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Abstract
This paper describes a review of articles published in the Cornell Hospitality Quarterly in the period 2008 to 2011. A content analysis approach was used to analyze 133 research articles making original contributions to the development of knowledge. The findings indicate that accounting and finance was the most researched area and that the hospitality sector receiving most attention from scholars was hotels. The authorship analysis also shows that most of the articles were written by academic researchers from the United States, illustrating the concentration of experience and practical expertise in that country. This paper is of interest to readers seeking information on the recent progress and development of hospitality research and practice in a top-tier hospitality journal.
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Introduction
The hospitality industry worldwide has experienced unprecedented levels of challenge and opportunity in recent years. Although these have been, and will continue to be, driven by economic, social, and other changes at both regional and global levels, they provide sufficient driving force for the continuous development of hospitality research and management practice. By supplementing the ongoing development of the hospitality industry, academic research plays a prominent role in extending knowledge and helping practitioners resolve managerial and operational problems. Among the different publication channels, academic journals are an important avenue for disseminating unbiased findings and up-to-date knowledge in a specific discipline. van Scutter and Culligan (2003) propose that academic research can benefit an industry by equipping it with the theoretical principles to guide practitioners’ decisions. Indeed, industrial professionals can apply empirical findings from academic journals to their businesses to remain competitive. The importance of academic research to improvements in business practice means researchers in the field have long endeavored to share their latest findings in a range of scholarly journals.

Yoo, Lee, and Bai (2011) suggest that topical trends in hospitality journals change to meet the realities and needs of the industry. As such, a comprehensive review of the literature is important because hospitality managers and practitioners need to be kept informed about the latest developments. From a scholars’ perspective, an analysis of what has already been done and the identification of new directions and challenges for the future would also be useful. Hence, many researchers have conducted regular, systematic reviews of prior research in information technology (see, for example, Ip, Leung, and Law 2011), finance (Jang and Park 2011), and other fields (Tsang and Hsu 2011). With the aim of providing readers with a better understanding of the trends and general issues in the hospitality industry, each of these review articles focuses on a specific topic, provides useful insights into past and present research efforts, and suggests directions for future work.

As a leading journal in hospitality management, the Cornell Hospitality Quarterly (CQ) has published a number of review articles covering a range of topics, such as hotel brand strategy (O’Neill and Mattila 2010), loyalty programs (McCall and Voorhees 2010), hotel management contracts (Deroos 2010), mergers and acquisitions (Canina, Kim, and Ma 2010), spas (Tabacchi 2010), employment law (Sherwyn 2010), and real estate investment trusts (REITs; P. Liu 2010). These articles generally evaluate past and present developments in the hospitality industry.
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developments in specific topics and refer mainly to publications in prominent journals in hospitality and other disciplines. In addition to providing a thorough review of topic-specific studies, these literature reviews present managerial implications and future research directions for the various functional disciplines. Despite their significant contribution to the development of knowledge, the uneven quality of the wide range of references cited could potentially hinder their overall value. For instance, in a review study of REITs, P. Liu (2010) analyzes post-2003 publications in finance and real estate journals, such as *Journal of Finance* and *Real Estate Economics*, as well as other academic sources. McCall and Voorhees (2010) present a similar study on the success of loyalty programs, drawing on the content of several marketing journals, including *Journal of Marketing, Marketing Science*, and others.

All these studies rely on material extracted from different publication channels instead of a single journal. It is therefore unknown whether the journals included are of comparable quality. Another potential limitation is the lengthy time period spanned by the selections. Although the inclusion and analysis of publications in a specific field over a long period may enhance the comprehensiveness and significance of a review study, it may also mean the latest research trends are not included, nor is an in-depth analysis of recent developments. In designing this study, it was considered that providing readers with an understanding of the research presented in a single journal would be a valuable project given that such a systematic review would be an alternative way of revealing what progress the industry is making in the field of study (Wang et al. 2010).

