

Tourism Workforce Research: A Review, Taxonomy and Agenda

ABSTRACT

This paper offers a critical review, purview and future view of ‘workforce’ research. We argue that the tourism (and hospitality) workforce research domain, beyond being neglected relative to its importance, suffers from piecemeal approaches at topic, analytical, theoretical and methods levels. We adopt a three-tiered macro, meso and micro level framework into which we map the five pervasive themes from our systematic review across a 10 year period (2005-2014). A critique of the literature, following a ‘representations’ narrative, culminates in the modelling of a tourism workforce taxonomy, which we propose should guide the acknowledgement and advancement of more holistic tourism workforce knowledge development.

Keywords: Workforce, labour/labor, employ*, human resource, HRM, service, macro-meso-micro

AUTHORS

Professor Tom Baum, University of Strathclyde, Scotland

Dr Anna Kralj, Griffith University

Dr Richard Robinson, University of Queensland, Australia

Associate Professor David Solnet, University of Queensland (d.solnet@uq.edu.au)

Tourism Workforce Research: A Review, Taxonomy and Agenda

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

ABSTRACT

This paper offers a critical review, purview and future view of ‘workforce’ research. We argue that the tourism (and hospitality) workforce research domain, beyond being neglected relative to its importance, suffers from piecemeal approaches at topic, analytical, theoretical and methods levels. We adopt a three-tiered macro, meso and micro level framework into which we map the five pervasive themes from our systematic review across a 10 year period (2005-2014). A critique of the literature, following a ‘representations’ narrative, culminates in the modelling of a tourism workforce taxonomy, which we propose should guide the acknowledgement and advancement of more holistic tourism workforce knowledge development.

Keywords: Workforce, labour/labor, employ*, human resource, HRM, service, macro-meso-micro

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1
2 Tourism relies intrinsically on those who work directly in, or impart influence on, its various
3 sectors. Notwithstanding the impact of technology and technology substitution within the
4 workplace, tourism organisations depend largely on the labour-intensive inputs of their
5 workforce. Consequently, tourism jobs which, to varying degrees, depend on location and the
6 nature of the business, have an important role to play in driving economic and employment
7 growth. Yet, the workforce is widely cited as a neglected research domain (Ballantyne,
8 Packer & Axelsen, 2009; Baum, 2007, 2015; Baum & Szivas, 2008; Ladkin, 2011; Solnet,
9 Nickson, Robinson, Kralj & Baum, 2014).

10
11
12 This argument is reinforced by reference to classifications of tourism topics addressed in the
13 published literature - Ballantyne et al. (2009), for example, identify 20 themes in tourism
14 research, of which only one (Education) has partial overlap with our field of concern here, the
15 workforce. Likewise, Cheng et al's (2011) study classifies tourism research (in this context
16 inclusive of hospitality) into 29 'subjects' none of which can be linked directly to the
17 workforce with the exception, again, of Education. It is probable that workforce themes have
18 been subsumed into classifications such as 'Hotel and Restaurant Administration' and
19 'Management and Administration' which hardly does justice to our area of interest, given
20 that 'Literature', 'Agriculture' and 'Medicine' merit separate categories.

21
22
23 In this paper we set about qualifying this contention of neglect by positing the reason as
24 partially due to the complexity and heterogeneity of the tourism industry (Baggio, Scott &
25 Cooper, 2010). There are perceptions of the sector and its workforce that are both entrenched
26 and well-reported, addressing characteristics of employment across tourism's sectors, for
27 example low entry barriers, mobility, seasonality, and challenging working conditions. These
28 seemingly intractable perceptions may well have dampened the appetite for research, led to
29 fatigue in the sense that no obvious 'solutions' have emerged from much of the research and,
30 as a consequence, have resulted in a general ambivalence regarding persistent workforce
31 issues (cf. Iverson & Deery, 1997).

32
33
34 We will argue and substantiate the case that these factors have culminated in three structural
35 research issues in need of attention. First, because much of the prior empirical research
36 conducted in this domain has been at the organisational and managerial level, there is a risk
37 that the body of work fails to position itself within the wider social, political and economic

1 context or schema of tourism research and, as such, could be adjudged to make a limited
2 contribution to the consolidated advancement of the tourism workforce narrative. Such
3 studies frequently have, as their underlying objective, the desire to ‘solve’ a perceived
4 ‘problem’ rather than to explain a phenomenon (e.g., Terry, 2014). Similarly, more often than
5 not such articles are limited to human resource *management* research. As such there is until
6 now no consolidated and comprehensive thematic review of the wider tourism workforce
7 area. Second, as characterised by a number of such review articles (e.g., Davidson et al.,
8 2011; Lucas & Deery, 2004; Kusluvan et al., 2010; King et al., 2011; Ryan, 2015; Singh et
9 al., 2007; Tracey, 2014; Wood, 1999) much of the extant work is categorized as ‘hospitality’
10 to the neglect of a wider tourism context. And thirdly, those review articles that have
11 attempted to scope tourism employment more broadly have done so largely thematically, or
12 ‘atheoretically’ (e.g., Baum, 2007, 2015; Ladkin, 2011), without sufficient critique of the
13 underpinning assumptions inherent (or absent) in the literature. In undertaking this
14 discussion, we acknowledge that the term ‘workforce’ itself is largely absent in the tourism
15 literature. ‘Workforce’ has much wider currency in relation to other sectors such as health
16 (see for example, Kirch et al, 2012). However it may be that other discipline and context
17 research areas view the workforce ‘resource’ and the language associated with it in a slightly
18 different way and with differing terminologies. Our use seeks to accommodate a breadth that
19 other available terms (such as the more widely employed ‘human resource management’) do
20 not afford.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 This paper reconciles the disparate ‘component parts’ of the tourism workforce or
39 employment domain, to include, *inter alia*, the industry’s labour process; human capital
40 policy and planning and labour markets; industrial and employee relations; education,
41 training and the development of talent; service delivery; organisational and occupational
42 cultures, and many others – under the unifying nomenclature of ‘workforce’. As suggested
43 above, these themes are frequently bundled together under what is, arguably, the somewhat
44 lazy umbrella of human resource management (or HRM) which implies a particularly
45 nuanced perspective on tourism work and the roles that are played within it. As we will
46 explain later in this paper, we consider ‘workforce’ to be a far more inclusive and, from a
47 labour process perspective, rather more neutral concept. In adopting this approach, hitherto
48 neglected interrelationships between these component parts can be identified and gaps prised
49 open.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

1 Specifically, the aims and, concomitantly, the structure of this paper are to: define and clarify
2 workforce research in tourism and propose a unifying definition and model, that incorporates
3 its multi-level nature; after outlining the methodological parameters of our systematic review
4 report on our comprehensive analytical review of the broader suite of tourism (and
5 hospitality) workforce literature across a defined period outlining five key emergent themes;
6
7 develop a ‘representations’ narrative to critique the literature’s shortcomings; and finally,
8
9 propose an explanatory taxonomy to guide future researchers. In so doing, we challenge the
10
11 academy to conceptually and theoretically locate their work in this taxonomy in a manner
12
13 that contributes to the advancement of knowledge about work, the workforce and the
14
15 workplace in tourism. We conclude by reflecting on the implications of this review on
16
17 tourism (and hospitality) workforce research by offering up resulting concerns/suggestions to
18
19 the broader tourism academy, consider the applied implications and propose an agenda for
20
21 future research focus.
22
23
24

25 Before moving forward we wish to qualify the inclusion of hospitality research in this
26
27 analysis of the tourism workforce, especially since the two areas have not always been the
28
29 easiest of bedfellows (Morrison & O’Gorman, 2008). All tourists must sleep somewhere and
30
31 all tourists must eat. The provision of accommodation/lodging and foodservice and
32
33 beverages, and entertainment, the core offer of hospitality organisations, are thus intrinsically
34
35 connected to the tourism experience. Indeed, some tourists travel almost exclusively for some
36
37 of these experiences, for example food tourism (Getz et al., 2014). Thus, we reason, the
38
39 workers who provide these hospitality services are as much a part of the tourism workforce as
40
41 are the workers at other tourism products, for instance theme parks or cultural institutions.
42
43

44 **2.0. LITERATURE AND BACKGROUND**

45 **2.1. Clarifying the definition of ‘workforce’**

46
47 In operationalising the term ‘workforce’, rather than employment, labour, human resources
48
49 (or their management), manpower, or other nomenclature, we acknowledge the breadth of the
50
51 workforce domain, from worker to organisation to broader labour force issues. Or, as one
52
53 senior industry stakeholder describes the term, “[it] embraces workforce development at its
54
55 broadest level, including a range of themes, such as structural adjustment and job redesign. It
56
57 also takes into account the external factors that impact upon workforce planning” (Service
58
59 Skills Australia, 2013: 4). Accordingly, workforce is a term readily understood and applied in
60
61 the policy and practitioner lexicon (cf WTTC, 2014). We propose that workforce equates to
62
63
64
65

1 all those people within an employment pool, whether in entire countries, regions or
2 destinations; sectors; or organisations, both large and small (www.oxforddictionaries.com).
3 Within tourism it can be defined as “the workforce in the businesses in which tourists spend
4 their money” (Andriotis & Vaughan, 2004: 69), with the caveats that some tourism industry
5 employees work in organisations that provide free-to-user services, for example visitor
6 information centres/convention bureaux (see Devine & Devine, 2011), some work in non-
7 remunerated positions as volunteers (Holmes et al, 2010; Terry, 2014) and that organisations
8 need to be seen in somewhat broader terms than just at the level of the firm.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 By definition, the term ‘workforce’ focuses foremost on ‘the worker’ and workers in the
17 collective, as groups. This defines individual-level analyses. The individual level is
18 imperative in the tourism context because this is where the paramount employee-customer, or
19 guest-host, nexus resides. *Workforce* implies the potential power of individuals and groups
20 once put to work and this labour power is most directly of benefit to the tourism organisation.
21 Thus the organisational level entails the priorities, processes and performance of firms and
22 associations vis-à-vis their workers, and this level approximates with organisational
23 behaviour, human resource management and related areas of theory and practice. The
24 organisation typically frames both the individual and collective (‘the team’) interactions
25 presented earlier, and hence we introduce the fluidity of this proposed definitional
26 conceptualisation. Of course the workforce is also an agent of, and shaped by, broader
27 environmental factors in which individuals, groups, organisations and economies / national
28 and regional labour markets operate and with which they have symbiotic relationships. These
29 include geo- and national political and socio-cultural, legal and technological dynamics,
30 which exert substantial influence on organisations.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44


45 A three-tiered conceptualisation of the tourism workforce intersects with wider workforce
46 studies and research (see meta reviews of workforce themes that all have implications for
47 tourism, for example, Cullen & Turnbull, 2005; Ehnert & Harry, 2012; Hancock et al, 2013;
48 Jiang et al, 2012; Van De Voorde et al , 2012; Watson, 2004) in that it brings together both
49 critical and organisational aspects, framing the tourism workforce in both societal and
50 organisational terms as well as intermediate points in between. Hence, in our analyses, we
51 were firstly attentive to a range of issues at the individual level including; who it is that works
52 in tourism (e.g., profile, diversity); why they choose to work in tourism (and, indeed, the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 choices or lack thereof that they may have); and the meaning of tourism work (real,
2 symbolic).

