develop and disseminate the knowledge of SM. From these efforts, a broad social structure or network of SM has emerged around the world. For example, the Strategic Management Society “is unique in bringing together the worlds of reflective practice and thoughtful scholarship” and has nearly 3,000 members representing a kaleidoscope of backgrounds and perspectives from more than 80 different countries. Membership, composed of academics, business practitioners, and consultants, focuses on the development and dissemination of insights on the SM process, as well as on fostering contacts and interchange around the world” (Strategic Management Society, 2017). This institution holds at least three conferences around the world. Additionally, many business and management conferences have SM tracks to help foster social networks for those who are involved with or interested in SM practices or theories.

There are many academic journals focusing directly on SM theories and practices. As indicated by Koseoglu (2016b), the main SM journals are *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, *Business Management and Strategy*, *International Journal of Applied Strategic Management*, *International Journal of Strategic Management*, *International Journal of Strategic Management and Decision Support Systems in Strategic Management*, *International Journal of Sustainable Strategic Management*, *International Strategic Management Review*, *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, *Journal of Management and Strategy*, *Journal of Strategy and Management*, *Journal of Strategic Management Education*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Strategic Management Quarterly*, and *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*. The *Strategic Management Journal (SMJ)* was released in 1980 and has been one of the most influential in the field of management and business (ISI Journal Citation Reports, 2016). According to the *SMJ* web page (<http://smj.strategicmanagement.net>, 2017), during 2015, almost 2,200 different scholars based in 85 countries submitted articles to the *SMJ*; in the prior five years, an average of 1,700 unique scholars submitted from more than 100 countries per year.

The evolution of the network structure of the SM scientific community shows three stages: formation/incorporation, consolidation/dissemination and expansion/transformation (Ronda-Pupo and Guerras-Martín, 2010). Koseoglu (2016a, 2016b) explained how the SM scientific community has grown and evolved based on co-authorship and co-institutional networks, respectively. According to Durand *et al.* (2017, p. 8):

[. . .] strategic management possesses strong and effective institutions that foster identity and promote belonging. As already noted, central to this identity are priorities and traits that

distinguish strategic management from other areas of management and organizational studies, notably a practical orientation. For example, interest in improving organizational performance by addressing the problems faced by managers draws many strategy scholars toward the normative application of their knowledge and clinical engagement with practitioners. In sum, the community's diversity reinforces the field's theoretical and analytical eclecticism.

Therefore, SM has a broad and strong social structure in both scientific and practitioner communities. Many disciplines, education institutions, and industries integrate practices related to strategy or SM into the center of their research agendas, practices or events.

On the basis of three structures (intellectual, conceptual and social), this study has discussed the main advances of the literature on this topic. At this point, it is worth highlighting that despite the notion that many characteristics of firms operating in H&T share similarities to those of organizations operating in other fields, there are specific features of the H&T industry, mainly attributable to their focus on service dimensions, which require different approaches from the SM perspective (Okumus *et al.*, 2010). On the basis of this consideration, it is possible to understand the value of critically discussing state-of-the-art research on SM in H&T. In this respect, an argument can be made by relying on the same structures previously adopted for general SM studies by specifically addressing the intellectual, conceptual and social structures of SM research in H&T.

3. Methodology

The main purpose of this study is to discuss the development of SM research in the H&T field. This paper contributes to the literature by comparing the evolution of SM in H&T with the evolution of mainstream SM research, and adopting the distinction among intellectual structure, conceptual structure and social structure introduced by Zupic and Cater (2015).

This study was conducted by reviewing SM articles in H&T that were published in leading hospitality and tourism management journals (Table I). These journals have been selected based on the impact factors of journals released by *Journals of Citation Reports* (2016). The period of analysis was limited to the years of the first issue of the journals, until the end of December 2016. The research study was carried out during January 2017. The following keywords were used that related to intellectual, conceptual and social structures of SM in H&T: bibliometric analysis, state of art, review, co-citation, co-word, co-authorship, intellectual structure, conceptual structure, social structure and citation analysis.