In addition, some of the review articles published recently in CQ have been based solely on papers previously published in CQ and its predecessor, the *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* (CHRAQ). For example, Anderson and Xie (2010) analyze CHRAQ articles and discuss the expansion of revenue management in hospitality over the past twenty-five years. Similarly, Thompson (2010) uses CHRAQ articles as the basis for reviewing the evolution of restaurant revenue management since 1961. Likewise, Dev, Buschman, and Bowen (2010) as well as Hesford and Potter (2010) examine post-1960 developments in hospitality marketing and accounting research. Despite the contributions made by these CQ- and CHRAQ-based review articles, research that summarizes the overall pattern of recent hospitality research is largely absent although desperately needed. In other words, no extant studies, if any, meet the essential needs of hospitality practitioners, researchers, educators, and students who seek to understand the latest developments in hospitality research as presented through CQ.

CQ has a mission to carry the best in useful management research on a broad range of topics relevant to the hospitality industry (The Cornell University 2012). As such, revisiting the studies published in CQ can assist hospitality researchers and practitioners in staying informed about successful business strategies, progress, and development in the field. As the answer to the research question “What is the progress and development of hospitality research as evidenced by published articles in CQ?” remains unknown, the study reported here represents the first-ever attempt to fill this gap. It does this by reviewing, analyzing, and providing an up-to-date overview of all CQ research articles published from 2008, the year the journal was first listed in Thomson Reuters’ Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) system, to 2011. Although the journal’s core mission remains the same, Linda Canina, its former editor, claimed in 2008 that the journal would begin to feature more industry-specific content to reflect the evolution of both the hospitality industry and the journal itself (Canina 2008). Since 2008 was therefore a milestone year as well as a new start for CQ, a study analyzing all research articles it has published since then would answer the primary research question set out above and also the subquestion, “What are the latest trends in topics, subjects, methodologies, analytical methods, and authorship format among research articles published in CQ?” Drawing on a content analysis of hospitality research published in CQ over this four-year period, we hope that hospitality researchers and practitioners will be able to appreciate the historical patterns and trends in hospitality research as viewed through a top-tier journal in the field.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The next section presents an overview of CQ and its predecessor publication. This is followed by a section on methodology, which describes the data collection and organization process. The two subsequent sections present the empirical findings and a critical analysis of them. The final part of the paper sets out the conclusions and suggestions for future work.

**Background of the Journal**

CQ is the modern incarnation of CHRAQ, which was first published in May 1960. Archived copies of CQ and CHRAQ show that the editors have changed only a few times since 1990. Likewise, the journal’s publisher has also changed twice in this time, from Cornell itself (supported by Partners Composition and Brodock Press) to Elsevier Science in 1995. Its current publisher, SAGE Publications, took over in 2004. In addition, CHRAQ was renamed CQ in 2008.

According to its goals as stated in the early 2000s, CHRAQ aimed to publish quality articles that would help advance the hospitality and tourism field. Its primary audience was hospitality managers at the corporate or property level, and its editorial content included a few key management disciplines. In 2006, the journal’s aims were revised slightly to include the dissemination of research findings and illustrative cases relevant to the hospitality industry.
Given the diversity of the field, the target audience was extended to hospitality managers, developers, consultants, investors, students, and academics. Similarly, the content of CHRAQ was expanded to encompass more than ten disciplines. The objectives of CHRAQ were modified again in 2007 by the inclusion of different types of articles helping all readers involved or interested in hospitality to remain up-to-date on the latest research findings. Similarly, the scope of its editorial content was revised to better reflect the disciplines covered by contemporary management.

The year 2008 was a milestone year for the journal, as its name was changed. In the same year, CQ was officially included in the SSCI list of journals for the first time. Regardless of the changes made over the years, CQ/CHRAQ has consistently been recognized as one of the best academic journals in the hospitality field by tourism and hospitality experts (McKercher, Law, and Lam 2006). Moreover, its editor has noted that CQ’s traditional emphasis on publishing articles that contribute to management practice and knowledge development in the broader hospitality industry is likely to be maintained in the future.

**Method**

To offer a comprehensive overview of recent hospitality research published in CQ, this study adopted a content analysis approach to examine research articles published in the journal from 2008 to 2011, a period covering fourteen issues from the first issue of Volume 49 to the fourth issue of Volume 52. In other words, the target sample comprised all articles published under the journal’s new name. The data collection and analysis were undertaken from the middle of 2011 to early 2012. Research and industrial papers that made novel contributions to the hospitality literature were selected for further analysis; introductory notes, commentaries on published references, book reviews, and reprinted articles were excluded owing to their limited, if any, contributions to knowledge development (Ip, Leung, and Law 2011; Jang and Park 2011; Tsang and Hsu 2011; Yoo, Lee, and Bai 2011). In addition, short articles that merely provided updated statistics relating to the hospitality industry but did not offer any meaningful insights based on the data were also excluded. All authors individually read through each article published in the sixteen issues to determine its inclusion. Only articles recognized as relevant by all three authors were included. It is possible that personal bias may have been present during the selection process but the consensus of three authors, all of whom are experienced researchers in hospitality management, should have minimized this possibility. The data collection process yielded a final sample of 133 papers for analysis.