3
4
5 This leads, secondly, to a consideration of a range of employment, organisational and
6 managerial themes generally associated with HRM systems and the practice of HRM. These
7 include service management (how organisations frame the employee to tourist/visitor/guest
8 interaction); labour or employee relations (seeking to accommodate the needs of the
9 workforce – both tangible and emotional within the framework of organisational and wider
10 business objectives; strategic HRM – which tends to be located organisationally and links HR
11 policies and practice to wider organisational goals and focus; and sustainable HRM (Kramar,
12 2014) Finally, we accommodate broader environmental or contextual factors (located
13 locally, nationally and trans-nationally) such as: social and cultural perspectives of tourism
14 and the tourism workforce and how these vary according to economic, geographical and
15 cultural context – the status of tourism work; the impact of tourism work and the tourism
16 workforce on the wider society in which it is located; the impact of social (demographic),
17 economic and technological change on the tourism workforce and on tourism work;
18 workforce themes within the context of tourism policy formulation and implementation;
19 tourism within the wider labour market and skills narrative; tourism in terms of its workforce
20 and labour process debates; and the position of tourism work and the tourism workforce in
21 discussions of employment futures (Solnet et al., in press).

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Our contention is that it is not possible to understand and engage with any of these levels, be
39 they the individual worker, organisational and managerial (HRM) themes, or the critical and
40 ‘broad brush’ environmental understandings which our conceptualisation provides – in
41 isolation. Yet our review reveals that the extant tourism (and hospitality) workforce literature
42 is characterised by precisely such a piecemeal approach. Building on this concern, we
43 appropriate a macro-meso-micro conceptualisation, firstly, to make sense of the layered and
44 hierarchically structured characteristics of the tourism workforce phenomena, and secondly,
45 as a framework to critique extant knowledge and propose future directions to overcome the
46 inherent deficiencies that we articulate. These three levels have been purposefully and widely
47 applied in economics (e.g., Jenkins, 2005), in other service industries (e.g., Melton &
48 Cunningham, 2014) and occasionally in the tourism literature (e.g., Lovelock & Boyd, 2006;
49 Meler & Ruzic, 1999). However, there is no consensus or consistency vis-a-vis the
50 conceptualisation of this framework, which is partially understandable given that units of
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 analysis differ from one disciplinary or investigative context to another. Even in the
2 workforce domain, divergent applications are used, for example, Seck, Finch, Mor-Barak and
3 Poverny (1993) and Gardner and Cogliser (2009) both consider the three levels to all operate
4 within organisations. Nonetheless, we adopt a more comprehensive conceptualisation
5 according with the integrative model of Halcomb and Davidson (2006) and workforce
6 analysis of Reifels and Pirkis (2012), and this is presented in Figure 1. Before
7 operationalising this model however, it is worth apprising ourselves of a body of tourism and
8 hospitality research which have provided review, or review-type articles.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16



44 **Figure 1: Three-tiered workforce conceptualisation**

45 46 47 **2.2. A retrospect of prior workforce reviews in tourism**

48
49 Over the past two decades, a kernel of key review articles has provided insights into the state
50 of workforce-related knowledge and research in the tourism and hospitality arena. Typically,
51 these meta-analyses have focused more directly upon the hospitality sector rather than on the
52 wider tourism environment. We have selected over-arching workforce, tourism employment
53 or HRM reviews and deliberately set aside reviews of sharper focus (e.g. Deery & Jago's
54 (2015) work/life balance review) regardless of their merit and recognising the limitations this
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 may impose on our analysis. We first address these generic hospitality workforce reviews
3
4 before turning to analyses that capture the broader tourism workforce landscape.

5
6 In one of the first workforce reviews in the hospitality literature, Woods' (1999) futures work
7
8 pondered on two scenarios - that HR will evolve to become more strategic or that HR will
9
10 devolve into departmental remits (a theme that Solnet, Kralj & Baum returned to in 2015).
11
12 Systematic, even empirical, reviews followed. Lucas and Deery (2004) examined the HRM-
13
14 related papers published in five leading tourism and hospitality journals in 2002 and 2003.
15
16 They found that, using an a priori classification schema to quantify categories, the majority of
17
18 HRM papers were concerned with employee development and employee relations, with
19
20 somewhat fewer articles concentrating on employee resourcing and general HRM issues.
21
22 Singh et al. (2007), on the other hand, in a sample of 40 HRM articles published in the
23
24 *International Journal of Hospitality Management* between 1994 and 2003, identified nine
25
26 common HRM themes; hospitality careers, training, satisfaction, turnover/recruitment, legal
27
28 issues, gender, workplace, personnel development and performance measurement.

29
30 More recent reviews have undertaken more extensive searches. Kusluvan et al. (2010),
31
32 surveying the hospitality field, discerned seven research foci; employee/ personality/
33
34 employee intelligence, emotional/aesthetic labour, HRM practices, internal marketing,
35
36 organisational culture/climate, business and HRM strategy, and employee job attitudes and
37
38 behaviours. Because of their concern for the practical implications of research findings to
39
40 date, the authors generated a relatively long list of generic recommendations to practitioners
41
42 on how best to manage employees for optimum business outcomes. Some of these spilled
43
44 over into policy and planning domains. Similarly, a more conceptually driven review
45
46 (Davidson et al., 2011) highlighted the issues of generational change, training, skills and
47
48 service quality, technology and the workforce, applications of strategic HRM, high
49
50 performance work practices (HPWP) and use of the Balanced Scorecard, as well as
51
52 casualisation and outsourcing as the most pressing areas of research concern for HRM in
53
54 tourism and hospitality. Thus, both these latter reviews extended the earlier work of Lucas
55
56 and Deery (2004) and Singh et al. (2007), who largely limited their analyses to employee and
57
58 organisational issues, to make inferences about broader relevancies.

59
60 A more recent review has taken a different tack. Focusing on just five HR functions; strategic
61
62 HR, staffing, training, performance appraisal and compensation and benefits, Tracey (2014),
63
64
65

1 concludes that there are many thematic overlaps in the published literature but also suggests
2 that unique contextual variables have emerged and need closer interrogation in a quest for
3 bettering our understanding of individual and organisational outcomes. There are then, in
4 these reviews, some resonating themes that were flagged in Woods' (1999) futures review;
5 that a range of HRM nuances and approaches are driven by location- and sector-specific
6 factors. In short, many of these review articles reproduce the idea that the hospitality (and
7 tourism) industry (and its workplace) is a unique context warranting individual research
8 treatment.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 Rather than conduct a study of hospitality workforce issues *per se*, some authors have
17 attempted to engage with the broader tourism landscape. Baum (2007) conducted an analysis
18 of change in tourism HRM over the two previous decades, predicated on his 1991 work,
19 which was one of the earliest contributions to take a more inclusive and holistic tourism
20 workforce approach. Influential social, economic, political and technological developments
21 in the external environment are at the heart of this analysis and also provided evidence of
22 contradiction and polarisation. Despite dominant global companies and apparent
23 improvements in HRM practice in developed countries, poor work practices and
24 marginalisation of tourism workers remain major issues in many parts of the world. In
25 particular, Baum highlighted discrepancies and dilemmas in the areas of globalisation and
26 global migration patterns, the impact of technology on the industry and its work practices, the
27 emergence of aesthetic labour as a concern and concerns relating to the appropriate
28 management of diversity in the workplace. In a recent reprise, Baum (2015: 210), while
29 updating some of the developments that are fast-changing the global tourism environment,
30 summed up his analysis, "[i]t is difficult to reach more optimistic conclusions today".
31 Tellingly, none of Davidson et al, Baum or the other reviews cited earlier, provide a coherent
32 justification for their choice of key themes and their exclusion of others, a criticism that can
33 be directed more widely at literature of this kind.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Contrarily, Ladkin (2011), in her exploration of tourism labour, conceptualised a triadic
52 relationship between three key stakeholders for workforce knowledge development; the
53 tourism worker, the tourism employer, and the tourism researcher. Ladkin attempted to
54 develop a pioneering framework to foreground the tourism, as opposed to hospitality,
55 workforce, embracing multi-disciplinary and methodological debate and acknowledging the
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 entanglements of the employment landscape (as did the reviews of Tracey, Davidson et al.
2 and Baum in particular). However, she stopped tantalisingly short of proffering a holistic
3 model that incorporates the multiple levels at which ‘workforce’ can be seen to operate. What
4 emerges from consideration of these hospitality and big picture, or meta-reviews, whether
5 research or policy orientated, is the sense of academic and application recidivism that
6 overshadows their reading. The identified issues, the conclusions reached and, in many cases,
7 the recommendations proposed across over 20 years of debate, do not vary significantly and
8 highlight a dislocation between analysis and action. Solnet et al. (2014c) highlight this with
9 regard to the policy formulation process in tourism employment but it is a criticism
10 applicable equally to academic studies. We contend that there is a need for a comprehensive
11 review, with broadened search parameters, looking for a more holistic ‘snapshot’ or ‘state of
12 play’ regarding tourism and hospitality workforce research. Moreover, there is a need to
13 reconcile the component parts of the tourism and hospitality workforce literature, be they
14 topical, contextual, thematic, theoretical or conceptual.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **3.0. METHODS AND FINDINGS**

