Journal of Hospitality &
Tourism Research

http://jht.sagepub.com/

Hospitality and Tourism Research Rankings by Author, University, and Country Using Six Major Journals : The First Decade of the New Millennium

Kwangmin Park, WooMi Jo Phillips, Deborah D. Canter and JéAnna Abbott

The online version of this article can be found at:
http://jht.sagepub.com/content/35/3/381

Published by:
$SAGE

http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:

CHRIE
Council on Hotel, Restaurant,
and Institutional Education

International Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education

Additional services and information for **Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research** can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://jht.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://jht.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://jht.sagepub.com/content/35/3/381.refs.html

HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM RESEARCH RANKINGS BY AUTHOR, UNIVERSITY, AND COUNTRY USING SIX MAJOR JOURNALS: THE FIRST DECADE OF THE NEW MILLENNIUM

Kwangmin Park
Sejong University
WooMi Jo Phillips
North Dakota State University
Deborah D. Canter
Kansas State University
JéAnna Abbott
University of Houston

This study reports productivity of authors, universities, and countries using research contributions to top hospitality and tourism journals. Since the new millennium, hospitality and tourism research has seen tremendous expansion and diversification. To understand hospitality and tourism research in the first decade of the new millennium, this study examined articles published in the six most commonly cited hospitality and tourism journals: Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, International Journal of Hospitality Management, Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, Tourism Management, Annals of Tourism Research, *and* Journal of Travel Research. *To provide more insight, this study classified and analyzed articles from the selected journals into various research agendas. A total of 2,834 research articles in these journals from 2000 to 2009 revealed the 50 most prolific authors and universities and the 20 countries of residence of these authors and institutions in the field of hospitality and tourism. In addition, overall productivity rankings for 100 hospitality and tourism authors and universities and 30 countries are presented. The results of this study provide valuable and detailed information for academic stakeholders such as current and prospect graduate students, faculty, and academic administrators.*

KEYWORDS: *hospitality; tourism; research ranking; author's university; country; research productivity; contribution*

Ten years have passed since the start of the new millennium. Hospitality and tourism research has increasingly expanded in this first decade (Airey & Tribe, 2000; Dale & Robinson, 2001; Jogaratnam, Chon, McCleary, Mena, & Yoo, 2005).

With the considerable growth of hospitality and tourism industry and more governments recognizing the industry's contribution to national and local economies, a number of academic institutions have expanded degree offerings and started specializing in these disciplines (Jogaratnam et al., 2005). Thus, the quality and quantity of academic research published by universities could contribute considerably to international recognition and represent the research productivity of institutions. The number of research articles published in quality journals is one way to rate productivity and determine which institutions and countries should be recognized as leaders in the field. Active authors are important to a university because they publish quality academic articles that bring prestige to their academic institutions. The contributions of authors and universities to hospitality and tourism research are essential not only for academic advances but also for developing practical applications. With the hospitality and tourism industries becoming more global over the past decade, the degree of research diversification at the country level is also important. Thus, understanding which authors, universities, and countries have contributed to research in hospitality and tourism during this period can give us meaningful insight into this growing field.

As per Jogaratnam et al. (2005), analyzing research productivity and contributions has its benefits. For example, such data provide academic administrators with a meaningful way to compare the efficiency and productivity of their institution with others. Also, such an analysis provides prospective graduate students and existing faculty members seeking new and collaborative research opportunities information they need to make appropriate choices. However, previous studies (Jogaratnam et al., 2005; Page, 2005; Ryan, 2005; Schmidgall & Woods, 1998; Weaver, McCleary, & Farrar, 1990) have not supplied sufficient information on the details of specific research areas. To find out which authors and academic institutions publish in a specific research field, each area of research must be identified (e.g., accounting and finance, human resource management, or marketing). With this information, prospective graduate students can easily find the best match among academic institutions for their research interests. Faculty members could also use this information to network and find new opportunities and collaborative research projects. Additionally, this study could provide useful information to universities with multiple global outreach programs. Finally, academic administrators can examine their institution's strengths and weaknesses in various research fields and use this information to create new faculty positions.

This study appraises hospitality and tourism research productivity during the first decade of the new millennium to determine which authors, universities, and countries have contributed the most to specific fields of hospitality and tourism research by counting the number of publications in quality journals. This study used fractional and weighted fractional scoring to gauge the number of research publications by authors, universities, and countries in six highly recognized journals in hospitality and tourism from 2000 to 2009. Even though this study investigated the quantity of published articles, we sampled only the six most cited and most highly recognized hospitality and tourism journals. These journals have

also been used in previous studies (Ferreira, DeFranco, & Rappole, 1994; Frechtling, 2004; McKercher, 2005; McKercher, Law, & Lam, 2006; Pechlaner, Zehrer, Matzler, & Abfalter, 2004; Ryan, 2005). Based on previous studies, three journals in hospitality and three in tourism were selected. Consequently, this study does focus on the quantity as well as quality of research in hospitality and tourism. The following section reviews prior empirical studies that investigated the scholarly productivity of authors, universities, and countries in hospitality and tourism. Next, the methodology and scope of this study are discussed, including the method used to calculate the contributions of authors, universities, and countries in hospitality and tourism research. Finally, this study presents its findings and concludes with academic and practical implications.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Prior Studies

Drawing on the existing research in hospitality and tourism management, we discovered two major research directions. One stream of the literature investigated the publication productivity of academic authors and institutions in hospitality and tourism (Jogaratnam et al., 2005; Page, 2005; Ryan, 2005; Schmidgall & Woods, 1998; Weaver et al., 1990). The second stream examined research trends and methodologies used in hospitality and tourism research (Ballantyne, Packer, & Axelsen, 2009; Baloglu & Assante, 1999; Chon, Evans, & Sutherlin, 1989; Crawford-Welch & McCleary, 1992; Dann, Nash, & Pearce, 1988; Eder & Umbreit, 1988; Harris & Brown, 1998; Rivera & Upchurch, 2008; Svensson, Svaeri, & Einarsen, 2009a, 2009b).

Strengths and weaknesses are evident in both approaches. In studies focusing on publication productivity, results provided academic stakeholders with useful information on research productivity and the efficiency of particular authors and universities. However, the topics investigated by these authors and universities were not included in these studies. On the other hand, although research trend studies supply detailed information about which topics are covered, they do not provide information as to which universities and researchers were actively engaged in that topic. To address these two issues, this study combined both approaches into one study to provide information about research productivity and topics, focusing on authors, universities, and countries.