Prior to embarking on the data analysis, a list of research fields was compiled to examine the trends in the areas covered by recently published articles. Although a number of different classification frameworks have been used in the hospitality literature, the one used by K. Park et al. (2011) was adopted here because of its up-to-date information and relevance. Adapted from Baloglu and Assante’s (1999) study of the subject areas and research methods used in five leading hospitality journals, the framework put forward by K. Park and colleagues comprises eleven fields representing the primary functional areas of hospitality management, namely, accounting and finance (ACF), education (EDU), green and environmental issues (ENV), human resource management (HRM), information technology and management information systems (IT/MIS), legal issues (LAW), marketing (MKT), operations management (ORM), strategic management (STM), and others (OTH). Having carefully examined all articles included in the sample, consumer behavior (CB) was added as a new field to enable these issues to be properly differentiated from general marketing issues. The twelve fields used in this study are described in Exhibit 1.

---

**Exhibit 1:**

**List of Research Fields and Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>Studies related to accounting, financial, and revenue aspects of hospitality organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Studies related to tourist behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>Studies related to teaching and education issues in the hospitality industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>Studies related to operations and management of food service organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>Studies related to environmental strategies and management in the hospitality industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>Studies related to human resource strategies and management in the hospitality industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT/MIS</td>
<td>Studies related to management and application of information technologies in the hospitality industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>Studies related to lawsuits and legal and ethical issues in the hospitality industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKT</td>
<td>Studies related to marketing and promotion practices in the hospitality industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORM</td>
<td>Studies related to operations management among hospitality organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STM</td>
<td>Studies related to the evaluation and control of business strategies of hospitality organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH</td>
<td>Studies that cannot be categorized into the above research fields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACF = accounting and finance; CB = consumer behavior; EDU = education; FSM = food service management; ENV = green and environmental issues; HRM = human resource management; IT/MIS = information technology and management information systems; LAW = legal issues; MKT = marketing; ORM = operations management; STM = strategic management; OTH = others.

a. CB is a newly added research field.
The procedure of grouping and classifying articles was rigorously designed to ensure objectivity and reliability. First, each of the authors independently reviewed all 133 articles included in the sample during the course of the evaluation process and assigned each to one of the twelve fields listed in Exhibit 1. The classification results input by the three authors were then cross-compared to ensure consistency. In the few cases in which the same article was assigned to different groupings by the authors, we reviewed the articles again, and further discussion took place until consensus was reached. In other words, the interrater reliability is ensured as the grouping and classification of papers into research fields were performed both individually and jointly by the three authors.

In addition to classifying the articles by field, each was also separately analyzed by affiliated hospitality sector, data collection method, data type (primary or secondary), data nature (quantitative or qualitative), major data analysis method used, geographical coverage of the study, the country or region where the data were collected, number of authors, position of author(s), and contributing institutions or organizations. The same classification approach as for assigning papers to fields was used. The following section presents and analyzes the empirical findings.

Findings
This study did not adopt the approach taken in some literature review articles whereby annual or historical fluctuations in research findings are outlined (see, for example, Dev, Buschman, and Bowen 2010; Thompson 2010). Although the short time frame (i.e., four years) made it inappropriate to analyze findings on an annual basis, the annual results 2008 to 2011 are still presented in different exhibits as appropriate. As noted previously, twelve areas were identified as the research fields. Exhibit 2 lists the groupings assigned to the sample papers, and Exhibit 3 shows the annual frequency with which articles in each of these groupings were published.