28 Our review of workforce research in the tourism and hospitality literature focused on the top
29 four tourism journals and the top four hospitality journals (as measured by Impact Factor,
30 2014). For the tourism field, the top four journals are *Annals of Tourism Research*, the
31 *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *Tourism Management* and the *Journal of Travel Research*.
32 For the hospitality field, the top four journals are the *International Journal of Hospitality*
33 *Management*, the *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *Cornell*
34 *Hospitality Quarterly*, and the *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*. To capture the
35 most recent thinking but also to gain insight into the development of knowledge over a period
36 of time, we restricted the review period to the ten years from 2005 to 2014. In this period, the
37 eight foremost T&H journals collectively published 6,449 articles, with *Tourism*
38 *Management* being the most prolific source of output with 1,700 articles or just over a quarter
39 of the total articles. When considering the hospitality journals alone, the *International*
40 *Journal of Hospitality Management* published by far the most articles, with 43% of the total
41 articles in the hospitality journals. We recognise that this selection of just eight journals (out
42 of a potential list of 330 identified by McKercher, 2015¹) is a limitation but it is a necessary
43 circumscription in order to ensure that our approach was manageable. In making this choice
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 ¹ McKercher, B. (2015) *Dedicated Tourism, Hospitality and Events Journals*, circulated on Trinet by the
60 International Academy for the Study of Tourism, 12th October 2015
61
62
63
64
65

1 we have, of course, purposefully excluded consideration of the wide range of other T&H
2 journals as well as contributions to the non-T&H literature that relate to workforce themes
3 within a tourism industry context.
4
5
6

7 Given the broad nature of our definition of workforce, it was necessary to select search
8 parameters that would identify relevant articles across the entire spectrum of disciplinary
9 underpinnings from whence workforce research may emanate. First, each of the authors
10 suggested their own list of possible search terms. This initial round of deriving search terms
11 resulted in a diverse array that would identify literature related to the worker (micro), the
12 work organisation (meso), and the broader environment as it impacts on work (macro).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Through an iterative process, and trialling in journal search fields, the lists of search terms
21 were collated, compared and collapsed into a final list of seven search terms: employ* (which
22 includes endings such as employee, employment, etc.); human resource* (which was also
23 operationalised as HR, HRM etc.); work* (which includes endings such as worker and
24 workforce); labour (and labor); frontline; staff; and job. These terms were considered generic
25 enough to identify the most relevant articles, and specific enough not to generate an
26 unmanageable sample.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Using each journal publisher's proprietary database, all articles that had any one of the search
35 terms as author-supplied keywords, with a publication year between 2005 and 2014, were
36 located and downloaded. Details of each article were entered into a bespoke review
37 catalogue. This process resulted in an initial sample of 490 articles. Closer inspection of the
38 articles included in the initial sample revealed 32 articles that were not appropriate for a
39 variety of reasons. For example some were opinion pieces (e.g. an interview with the GM of
40 one company); some were short research notes simply proposing a research agenda; and
41 others only treated keywords as a cursory afterthought. After removing superfluous entries
42 from the catalogue, the final sample of articles for review included 458 articles. Table 1
43 summarises the workforce articles by journal and the ratio of workforce-related articles to
44 total articles published in each journal.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1: Summary of review sample

		Frequency of articles by journal		Total articles published in journal	
		No.	%	No.	%
Tourism	Tourism Management	48	10.5	1700	2.8
	Journal of Travel Research	10	2.2	501	2.0
	Annals of Tourism Research	20	4.4	1170	1.7
	Journal of Sustainable Tourism	4	0.9	633	0.6
<i>Tourism Total</i>		82	17.9	4004	2.0
Hospitality	International Journal of Hospitality Management	172	37.6	1062	16.2
	International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management	121	26.4	592	20.4
	Cornell Hospitality Quarterly (formerly CHRAQ)	58	12.7	510	11.4
	Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research	25	5.5	281	8.9
<i>Hospitality Total</i>		376	82.1	2445	15.4
TOTAL		458	100	6449	7.1

Workforce research is clearly dominated by hospitality researchers. One demonstration of this is that the lion's share of articles (82 per cent) from our review sample is published in the hospitality journals. Further evidence is in the ratio of workforce-related articles to total published articles – it is consistently and substantially higher in the hospitality journals (15 per cent of all articles published in the leading hospitality journals) than the tourism journals (only 2 per cent of all articles published in the leading tourism journals). Figure 2 depicts the total articles published in all eight journals by year, broken down by workforce-related articles and other articles. Although a greater number of workforce-related articles have been published in the latter half of the sample period, the total number of articles published has also increased substantially. Thus, the ratio of workforce articles to total published articles has not changed significantly over the same timeframe. We will return to the representation of workforce themes in the T&H literature later in our discussion.




Figure 2: Total articles published by year

For each article in the review catalogue, the research team identified primary workforce topics. This resulted in an initial list of over 1000 individual topics. Inspection of the list resulted in the identification of semantic similarities between individually identified topics. This enabled the researchers to collapse the initial list of individual topics into 74. From there, the research team engaged in an iterative process of grouping topics into themes and comparing these overarching themes as proposed by members of the team. Then we returned to the review catalogue to consider the fit of topics, topic areas and themes under consideration. These themes were then further collapsed into more meaningful and inclusive groups, before finally settling on a set of five distilled over-arching themes that provide a coherent summary of the contents and thrust of the articles contained in the review catalogue. Table 2 summarises the five themes and the topic areas related to each. The table also demonstrates the alignment of themes with the macro-meso-micro definitional framework that we introduced earlier for the term workforce, which ultimately will inform our proposed taxonomy.

Table 2: Summary of review themes and topic areas


MACRO	Tourism work and the wider society	economics, inc. impact, labour markets, tourism supply, etc.; HRD / workforce policy & planning; tourism planning; labour mobility; Labour regulation (law, unions, etc.); employment agencies; customer perceptions of employees/managers/HR practices; link between tourism and increase in sex workers; T&H workforce research
MESO	Organisational practices and functions	HR/HRM/strategies/systems/practices/functions/high-performance work practices; recruitment & selection practices; training & development; org./managerial practices & responsibilities (e.g. decision making); pay compensation and rewards; scheduling practices; talent management; wages; knowledge sharing and use of information; retention; HRM trends/changes/issues/challenges; rg/dept. performance/effectiveness, inc. labour productivity; organisational change; assessment centres; employee work outcomes; labour costs
	The job, the workplace and the work environment	workplace / work environment; job characteristics and demands; discrimination and harassment; turnover; service mgmt, inc. orientation, delivery, failure etc.; organisational culture and climate; occupational communities/cultures; job crafting; employees' experiences; work experience / experiential learning
MICRO	Worker attitudes and behaviours	employee/manager values, attitudes & perceptions; job satisfaction; employee/manager behaviours; organisational commitment; emotional labour; burnout/stress/exhaustion/disengagement; organisational citizenship behaviour; engagement; trust; job embeddedness; leadership; empowerment; organisational/supervisor/co-worker support; job performance; roles; motivation; creativity; psychological contract; team/group; psychological capital; core self-evaluations
	Workforce composition and worker characteristics	employees with disabilities; skills and competencies; employment status (inc. contingent and migrant workers); diversity; volunteers; gender; labour composition / transient workforce; working holiday-makers; personal characteristics/attributes/traits (inc. demographics + Gen Y); work-family / work-life; career; students/graduates/degrees

Figure 3 illustrates the themes as a proportion of all individual (1000+) T&H workforce research topics in the sample. The micro theme of ‘worker attitudes and behaviours’ clearly dominates the research. Within this theme, the most prolific topic areas, each with over 50 papers talking to them, included employee/manager values, attitudes and perceptions (69), job satisfaction (68) and emotional labour (51). Topics that are well trodden in the generic literature, such as the psychological contract (3) and emerging constructs, such as job-embeddedness (4), are examples of less-treated workforce research areas.

Three themes represented reasonably equal numbers of topics: ‘workforce composition and worker characteristics’ (micro), ‘job, the workplace and the work environment’ (meso), and ‘organisational practices and functions’ (meso). In the ‘workforce composition and worker characteristics’, the work-family / work-life balance papers (41) and personal characteristics/attributes/traits (40), for instance Gen Y research, were the most prolific.

1 Topics such as working holiday makers (3) and volunteers (2), though scarce, demonstrate
 2 the diversity of workforce topics we captured. The most populous topic in the ‘job, the
 3 workplace and the work environment’ category, omnipresent in the T&H literature, was
 4 turnover (46). Service management (33) and workplace/work environment (22) was well-
 5 represented but research regarding employee experiences (3) and job crafting (1) was scant.
 6 The theme ‘organisational practices and functions’ was dominated by work treating
 7 HR/HRM strategies, systems, practices and functions (46). Specific HR functions like
 8 recruitment and selection (18), training and development (17) and organisational performance
 9 (e.g., labour productivity) formed the staple topics of this theme, while seemingly intractable
 10 topics like wages (2) and emergent ones, such as assessment centres (1), only just registered.

11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20 Our fifth theme, with the smallest representation in our sample, ‘tourism work and the wider
 21 society’, had half its topics supplied by papers dealing with economics (for instance
 22 workforce impacts, labour markets, tourism supply). Policy formulation and implementation
 23 also come under this heading. There are also a small number of studies that consider the
 24 tourism workforce in a wider international or comparative trans-national context. Relatively
 25 few papers were dedicated to what we would see as pertinent issues like labour mobility (4),
 26 tourism planning (3) or even T&H workforce research.