The journal search provided several review articles related to SM in H&T. However, no paper focusing on the progress or evolution of SM in H&T literature using quantitative bibliometric methods was found. Next, the selected papers were critically reviewed, and several articles focusing on the topics were identified. By adopting the intellectual,

Table I Selected leading hospitality and tourism journals

No.	Name
1	<i>Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research</i>
2	<i>Annals of Tourism Research</i>
3	<i>Cornell Hospitality Quarterly</i>
4	<i>Current Issues in Tourism</i>
5	<i>International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management</i>
6	<i>International Journal of Hospitality Management</i>
7	<i>International Journal of Tourism Research</i>
8	<i>Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management</i>
9	<i>Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research</i>
10	<i>Journal of Sustainable Tourism</i>
11	<i>Journal of Travel Research</i>
12	<i>Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing</i>
13	<i>Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism</i>
14	<i>Tourism Management</i>

conceptual and social structures as guiding dimensions, the main research topics and methods of study used in the literature on SM in H&T were identified and classified.

4. Strategic management research in hospitality and tourism

4.1 Intellectual and conceptual structures of strategic management research in H&T

No previous studies were identified that used the intellectual and conceptual structures of SM research in H&T via quantitative bibliometric methods. Therefore, this study discusses both the intellectual and conceptual structure of SM in H&T. Extant review studies evaluated the development of SM research in H&T literature (Athiyaman, 1995; Harrington and Ottenbacher, 2011; Harrington *et al.*, 2014; Olsen, 2004; Olsen and Roper, 1998; Phillips and Moutinho, 2014). Athiyaman (1995) focused on strategy research to explore the development of business strategies in tourism. This study claimed that researchers primarily have focused on tourism and strategy, tourism and strategy planning or tourism and strategy management. However, there were no studies on tourism and strategy content, strategy process or strategy formulation. The papers on tourism and strategy were related to analyzing the environment, implementing strategy, planning direction, and planning strategy by dealing with international and/or national businesses.

Olsen and Roper (1998) assessed SM research in H&T by focusing on the four main areas of strategy research: strategic planning, competition and competitive advantage, internationalization and strategic implementation. They found that many studies have been conceptual and have focused on traditional constructs of the strategy paradigm, including environmental analysis, strategy formulation, strategic planning and the strategy-structure-performance relationship. They described the development of the SM field in H&T as hardly embryonic.

In a later study, Olsen (2004) reviewed research pertaining to SM in hospitality using hospitality and non-hospitality referred journals published in 2002-2003. He used a contingency model that included constructs such as environmental scanning, strategy choice and strategy implementation based on resource-based view, implementation and evaluation dimensions. He found the research to be mainly conceptual and descriptive, and some of the findings could be argued as problematic due to limited evidence of validity, potentially misdirecting some practitioners with limited understanding of scholarly papers.

Harrington and Ottenbacher (2011) identified ten main topics related to SM in the hospitality literature using studies from 2005 to 2009, namely, strategy and uncertainty, strategy and the internal organization, competitive strategy, corporate strategy and governance, global strategy, strategy process, strategy implementation, knowledge and innovation, the practice of strategy and entrepreneurship and strategy. SM topics studied in H&T were significantly extended; however, these authors claimed that SM research studies used more tactical methods when addressing questions of strategy rather than more theoretical notions of strategy. In a follow-up study, Harrington *et al.* (2014) stressed that the boundaries of SM in H&T were improved upon and extended from 1980 to 2013. While largely being influenced by the mainstream SM, subtle differences in research methods, unique to H&T firms, were captured. Additionally, they observed that SM research in H&T followed mainstream SM theory-based trends by applying more process-based concepts.

4.2 Social structure of strategic management research in H&T

Hospitality and tourism literature has a vibrant community, significant reputation around the world and an influence on and interaction with other disciplines. For example, Leung and Law (2006) found intensified collaboration in information technology publications in leading H&T journals. Hu and Racherla (2008, pp. 310-311) illustrated that "the hospitality research

community is a large yet cohesive knowledge network that is still evolving through rich collaborations that are important for its advancement as a scientific field". However, there is no study critically discussing the social structure of SM research in H&T. SM is an important part of curriculums in both hospitality and tourism programs, as well as graduate and undergraduate studies. However, there is no leading school or dedicated association for studying SM, even though practitioners in the industry use practices of SM. Moreover, no traditional SM events or academic SM journals in the H&T field exist that aim to build and strengthen the network of SM in H&T. These fallbacks clearly retard the advancement of SM research in the H&T field.