As indicated by Exhibits 2 and 3, ACF was the most researched field with twenty-three papers, followed by HRM with twenty-one and ORM with sixteen. No papers related to EDU were found. ENV (six papers), MKT (seven papers), and LAW (seven papers) were the three least popular fields. Given that accounting is an essential element of running any type of successful business (Weygandt et al. 2009), it is not surprising that many researchers and practitioners are interested in examining the accounting, financial, and revenue aspects of hospitality organizations. One possible reason for the attention paid to HRM is the labor-intensive nature of the hospitality industry. Human resources are often considered as one of the essential elements in delivering service quality, customer satisfaction and loyalty, competitive advantage, and organizational performance (Back, Lee, and Abbott 2011; Kusluvan et al. 2010). This may partly justify the amount of attention paid to the topic by hospitality researchers and the amount of empirical studies that have been conducted.

An analysis of affiliated sectors covered by the papers included shows that a wide range of hospitality-related functional sectors were identified. Exhibit 4 reports that hotels (sixty-three papers) and restaurants (thirty-three papers) were the leading sectors; tour operators and wineries were the least-common fields, with only one paper in each. This finding is not unexpected, as CQ is a hospitality-oriented journal. To better illustrate the topical trend across different hospitality sectors, Exhibit 5 presents a contingency table of research fields and affiliated hospitality sectors. As shown in the table, all research fields were investigated in the context of hotels, except for FSM. However, hotel-related studies in CQ generally focused on ORM (with twelve papers), ACF (eleven papers), and HRM (ten papers). Similarly, studies in the context of restaurants examined all but one of the research fields. However, authors of those restaurant-related studies usually focused on the ORM of food service organizations (FSM with ten papers), whereas studies on legal issues were absent altogether. Apart from the above two sectors, no special trend was identified, as more than 72.2 percent of the hospitality research studies reported in CQ were conducted either in the context of hotels (47.4%) or restaurants (24.8%).

As found in other literature review studies (such as Jang and Park 2011; Tsang and Hsu 2011), surveys were the most commonly used means of data collection among the papers (36.1%). Although questionnaires are generally used to collect data in social science and management studies, published references were also widely used in forty instances, making them the second most commonly used data collection method (see Exhibit 6). One possible reason for this result is that 27 (20.3%) of the 133 papers analyzed were review articles, which are the type most likely to have used published references as the primary data source. A total of 43 papers used content analysis, the most popular method as indicated in Exhibit 7. This finding was expected as content analysis is commonly adopted as a data analysis method in review articles.

This study also included a citation analysis of the reviewed papers and others. The average number of citations on Google Scholar for reviewed papers was 6.33 and for other papers 3.42. The corresponding averages were on Scopus 3.22 and 1.71, and on Web of Science 1.81 and 1.23. Despite the differences in the mean number of citations between review papers and other papers, statistical analysis showed this to be insignificant ($p > .05$). In terms of data type (primary or secondary) and nature (quantitative or qualitative data), the number of papers using primary data ($n = 70$) was about the same as those using secondary data ($n = 63$). Among these papers, ninety (67.7%) relied on
quantitative data, with forty-one (30.8%) using qualitative data and two (1.5%) using both.

The analysis of geographical coverage is shown in Exhibit 8. In a pattern that can probably be attributed to the convenience of data collection, most articles focused on topics related to a particular country (n = 66), whereas attraction was the least popular focus (n = 1). In relation to the countries or regions where data were collected, fifty-one papers used data collected from the United States and twenty-four used data collected from Asia (see Exhibit 9).

Among Asian countries and regions, Korea and Taiwan were the main focus, with six instances in both cases; the corresponding numbers for Hong Kong and Mainland China were three and two. As the world’s most populated country and one of the most promising markets for hospitality development, one might have expected Mainland China to be covered by a greater number of articles. Among the ten European-based papers, six used data from Spain and each of the others used data from the Aegean region, Poland, Norway, and the United Kingdom. The geographical analysis therefore revealed an uneven distribution of data in terms of national or regional coverage.