27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55 **Figure 3: Representation of themes by individual topics in sample**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
Examining the themes as they relate to our definitional framework, it appears the preponderance of T&H workforce research has focused on the micro-level themes related to the worker. Of these two micro-level themes, the ‘attitudes and behaviours’ theme stands out. Almost half of all the 1000+ individual topics identified in the initial coding belong to the ‘attitudes and behaviours’ theme. This may be a reflection on the managerial and organisational behavioural focus of hospitality-based workforce research that is highly positivist in its orientation (as will be discussed later in this paper). Just under a third of all individual topics fell into the two meso-level themes. These two themes were almost equally represented. Most notably however, less than a tenth of all individual topic areas fell into the macro-level theme. The theme of ‘tourism work in the wider society’ is represented substantially more in the tourism journals than in the hospitality journals. Futures-oriented studies on the tourism workforce are generally well rooted in the wider context of changes in work, technology, demography and consumer expectations, rightly identified as major influences on the workforce (Solnet et al, 2014a; Robinson et al, 2014a; Solnet et al, in press). Again this is perhaps reflective of a more sociological orientation in many tourism journals versus a managerial perspective in the hospitality journals.

31 **4.0 ANALYSIS AND CRITIQUE**

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
Further analysis of our systematic review data has enabled us to raise a range of observations, criticisms and, from these, reflections. We now classify our analysis as workforce themes in the T&H literature that we would consider to be ‘overrepresented’, those that are ‘underrepresented’ and finally themes that we would see as ‘misrepresented’ as we develop a tourism workforce ‘representation’ narrative. We did consider a further classification of ‘unrepresented’ but recognised that this would be a step beyond our data and a venture into the speculative.

47 ***4.1 ‘Overrepresented’***

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Referring back to Table 1, and reiterating our earlier observation, the workforce literature is clearly dominated by research published in the hospitality journals. Reading this in combination with Figure 3, it is clear there is a wealth of research at the micro-, or individual worker level and at the meso-, or organisational, level and that, arguably, this represents excess to the extent that few theoretical debates are advanced significantly on the basis of these studies. To reiterate, at the micro- level, we identified two major themes; ‘workforce composition and workforce characteristics’ and ‘worker attitudes and behaviours’. An

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

example of research typical of the first theme, which could be conceptualised as the foundation of the tourism workforce, is the work of Kara, Uysal and Magnini (2012), who studied the gender difference (i.e. personal characteristics) impacts of hotel workers on job satisfaction. Janta's (2012) research on workforce diversity in terms of the profiles and work experiences of Polish migrants finding employment into the UK hospitality industry also fits this first theme. While both these papers are published in our hospitality journal sample, as are most in this theme, there are exceptions. For, example Karatepe et als' (2006) study of hotel worker's job satisfaction as influenced by their individual characteristics is published in *Tourism Management*. On the other hand, the second theme, 'worker attitudes and behaviours' is represented by papers such as Robinson et als' (2014a) work on employee's job embeddedness on organisational commitment and intention to quit.

Moving to the meso-, or organisational, level, again two themes predominate. The first is 'the job, workplace and work environment'. Evidently, these are organisation influences on the workforce and Chan's (2010) typology of factors influencing a fun workplace serves as a clear example. The second theme, 'organisational practices and functions', is typified by topics dealing with HR practices and systems and knowledge sharing. An example from our review sample is research on the relationship between compensation practices and firm performance (Namasivayam, Miao & Zhao, 2007). The vast majority of these papers are published across the four hospitality journals sampled in our review.

Another factor contributing to what we argue is a proliferation of articles across the micro- and meso- levels is that large studies are often 'sliced and diced' into a series of papers. These articles may emanate from doctoral studies or larger funded projects. An example of PhD work that has been apportioned to tell a number of stories to different audiences is that of Janta's research on Polish migrant experiences, resulting in publication in quality articles in two of the tourism journals (Janta et al., 2011; Janta, 2011; Janta et al., 2012), and one hospitality journal, in our review sample, as well as another elsewhere (Janta & Ladkin, 2009). Similarly, a project to develop a regional tourism employment plan, funded by the Australian Government, yielded three outputs in the review sample for the researchers (Solnet et al., 2014a; Robinson et al., 2014b; Solnet et al., 2014b). While not levelling criticism at this practice, in the contemporary 'publish or perish' academic environment, impact is still largely determined by somewhat obscure quality and quantity quotients (Hall,

1
2 2011), which promotes the generation of multiple outputs from substantive, and possibly
3 even somewhat less substantive work.
4

5 Our analysis could lead to the conclusion that workforce research can neatly be allocated as
6 either micro- or meso- level. However, more commonly, we found much of the literature
7 traverses those two levels. Indeed, in the region of half of our sample was cross-coded in this
8 manner. A prime example is Lee et als' (2013) work which investigated the influence of
9 leadership styles on employee attitudes towards a target organisational practice. This is a
10 hybrid of the organisational practices and functions (macro) and worker attitudes and
11 behaviours (micro) themes. Similarly, the work of Robinson and Beesley (2010), which
12 investigates the disconnect between chefs' creative instincts and the organisational practices
13 of deskilling and standardisation captures both individual characteristics and organisational
14 practices. While this last example is published in a tourism journal, we reiterate that the vast
15 majority of papers captured in our analysis and categorised as meso-, micro-, or cross coded,
16 appear in the four hospitality outlets.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 While these in themselves are mundane observations, when one looks at the particular
29 constructs being examined across the micro- and meso- levels, there are hints of further
30 overrepresentations. The first of these is that routine constructs developed in, and borrowed
31 from, the HR and OB literature are being applied in the tourism workforce domain. Narrowly
32 scoped investigations of job satisfaction and organisational commitment are prime examples
33 of this practice. As an example, one study examined differences in levels of job satisfaction
34 in two different regions (e.g. Gallardo et al., 2010). Another study investigated the effect of
35 personality traits on job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Silva, 2006). This is
36 largely a symptom of researchers arguing that tourism and/or hospitality are unique and
37 hence important contexts for theory testing (cf. Rivera & Upchurch, 2008; Tracey, 2014),
38 although the underpinning rationale that the T&H industries are uniquely 365/24/7 and/or
39 service orientated probably does not stand up to rigorous scrutiny, when compared to a range
40 of other industries for example retail and healthcare (Duxbury et al., 2007).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Although this review is not an analysis over time, but rather a snapshot of a period in time,
54 also observable in our data was a lack of innovation, experimentation or sophistication in
55 methodology. In fact over the ten years of our analysis, single cross-sectional surveys
56 analysed with SEM are the norm. Rapid advances in software analysis packages have
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 facilitated this type of technically sound (Ryan, 2015), yet often less than conceptually
2 profound, work to proliferate. Similarly, qualitative work, scarce as it is, relies largely on
3 single-point-in-time semi-structured interviews (cf. the valuable 2008 Kline & Harris study
4 of hotelier's neglect of measuring the ROI of training), rarely accessing multi-method or
5 more complete ethnographic approaches that have a deep heritage in early hospitality
6 workforce studies (cf. Whyte, 1948; Fine, 2008). Qualitative research is even considered by
7 some as non-empirical and/or conceptual in nature (cf. Rivera & Upchurch, 2008). Needless
8 to say the vast majority of the meso- and micro- level research studies are quantitative and
9 consist of a remodelling of many well-understood variables from management, strategy and
10 marketing journals and overwhelmingly provide support for hypotheses logically derived a
11 priori from the literature. Ryan (2015) claims that this may be a product of hospitality
12 researcher attempts to make their work accessible to practitioner industry audiences.
13 Regardless, the majority of workforce papers in the tourism journals in the sample also
14 employ positivistic quantitative approaches, as even gleaning their titles discloses: for
15 'antecedents', 'scale development', 'moderating/mediating factors' and so on (e.g., Chen &
16 Kao, 2012; Chu & Murrmann, 2006; Namasivayam & Zhao, 2007).

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 Increasingly, a trend in the hospitality literature is what Ryan terms a "switch from the North
32 Atlantic hegemony of North America and Western Europe to the emergent nations of Asia"
33 (2015: 349). Indeed, a review of journals approximating with our sample found that less than
34 1% of articles between 1978 and 2008 related to Chinese tourism or hospitality (Tsang &
35 Hsu, 2011). This shift is certainly apparent in our workforce sample, as evidenced by many
36 Asian-heritage scholars publishing empirical work based on data collected in Asian-industrial
37 contexts. This indeed may go some way to explaining the predominant application of
38 quantitative positivist methods. Indeed, similar observations are made in the generic
39 management/HR and OB literature, some of which question the validity of western-
40 developed theory in Asian (mainly Chinese) contexts due to the fundamentally differing
41 intellectual origins, conceptual models, and paradigmatic positions of western versus eastern
42 cultures (Cheung et al, 2012). This is even more pertinent in the sense that studies often
43 conclude that cultural values and practices have impacted on the findings (Li & Nesbit,
44 2014). Moreover, sampling issues and an evident paucity of theory development further
45 characterise workforce research as published in disciplinary journals. A significant narrative
46 in the HR/OB field is consensual in arguing that western developed research tools that are
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 grounded in western conceptual and analytic frameworks and then employed to investigate
2 workforce issues in non-western contexts generates outcomes that are superficial and lack
3 penetrative explanatory qualities (Cooke, 2009). It is important then, to also take stock of
4 these issues when considering the contributions of a significant portion of tourism, or more
5 specifically hospitality, research studies as they appear in journals in the T&H field.
6
7
8
9