To provide detailed and useful information, this study categorized the research fields of hospitality and tourism. Baloglu and Assante (1999) categorized hospitality research into 6 fields: marketing, finance, administration/strategy, operations, research and development, and human resources. However, the growing diversity of research topics in the past decade required us to divide hospitality research into 11 categories: accounting and finance (ACF), education (EDU), green and environmental issues (ENV), foodservice management (FSM), human resource management (HRM), information technology and management information systems (IT/MIS), legal issues (LAW), marketing (MKT), operations management (ORM), strategic management (STM), and other (OTH).

Ballantyen et al. (2008) classified tourism research into 21 categories, although some of the tourism categories overlapped hospitality topics. This study recategorized tourism research into 20 categories: attraction management (ATT); crisis and safety management (CSM); destination marketing and management (DMKT); tourism development and residence perception (DVP); economic impact and econometrics (ECO); education (EDU); geographical issues (GEO); general marketing (GMKT); image and branding (IMG); information technology (IT); meetings, incentives, conventions, and exhibitions, including festivals and fairs (MICE); tourism planning (PLN); politics, policy, legal, and governmental issues (PPL); supply chain management (SCM); market segmentation (SEG); special interests tourism such as heritage, farm, cultural, wine, or food tourism (SIT); service management (SMT); sustainable tourism and ecotourism (SUT); tourists' perceptions and behavior (TPB); and other (OTH). Thus, the results of this study provide more useful information about which researchers and universities actively published academic articles in special categories as well as providing an overview of hospitality and tourism research over the past decade.

Target Journals and Calculating Method

A critical factor in this type of study is deciding which journals to select for analysis. In general, journal publications serve as a primary indicator of knowledge creation and scholarly productivity. However, not all productivity is the same. That is, not all publications are equal indications of influential, effective scholarship. Instead, publications in the most selective and influential journals were chosen as indicators of research excellence, and thus are recognized as more prestigious within the academy. Hospitality and tourism academia claim a rapidly expanding number of refereed journals. Several previous studies (Ferreira et al., 1994; Frechtling, 2004; McKercher, 2005; McKercher et al., 2006; Pechlaner et al., 2004; Ryan, 2005) investigated the contributions and prestige of hospitality and tourism journals. Even though not all researchers agreed, they did show consensus on the most highly recognized hospitality and tourism journals. In hospitality, the following journals were the most influential: *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research* (*JHTR*), *International Journal of Hospitality Management* (*IJHM*), and *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly* (*CHQ*). In the area of tourism, *Tourism Management* (*TM*), *Annals of Tourism Research* (*ATR*), and *Journal of Travel Research* (*JTR*) were rated most highly. Consistent with the above selection, Svensson et al. (2009a, 2009b) sampled the same six journals, and Jogaratnam et al. (2005) collected data from the three tourism journals. Thus, following prior studies, this study chose these same six hospitality and tourism journals for analysis.

As Jogaratnam et al. (2005) indicated, in research productivity studies various methodologies can be used to evaluate the contributions of authors and academic universities: surveys, citation analysis, content analysis, or Delphi analysis. One traditional method of analysis is simply to count the number of articles published in academic journals. For example, Laband and Wells

(1998) counted the number of pages in each article published in three well-established journals in economics. They found that the average length of an article depended on the subject of each article. However, McKercher (2008) identified the most prolific scholars in tourism research by reporting their impact, which was determined by the number of times their scholarly articles were cited. Another method used recently (Jogaratnam et al., 2005; Severt, Tesone, Bottorff, & Carpenter, 2009) counted the frequency or "instances" of authors and universities in a sample of journal articles. For example, if one article was cowritten by three authors from three different universities, each author and each university was given one point for that article. If an article was published by one author from one university, the author and the affiliated university would each get one point for the article. Using this instance method, Jogaratnam et al. (2005) analyzed three tourism journals, *Annals of Tourism Research*, *Journal of Travel Research*, and *Tourism Management* from 1991 to 2001. In their study, they simply counted the number of author appearances in published articles, giving each author credit for an appearance regardless of the order of authorship (first, second, third, and so forth) or the number of coauthors. Severt et al. (2009) used the same method as Jorgartnam et al. (2005) to count the instances of universities, articles, and authors.

However, the instance counting method inflates the weight of multiple authorship articles, while diminishing the weight of single author articles. To overcome this limitation, our study used a fractional scoring method. For example, one article written by a single author at a university would be worth one point per category (i.e., author or university). However, if a single article is cowritten by three authors from three different universities, the authors and universities would divide the point and each would receive ⅓ point for the article. The benefit of the fractional scoring method is that the contribution of published articles is neither inflated nor deflated, regardless of the number of authors, affiliated universities, or countries. Moreover, the total number of authors, universities, and countries is the same as the number of articles published during the sample period. For example, if a journal published 100 articles by 500 affiliated authors in a year, the total number by the instance method would be 500. Yet the total number using the fractional scoring method would be 100, the same as the number of articles published by the journal. Accordingly, the fractional scoring system offers a clearer picture of the results of research contributions and productivity at the level of author, university, and country.

However, the fractional scoring method faces one issue in measuring university and country productivity and their contribution to academic research. Each hospitality and tourism program/department/school is different in size, which could affect productivity. For example, if a program from University A has 5 faculty members and a program from University B has 20 faculty members, logically, the fractional score from University B should be higher than University A after controlling for all other factors. Thus, to measure research productivity and contributions at the level of university and country, the size of each institution or country is critical. To overcome this limitation, this study incorporated a

weighted fractional scoring method, calculated by dividing the fractional score by the number of faculty members in each hospitality and tourism program/department/school. At the university level, the fractional score shows how much total academic research has been produced, while the weighted fractional score represents the amount of research produced per faculty member in that university. However, applying the weighted fractional scoring method at the country level is not possible because it is difficult to identify all universities offering degrees in hospitality and tourism. Although using the fractional scoring method at country level is limited, the fractional score still identifies which countries publish more in the fields of hospitality and tourism. This study applied the fractional score at the author, university, and country level and the fractional and weighted fractional score at the university level in the analysis.

DATA AND ANALYSES

This study explored research articles published in three hospitality journals (*JHTR*, *IJHM*, and *CHQ*) and three tourism journals (*TM*, *ATR*, and *JTR*) from 2000 to 2009, including full-length academic articles and research notes but excluding editors' comments, simple trend reports, commentaries, and book reviews. In this study, we assigned fractional scores to hospitality and tourism articles and then summed the scores to determine the overall productivity and contributions of authors, universities, and countries. Even though this study sampled data from three hospitality and three tourism journals, some articles in the hospitality journals were about tourism and some articles in the tourism journals included hospitality research. Thus, this study categorized articles as hospitality or tourism based not on the journal characteristics but on the article itself. This made for a more logical process and provides more precise information to academic stakeholders. Next, we identified a subcategory of hospitality and tourism research for each article. When categorizing each article as either hospitality or tourism and then classifying it as a particular subcategory, the title of the article, abstract, and keywords were checked. If the category was not obvious, the contents of the whole article were thoroughly examined. Finally, this study added and reported the fractional scores for author, university, and country according to journal. This information shows the publication tendencies of authors, universities, and countries for various journals. Additionally, the weighted fractional score addressed institution size bias. The number of faculty members, including academic staff but excluding visiting, adjunct, and emeritus professors, was collected from the webpage of each hospitality and tourism program/department/school during the first 2 weeks of August 2010.