Categorization by author and institution showed that the 133 papers were written by 297 authors affiliated with 116
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Contingency Table of Research Fields and Affiliated Hospitality Sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACF</th>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>ORM</th>
<th>STM</th>
<th>FSM</th>
<th>IT/MIS</th>
<th>OTH</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>LAW</th>
<th>MKT</th>
<th>ENV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casinos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality in general</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality and tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple sectors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee shops/cafeteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destinations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism in general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour operators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACF = accounting and finance; HRM = human resource management; ORM = operations management; STM = strategic management; FSM = food service management; IT/MIS = information technology and management information systems; OTH = others; CB = consumer behavior; LAW = legal issues; MKT = marketing; ENV = green and environmental issues.
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institutions and organizations around the world. In line with the increasingly common practice of collaborative research, 73.7 percent were cowritten by multiple authors (Exhibit 10), with the remaining 35 papers having single authors. Exhibit 11 shows the results of a further analysis conducted according to author position, from which it can be seen that most papers were produced by academic researchers, most of whom were experienced researchers holding a professorship or associate professorship. Considering the high quality of CQ and its wide recognition, many experienced researchers from around the world choose it as the channel to disseminate their findings. Although the authors included postgraduate students, industry managers, and teaching staff, these groups represented a much smaller proportion of authors than did academic researchers. Moreover, 88.7 percent (118) of the papers examined were written by authors from academic institutions, with only 3.8 percent (5) written by industry practitioners. The remaining 7.5 percent (10) of the papers were coauthored by members of both groups. Exhibit 12 lists the 20 institutions and organizations making the biggest contributions to the papers included in this study. Most are located in the United States, with Cornell University, the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, and Pennsylvania State University being the most prolific institutions in terms of CQ contributions.

Analysis and Evaluation

As its primary audience comprises both scholars and practitioners in the hospitality arena, CQ aims to achieve an appropriate balance between technical input from academic researchers and readable articles on the application of research by industry practitioners. In all but a few exceptional cases, the papers analyzed therefore included implications for practitioners. Nevertheless, some readers with limited knowledge of the state of academic research in certain disciplines may find some of the papers hard to comprehend and thus have difficulty in appreciating their industrial or managerial implications. For example, Dev, Thomas, et al. (2010) discuss brand rights issues and set out managerial implications relating to hotel management agreements. However, readers without background knowledge of U.S. law would find it difficult to follow and interpret their findings as they assume a certain degree of legal expertise.

Although the papers analyzed in this study were generally clearly presented and well prepared, a couple of minor errors in language use or preparation were noted. Another observation that can be made is that the papers were generally related to the goals of the journal. Topics were usually addressed timely and had a comprehensible industrial focus, making CQ different from other research-oriented journals.
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in the hospitality field. In particular, some articles discussed unique topics such as celebrity endorsers (Magnini, Garcia, and Honeycutt 2010) and customer choice modeling (Verma 2010). These studies may offer novel theoretical knowledge to managers working in the industry. Moreover, most of the articles did not use sophisticated data analysis methods, probably due to the nature of the studies they described. In addition, some articles that lacked empirical data appeared to be more in the nature of policy or consultancy reports rather than research papers. The lack of empirical testing of the concepts explored in some papers presented another limitation on their academic rigor. Hospitality researchers could, and probably should, diversify the methodological approaches used and apply more rigorous methods when addressing different research problems.

As indicated in the previous section, the United States is the journal’s home country in the sense of having the largest number of institutions making the greatest contributions, and was also the country setting most often focused on by authors in terms of data collection or geographical coverage. Although it is encouraging to note the positive support provided by researchers from the United States, the overwhelming dominance of contributions from a single country inevitably results in a concentration of experience and practice there. That is, although the findings, especially those related to legal issues, make sense to U.S. audiences, their applicability to audiences in other regions of the world may be limited, thus potentially restricting their generalizability.

Despite the high quality of the published articles, some noticeable gaps were still found. For instance, Tse and Ho state that “a representative list of hotels drawn from the membership directory of the Hong Kong Hotels Association, . . . included hotels with 5- and 4-star ratings” (2009, 462). However, there is no official star-rating system for hotels in Hong Kong. Although it is possible the list had been drawn from another channel such as a third-party travel web site, the source of such a classification should be clearly stated. Another example is the inaccurate use of methodology in Hu, Parsa, and Self’s study in which data were “collected . . . over a four-week period at a busy retail shopping center in Taiwan, where we randomly invited people to participate in a survey” (2010, 349). From a practical perspective, it is simply not possible for the authors to have “randomly” invited people to participate due to their unclear sampling frame. Camillo, Connolly, and Kim (2008) develop their study and discuss their findings primarily on the basis of interview data. In these circumstances, the authors should not have referred, as they did, to questionnaires, as readers expecting a discussion of survey findings would have been somewhat perplexed given that none were reported. In another study, Karatepe and Magaji (2008) draw on 102 usable questionnaire responses to conduct factor analysis for an instrument comprising twenty-one attributes. Their sample population does not, however, appear to meet the