10 **4.2. 'Underrepresented'**

11 Although it is our contention that there is a general underrepresentation of workforce research
12 in the T&H literature, it is worth acknowledging evidence of a clear trend that points to an
13 increase in published research in this area over the timeframe of this analysis. However, this
14 needs to be seen in the context of an overall increase in total article publications, particularly
15 since 2010 (see Table 1 and Figure 2). Thus, notwithstanding an increase from the scarce
16 years of tourism workforce research representation in 2005 and 2006, the trend line has
17 somewhat flat-lined. Hence, the obverse of some of the observations from the above section
18 is manifest when looking at the representation of workforce debates in tourism's four premier
19 journals.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Our data shows that just 2% of research in the tourism journals in the sample, and 15% in the
32 hospitality journals, over the study timeframe, give coverage to workforce issues. Moreover,
33 the majority of this research output in tourism journals is at the macro-level, and hence
34 misses the opportunity to engage with key issues that are critical in contemporary tourism, for
35 example how the tourism worker might benefit, or not, from emerging economic growth
36 policy instruments like pro-poor or developmental tourism for poverty alleviation (e.g.,
37 Snyman, 2012). It is worth pondering the roles played by tourism journal gatekeepers, as
38 others have (Ballantyne et al., 2009). Do they consider micro- and meso- level research work
39 as 'hospitality', and hence less relevant to their audiences?
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 This last work by Snyman also highlights another associated underrepresentation in the
50 literature and that is studies that connect the macro, meso and micro levels. Snyman
51 addresses this via investigation of a policy intervention to reduce poverty by taking account
52 of the lives of workers and the tourism enterprises they are employed in. Similarly, Solnet et
53 al. (2014b), in their consideration of regional tourism destinations addressing skills shortages
54 develop a tool for destinations and organisations to recruit workers who 'fit'. However,
55 studies of this nature are rare.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 Notwithstanding the presence of some macro-level studies in the tourism journals, what is
3 certainly clear in a wider sense is that there is a paucity of research published within the
4 academy that investigates this level, in fact less than a tenth of our sample gave direct
5 coverage to work of this kind. Duncan et al's', (2013) workforce mobilities analysis or Terry's
6 (2014) investigation of volunteer tourism's potential to alleviate employment issues are
7 relatively rare examples. Similarly underrepresented is macro-level research in our sample's
8 hospitality journals. Some work, such as that of Zopiatis, Constanti and Theocharous (2014),
9 which examines migrant labour, Gibson's (2008) cruise industry employment research and
10 Tavitiyaman, Qu and Zhang's (2011) study of industry factors that impact on strategy and
11 hotel performance, by their very nature must engage with macro-level factors but do so as a
12 'by-product' of their rather more specific objectives. It is, therefore, noteworthy that there is a
13 lack of recognition of the globalisation of tourism workforce issues. While some research in
14 our sample does acknowledge this theme (e.g., Jarvis & Peel, 2013; Williams & Shaw, 2011),
15 for most it is by implication rather than be deliberate design. Moreover, the literature does not
16 generally report the macro-level research commissioned by transnational bodies (UNWTO,
17 WTTC, ILO), which often traverse the levels, for example engaging with detailed
18 demographic trends (Baum, 2012, 2013).

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 While we highlighted the concentration of workforce articles in the hospitality journals in the
35 previous section, contrarily, we can also consider this an underrepresentation. On average
36 only 15% of articles in the hospitality journals are dedicated to workforce matters, when
37 compared to the claimed paramount importance of workforce (Enz, 2001; 2009) and HRM
38 themes (King et al., 2011) by practitioners and academics alike. This suggests a significant
39 disconnect. Indeed, this number would be far less if it was not for the contributions of several
40 highly prolific authors both in our sample and outside it. We argue that, as a consequence of
41 the aforementioned absence of theory testing, very little new knowledge, or theory building,
42 occurs in tourism and/or hospitality workforce research. Further developing the theme of
43 methods and methodology, we note that scant research studies can be identified that attempt
44 to conceptualise and bring together as a whole the research undertaken in an area. Although
45 not within this sample, the work of Lugosi et al. (2009) in modelling the relationship between
46 hospitality management, hospitality studies and critical hospitality management research
47 serves as an exemplar of research that can be described as an attempt at 'unification studies',
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 or bringing together parts into a whole (see also Ottenbacher et al., 2009). While
2 acknowledging that paradigmatic positions are highly contested in the T&H domain (cf.
3 Tribe, Dann & Jamal, 2015), exploratory qualitative studies and ‘pot-holing’ quantitative
4 studies, in relative isolation from anything other than a few articles to frame a tidy study,
5 proliferate. This militates against the development of robust frameworks within which
6 knowledge in an emerging (T&H) domain, let alone workforce research, can advance
7 incrementally and with agreed purpose. Studies that debate the finer points of methodology
8 and approaches for T&H workforce research are rare (cf. Ladkin, 2011; Robinson et al.,
9 2014c). In a similar vein, conceptual papers which challenge extant narratives and
10 assumptions and propose new theoretical models are almost completely absent (Ladkin, 2011
11 being a notable exception) and this has also been observed of tourism research generically
12 (Xin, Tribe & Chambers, 2013).

23 **4.3. ‘Misrepresented’**

24 The largest misrepresentation that emerges from the above discourse is that tourism
25 workforce domain is synonymous with ‘hospitality’. Liu and Wall (2006) spoke to this
26 disconnect in their study of barriers to workforce development in the context of tourism in
27 China. Notably, although they proposed a state policy-T&H industry-regional framework,
28 this stopped short of the micro-level considerations we have proposed in this study. Part of
29 the issue with respect to the tourism-hospitality disjuncture resides in issues of nomenclature.
30 Highly focused OB or HR or even strategy research that is located within hotel, restaurant or
31 similar businesses, by not making more direct references to employment, labour markets or
32 even the workforce, by default remain in the hospitality domain and may not reach the
33 attention of the tourism academy. Moreover, there are structural explanations for this within
34 the academy. Tourism and hospitality may be located in different departments across
35 different jurisdictions. In Australia and the UK, H&T are often incorporated, but the US, and
36 hence Asian tradition, may domicile hospitality in business and management departments and
37 tourism in leisure, parks and recreation. It may not occur to researchers working within these
38 latter arrangements to cross-reference their work to both tourism and hospitality audiences.

39 An outcome of the rhetoric that hospitality *is* tourism employment is that the workforce
40 narrative is represented only by business and management studies. Thus, sociological
41 examinations of the Whyte (1948), Fine (2008) and Wood (1994) genre are largely absent.
42 One exception to this is a study by Rydzik, Pritchard, Morgan & Sedgley (2013) that
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 involved tourism migrant workers creating artworks to express their transformative
2 experiences – contributing to knowledge on identity formation and community development
3 though mobility and tourism employment. Even econometric studies are also fleeting, with
4 works such as those of Smeral (2009) conspicuous by their rarity. This last work also
5 challenges the misrepresentation of tourism workforce as a trenchant problem – as secondary
6 to product and experience development, infrastructure and marketing priorities. Rather,
7 Smeral (2009) argues that measurable inputs of labour, as opposed to capital and/or
8 information and communication technologies, is the key driver of hospitality (and, by proxy,
9 tourism) industry growth. Some other research contradicts established tourism myths, such as
10 that of the prevalence of SMEs, often cited as a key workforce challenge. Smith (2006)
11 contends that the proportion of SMEs in tourism is actually lower than that in other industrial
12 sectors, challenging the sector’s depiction as one where small businesses, as Baum and
13 Szivas (2008) contend, convolute workforce development (for other myths see McKercher &
14 Prideaux, 2014).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 The job profile of those working in hospitality and tourism is developing in line with wider
28 social, economic and technological change and there are many highly skilled roles emerging
29 in the industry (Solnet et al, in press). Yet the dominant discourse in much of the literature is
30 to start with the what might be called Orwellian stigmas including, to name a few, low
31 skills/deskilling, low entry barriers, the 365/24/7 demand for service, poor working
32 conditions, intrinsically unrewarding repetitive jobs (e.g. Pienaar & Willemse, 2008),
33 hierarchical organisations, precarious and/or seasonal employment (e.g. Lundberg,
34 Gudmundson & Andersson, 2009), even deviance and exploitation (e.g. Harris, 2012). While
35 this may well be the case in some if not many circumstances, the lazy reproduction of these
36 ideas as the assumptive base of research endeavours is, arguably, a misrepresentation of the
37 nature of many aspects of the T&H workforce, especially in the developing world (cf.
38 Gentry’s 2007 study of Belizean women & Higgins-Desbiolles’ 2012) account of Argentinian
39 hotel workers). Narratives in the migrant (Janta, et al, 2011, 2012) and mobilities literature
40 (Riley, Ladkin & Szivas, 2002) frame tourism employment as a final option, or in the case of
41 working holiday makers, as tourists first and workers last (Cohen, 2011). A notable challenge
42 to this discourse is Vaugeois and Rollins’ (2007) empirical contestation of tourism as a
43 ‘refuge employer’. It is difficult, we contend, to develop new knowledge in a research
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 environment when subjected to the perpetuation of ‘half-truths’ in the conceptualisation and
3 framing of research problems.
4

5 6 **5.0. A PROPOSED ‘WORKFORCE RESEARCH TAXONOMY’**

7
8 This study highlights a number of key issues with respect to workforce research in the T&H
9 literature. Our starting point was to contend that workforce is a relatively neglected theme in
10 the T&H literature and the evidence from this analysis certainly bears this out. Our analysis
11 of the ten year time frame highlights the relative paucity of workforce research published in
12 the leading tourism and hospitality journals and notes the particular inattention to this theme
13 in four major tourism publications. By contrast, the four hospitality journals that were
14 interrogated included rather more workforce-related studies but even here their presence was
15 limited when set alongside other major themes. This disparity in itself leads to questions
16 about how the respective journals perceive themselves and the boundaries of their academic
17 ‘patches’ and highlights the tensions that exist between the two areas, to which we have
18 already alluded.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Of course, our case for neglect is predicated upon acceptance of the argument that workforce
30 and its associated sub-themes are, indeed, of the level of importance that we ascribe. We
31 accept that there are arguments that, alongside the themes that dominate the T&H literature –
32 marketing, technology, the natural environment, culture and others – some may see
33 workforce concerns as marginal at best. Both the work of Ballantyne et al. (2009) and Cheng
34 et al. (2011) would seem to adopt this position. However, we would counter this argument by
35 noting the cross-cutting nature of workforce concerns in T&H, impinging directly on and
36 drawing from the major social science fields of anthropology, economics, geography,
37 political science, psychology and sociology. How it is that an activity that is central to the
38 lives of people and communities in all cultures – work – can be marginalised in this way
39 when placed in the context of a specific economic sector, T&H, is perplexing. The workforce
40 in T&H is also cross-cutting in relation to a number of the themes which dominate
41 publications in this area – sustainability, human rights, culture, product/service development
42 and delivery and destination management among others.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 We also recognise the possibility that the neglect of workforce research may simply be the
56 product of poor research, that far too few papers meet the standard demanded by the eight
57 leading journals in the T&H field. The rigorous review process through which all papers
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 submitted are subjected acts as an important filter in terms of both quality and fit with the
2 aims of the publication. It is interesting to speculate about the rejection rate and reasons for
3 rejection for workforce-related research by the eight journals that formed our sampling frame.
4 Such information is currently not available but we would challenge editors to publish this
5 data and even allow access to the reasons for rejection of papers within this (and other)
6 domains. This would help to dispel any sense that work in a particular area is not given
7 appropriate recognition within the review process.
8
9
10
11