5. Observations, gaps and future research

H&T is an industry-based field/speciality showing multidisciplinary characteristics (Tribe, 2000, 2004, 2010) that ultimately provides a unique laboratory for researchers to generate SM studies in an H&T context. Okumus (2002), Harrington and Ottenbacher (2011) and Harrington *et al.* (2014) offer specific recommendations on how H&T researchers can contribute to the H&T-focused SM literature based on quality and quantity of studies. In considering their recommendations, developments for intellectual, conceptual and social structures of SM are addressed below.

5.1 Development of intellectual structure of strategic management in H&T

First, studies elucidating the boundaries of intellectual structure of SM in H&T via quantitative bibliometric methods are needed at any level, including disciplinary, in subfields of SM in H&T or geographically (regional and country). This can help researchers build and extend theory development in this field. Second, because H&T research is industry-centered, there is a need for scholars to focus more on practice-based studies to solve organizations' problems in the H&T industry. Without additional research, it is likely that knowledge growth related to methodology and theoretical constructs or advancements will be hindered (Xiao and Smith, 2006). In this respect, an analysis and review of empirical studies is needed to understand the use of qualitative and quantitative approaches and the contribution of these methods to the existing knowledge. Furthermore, H&T researchers should use theory-based studies by using bibliometric methods for theory development. For example, mainstream SM research studies used 194 theories (Kenworthy and Verbeke, 2015). The most frequently utilized theories include resource-based view, TCE, agency theory, (neo) institutional theory, upper echelon theory, resource dependence theory, contingency theory, social capital theory, signaling theory and stakeholder theory with knowledge-based view and behavioral strategy gaining afoot. Therefore, SM researchers in H&T should take unique practices from the H&T industry and incorporate them into extensions of existing theories or the development of new ones.

There are important efforts for SM research in H&T to create repeatable cumulative knowledge (Bettis *et al.*, 2016) and accumulate integrated and empirically-validated knowledge (Durand *et al.*, 2017). For example, Bettis *et al.* (2016, p. 260) have recently called all SM researchers to consider the meaning of the interestingness of a research question as something that they want to learn more about to build cumulative knowledge of the SM phenomena through replications and publication of non-results. Durand *et al.* (2017, p. 15) also emphasize the way of integration in the field:

We may disagree on whether an overall dominant paradigm is to be wished for or not, but, either way, theoretical eclecticism and empirical plurality remain core characteristics of strategy, and integration will require fostering both taxonomic and methodological commensurability among the different subfields and contributing disciplines. Ultimately, the counteracting power of fragmentation will depend upon the values and behaviors we embrace as a community of scholars. However, the same factors that have nurtured the remarkable development of the field over the past four decades – notably our willingness to embrace complex problems, to draw

concepts, theories, and ideas from diverse disciplines, to contribute to practice, and to resist parochialism – are strong enablers of continuing progress.

There is a good opportunity for SM researchers and graduate students in the H&T field to contribute to SM literature by exploiting unique characteristics of the H&T industry.

5.2 Development of conceptual structure of strategic management in H&T

Although consensual definitions of strategy and SM are proposed (Nag *et al.*, 2007), industry matters when strategies are formulated and implemented (McGahan and Porter, 1997; Rumelt, 1991; Weerawardena *et al.*, 2006). Hence, researchers should first identify the boundaries of conceptual structures of SM research in H&T via quantitative bibliometric methods. Second, they should identify an agreed upon definition for strategy and SM in H&T reflecting the unique characteristics of the industry. Third, researchers should identify and classify the relevant mechanisms of SM in H&T to have a holistic view of the conceptual structure. Finally, by considering these structures, researchers should open new windows to accomplish sustainable growth over a set of core lines of research (Ronda-Pupo, 2015). For example, studies are needed to understand how the latest innovations are incorporated in the literature of SM in H&T. Particular interests should be dedicated to the role of new technologies, the development of e-tourism and the study of best practices. Because the H&T industry depends on external factors more than other businesses and industries, specific attention should be given to external factors that can influence the competitive advantage of firms in H&T (Schwaninger, 1989; Okumus *et al.*, 2010). Natural resources, in particular, can be considered critical factors of success in this industry. Another important topic of study is on collaborative strategies and the development of clusters in tourism; the birth of alliances and the collaborative use of resources, in fact, generate long-term benefits (Novelli *et al.*, 2006). The coordination and collaboration among the variety of different players in a destination is often one of the most useful strategies for the development and economic growth in the H&T context (Wang and Fesenmaier, 2007).