Using the fractional counting technique and examining the 11 hospitality research categories and 21 tourism categories, this study identified the 50 most prolific authors and universities in both hospitality and tourism. The study also revealed the 100 most prolific authors and universities for total articles on hospitality and tourism. Additionally, we reported the top 20 countries for both hospitality and tourism research and the top 30 countries based on all articles on hospitality and tourism.

Table 1
Descriptions of Published Hospitality and Tourism Research (2000–2009)

				Number of Authors	
Journal	Hospitality Articles	Tourism Articles	Total Articles	Total Appeared Number of Authors	Average Number of Author per Article
JHTR	201	46	247	552	2.23
IJHM	426	10	436	910	2.09
CHQ	352	27	379	786	2.07
Subtotal	979	83	1,062	2,248	2.12
TM	76	722	798	1,733	2.17
ATR	17	536	553	1,041	1.88
JTR	10	411	421	949	2.25
Subtotal	103	1,669	1,772	3,723	2.10
Total	1,082	1,752	2,834	5,971	2.11

Note: *JHTR = Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*; *IJHM = Journal of International Journal of Hospitality Management*; *CHQ = Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*; *TM = Tourism Management*; *ATR = Annals of Tourism Research*; *JTR = Journal of Travel Research*.

RESULTS

Descriptive Information

Table 1 shows the overall information on hospitality and tourism articles published during the sample period. In the first decade of the new millennium, 2,834 articles were published by these six journals. The three hospitality journals published 1,062 articles, and the tourism journals published 1,772 articles. Among the six journals, the *JHTR* published the least number of articles (247), and *TM* published the most (798). However, the *JHTR* published 46 tourism articles (18.6%), which is the largest number of tourism articles in the three hospitality journals. Also, *TM* published 76 hospitality articles (9.5%), which is the largest number of hospitality articles in the three tourism journals. Table 1 also shows how many times authors appeared in all journal articles. In total, there were 2,834 published articles with 5,971 authors, with an average of 2.11 authors per article. This number is very similar among all six journals. *ATR* had the smallest number (1.88 authors per article), and *JTR* had the largest (2.55 authors per article).

Research Rankings in Hospitality

Table 2 shows the 50 most prolific authors in the three hospitality journals. Even if hospitality articles were published in the tourism journals, this study still categorized them as hospitality research. The total number of points garnered by hospitality research was 1,082. The 50 most prolific authors in hospitality research garnered 280.33 points, accounting for 25.9% of all the points assigned to hospitality articles. Among individual authors identified during the sample period, Anna S. Mattila (Pennsylvania State University) wrote 28 hospitality articles and received the highest score (16.33). She was followed by SooCheong (Shawn) Jang (Purdue University: 12.50) and Cathy A. Enz (Cornell University: 11.25). Anna S. Mattila's total score (16.33) indicates that the author contributed

Table 2
Hospitality Research Rankings by Author

	Authors	Current Affiliation	Total Score	ACF	EDU	ENV	FSM	HRM	IT/MIS	LAW	MKT	ORM	STM	OTH	Total Number of Articles
								Hospitality Research Field							
1	Anna S. Mattila	Penn State	16.33	0.67							12.67	1.50	0.50	1.00	28
2	SooCheong (Shawn) Jang	Purdue	12.50	5.67	0.25						4.00	1.00	1.00	0.33	28
3	Cathy A. Enz	Cornell	11.25					3.83	0.33		2.00	0.33	1.67	3.08	19
4	Sheryl E. Kimes	Cornell	10.92						1.00		2.08	7.83			17
5	Woo Gon Kim	Florida State	9.83	2.50				0.67	0.33		5.67	0.33	0.33		24
6	Michael Lynn	Cornell	9.50					1.00			8.50				12
7	Rob Law	HK Poly U.	8.03						3.83		0.67	0.50	1.00	2.03	18
8	Gary M. Thompson	Cornell	8.00			0.50						7.50			10
9	Haemoon Oh	U. of Mass	7.50								6.50		0.33	0.33	11
10	John W. O'Neill	Penn State	7.17	3.50				0.42	0.33		2.08		1.17		15
10	Zheng Gu	UNLV	7.17	6.17								1.00			13
12	David S. Sherwyn	Cornell	6.78					1.00		5.78					15
13	Michael C. Sturman	Cornell	6.37					3.67		0.20				2.00	10
14	Peter O'Connor	Essec Business School, FR	6.25						3.50		0.50	1.00		0.50	9
15	Seoki Lee	Temple	6.17	3.50							1.25	0.50	1.83		11
15	Dennis Reynolds	Washington State	6.17				0.50	2.33			0.33	2.83	0.50		10
17	Robert J. Harrington	U. of Arkansas	6.08		1.08			0.50					4.50		9
18	Osman M. Karatepe	E. Mediterranean U.	5.70					4.70			1.00				11
19	J. Bruce Tracey	Cornell	5.33					3.83			1.00				11
19	Vincent P. Magnini	Virginia Tech	5.33					3.00		0.50	1.00		1.00	0.33	8
21	Terry Lam	HK Poly U.	4.83					2.00			1.17		0.50	0.33	11
21	Michael D. Olsen	Virginia Tech[a]	4.83	1.00		0.50			0.33		0.50	0.33	1.50	1.00	9
21	Zvi Schwartz	UIUC	4.83				0.33		0.50			4.00			8
24	Alex M. Susskind	Cornell	4.67					0.83			3.50	0.33			8
25	Kate Walsh	Cornell	4.50					0.50			1.00		0.67	2.33	7
25	Robert J. Kwortnik, Jr.	Cornell	4.50								1.00		0.50	3.00	5