12 As well as addressing the neglect (or otherwise) of workforce themes in the major T&H
13 journals, our purpose was to assess and classify those papers that did make it through the
14 review process to publication. Our consideration of 458 contributions from the ten year
15 timeframe, led us through a classificatory process that enabled broad labelling of papers as
16 ‘micro’, ‘meso’ and ‘macro’ on the basis of their focus and the empirical ‘laboratory’ within
17 which the research was located. A number of the papers did straddle more than one area but,
18 broadly speaking, the process of classification enabled us to flesh out our three original
19 categories and to illustrate the areas of workforce research within each.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Figure 4 presents a classification and the sub-categories in each as a model that straddles
31 conception as a typology or taxonomy of workforce research in T&H, and possibly beyond.
32 In proposing a typology or taxonomy for workforce research, we are heartened by the
33 arguments in favour of this approach by Dellbridge and Fiss (2013) in which they clearly
34 articulate the value that the use of classifications can bring to advancing theory within the
35 business and management space. However, we believe that our approach in this paper
36 challenges the criteria set out by Snow and Ketchen (2014:231) for an effective typology
37 when they argue that “ideal types are comprehensive and mutually exclusive, the types can be
38 validly and reliably measured, and the theoretical foundation underlying the typology is
39 clearly articulated”. We do not see the mutual exclusivity of a typology in the tourism
40 workforce space and, as a result, describe what follows as a taxonomy.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 The initial feature of this model, as informed by our analysis, depicts the macro as not
52 distinct from, but rather embracing, the meso and micro, thus immediately signalling the
53 inherent interconnections and interdependencies of all these forces and factors on the tourism
54 workforce. The three levels in our taxonomy are populated by examples of selected themes
55 and topics from our analysis. Of note within this depiction is the overlap that exists between
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

our conception of micro and meso, areas that cross-cut concern for the individual with a focus on organisational outcomes and needs. And this distinguishes our model from those that informed its development, notably Halcomb and Davidson (2006) and Reifels and Pirkis (2012).

Figure 4: Taxonomy of Workforce Research in Tourism & Hospitality



This area of overlap is worthy of further discussion along two lines, first that captured here is the nexus between organisation and worker – or the host-guest nexus. From a meso perspective, customer attitudes and behaviours are an outcome of organisational dynamics (e.g. Chi & Gursoy, 2009). Yet it is the individual worker, at the micro level, that interacts directly with the tourist/guest to provide the tourism experience. The co-creation of value (Vargo & Lusch, 2004) at the point of interaction between the service provider and the customer is a unique characteristic of the tourism and hospitality work environment (Andersson Cederholm & Hultman, 2010), with implications for workers such as emotional labour, role conflict and cognitive dissonance (cf. Chen & Kao, 2012; Karatepe & Aleshinloye, 2009; Yang, 2010). This guest/host interaction impacts concomitantly on worker and customer attitudes and behaviours, thus highlighting the micro-meso overlap.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Second, SMEs again are demonstrative of the meso-micro interface whereby owner can be manager and worker simultaneously. Although we earlier leaned on Smith (2006) to dispel the rhetoric that SMEs are a unique tourism ‘lifeform’, small businesses are nonetheless an important part of the industry’s fabric. Thus, the inherent connection between organisation and individual via this example is glaring. Often, as Getz and Carlsen (2005) highlight, SMEs are family businesses – indeed those with four or fewer employees are sometimes labelled ‘micro-businesses’. They found that children were often employed, and this leaves open suggestions of ‘grey economies’ such that various forms of benefits and capital accumulate in lieu of regular wages. This, in turns, raises a range of human rights pertaining to children and their families issues (child labour, sex tourism work) that rarely feature in the extant tourism workforce literature (but see, for example, Black, 1995; Boardman et al, 2015; Edralin, 2002; Plüss, 1999). Moreover, although Brizek and Khan (2007) rightly point of the evolution of entrepreneurship into corporations, Getz and Carlsen highlight that SMEs, in their review of family businesses, are often born of entrepreneurship. Although this is not the focus of the paper per se the various motivations for entrepreneurship in tourism and hospitality, for example lifestyle or ‘sea change’ or partners (typically female) supplementing incomes or seeking fulfilment (which paradoxically often brings further stresses as Li et als’ (2013) study of American B&B operators highlights), bring richness and salience to this micro-meso overlap.

This taxonomy provides a definitional tool designed to assist workforce researchers to locate their work within the broad and multi-tiered spectrum of studies in this space. We also see this classification as potentially of value to journal editors and the reviewers of submitted papers in gaining a clearer insight into research within the workforce family of studies. These studies are bound together by their common roots in seeking to contribute to hitherto under-developed understanding of the workforce environment and its multiple layers. It is our contention that explanatory power will only be attainable through research in this field when those expressing concern for the range of issues to which we have alluded earlier (such as labour turnover, professionalisation of the sector, skills shortages, a mismatch of graduate skills and industry expectations) recognize the inter-connectedness of the micro, meso and macro layers within the workforce environment. Further, this taxonomy brings into sharp relief the three structural research issues enunciated at the beginning of this paper: that the extant literature is dominated by managerial/organisational/HRM approaches; that hitherto

1 workforce has been considered as the purview of hospitality researchers; and that those few
2 studies that do attempt to reconcile or comment on tourism workforce holistically are lacking
3 theoretical and conceptual underpinnings.
4

5 6 **6.0 FINAL REFLECTIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH**

7
8 We postulate that this analysis and the taxonomy that we derive from it provides a solid
9 foundation for validating ‘workforce’ as a nomenclature appropriately inclusive of the
10 various ‘component parts’ of the tourism labour and employment space. Moreover, it will
11 enable verifiable claims to be made in relation to a number of areas, that the tourism
12 workforce literature is deficient: in its coherence between the three identified levels; in
13 providing understanding of the declared theoretical positions that underpin knowledge
14 claims; in recognising challenges to dominant Euro-American scientific assumptions; and
15 clarifying underpinning social scientific lens/es and enabling greater consistency in the use of
16 terminology.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Our analysis also enables us to propose areas where future workforce research in T&H can
27 usefully be directed in order both to extend the explanatory scope of research in this area and
28 engage with wider social science constructs in so doing. This leads us to identify a future
29 workforce research agenda which includes studies that:
30
31
32

- 33 - are cross-cutting in recognising interdependencies across micro, meso and macro
34 levels within our workforce research taxonomy;
- 35 - explore the nuanced workforce implications of the overlap of the micro and meso
36 levels, particularly in respect to impacts on the customer/guest;
- 37 - draw explicitly on their social science discipline origins and clearly articulate their
38 methodological and theoretical contributions to social science;
- 39 - challenge the ghettoisation of workforce research within ‘hospitality’ and recognise
40 the central position of such work within mainstream tourism research;
- 41 - extend beyond a ‘problem solving’ managerial perspective on workforce research and
42 seek to engage with explanation as a starting point in seeking change;
- 43 - traverse the divide between empirical academic work and the high-value research
44 conducted, or commissioned, by trans-national agencies – both representing tourism
45 (e.g. UNWTO, WTTC) and the workforce (e.g. ILO);
- 46 - investigate discourses of work and how tourism employment perpetuates or
47 challenges these narratives;
- 48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- enunciate a just and sustainable glocal vision for tourism and its workers.

In conclusion, this paper has considered the position of workforce research, areas of overrepresentation, its relative underrepresentation, and even misrepresentations in the leading T&H journals. That an academy dedicated to researching an industry which supports 347 million jobs around the world (WTTC, 2015) and is almost entirely dependent on people to deliver services and experiences, can dedicate just 2% and 15% of its research output in its leading tourism and hospitality journals respectively to the workforce space and evidently in such an ad hoc manner is, we contend, a matter of concern. The vision of this review is to provide a platform from which future research that informs and advances workforce theory, policy and practice is able to inform debate in the leading T&H journals.

7. REFERENCES

- Andersson Cederholm, E., & Hultman, J. (2010). The value of intimacy: Negotiating commercial relationships in lifestyle entrepreneurship, *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 10(1), 16-32.
- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, D. R. (2004). The tourism workforce and policy: Exploring the assumptions using Crete as the case study. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 7(1), 66-87.
- Baggio, R., Scott, N., & Cooper, C. (2010). Network science: A review focused on tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(3), 802-827.
- Ballantyne, R., Packer, J., & Axelsen, M. (2009). Trends in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36, 149-152.
- Baum, T. (1991). Human resource issues in tourism—global concerns and local response. *World Travel and Tourism Review*, 1.
- Baum, T. (2007). Human resources in tourism: Still waiting for change. *Tourism Management*, 28(6), 1383-1399.
- Baum, T. (2012), *Migrant workers in the international hotel industry*, Geneva: ILO
- Baum, T. (2013), *International Perspectives on Women and Work in Hotels, Catering and Tourism*, Geneva: ILO
- Baum, T. (2015). Human resources in tourism: Still waiting for change? - a 2015 reprise. *Tourism Management*. 50, 204-2012.
- Baum, T., & Szivas, E. (2008). HRD in tourism: A role for government? *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 783-794.

1 Black, M. (1995) *In the twilight zone: child workers in the hotel, tourism and catering*
2 *industry*, Geneva: ILO.

3 Boardman, J., Johns, A., Petre, D., & Weinz, W. (2015), *Opportunities and Challenges in the*
4 *Promotion of Decent Work in Hotel Global Supply Chains*, Geneva: ILO

5
6 Brizek, M. G., & Khan, M. A. (2007). An empirical investigation of corporate
7 entrepreneurship intensity in the casual dining sector. *International Journal of Hospitality*
8 *Management*, 26(4), 871-885.

9
10
11 <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/workforce.html#ixzz3Rzh29d6N>

12
13 Chan, S. C. (2010). Does workplace fun matter? Developing a useable typology of workplace
14 fun in a qualitative study. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(4), 720-728.