5.3 Development of social structure of strategic management in H&T

There is no evidence to precisely define how big or small the SM community in H&T is, or how impactful it is. Therefore, the SM community in H&T should perhaps build its own identity that “gives members a fundamental sense of who they are as a community, and how they differ from other communities” (Nag *et al.*, 2007, p. 937), because a shared identity is needed to be a scientific community (Kuhn, 1962). There are a few possible ways to develop social structure of SM in H&T. First, H&T has vibrant and broad academic and business environments and communities around the world (Cheng *et al.*, 2011; Hall, 2011; McKercher, 2008; McKercher and Tung, 2015). These communities interact with many other scientific disciplines and businesses. Hence, there is a need to establish an association or a special interest group engaging in SM research in H&T, similar to the Strategic Management Society. This type of association or a special interest group may contribute to the field from both an academic and a practical perspective.

Many hospitality and tourism organizations (and their managers and executives) have problems in understanding and putting into practice SM theories and research published in academic journals (Koseoglu *et al.*, 2015, 2016; Okumus *et al.*, 2010). Therefore, this association or special interest group can help these organizations and work with them to improve their SM practices. Second, there are several leading hospitality and tourism schools around the world. However, they are not focused on specific disciplines, such as SM, human resource management, operation management and marketing. Many H&T schools focus on research studies and deal with solving managerial problems, with the ultimate goal of publishing papers rather than solving larger problems. Instead of acting as knowledge-generating centers and focusing on a variety of intellectual areas, some of these programs or schools may focus on only one or two disciplines. In other words, there

is currently no H&T program or school in a leading position in SM research in the H&T industry. A clear focus on SM research may give a program or a school an opportunity to create a distinctive competitive edge compared to their rivals.

Third, many H&T programs and schools consider and encourage publications from their faculty members only in leading H&T journals for promotional purposes (i.e. tenure). It can be suggested that H&T scholars should also publish their SM research in mainstream top-tier SM journals. To be able to achieve this, H&T scholars should design and execute cutting-edge research projects on current SM topics rather than studying and replicating previous SM studies in the H&T context. Fourth, there is no graduate program dedicated to SM in H&T. To support the growing social structure of SM research in the field, dedicated graduate programs or tracks may be needed. Finally, there are many academic journals publishing SM research in the H&T field. Given the small number of SM research articles published in H&T journals annually, proposing and publishing an SM journal in H&T may not yet be viable. However, leading journals in this field may publish special issues related to SM in H&T. Additionally, many conferences related to H&T do not offer SM as a specific track. To increase the collaboration among SM researchers in H&T, conferences should offer SM tracks/sections. Such dedicated tracks can be the initial steps in creating and developing a strong SM community of scholars in the H&T field.

6. Conclusions

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the evolution of research on scientific development of SM research in the H&T field. As in many other disciplines, SM has become an important focus of attention for H&T scholars in recent years. Although the concept of SM may be challenging to define in the H&T context, similarities of H&T firms with organizations operating in other industries/fields can allow us to relate the evolution of SM in H&T with the evolution of mainstream SM research. However, H&T necessitate an own "strategic management" research track conceptually as well as practically, because H&T industry have their uniqueness (e.g. globalization and seasonality), and because industrial structures (McGahan and Porter, 1997; Rumelt, 1991) matter when formulating and implementing strategies. A majority of SM approach based on the manufacturing industries used in H&T field research was adopted into our industry. We should consider unique structure and characteristics (such as perishability, simultaneity, intangibility and heterogeneity) of services in addition to participation of customers in the service process (Okumus and Wong, 2005) when we are investigating SM-related issues. For example, Edgar and Nisbet (1996) and Olsen and Roper (1998) argued that long-term strategic planning as defined in mainstream research might not be suitable considering complexities surrounding the hospitality organizations where majority of the firms are small firms. Considering the few differences discussed earlier, if we want to be able contribute to both SM research in H&T and mainstream SM research, we need to understand our differences and/or similarities with mainstream theories and developments. This way we can build upon this knowledge to create our own approaches. Given this, future research is necessary to identify the main aspects of the intellectual structure, conceptual structure and social structure of literature on SM in H&T.