---

**Exhibit 12:**
The Twenty Institutions/Organizations with the Greatest Number of Contributions to CQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution/Organization</th>
<th>Total Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cornell University, USA</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Nevada, USA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University, USA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seattle University, USA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Central Florida, USA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Alicante, Spain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Purdue University, USA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of Houston, USA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Michigan State University, USA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Florida State University, USA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kyung Hee University, South Korea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of Nevsehir, Turkey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tunghai University, Taiwan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, USA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Appalachian State University, USA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kansas State University, USA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Revenue Analytics, USA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>University of Cantabria, Spain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CQ = Cornell Hospitality Quarterly.
criterion for the minimum number of usable questionnaires (105) suggested by Baggio and Klobas (2011).

Another interesting observation made in this study relates to an editor’s note stating that authors whose articles had been published in leading business journals were invited to submit articles to CQ (see Volume 50, Issue 1, pp. 6-7). Although this initiative may be beneficial in attracting prominent business scholars from around the world to submit articles to CQ, some of the published articles were simply reprinted (or shortened) versions of other papers. In some cases, readers were asked to refer to publications in other journals to obtain a better understanding of the literature related to the study. As an example, it is somewhat surprising to read “this article was adapted from Zhou et al. (2007)” (Dev et al. 2009, 19) and “see Zhou et al. (2007) for detailed information about the measures, the statistical tests we performed and the control variables we used” (Dev et al. 2009, 25). These statements might easily cause readers to become confused about the similarities or differences between the two papers. A final point to note here is that the preservation of author anonymity during the review stages is maintained by citing authors’ prior studies in the third person during review but then revising such references to the first person on publication.

**Conclusion**

This paper reports the results of a study analyzing the research articles published in CQ over a four-year period. Although the study was limited by the scope of analysis, the time span covered, and the focus on a single journal, its findings nevertheless offer some insights into hospitality researchers. As a top-tier journal that is well recognized by international scholars in the field (McKercher, Law, and Lam 2006), CQ achieves its stated objective of providing an avenue for knowledge dissemination in the hospitality industry. Readers can generally find useful information on the latest research findings and the most up-to-date industry practices. This, in turn, assists hospitality managers and researchers to improve their business operations and strategies. Moreover, the managerial and theoretical implications of some of the papers published in CQ are insightful and offer the potential to facilitate synergies in the development of theory and knowledge in academia.

The gaps identified in this study—such as the uneven distribution of published articles in different research fields and affiliated hospitality sectors, across different data collection and analysis methods, and in terms of authorship and authors’ affiliated institutions—should be addressed in future research endeavors. One way to achieve this would be to encourage more international contributions, especially from emerging countries or regions. This would make CQ a truly international journal that benefits hospitality managers, academics, and students around the world.

A natural extension of this study would be to examine the citations for the papers analyzed. In other words, it would be a valuable exercise in the future to establish the types of references used by the authors of the articles examined here. Another useful avenue would be to repeat this study using longitudinal data. An examination of how editors’ research interests as well as strategic changes in the hospitality industry affect the fields covered in the journal might be of interest to academics and practitioners alike. Besides, the authors acknowledge that this study is limited by the potentially fuzzy grouping of articles. For example, one paper on restaurant revenue management was assigned to the ACF group instead of being categorized as a FSM article. Another possible direction for future work would be to group the articles on the basis of functional areas of the hospitality business rather than according to broad management categories.

Although its articles focus on specific areas, disciplines, and fields, CQ should use its status as one of the few leading hospitality journals by taking the lead in defining hospitality and how hospitality businesses should be managed. By doing so, it would help address the major challenges facing the industry worldwide. In this context, the authors would like to raise the following philosophical question: Although much effort has been directed toward hospitality management and research, what does hospitality actually comprise? While it is unlikely that an answer agreeable to everyone will emerge within the near future, the extant and future articles published in CQ are likely to help illuminate this fundamental question.
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