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

#	Authors	Current Affiliation	Total Score	ACF	EDU	ENV	FSM	HRM	IT/MIS	LAW	MKT	ORM	STM	OTH	Total Number of Articles
27	Wilco W. Chan	HK Poly U.	4.46			3.46		0.50				0.50			9
28	Karthik Namasivayam	Penn State	4.17					1.33	0.33		1.50			1.00	8
29	Linda Canina	Cornell	4.08	1.75								0.33	0.67	1.33	9
29	Prakash K. Chathoth	HK Poly U.	4.08	0.50				0.25	1.50			0.33	1.50		8
31	Ki-Joon Back	U. of Houston	4.00								4.00				8
31	Sunmee Choi	Yonsei	4.00								0.50	3.50			6
33	Chekitan S. Dev	Cornell	3.83								2.92		0.67	0.25	9
34	Robert H. Woods	UNLV	3.75		0.33			1.08			0.50		1.83		8
35	Dogan Gursoy	Washington State	3.67	0.33	0.50		0.33	0.83			0.83	0.33	0.50		9
35	Hyunjoon Kim	Dong-A	3.67	3.67											8
37	Timothy R. Hinkin	Cornell	3.50					2.00			1.50				7
37	Jen-te Yang	NKHC	3.50					3.50							4
37	Mark R. Testa	San Diego State	3.50					3.00			0.50				4
40	Anthony F. Lucas	UNLV	3.42								0.50	2.08	0.50	0.33	8
41	Alan C. B. Tse	Chinese U. of HK	3.37								1.53		1.50	0.33	7
42	Clark Hu	Temple	3.33		0.25			0.33	0.67		0.58		0.50	1.00	9
42	Hyun Jeong Kim	Washington State	3.33	0.33				2.33			0.67				8
42	Arun Upneja	Penn State	3.33	3.00									0.33		7
42	Lokman Mia	Griffith	3.33	1.50				1.33	0.50						7
42	Randall S. Upchurch	UCF	3.33					0.67				0.67	1.50	0.50	7
42	Amrik Singh	U. of Denver	3.33	3.00									0.33		5
48	H. G. Parsa	UCF	3.25	0.25	0.33						1.17	1.50			8
49	Karin Weber	HK Poly U.	3.20		0.50						1.50		1.00	0.20	5
50	Andrew H. Feinstein	California State Poly	3.17		0.50		0.33	1.33			0.33	0.33	0.33		7
50	Paul A. Lynch	U. of Strathclyde	3.17			0.33					0.50		0.33	2.00	5

Note: ACF = accounting and finance; EDU = education; ENV = green and environmental issue; FSM = food service management; HRM = human resource management; IT/MIS = information technology and management information system; LAW = legal issue; MKT = marketing; ORM = operating management; STM = strategic management; OTH = others; HK Poly U. = Hong Kong Polytechnic University; U. = University; UNLV = University of Nevada, Las Vegas; E. Mediterranean = East Mediterranean; UIUC = University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; NKHC = National Kaosiung Hospitality College; HK = Hong Kong; UCF = University of Central Florida.
a. The author is now retired from the university.

the equivalent of approximately 16 single-authored articles in 10 years. The current affiliation of each author was included to provide additional information. However, the authors' score does not necessarily affect their current university affiliation. Points were assigned to the university that each author was affiliated with at the time of publication, even if they had changed university affiliation over the past 10 years. Among the 50 most prolific authors, 13 were affiliated with Cornell University, the largest number of affiliations with one university. Additionally, Table 2 notes individuals who were actively conducting research in each area. For example, Anna S. Mattila was active in hospitality marketing research; her marketing field score was the highest among the 50 authors. David S. Sherwyn was the most productive researcher in hospitality legal issues, whereas Zheng Gu was the most prolific hospitality accounting and finance researcher. Wilco W. Chan was the most productive author in hospitality green and environmental issues.

Table 3 presents the 50 most prolific universities in hospitality research. During the sample period, these 50 universities accounted for 702.69 points in hospitality research, 64.9% of all hospitality articles. In terms of fractional scores, Cornell University contributed the most to hospitality research. Cornell University showed strength in hospitality marketing, operations management, and human resource management. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University came next, receiving 64.41 points and contributing approximately 6% of the hospitality research. Human resource management, green and environmental issues, and strategic management were their strongest research topics. Hospitality marketing was the strongest area for Pennsylvania State University. Of the 50 most prolific universities, Oxford Brookes University ranked the highest (4.61) in weighted fractional scores; their research productivity per faculty member was the highest among the 50 universities. Given these results, prospective graduate students, relocating faculty members, and universities' administrators searching for new faculty can better focus their efforts.

Table 4 shows the 20 countries that contributed the most to hospitality research. The United States was strongest in hospitality research, followed by Hong Kong and the United Kingdom. The United States received 639.20 points, 59.1% of the hospitality research during the last decade. Presumably, this is due to the number of hospitality programs and schools in the United States when compared with other countries. Interestingly, although Hong Kong came in second place with a total score of 88.28, it ranked first in the area of green and environmental issues. The United Kingdom and Australia focused more on human resource management and hospitality marketing, whereas Taiwan concentrated on human resource management and operation management.

Although Hong Kong is a special administrative region of the People's Republic of China, we counted the number of publications separately for Hong Kong and China instead of combining them to provide more specific information. When the total scores of Hong Kong (88.28) and China (5.94) are combined, the total score is 94.22, putting China as a whole in second place with a contribution rate of approximately 8.7% of hospitality research.

Table 3

Hospitality Research Rankings by University

	University	Total Score	Hospitality Research Field											Weighted Score	Total Appeared Number
			ACF	EDU	ENV	FSM	HRM	IT/MIS	LAW	MKT	ORM	STM	OTH		
1	Cornell	134.88	10.17	0.50	1.00	1.00	23.50	4.92	8.07	33.83	25.75	8.90	17.25	1.95	248
2	HK Poly U.	64.41	3.00	3.00	9.63		11.58	8.50		8.53	2.83	9.00	8.33	1.13	140
3	Pennsylvania State	50.17	9.00	0.50			7.42	0.50		24.75	2.50	3.00	2.50	1.52	101
4	UNLV	41.67	8.50	1.08		1.00	3.92	0.33	1.25	10.33	7.67	6.92	0.67	0.72	94
5	Purdue	25.92	7.50	1.25			5.17	0.33	1.25	8.25	0.50	1.67		1.18	63
6	Griffith	23.58	5.00	1.00			6.42	1.00		8.17		1.00	1.00	0.62	56
7	Virginia Tech	23.08	1.50	0.33			6.00	0.50		8.83	0.33	4.33	1.25	1.21	52
8	UCF	19.58		2.33			5.08	1.50		4.00	1.33	2.33	3.00	0.49	40
9	Washington State	19.33	0.67	1.50		2.00	7.17			2.67	1.83	2.50	1.00	1.21	40
10	Temple	16.17	4.00	0.50			1.50	2.00		2.25	1.25	3.17	1.50	0.85	38
11	Chinese U. of HK	14.53	1.00				0.50	0.67		6.28	0.33	4.00	1.75	0.39	40
12	Kansas State	14.00	2.50		1.00	1.00	1.33	0.50		5.50	1.00	0.50	0.67	0.56	32
13	Oxford Brookes	13.83	1.00	2.00			5.33	0.50		1.50	0.50	1.00	2.00	4.61	21
14	U. of Surrey	13.27				3.60	1.50	0.50		6.67			1.00	0.60	32
15	Iowa State	13.08				0.50		2.00		7.58		1.00	2.00	0.69	24
16	Oklahoma State	12.50	2.83				2.00	0.67		6.33	0.33	0.33		1.25	31
17	Florida State	11.33	0.83				3.00	0.33	0.50	2.67		3.00	1.00	1.26	31
18	Michigan State	10.83	1.50	0.33		0.67	4.00	0.50		2.00	1.00	0.33	0.50	0.36	27
19	E. Mediterranean	10.50					9.50			1.00				0.38	23
20	B-GUN	8.83				1.00	1.50					1.33	2.00	n/a	16
21	The Ohio State U.	8.42	0.75				2.83			1.83	3.00			0.47	20
22	UIUC	7.83						1.50	1.50	1.33	4.00	1.00		0.52	15
22	Manchester Metropolitan	7.83				0.50	3.33				1.00	1.00	1.50	n/a	14
24	U. of Stavanger	7.67					4.00			2.67			1.00	n/a	15