The analysis in this article has enabled us to outline key research topics and main issues that can be useful as a road map for tourism researchers interested in SM. This study has also provided a number of recommendations for the development of the intellectual, conceptual and social structures of SM in H&T, providing the base for an in-depth discussion on the future research on SM in H&T. However, future research needs to be better integrated with past and current research to illustrate the advancements of SM literature in H&T. Emerging questions from the mainstream SM literature, for example, questions related to the internal and external sources of competitive advantage, the sources of long-term profit and whether the strategy formulation and implementation

process should be transferred to the H&T context (Okumus, 2002). Additionally, hospitality researchers should focus on the link between international business and entrepreneurship, the relation between finance and sociology (Nerur *et al.*, 2015) and knowledge-based views and knowledge transfer as sources of competitive advantage (Krylova *et al.*, 2016; Szulanski *et al.*, 2016), and competition (Corte and Aria, 2016). Some emerging approaches such as strategic behavior (Ferreira *et al.*, 2016), strategy as a practice (Jarzabkowski, 2004; Jarzabkowski *et al.*, 2007, 2016) and a practice-based view of strategy (Bromiley and Rau, 2014a, 2014b) should be addressed in the hospitality and tourism context.

References

- Andrews, K.R. (1965), *The Concept of Corporate Strategy*, Dow Jones-Irwin, Homewood, IL.
- Ansoff, H.I. (1965), *Corporate Strategy*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Athiyaman, A. (1995), "The interface of tourism and strategy: an analysis", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 16 No. 6, pp. 447-453.
- Barney, J.B. (1991), "Firm resources and sustainable competitive advantage", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 99-120.
- Bettis, R.A., Ethiraj, S., Gambardella, A., Helfat, C. and Mitchell, W. (2016), "Creating repeatable cumulative knowledge in strategic management: a call for a broad and deep conversation among authors, referees, and editors", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 37, pp. 257-261.
- Bromiley, P. and Rau, D. (2014a), "Missing the point of the practice-based view", *Strategic Organization*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 260-269.
- Bromiley, P. and Rau, D. (2014b), "Towards a practice-based view of strategy", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 35 No. 8, pp. 1249-1256.
- Chandler, D. (1962), *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the American Industrial Enterprise*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Cheng, C., Li, X., Petrick, J.F. and O'Leary, J.T. (2011), "An examination of tourism journal development", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 32, pp. 53-61.
- Corte, V.D. and Aria, M. (2016), "Coopetition and sustainable competitive advantage: the case of tourist destinations", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 54, pp. 524-540.
- Durand, R., Grant, R.M. and Madsen, T.L. (2017), "The expanding domain of strategic management research and the quest for integration", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 38, pp. 4-16.
- Edgar, D.A. and Nisbet, L. (1996), "A matter of chaos-some issues for hospitality businesses", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 6-9.
- Ferreira, J.J.M., Fernandes, C.I. and Ratten, V. (2016), "A co-citation bibliometric analysis of strategic management research", *Scientometrics*, Vol. 109 No. 1, pp. 1-32, doi: [10.1007/s11192-016-2008-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2008-0).
- Furrer, O., Thomas, H. and Goussevskaia, A. (2008), "The structure and evolution of the strategic management field: a content analysis of 26 years of strategic management research", *International Journal of Management Review*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 1-23.
- Grant, R.M. (1996), "Toward a Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 17, pp. 109-122.
- Guerras-Martín, L.A., Madhok, A. and Montoro-Sánchez, Á. (2014), "The evolution of strategic management research: recent trends and current directions", *Business Research Quarterly*, Vol. 17, pp. 69-76.
- Hall, C.M. (2011), "Publish and perish? Bibliometric analysis, journal ranking and the assessment of research quality in tourism", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 32, pp. 16-27.
- Harrington, R.J. and Ottenbacher, M.C. (2011), "Strategic management: an analysis of its representation and focus in recent hospitality research", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 439-462.

