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An abstract provides an important first impression of your research. If well-written, it can increase the chances of your manuscript being read and cited. The abstract should be the last component you work on prior to submitting a manuscript and should be as concise and informative as possible. Each should include the following elements:

- Introductory statement of the problem (hook sentence) which often includes the rationale for the research.
- Brief and concise explanation of the methods used.
- Summary of most relevant results.
- The most substantive implications of the study.

JTR’s abstracts are limited to 150 words, all of which should be carefully selected. Here are some quick tips to assist you in choosing each of those precious words:

- Don’t cut and paste from the manuscript, particularly the introduction. Use different, more concise wording.
- Avoid unfamiliar terminology, laundry lists of variables, and acronyms.
- Use past tense for results, present tense for implications.
- Write -> read -> edit -> read -> edit, etc.

Also check submission guidelines for how many keywords you can include:

- Include keywords that are not already in your title.
- Test the keywords via search engines to make sure they find similar articles.
  - Test and use phrases, if relevant (e.g., “destination image”).
- If your study employed unique methods, include as a keyword/phrase.

Examples of good abstracts can be found here:

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/00472875221133042
https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/00472875221140903

Always make sure you follow the specific submission guidelines for the journal in which you are submitting. JTR’s Submission Guidelines, as well as editorial review policies can be found here.
On Being a Conscious Reviewer
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There are many aspects to a good review of a manuscript. Over the coming months we’ll cover a variety of these elements from time to time, but for this installment we are focusing on an under-emphasized topic that we are naming **Conscious Reviewing**. Recently there have been discussions on TRINET regarding systems of knowledge production and the dominance of Anglo-Saxon journals and the thinking that dominates those journals. While JTR is undoubtedly an English-speaking journal, we can, along with other English-speaking journals, work to be more conscious of different approaches to knowledge, self-reflect on our own biases, and as a result adjust our approach to reviewing. In many cases, a simple adjustment of a request can make a big difference.

**Here are a few suggestions for your next reviewing assignment:**

- When faced with a manuscript that needs editing for grammar, rather than assuming the authors aren’t native English speakers and recommending a native English speaker to review/edit, ask instead that they seek a professional review. It takes away the assumption that the authors are not English-speaking. Many of us, regardless of our first language, could benefit from a professional editor.

- Whenever reviewing a paper that is targeting an under-studied area of research, resist the questions of “why did you only study Black travelers?” or “only women travelers?” or “only disabled travelers?” or “only indigenous communities?” This implies that these segments are less important than others, *when in fact these and many other segments are incredibly under-studied and need the spotlight shined on them*. Conversely, don’t agree that a study is generalizable if the focus is solely on a broadly studied group like White European or American respondents.

- We all suffer from “reviewer bias.” The trick is to recognize your biases and work to reduce them. Take advantage of on-campus or online resources, including those below, that can help you expose your unconscious biases. *Being aware is half the battle!*

- **Don’t be THAT reviewer.** We’ve all had a reviewer who just comes across as mean. They will often use demeaning or condescending language to convey their message. Focus on constructive criticism.

- As a reviewer, consider requesting that the **authors of any paper include their reflexivity**
statements. Even quantitative work could benefit from understanding the viewpoint of the researcher. Of course, it’s important to recognize that sometimes these cannot be added until after the paper has gone through review as their reflexivity might reveal their identity and compromise the double-blind process.

- Ask authors to also address how diversity, equity, inclusion, and systems of knowledge were considered as part of the research journey and how it could be considered in future papers in the conclusions.

Unfortunately, we cannot include examples of conscious reviews as that would compromise the double-blind process, but we welcome other examples of good practices from our peers!