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

	University	Total Score	ACF	EDU	ENV	FSM	HRM	IT/MIS	LAW	MKT	ORM	STM	OTH	Weighted Score	Total Appeared Number
							Hospitality Research Field								
25	U. of Houston	7.10	1.00			1.00	0.50	0.33		3.17	0.50	0.60		0.23	16
26	ULPGC	7.00					1.00			1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	n/a	17
27	U. of Strathclyde	6.67		1.00	0.33		2.17			1.50			1.67	0.32	12
28	Sejong U.	6.58	0.67	1.25						3.33	1.00		0.33	0.39	14
29	San Diego State	6.33	1.00				3.33			1.00		1.00		0.53	10
30	France's IMHI	6.25					1.50	2.50		1.25		0.50	0.50	0.57	9
31	Seattle	6.00								1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	n/a	17
32	U. of Massachusetts	5.83							3.00	0.83		2.00		0.49	8
33	U. of Denver	5.50	3.00				0.83					0.67	1.00	0.42	9
34	U. of Hawaii	5.17	3.83					0.33				1.00		0.29	11
35	NKHC	5.00					4.00			1.00				n/a	6
36	Victoria	4.50		1.00			2.00			0.50	0.50		0.50	n/a	10
37	U. of Western Australia	4.33						2.17		1.33	0.33	1.33	0.50	n/a	12
37	KyungHee	4.33	0.33							2.00	0.67			0.14	10
40	U. of Waikato	4.17								1.00	2.33		1.00	0.43	7
40	U. of Delaware	4.17	0.33	0.50						1.33	1.83	0.67		0.26	13
42	George Washington	4.00	0.50				0.33			0.33		0.83	1.67	0.22	9
42	Queen Margaret U.	4.00			0.67	1.00		1.00				0.33	1.00	0.17	7
42	Yonsei	4.00					0.67			0.33	3.00			n/a	7
44	Florida International	3.83	0.50				1.00			0.33	1.00		1.00	0.16	7
45	Texas Tech	3.67					0.67			3.00				0.20	12
46	Eastern Michigan	3.50		1.00			0.25			1.00		0.50	0.75	n/a	9

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

University	Total Score	ACF	EDU	ENV	FSM	HRM	IT/MIS	LAW	MKT	ORM	STM	OTH	Weighted Score	Total Appeared Number
46 Leeds Metropolitan	3.50		1.00						1.00		1.00	0.50	0.23	7
46 Northern Arizona	3.50		1.00						2.00			0.50	0.16	7
46 U. of Guelph	3.50					0.50		1.00					0.16	4
50 National Chung Cheng	3.33	3.00				0.33							n/a	6
50 U. of Queensland	3.33			1.00		2.33					2.00		0.13	6

Note: ACF = accounting and finance; EDU = education; ENV = green and environmental issue; FSM = food service management; HRM = human resource management; IT/MIS = information technology and management information system; LAW = legal issue; MKT = marketing; ORM = operating management; STM = strategic management; OTH = others; n/a = not available; HK Poly U. = Hong Kong Polytechnic University; U. = University; UNLV = University of Nevada, Las Vegas; UCF = University of Central Florida; HK = Hong Kong; E. Mediterranean = East Mediterranean; B-GUN = Ben-Gurion University of the Negev; UIUC = University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; ULPGC = University of Las Palmas de Grad Canaria; IMHI = Institute de Management Hotelier International; NKHC = National Kaosiung Hospitality College. Total score is the sum of "fractional scores" from hospitality and tourism research. Weighted score is the "weighted fractional score," which is calculated as total score divided by the number of faculty members.

Table 4
Hospitality Research Rankings by Country

	University	Total Score	Hospitality Research Field											Total Appeared Number
			ACF	EDU	ENV	FSM	HRM	IT/MIS	LAW	MKT	ORM	STM	OTH	
1	United States	639.20	71.50	15.08	4.00	12.67	114.00	20.25	30.00	178.20	73.75	65.67	54.08	1,362
2	Hong Kong	88.28	4.00	3.50	10.63	0.33	13.75	10.50		15.90	4.17	14.67	10.83	203
3	United Kingdom	87.78	3.00	7.50	1.00	7.00	25.17	3.00	2.20	18.17	2.50	6.83	11.42	167
4	Australia	54.50	5.00	4.00			16.33	3.83		15.00	4.00	3.33	3.00	118
5	Taiwan	33.92	3.00	1.25			10.83			6.00	9.08	3.75		65
6	South Korea	26.58	2.50	1.58			2.00	1.67		9.67	4.33	4.17	0.67	61
7	Spain	22.67	1.00		1.00		5.67	2.33		3.00	1.67	7.00	1.00	58
8	Turkey	21.67	1.00		2.00		12.50			4.50	0.67	1.00		44
9	Canada	13.08					1.50	2.00	1.00	2.83		4.50	1.25	27
10	France	12.70					2.50	2.50	0.20	4.25	1.00	1.00	1.25	26
11	Israel	10.83				1.00	1.50			2.00	3.00	1.33	2.00	19
12	Norway	10.50	1.00				4.00			2.00			3.50	22
13	New Zealand	8.50					0.50		1.00	3.67	2.33		1.00	13
14	China	5.94		0.25	0.38		1.33			1.73		0.83	1.42	20
15	Switzerland	5.58					1.00	0.25		2.33	0.50	1.50		14
16	Singapore	4.25							1.00	1.25	0.50		1.50	7
17	Greece	4.17		0.50							3.00	0.33	0.33	8
18	Portugal	3.00			2.00			1.00						5
19	Sweden	3.00					1.00				2.00			5
20	Germany	2.93		0.33			1.00		0.60		1.00			7

Note: ACF = accounting and finance; EDU = education; ENV = green and environmental issue; FSM = food service management; HRM = human resource management; IT/MIS = information technology and management information system; LAW = legal issue; MKT = marketing; ORM = operating management; STM = strategic management; OTH = others.