- Harrington, R., Chathoth, P., Ottenbacher, M. and Altinay, L. (2014), "Strategic management research in hospitality and tourism: past, present and future", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 778-808.
- Hatten, K.J., Schendel, D.E. and Cooper, A.C. (1978), "A strategic model of the US brewing industry, 1952-1971", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 592-610.
- Hoskisson, R. Hitt, M., Wan, W. and Yui, D. (1999), "Theory and research in strategic management: swings of a pendulum", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 417-456.
- Hu, C. and Racherla, P. (2008), "Visual representation of knowledge networks: a social network analysis of hospitality research domain", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 27, pp. 302-312.
- Jarzabkowski, P. (2004), "Strategy as practice: recursiveness, adaptation, and practices-in-use", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 529-560.
- Jarzabkowski, P., Balogun, J. and Seidl, D. (2007), "Strategizing: the challenges of a practice perspective", *Human Relations*, Vol. 60 No. 1, pp. 5-27.
- Jarzabkowski, P., Kaplan, S., Seidl, D. and Whittington, R. (2016), "On the risk of studying practices in isolation: linking what, who, and how in strategy research", *Strategic Organization*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 248-259.
- Kenworthy, T.P. and Verbeke, A. (2015), "The future of strategic management research: assessing the quality of theory borrowing", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 179-190.
- Koseoglu, M.A. (2016a), "Mapping the institutional collaboration network of strategic management research: 1980-2014", *Scientometrics*, Vol. 109 No. 1, pp. 203-226.
- Koseoglu, M.A. (2016b), "Growth and structure of authorship and co-authorship network in the strategic management realm: evidence from Strategic Management Journal", *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, Vol. 19, pp. 153-170.
- Koseoglu, M.A., Parnell, J.A. and Doyle, J.D. (2015), "Market orientation, strategy and revenue growth in the Turkish hotel industry", *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, Vol. 32 No. 8, pp. 1099-1116.
- Koseoglu, M.A., Rahimi, R., Okumus, F. and Liu, J. (2016), "Bibliometric studies in tourism", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 61, pp. 180-198.
- Krylova, K.O., Vera, D. and Crossan, M. (2016), "Knowledge transfer in knowledge-intensive organizations: the crucial role of improvisation in transferring and protecting knowledge", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 20 No. 5, pp. 1045-1064, doi: [10.1108/JKM-10-2015-0385](https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-10-2015-0385).
- Kuhn, T.S. (1962), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Leung, R. and Law, R. (2006), "Analyzing the authorship of information technology publications in leading Hospitality and Tourism Journals", in Hitz, M., Sigala, M. and Murphy, J. (Eds), *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism*, Springer, Vienna.
- McGahan, A.M. and Porter, M.E. (1997), "How much does industry matter, really?", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 18, pp. 15-30.
- McKercher, B. (2008), "A citation analysis of tourism scholars", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 29, pp. 1226-1232.
- McKercher, B. and Tung, V. (2015), "Publishing in tourism and hospitality journals: is the past a prelude to the future?", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 50, pp. 306-315.
- Mintzberg, H. (1978), "Patterns in strategy formulation", *Management Science*, Vol. 24 No. 9, pp. 934-938.
- Molina-Azorin, J.F. (2014), "Microfoundations of strategic management: toward micro-macro research in the resource-based theory", *Business Research Quarterly*, Vol. 17, pp. 102-114.
- Nag, R., Hambrick, D.C. and Chen, M.-J. (2007), "What is strategic management, really? Inductive derivation of a consensus definition of the field", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 28 No. 9, pp. 935-955.
- Nerur, S.P., Rasheed, A.A. and Natarajan, V. (2008), "The intellectual structure of the strategic management field: an author cocitation analysis", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 29, pp. 319-336.