15
16
17 Chen, C. F., & Kao, Y. L. (2012). Investigating the antecedents and consequences of burnout
18 and isolation among flight attendants. *Tourism Management*, 33(4), 868-874.

19
20
21 Cheng, C., Z. Li, J. Petrick, & J. O'Leary (2011) An Examination of Tourism Journal
22 Development. *Tourism Management*. 32, 53-61.

23
24
25 Cheung, C., Baum, T., & Wong, A. (2012). Relocating Empowerment as a Management
26 Concept for Asia. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(1), 36-41.

27
28
29 Chi, C.G., & Gursoy, D. (2009). Employee satisfaction, customer satisfaction, and financial
30 performance: An empirical examination, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*,
31 28(2), 245-253.

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Chu, K. H. L., & Murrmann, S. K. (2006). Development and validation of the hospitality
emotional labor scale. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1181-1191.

Cohen, S. A. (2011). Lifestyle travellers: Backpacking as a way of life. *Annals of Tourism
Research*, 38(4), 1535-1555.

Cooke, F. L. (2009). A decade of transformation of HRM in China: A review of literature and
suggestions for future studies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 47(1), 6-40.

Cullen, J. & Turnbull, S. (2005), A meta-review of the management development literature,
Human Resource Development Review, 4(3), 335-355.

Davidson, M.C.G., McPhail, R., & Barry, S. (2011). Hospitality HRM: Past, present and the
future. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 23(4), 498-516.

Deery, M., & Jago, L. (2015). Revisiting talent management, work-life balance and retention
strategies. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(3), 453-472.

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

Devine, A. & Devine, F. (2011) Planning and developing tourism within a public sector
quagmire: Lessons from and for small countries, *Tourism Management*, 32, 1253-1261.

1 Duncan, T., Scott, D., & Baum, T. (2013), The mobilities of hospitality work: an exploration
2 of issues and debates, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 41(4), 1-19.
3

4 Duxbury, L., Thomas, J. A., Towers, I., & Higgins, C. (2007). From 9 to 5 to 24 and 7: How
5 technology has redefined the workday. *Information resources management: global
6 challenges*. Idea Publishing, London, 305-331.
7
8

9 Edralin, D. (2002) Child labor in the tourism industry, *Notes on Business Education*, 5(2), 1-
10 6.
11

12 Ehnert, Harry, W. (2012) & I : Recent developments and future prospects on sustainable
13 human resource management: Introduction to the special issue, *Management Revue*, , 23(3),
14 221-238.
15
16

17 Enz, C. A. (2001). What keeps you up at night? Key issues of concern for lodging managers.
18 42 (2), 38-45.,
19
20

21 Enz, C. A. (2009). Human resource management: A troubling issue for the global hotel
22 industry. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*.
23
24

25 Fine, G. A. (2008). *Kitchens: The Culture of Restaurant Work, Updated with a New Preface*.
26 Univ of California Press.
27
28

29 Gallardo, E., Sánchez-Cañizares, S., López-Guzmán, T., & Nascimento Jesus, M., (2010).
30 Employee satisfaction in the Iberian hotel industry: The case of Andalusia (Spain) and the
31 Algarve (Portugal), *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22 (3),
32 321-334.
33
34

35 Gardner, W. L., & Cogliser, C. C. (2009). Meso-modeling of leadership: Following James
36 G.(Jerry) Hunt's lead in integrating micro-and macro-perspectives of leadership. *The
37 Leadership Quarterly*, 20(4), 493-500.
38
39

40 Gentry, K. M. (2007). Belizean women and tourism work: Opportunity or
41 impediment?. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(2), 477-496.
42
43

44 Getz, D., & Carlsen, J. (2005). Family business in tourism: state of the art. *Annals of Tourism
45 Research*, 32(1), 237-258.
46

47 Getz, D., Robinson, R.N.S., Andersson, T. D., & Vujicic, S. (2014). *Foodies and food
48 tourism*. Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers.
49
50

51 Gibson, P. (2008). Cruising in the 21st century: Who works while others play? *International
52 Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27(1), 42-52.
53
54

55 Halcomb, E. J., & Davidson, P. M. (2006). The role of practice nurses in an integrated model
56 of cardiovascular disease management in Australian general practice. *Australian Journal of
57 Primary Health*, 12(2), 34-44.
58
59

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

3 Hancock, J., Allen, D., Bosco, F., McDaniel, K. & Pierce, C. (2013), Meta-Analytic Review
4 of Employee Turnover as a Predictor of Firm Performance, *Journal of Management*, 39(3),
5 573-603.
6

7
8 Harris, L. C. (2012). 'Ripping off' tourists: An empirical evaluation of tourists' perceptions
9 and service worker (mis)behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 1070-1093.
10

11 Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2012). The Hotel Bauen's challenge to cannibalizing
12 capitalism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 620-640.
13

14
15 Holmes, K., Smith, K., Lockstone-Binney, L., & Baum, T. (2010) Developing the
16 Dimensions of Tourism Volunteering, *Leisure Sciences*, 32(3), 255-269.
17

18
19 Iverson, R. D., & Deery, M. (1997). Turnover culture in the hospitality industry. *Human*
20 *Resource Management Journal*, 7(4), 71-82.
21

22
23 Janta, H., & Ladkin, A. (2009). Polish migrant labor in the hospitality workforce:
24 Implications for recruitment and retention. *Tourism Culture & Communication*, 9(1-2), 5-15.
25

26
27 Janta, H. (2011). Polish migrant workers in the UK hospitality industry: Profiles, work
28 experience and methods for accessing employment. *International Journal of Contemporary*
29 *Hospitality Management*, 23(6), 803-819.
30

31
32 Janta, H., Brown, L., Lugosi, P., & Ladkin, A. (2012). Migrant relationships and tourism
33 employment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1322-1343.
34

35
36 Janta, H., Ladkin, A., Brown, L., & Lugosi, P. (2011). Employment experiences of Polish
37 migrant workers in the UK hospitality sector. *Tourism Management*, 32(5), 1006-1019.
38

39
40 Jarvis, J., & Peel, V. (2013). Tourists for hire: International working holidaymakers in a work
41 based destination in regional Australia. *Tourism Management*, 37, 114-124.
42

43
44 Jenkins, R. (2005) Globalisation of production, Employment and Poverty: Three Macro-
45 Meso-Micro Studies, *The European Journal of Development Research*, 17(4), 601-625.
46

47
48 Jiang, K., Lepak, D., Hu, J. & Baer, J. (2012) How does human resource management
49 influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms,
50 *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1264-1294.
51

52
53 Kara, D., Uysal, M., & Magnini, V. P. (2012). Gender differences on job satisfaction of the
54 five-star hotel employees: the case of the Turkish hotel industry. *International Journal of*
55 *Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 24(7), 1047-1065.
56

57
58 Karatepe, O.M., & Aleshinloye, K.D. (2009). Emotional dissonance and emotional
59 exhaustion among hotel employees in Nigeria, *International Journal of Hospitality*
60 *Management*, 28, 349-358.
61
62
63
64
65

1 Karatepe, O. M., Uludag, O., Menevis, I., Hadzimehmedagic, L., & Baddar, L. (2006). The
2 effects of selected individual characteristics on frontline employee performance and job
3 satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 27(4), 547-560.

4 King, C., Funk, D.C., & Wilkins, H. (2011). Bridging the gap: An examination of the relative
5 alignment of hospitality research and industry priorities. *International Journal of Hospitality*
6 *Management*, 30, 157-166.

7
8
9
10 Kirch, D., Henderson, M. and Dill, M. (2012) Physician Workforce Projections in an Era of
11 Health Care Reform, *Annual Review of Medicine*, 63, 435-445

12
13 Kline, S., & Harris, K. (2008). ROI is MIA: why are hoteliers failing to demand the ROI of
14 training?. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(1), 45-59.

15
16 Kramar, R. (2014). Beyond strategic human resource management: is sustainable human
17 resource management the next approach?. *The International Journal of Human Resource*
18 *Management*, 25(8), 1069-1089.

19
20
21 Kusluvan, S., Kusluvan, Z., Ilhan, I., & Buyruk, L. (2010). The human dimension: a review
22 of human resource management issues in the tourism and hospitality industry. *Cornell*
23 *Hospitality Quarterly*, 51(2), 171-214.

24
25
26 Ladkin, A. (2011). Exploring Tourism Labor. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), 1135-
27 1155.

28
29
30 Lee, J.E., Almanza, B.A., Jang, S.C., Nelson, D.C., & Ghiselli, R.F. (2013). Does
31 transformational leadership style influence employees' attitudes toward food safety practices?
32 *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 282-293.

33
34
35 Li, Y., Miao, L., Zhao, X., & Lehto, X. (2013). When family rooms become guest lounges:
36 Work–family balance of B&B innkeepers. *International Journal of Hospitality*
37 *Management*, 34, 138-149.

38
39
40 Li, S., & Nesbit, P. L. (2014). An exploration of the HRM values of Chinese managers
41 working in Western multinational enterprises in China: implications for HR practice. *The*
42 *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(11), 1529-1546.

43
44
45 Liu, A., & Wall, G. (2006). Planning tourism employment: a developing country
46 perspective. *Tourism Management*, 27(1), 159-170.

47
48 Lovelock, B., & Boyd, S. (2006). Impediments to a cross-border collaborative model of
49 destination management in the Catlins, New Zealand. *Tourism Geographies*, 8(2), 143-161.

50
51
52 Lucas, R., & Deery, M. (2004). Significant developments and emerging issues in human
53 resource management. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 23(5), 459-472.

54
55
56 Lugosi, P., Lynch, P., & Morrison, A. (2009). Critical hospitality management research. *The*
57 *Service Industries Journal*, 29(10), 1465-1478.

1 Lundberg, C., Gudmundson, A., & Andersson, T. D. (2009). Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory
2 of work motivation tested empirically on seasonal workers in hospitality and
3 tourism. *Tourism Management*, 30(6), 890-899.