Research Rankings in Tourism

Table 5 shows the 50 most prolific authors in tourism research. The sum of these 50 authors' fractional scores was 306.36, which is 17.5% of all tourism research (out of 1,752 tourism articles). Compared with the 25.9% contribution rate from the top 50 researchers in hospitality, the contribution of the 50 most prolific researchers in tourism (17.5%) was significantly less with more discrepancies between the rankings using total scores and total articles. For example, Bob McKercher (The Hong Kong Polytechnic University) was ranked as the top tourism author using the fractional score, but he placed third, with 20 published articles, based on the total number of articles (see Table 5). The rankings by total score (fractional score) and total articles (instance score) in hospitality were more consistent. For example, Anna S. Mattila was ranked first both for total score and total articles (see Table 2).

These results clearly show the differences between the instance score and fractional score counting methods. Bob McKercher received 11.25 total points in tourism research, which means that out of the 1,752 published tourism research articles, he contributed approximately 11 articles according to the fractional score whereas the instance score reported a total of 20 articles. This is one of the unique contributions of this study. The fractional score is more specific than instance scores used in previous studies.

Table 5 also shows the affiliation of tourism authors. Seven authors were affiliated with The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, the largest number of authors at one university. For the various tourism research topics, James F. Petrick researched service management, John T. Coshall and Haiyan Song focused on economic impact and econometrics, Cathy H. C. Hsu focused on tourists' perceptions and behavior, and Chris Ryan and Carla Almeida Santos were actively involved in special interest tourism research such as heritage, farm, cultural, and food tourism. The research from Bob McKercher was diverse and focused on a variety of topics.

Table 6 shows the 50 universities with the most contributions to tourism research. The sum of the fractional score of these universities was 790.24 points, which is 45.1% of all tourism articles published during the last decade (1,752 total tourism articles). This percentage is lower than the contribution of the top 50 universities in hospitality research. Comparing the two numbers (64.9% vs. 45.1%), contributions from the 50 most prolific universities in hospitality was much higher than the top 50 schools in tourism research.

In terms of the fractional score, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University received 72.60 points, which means that the university contributed approximately 4.1% of tourism research. The focus of their research was economic impact and econometrics and tourists' perceptions and behavior. Griffith University focused on special interests in tourism, and the University of Surrey mostly concentrated on economic impact and econometrics in tourism. Research from Texas A&M University was well balanced among all tourism research fields. In terms of the weighted fractional score, the University of Nottingham (2.07) was the most prolific tourism university (Table 6).

Table 5
Tourism Research Rankings by Author

Author	Current Affiliation	Total Score	Tourism Research Field																				Total Number of Articles
			ATT	CSM	DMKT	DVP	ECO	EDU	GEO	GMKT	IMG	IT	MICE	PLN	PPL	SCM	SEG	SIT	SMT	SUT	TPB	OTH	
1 Bob McKercher	HK Poly U.	11.25	0.33	0.50	1.50	1.50				0.33	0.33						1.00	1.17			1.75	2.83	20
2 James F. Petrick	Texas A&M	10.92								1.08	1.00		0.33				1.50	2.83	3.83		0.33		19
3 Cathy H. C. Hsu	HK Poly	9.67				1.50				1.00	0.83						1.67	0.50	2.00		2.17		18
4 Chris Ryan	U. of Waikato	9.42			0.50	0.83				0.50	1.00							3.42		1.33		1.83	18
5 Samuel Seongseop Kim	Sejong	8.92			0.33	0.50	0.83			2.00	0.83		0.33		1.42		0.25	1.08	0.50		0.83		22
6 Joseph S. Chen	Indiana	8.67				2.33				0.50	1.83	1.00					2.00	0.50			0.50		12
7 Stephen W. Litvin	C. of Charleston	8.58			1.00					0.33	0.50				0.25			1.00	2.00		2.00	3.50	13
8 Daniel R. Fesenmaier	Temple	8.50			0.50	0.25				0.33	0.50							0.33			1.00		21
9 Carla Almeida Santos	UIUC	8.17									2.17		0.50					3.00			0.50	2.00	15
10 Stephen J. Page	U. of Stirling	7.62		2.45					0.50				0.33		0.50			1.00		0.33	0.50	2.00	15
11 Rob Law	HK Poly U.	7.58					3.58					2.50							0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	15
12 Choong-Ki Lee	KyungHee	7.25				1.58	0.50			0.83	0.83		1.33				1.08		0.25	0.50	0.33		17
13 Ercan Sirakaya-Turk	U. of South Carolina	7.17				1.00	0.50			0.50	1.00						1.17		0.33	2.67			16
13 Metin Kozak	Mugla	7.17			2.00					2.00								0.33	1.50		1.00		9
15 Dogan Gursoy	Washington State	7.08	0.50			2.25	0.33			1.50		1.00	0.67						0.33		0.83		17
16 John T. Coshall	London Metropolitan	7.00		1.00			5.00				1.00					0.58							7
17 Haiyan Song	HK Poly U.	6.50					4.75			0.83											0.33	0.33	18

(continued)

Table 5. (continued)