- Nerur, S., Rasheed, A.A. and Pandey, A. (2015), "Citation footprints on the sands of time: an analysis of idea migrations in strategic management", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 37 No. 6, pp. 1065-1084.
- Novelli, M., Schmitz, B. and Spencer, T. (2006), "Networks, clusters and innovation in tourism: a UK experience", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 27, pp. 1141-1152.
- Okumus, F. (2002), "Can hospitality researchers contribute to the strategic management literature?", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 105-110.
- Okumus, F. and Wong, K. (2005), "In pursuit of contemporary content for courses on Strategic Management in Tourism and Hospitality schools", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 259-279.
- Okumus, F., Altinay, L. and Chathoth, P. (2010), *Strategic Management for Hospitality and Tourism*, Elsevier, Oxford.
- Olsen, M.D. (2004), "Literature in strategic management in the hospitality industry", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 23, pp. 411-424.
- Olsen, M.D. and Roper, A. (1998), "Research in strategic management in the hospitality industry", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 111-124.
- Phillips, P. and Moutinho, L. (2014), "Critical review of strategic planning research in hospitality and tourism", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 48, pp. 96-120.
- Porter, M.E. (1980), *Competitive Strategy*, Free Press, New York, NY.
- Porter, M.E. (1981), "The contributions of Industrial Organization to Strategic Management", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 609-620.
- Porter, M.E. (1985), *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*, Free Press, New York, NY.
- Porter, M.E. (1991), "Towards a dynamic theory of strategy", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 12, pp. 95-117.
- Quinn, J.B. (1980), *Strategies for Change: Logical Incrementalism*, Richard D. Irwin, Homewood, IL.
- Ramos-Rodriguez, A-R. and Ruiz-Navarro, J. (2004), "Changes in the intellectual structure of strategic management research: a bibliometric study of the Strategic Management Journal, 1980-2000", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 25 No. 10, pp. 981-1004.
- Ronda-Pupo, G.A. (2015), "Growth and consolidation of strategic management research: insights for the future development of strategic management", *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 155-169.
- Ronda-Pupo, G.A. and Guerras-Martín, L.Á. (2010), "Dynamics of the scientific community network within the strategic management field through the Strategic Management Journal 1980-2009: the role of cooperation", *Scientometrics*, Vol. 85, pp. 821-848.
- Ronda-Pupo, G.A. and Guerras-Martín, L.Á. (2012), "Dynamics of the evolution of the strategy concept 1962-2008: a co-word analysis", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 162-188.
- Rumelt, R.P. (1991), "How much does industry matter?", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 167-185.
- Schwanger, M. (1989), "Strategic management in tourism", in Witt, S.F. and Moutinho, L. (Eds), *Tourism Marketing and Management Handbook*, Prentice Hall International, New York, NY, pp. 425-432.
- Shaw, G. and Williams, A.M. (2009), "Knowledge transfer and management in tourism organizations: an emerging research agenda", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 325-335.
- Zsulanski, G., Ringov, D. and Jensen, R.J. (2016), "Overcoming stickiness: how the timing of knowledge transfer methods affects transfer difficulty", *Organization Science*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 304-322.
- Tan, L. and Ding, J. (2015), "The frontier and evolution of the strategic management theory: a scientometric analysis of Strategic Management Journal, 2001-2012", *Nankai Business Review International*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 20-41.

Tribe, J. (2000), "Undisciplined and unsubstantiated", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 809-813.

Tribe, J. (2004), "Knowing about tourism: epistemological issues", in Phillimore, J. and Goodson, L. (Eds), *Qualitative Research in Tourism: Ontologies, Epistemologies and Methodologies*, Routledge, New York, NY, p. 46.

Tribe, J. (2010), "Tribes territories and networks in the tourism academy", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 7-33.

Wang, Y. and Fesenmaier, D.R. (2007), "Collaborative destination marketing: a case study of Elkhart county, IN", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 863-875.

Weerawardena, J., O'Casey, A. and Julian, C. (2006), "Does industry matter? Examining the role of industry structure and organizational learning in innovation and brand performance", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 59 No. 1, pp. 37-45.

Whittington, R. (1996), "Strategy as practice", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 731-735.

Xiao, H. and Smith, S. (2006), "The making of tourism research: insights from a Social Sciences Journal", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 490-507.

Zupic, I. and Cater, T. (2015), "Bibliometric methods in management and organization", *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 429-472.

Further reading

Koseoglu, M.A., Topaloğlu, C., Parnell, J.A. and Lester, D.L. (2013), "Linkages among business strategy, uncertainty and performance in the hospitality industry: evidence from an emerging economy", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 34, pp. 81-91.

Pettigrew, A.M. (1987), "Context and action in the transformation of the firm", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 649-669.

Corresponding author

Mehmet Ali Köseoglu can be contacted at: mehmetali.koseoglu@polyu.edu.hk

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner.
Further reproduction prohibited without permission.