4 McKercher, B., & Prideaux, B. (2014). Academic myths of tourism. *Annals of Tourism
5 Research*, 46, 16-28.

6 Meler, M., & Ruzic, D. (1999). Marketing identity of the tourist product of the Republic of
7 Croatia. *Tourism Management*, 20(5), 635-643.

8 Melton, N.E., & Cunningham, G.B. (2014). Who Are the Champions? Using a Multilevel
9 model to Examine Perceptions of Employee Support for LGBT Inclusion in Sport
10 Organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28, 189-206.

11 Morrison, A., & O'Gorman, K. (2008). Hospitality studies and hospitality management: A
12 symbiotic relationship. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27, 214-221.

13 Namasivayam, K., & Zhao, X. (2007). An investigation of the moderating effects of
14 organizational commitment on the relationships between work-family conflict and job
15 satisfaction among hospitality employees in India. *Tourism Management*, 28(5), 1212-1223.

16 Namasivayam, K., Miao, L., & Zhao, X. (2007). An investigation of the relationships
17 between compensation practices and firm performance in the US hotel industry. *International
18 Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(3), 574-587.

19 Ottenbacher, M., Harrington, R., & Parsa, H. G. (2009). Defining the hospitality discipline: A
20 discussion of pedagogical and research implications. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism
21 Research*, 33(3), 263-283.

22 oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/workforce accessed 4 August, 2015.

23 Pienaar, J., & Willemse, S. A. (2008). Burnout, engagement, coping and general health of
24 service employees in the hospitality industry. *Tourism Management*, 29(6), 1053-1063.

25 Plüss, C. (1999) *Quick Money – Easy Money? A Report on child labor in tourism*, Basel:
26 Arbeitskreis Tourismus & Entwicklung,

27 Reifels, L., & Pirkis, J. (2012). Meso and micro level workforce challenges in psychiatric
28 rehabilitation. *Psychiatric rehabilitation journal*, 35(4), 341.

29 Riley, M., Ladkin, A., & Szivas, E. (2002). *Tourism employment: Analysis and
30 planning* (Vol. 6). Channel View Publications.

31 Rivera, M. A., & Upchurch, R. (2008). The role of research in the hospitality industry: A
32 content analysis of the IJHM between 2000 and 2005. *International Journal of Hospitality
33 Management*, 27(4), 632-640.

34 Robinson, R.N.S., & Beesley, L. (2010). Linkages between creativity and intention to quit:
35 An occupational study of chefs. *Tourism Management*, 31(6), 765-776.

1 Robinson, R.N.S., Kralj, A., Solnet, D., Goh, E., & Callan, V. (2014a). Thinking job
2 embeddedness not turnover: Towards a better understanding of frontline hotel worker
3 retention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 36, 101-109.

4 Robinson, R.N.S., Ritchie, B.W., Kralj, A., Solnet, D.S., Baum, T., & Ford, R. (2014b). An
5 Asia-Pacific core-periphery futures paradox: Divergent worker and tourist mobilities, *Journal*
6 *of Travel Research*, 53(6), 805-818.

7 Robinson, R.N.S., Solnet, D., & Breakey, N.M. (2014c). A phenomenological approach to
8 hospitality management research: Chefs' occupational commitment. *International Journal of*
9 *Hospitality Management*, 42, 65-75.

10 Ryan, C. (2015). Trends in hospitality management research: a personal
11 reflection. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(3), 340-361.

12 Rydzik, A., Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., & Sedgley, D. (2013). The potential of arts-based
13 transformative research, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 40, 283-305.

14 Seck, E. T., Finch Jr, W. A., Mor-Barak, M., & Poverny, L. M. (1993). Managing a diverse
15 workforce. *Administration in Social Work*, 17(2), 67-79.

16 Service Skills Australia (2013). *Tourism, Travel & Hospitality Workforce Development*
17 *Strategy 2014-2019*, Accessed 7 July 2015 <http://www.serviceskills.com.au>

18 Silva, P. (2006). Effects of disposition on hospitality employee job satisfaction and
19 commitment, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18 (4), 317-
20 328.

21 Singh, N. Hu, C., & Roehl, W.S. (2007). Text mining a decade of progress in hospitality
22 human resource management research: Identifying emerging thematic development.
23 *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(1), 131-147.

24 Smeral, E. (2009). Growth accounting for hotel and restaurant industries. *Journal of Travel*
25 *Research*, 47(4), 413-424.

26 Smith, S. L. (2006). How big, how many? Enterprise size distributions in tourism and other
27 industries. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(1), 53-58.

28 Snow, C., & Ketchen, D. (2014). Typology-Driven Theorizing: A Response to Delbridge and
29 Fiss, *Academy of Management Review*, 39(2), 231-233.

30 Snyman, S. L. (2012). The role of tourism employment in poverty reduction and community
31 perceptions of conservation and tourism in southern Africa. *Journal of Sustainable*
32 *Tourism*, 20(3), 395-416.

33 Solnet, D., Baum, T., Kralj, A., Robinson, R.N.S., Ritchie, B.W., & Olsen., M. (2014a). The
34 Asia-Pacific tourism workforce of the future: Using Delphi techniques to identify possible
35 scenarios, *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(6), 693-704.

1 Solnet, D., Baum, T., Robinson, R.N.S., & Lockstone-Binney, L. (accepted 7 Sept., 2015).
2 “What about the workers? Roles, scripts and skills for employees in the hotels of the future”,
3 *Journal of Vacation Marketing* (Special issue - “Future of Hotels”).

4 Solnet, D., Ford, R., Robinson, R.N.S., Ritchie, B.W., & Olsen, M. (2014b). Locational
5 factors for tourism employment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 45, 30-45.

6 Solnet, D., Kralj, A., & Baum, T. (2015). 360 Degrees of Pressure the Changing Role of the
7 HR Professional in the Hospitality Industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism*
8 *Research*, 39(2), 271-292.

9 Solnet, D., Nickson, D., Robinson, R. N., Kralj, A., & Baum, T. (2014c). Discourse About
10 Workforce Development in Tourism—An Analysis of Public Policy, Planning, and
11 Implementation in Australia and Scotland: Hot Air or Making a Difference? *Tourism*
12 *Analysis*, 19(5), 609-623.

13 Tavitiyaman, P., Qu, H., & Zhang, H. Q. (2011). The impact of industry force factors on
14 resource competitive strategies and hotel performance. *International Journal of Hospitality*
15 *Management*, 30(3), 648-657.

16 Terry, W. (2014). Solving labor problems and building capacity in sustainable agriculture
17 through volunteer tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, 94-107.

18 Tsang, N. K., & Hsu, C. H. (2011). Thirty years of research on tourism and hospitality
19 management in China: A review and analysis of journal publications. *International Journal*
20 *of Hospitality Management*, 30(4), 886-896.

21 Tracey, B. (2014). A review of human resources management research, *International Journal*
22 *of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(5), 679-705.

23 Tribe, J., Dann, G., & Jamal, T. (2015). Paradigms in tourism research: a triologue. *Tourism*
24 *Recreation Research*, 40(1), 28-47.

25 Van De Voorde, K., Paauwe, J. & Van Veldhoven, M. (2012), Employee Well-being and the
26 HRM—Organizational Performance Relationship: A Review of Quantitative Studies,
27 *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14, 391-407.

28 Vargo, S.L., & Lusch, R.F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal*
29 *of Marketing*, 68(1), 1-17.

30 Vaugeois, N., & Rollins, R. (2007). Mobility into tourism refuge employer? *Annals of*
31 *Tourism Research*, 34(3), 630-648.

32 Watson, T. (2004), HRM and Critical Social Science Analysis, *Journal of Management*
33 *Studies*, 41(3), 447-467.

34 Whyte, W. F. (1948). Human relations in the restaurant industry (1948). McGraw-Hill Book
35 Co.: New York.

1 Williams, A. M., & Shaw, G. (2011). Internationalization and innovation in tourism. *Annals*
2 *of Tourism Research*, 38(1), 27-51.

3 Wood, R. C. (1994). Hotel culture and social control. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 65-
4 80.
5

6
7 Woods, R.H. (1999). Predicting is difficult, especially about the future: Human resources in
8 the new millennium. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 18, 443-456.
9

10 World Travel & Tourism Council. (2014). *Global Talent Trends and Issues for the Travel &*
11 *Tourism Sector*, WTTC, London.
12

13
14 Xin, S., Tribe, J., & Chambers, D. (2013). Conceptual research in tourism. *Annals of Tourism*
15 *Research*, 41 (April), 66-88.
16

17
18 Yang, J.-T. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction in the hotel industry,
19 *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(4), 609–619.
20

21 Zopiatis, A., Constanti, P., & Theocharous, A. L. (2014). Job involvement, commitment,
22 satisfaction and turnover: Evidence from hotel employees in Cyprus. *Tourism*
23 *Management*, 41, 129-140.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Tourism Workforce Research: A Review, Taxonomy and Agenda

What is the contribution to knowledge, theory, policy or practice offered by the paper?

This is the first paper, to the best of our knowledge, that attempts holistic review the tourism employment/labour/workforce literature. In particular, our analysis highlights the neglect of workforce research in the field, and the perception that workforce research is ‘hospitality’ research. We conceptualise an innovative macro, meso, micro tourism workforce taxonomy to accommodate the component parts of the tourism workforce, which helps to explain their interdependencies and overlaps. By critiquing the extant literature we offer this taxonomy as guidance for future workforce research. In doing so we position the utility of our work as a framework for the more effective translation of academic research into policy and practice, with a better appreciation of the other ‘moving parts’ that may attenuate the impact of a single study.

How does the paper offer a social science perspective / approach?

While not domiciled in a particular social science discipline our paper is largely predicated on the fact that the vast majority of research in the tourism workforce field to date has focused at the organisational and/or deindividualised (worker) level of analysis without reference to the broader social, economic, cultural and political environment. We also acknowledge the unique individual characteristics of the diverse tourism workforce, which manifests a range of pertinent social questions, and the agency of groups, whether these are geographically, culturally/ethnically, occupationally or departmentally defined. This paper addresses these shortcoming in the presentation of our three-tiered tourism workforce taxonomy which embraces, and allows for greater explanatory powers of, these broader environmental factors.