	Author	Current Affiliation	Total Score	ATT	CSM	DMKT	DVP	ECO	EDU	GEO	GMKT	IMG	IT	MICE	PLN	PPL	SCM	SEG	SIT	SMT	SUT	TPB	OTH	Total Number of Articles
17	Stephen L. J. Smith	U. of Waterloo	6.50			0.33	0.33	1.00				0.33					0.50						4.00	12
17	Bruce Prideaux	James Cook	6.50			1.00	2.50	0.33			0.50					0.83				1.00		0.33		11
17	Douglas G. Pearce	Victoria U. of Wellington	6.50			1.00					1.50			0.50	1.00		1.00		1.00			0.50		8
21	SooCheong (Shawn) Jang	Purdue	6.17					2.58			0.75			0.50				0.33	0.50	0.50		0.50	0.50	13
22	Atila Yüksel	Adnan Menderes	5.83			0.50	1.00				1.00					0.33		0.50	2.50	0.50		1.00	1.00	9
23	Yaniv Poria	B-GUN	5.50																	1.00			2.00	10
23	David B. Weaver	Griffith	5.50	0.50			2.00											0.50			2.50			8
23	Konstantinos Andriotis	CUT	5.50				4.50												1.00					6
26	Alastair M. Morrison	Purdue[a]	5.37			0.33						2.17	0.67					0.78		0.50		0.92		15
27	John Tribe	U. of Surrey	5.33						2.33														3.00	6
28	John C. Crotts	C. of Charleston	5.25			0.50					0.50		0.67			0.25		0.33	1.50			1.50		11
29	John L. Crompton	Texas A&M	5.00					1.33			0.50			1.33				0.33		0.50		0.50	2.50	9
29	Honggen Xiao	HK Poly U.	5.00						1.00							1.00	0.50						2.50	8
31	Arie Reichel	B-GUN	4.92		0.67		0.67				0.33								1.50	0.33		0.42	1.00	14
32	Natan Uriely	B-GUN	4.83		0.67		0.67				0.33								0.50	0.50		1.83	0.83	11
32	Karin Weber	HK Poly U.	4.83			0.33								2.00					1.00			1.00		7
32	Cevat Tosun	Mustafa Kemal	4.83				3.00				0.33										1.00	0.50		6
35	Stephen F. Witt	HK Poly U.	4.75			0.50		4.25																12

(continued)

Table 5. (continued)

No.	Author	Current Affiliation	Total Score	ATT	CSM	DMKT	DVP	ECO	EDU	GEO	GMKT	IMG	IT	MICE	PLN	PPL	SCM	SEG	SIT	SMT	SUT	TPB	OTH	Total Number of Articles
35	Youcheng Wang	UCF	4.75			2.00							2.17	0.25					0.33					10
37	Graham A. Miller	U. of Surrey	4.67				0.33				0.25					0.67				0.33	1.50		1.58	10
37	Aliza Fleischer	HUJ	4.67				0.50	1.50			0.50			0.50				0.33			0.33	1.00		9
37	Deepak Chhabra	Arizona State	4.67					1.00			1.00			0.33					0.33			1.00	1.00	6
40	Joanne Connell	U. of Stirling	4.53		0.20	1.00													2.50		0.33	0.50		7
41	Laura J. Lawton	Grffith	4.50	0.50			2.00				2.50							0.50						7
41	Juan L. Nicolau	U. of Alicante	4.50			1.00		1.00															1.00	6
43	Duarte B. Morais	Penn State	4.42				0.83				0.33	0.75							1.00	0.67	0.83			12
43	Ralf Buckley	Grffith	4.42																1.83		1.58		1.00	7
45	Geoffrey Wall	U. of Waterloo	4.33					0.67	0.50	0.50					0.50				1.17		0.50	0.50		10
45	Donald Getz	U. of Queensland	4.33											1.50					1.00	0.33	1.50			8
45	Bill Bramwell	Sheffield Hallam	4.33				1.50									2.33			0.50					7
45	Neil Carr	U. of Otago	4.33		0.33																	3.00	1.00	5
49	Arch G. Woodside	Boston C.	4.17								0.83					0.50				0.33	1.00	1.00	0.50	8
49	Seyhmus Baloglu	UNLV	4.17				0.50					1.83	0.50	0.50							0.83			8

Note: ATT = attraction management; CSM = crisis and safety management; DMKT = destination marketing and management; DVP = tourism development; ECO = economic impact and econometrics; EDU = education; GEO = geographical issue; GMKT = general marketing; IMG = image and branding; IT = information technology; MICE = meetings, incentives, conventions, and exhibitions including festival and fair; PLN = tourism planning; PPL = politics, policy, legal, and governmental issue; SCM = supply chain management; SEG = segmentation; SIT = special interests tourism such as heritage, farm, cultural, wine, or food tourism; SMT = service management; SUT = sustainable tourism and ecotourism; TPB = tourists' perception and behavior; OTH = others; HK Poly U. = Hong Kong Polytechnic University; U. = University; C. = College; UIUC = University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; B-GUN = Ben-Gurion University of the Negev; CUT = Cyprus University of Technology; UCF = University of Central Florida; HUJ = Hebrew University of Jerusalem; UNLV = University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

a. The author is now retired from the university.

Table 6
Tourism Research Rankings by University

	University	Total Score	ATT	CSM	DMKT	DVP	ECO	EDU	GEO	GMKT	IMG	IT	MICE	PLN	PPL	SCM	SEG	SIT	SMT	SUT	TPB	OTH	Weighted Score	Total Appeared Number
																	Tourism Research Field							
1	HK Poly U.	72.60	1.00	1.00	1.83	3.33	17.00			7.17	2.50	4.00	3.83			1.17	2.67	3.75	3.83		12.58	6.93	1.27	163
2	Texas A&M	37.98			0.33	2.00	3.92			3.00	3.67	2.83	2.50				3.73	3.83	5.17	4.17	1.17	1.67	1.31	81
3	Griffith	37.33		2.00	2.00	4.42	3.33			2.00			1.00					8.50	0.50	4.83	1.50	5.25	0.98	71
4	U. of Surrey	33.50			0.50	0.83	6.42	1.67		0.50	2.33	1.25		0.50	1.50			3.25	1.17	1.00	0.50	12.08	1.52	76
5	U. of Queensland	28.37			0.67	2.00	0.83			4.00	2.00		0.50		1.83		0.67	1.50	1.50	4.53	2.83	5.50	1.13	56
6	B-GUN	25.26		1.33		2.00				1.00	0.33				1.00			4.83	1.67		4.26	8.83	n/a	52
7	UIUC	24.08			0.33	1.25	1.00			0.50	3.83	4.17	1.00				0.33	6.17			2.50	3.00	1.61	53
8	Purdue	21.73			1.33		1.33			1.58	5.17	1.67	0.50		1.00		1.65	0.50	1.00	0.67	4.83	0.50	0.99	55
9	ULIB	20.33				1.50	7.33			2.00				0.50	2.00			1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	n/a	50
10	U. of Waterloo	20.33			0.83	1.67	1.50	0.50	0.33		0.33	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00		1.83		0.50	1.00	7.83	1.27	43
11	Virginia Tech	18.78	0.50		1.00	3.83	0.50			1.25	2.67	1.50	0.33		2.00		0.33	1.83	0.83		1.00	1.20	0.99	39
12	U. of Waikato	18.62			2.50	1.50				1.33	2.50	0.33						5.20		1.33		3.92	1.86	38
13	Sejong	18.33			0.33	0.83	1.17			2.75	1.50	0.67	1.83		1.75		1.00	1.75	1.75		3.00		1.08	47

(continued)

Table 6. (continued)