For more information on being a conscious reviewer, check out these resources:

- https://hbr.org/2021/09/unconscious-bias-training-that-works

For more information on JTR’s Submission Guidelines, as well as editorial review policies, click here.
Finding the Sweet-Spot in Multi-Study Research: How Many Studies are Enough?
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The primary goal of multi-study research should be to draw reliable, valid (quantitative) or transferable, confirmable (qualitative) conclusions while advancing the field’s knowledge in a succinct and parsimonious manner. The correct number, order, and format of studies can depend on multiple factors including: the problem studied, resources available, and the nature of the experiments or other methods conducted. Here are a few general recommendations when considering multi-study research:

• Read the literature first. The process of determining the most parsimonious number of studies to conduct should not be considered until gaps in the current literature have been identified and the true purpose of the study has been clearly defined and conceptualized. The research question should drive the research design.

• Visualize the multi-study relationship, including a figure or table that shows how the studies are inter-related, is extremely helpful for reviewers and readers.

• Clearly justify your multi-study approach. Discuss other options you considered and why you feel the approach taken was the best option.

• For quantitative studies, time and resources spent on conducting small, incremental advances is likely better spent on participant randomization, controlling for extraneous variables (e.g., increasing internal validity) and better understanding the interaction effects of the independent variables examined.

• For qualitative research, include discussion of triangulation, specifically why the triangulation you chose was the best for the research question.

In addition to the problem being studied, resources available, and the nature of the experiments conducted, the correct number and type of studies can depend on multiple factors including:

• Is there a need to study different populations, perhaps in different ways?

• Conversely, does the research question and study population dictate a bricoleur approach, that is, a multi-faceted view of one group?

• Would the research benefit from being replicated in different geographic locations?
As always, we suggest young scholars consult with their advisors, peers, and other experienced researchers to help determine which manipulations have the best potential to maximize knowledge development.

**Examples of recent, strong multi-study manuscripts can be found here:**

- [https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00472875221138788](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00472875221138788)
- [https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00472875231164987](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00472875231164987)

Please make sure you follow the specific submission guidelines for the journal in which you are submitting. JTR’s Submission Guidelines, as well as editorial review policies can be found [here](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00472875231164987).
Hypotheses form the backbone of quantitative research. If well-conceived, they help establish a strong manuscript. Hypotheses should only be created after intense analysis of the current literature as well as review of the state of the subject currently in practice in the “real world”.

**Hypotheses should:**

- Be connected to an over-arching research question.
- Be testable and predictive; predict both the relationship and outcome.
- Include clearly measured independent and dependent variables.
- Be written clearly and simply.
- Consider the if-then format.

**In addition to guidelines on individual hypotheses, it’s also important to consider how the hypotheses interact with each other. Researchers should:**

- Demonstrate how your hypotheses build upon previous research.
- Discuss other potential hypotheses you considered and why you ruled them out.
- Include a visual figure or diagram in your manuscript that shows how the hypotheses interact with each other.
- Clearly justify the variables used and demonstrate that they are both valid and reliable.
- Avoid “hypotheses overkill”. The number of hypotheses for each manuscript should be directly related to the theory or model examined, parsimonious, and contribute to the larger body of knowledge.
- Clearly justify any hypotheses included that are outside the theoretical framework; these should be used judiciously.
- Confirm that your moderating hypotheses identify relationships that are conditional (e.g., the relationship between X and Y depends on M), while mediating hypotheses suggest a sequential relationship chain (e.g., X is related to M and M is related to Y).
Hypothesis writing skills can be sharpened by observing and analyzing existing hypotheses.

Here are some hypothetical examples of poorly written hypotheses:

- H: Visitors will be satisfied due to the quality of the service they receive. For this hypothesis, it is difficult to know precisely what “satisfied” means and multiple factors other than quality are likely related to perceptions of quality.

- H: Travelers who travel more frequently will have more experiences. This is a tautological hypothesis as it states that if something happens, it will happen.

- H: All residents who receive sustainable tourism training will have more respect for visitors. This hypothesis is an overgeneralization and assumes a universal causal relationship.

Here are some published examples of good hypotheses:


Always make sure you follow the specific submission guidelines for the journal in which you are submitting. JTR’s Submission Guidelines, as well as editorial review policies can be found [here](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/00472875221095212).