	University	Total Score		Tourism Research Field																				Total
			ATT	CSM	DMKT	DVP	ECO	EDU	GEO	GMKT	IMG	IT	MICE	PLN	PPL	SCM	SEG	SIT	SMT	SUT	TPB	OTH	Weighted Score	Appeared Number
14	Penn State	17.65				2.67	0.75			2.50	1.50		0.50		1.00			3.33	0.67	0.67	3.23	0.83	0.53	45
15	UCF	16.09	1.00			1.00	4.00			0.83		1.83	2.50					1.00	0.33	0.33	0.92	0.33	0.40	35
16	Arizona State	15.32		2.00	1.00	3.50	2.00			2.00	1.00				0.58		0.33	0.67	0.50	0.50	3.23		n/a	35
17	La Trobe	15.27		0.50	1.00	2.00	2.00			0.42		0.50	1.50	1.00		1.00	1.67	2.85			0.83		0.95	28
18	U. of Stirling	14.02		3.52	1.00				0.50				0.33		0.50			3.50		0.67	1.00	3.00	n/a	26
19	C. of Charleston	13.92		0.50	1.50					0.83		1.50			0.75		0.33	2.50			3.00	2.00	1.99	27
20	HIJ	13.67		0.33	2.00	2.00	2.50			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00				2.00	0.50			1.00	1.00	n/a	26
21	James Cook	13.37				0.50		1.00		1.50	1.00	1.00		1.00	0.33		0.60	1.60	0.33	0.33	1.50	2.00	1.67	26
22	U. of Otago	13.28		1.25		1.67				0.50			1.00				0.83	1.20		2.50	1.50	2.50	1.11	25
23	U. of Calgary	12.62			1.50	1.00				0.75	1.17	0.50	1.00				1.00	1.70	0.67	0.50		2.83	n/a	27
24	Victoria	12.50	0.33			4.50				2.00	0.50			0.33				1.00	0.50		0.33	3.00	n/a	25
25	Washington State	11.50	0.50		0.50	3.25	0.33			1.50	1.00	1.50	1.33					0.25	0.67		0.67		0.72	28
26	Monash	11.45	0.50							2.75		0.50			0.50		1.17	1.00		0.20	0.50	1.00	n/a	27
27	Temple	11.25			1.50		3.83			0.58	2.17	4.83		1.00				0.33			1.50	1.00	0.59	26
28	UNLV	11.00				0.50	2.00			1.25	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.33			0.25				2.33	0.67	0.19	27

(continued)

Table 6. (continued)

	Total Score	Tourism Research Field																				Weighted Score	Total Appeared Number
University		ATT	CSM	DMKT	DVP	ECO	EDU	GEO	GMKT	IMG	IT	MICE	PLN	PPL	SCM	SEG	SIT	SMT	SUT	TPB	OTH		
29 ULPGC	10.50			2.00	1.00	1.00				3.50					1.00			1.00			1.00	n/a	21
30 U. of Nottingham	10.36	1.00				5.53								1.67			1.00		0.50		0.67	2.07	25
31 Victoria U. of Wellington	10.33			1.33		0.50			2.00	1.00	0.50				1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	n/a	15
32 Sheffield Hallam U.	10.17			1.50	1.50									3.17	0.50	0.50	3.00					n/a	18
33 U. of Alicante	10.00			1.00		1.00			4.00				2.00								2.00	n/a	15
34 Michigan State	9.92			0.50	1.25	1.50			0.33	0.67	1.00					0.50	1.33			0.50	2.33	0.33	21
35 U. of Western Australia	9.67	0.67			1.00	3.17			2.33		1.00						0.50				1.00	n/a	21
35 U. of Wollongong	9.67					1.00			0.67		0.67					2.67	2.00		1.50	0.50	0.67	n/a	20
37 U. of New South Wales	9.48		1.00			2.00			1.25		1.50					0.33	1.00		0.40	0.50	1.50	0.33	22
38 Massey U.	9.42		2.08		2.00							1.67					2.00		1.67			0.36	19
39 Kansas State	9.08				2.67	1.25				0.50				1.00		1.17	0.50	1.00		1.00		0.36	16
40 U. of Florida	9.00				0.50	0.50			2.33								1.67		1.50	2.50		0.28	19
41 U. of Valencia	8.83					1.00			2.67							1.00		3.17			1.00	n/a	23
41 U. of Hawaii	8.83				1.00	3.67							0.50	0.50						2.17	1.00	0.49	19

(continued)

Table 6. (continued)

	University	Total Score	ATT	CSM	DMKT	DVP	ECO	EDU	GEO	GMKT	IMG	IT	MICE	PLN	PPL	SCM	SEG	SIT	SMT	SUT	TPB	OTH	Weighted Score	Total Appeared Number
43	U. of South Carolina	8.67	1.00			1.00				1.25	0.75		1.00						0.33	3.33			0.48	15
43	Mugla U.	8.67			2.00		1.50			2.50	1.17									0.50		1.00	n/a	14
45	National U. of Singapore	8.50	0.33			1.33	2.00								0.67			0.50	1.00		0.50	2.17	n/a	19
45	Nanyang Tech	8.50		1.00	1.00						0.50		1.00					2.00			1.00	2.00	0.34	12
47	Lincoln	8.33		1.00						0.50				0.33			0.67	1.33	2.00		2.50		n/a	16
48	Oklahoma State	8.08		0.50	0.50	0.33	1.00			1.33	0.67	2.00	0.67					0.25			0.83		0.81	22
48	Bournemouth	8.08	1.33			1.00				0.67	1.33	0.50	0.50		0.50		0.67				2.00	0.25	0.22	17
50	KyungHee	8.00			1.83		0.50			0.67	1.00	0.33	0.33				1.58		0.25	0.50	0.67		0.26	21
50	U. of Sunderland	8.00								1.00	1.00	0.50	0.50					3.50			2.00		1.14	13

Note: ATT = attraction management; CSM = crisis and safety management; DMKT = destination marketing and management; DVP = tourism development; ECO = economic impact and econometrics; EDU = education; GEO = geographical issue; GMKT = general marketing; IMG = image and branding; IT = information technology; MICE = meetings, incentives, conventions, and exhibitions including festival and fair; PLN = tourism planning; PPL = politics, policy, legal, and governmental issue; SCM = supply chain management; SEG = segmentation; SIT = special interests tourism such as heritage, farm, cultural, wine, or food tourism; SMT = service management; SUT = sustainable tourism and ecotourism; TPB = tourists' perception and behavior; OTH = others; n/a = not available; HK Poly U. = Hong Kong Polytechnic University; U. = University; B-GUN = Ben-Gurion University of the Negev; UIUC = University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; ULIB = Universitat de les Illes Balears; UCF = University of Central Florida; C. = College; HUJ = Hebrew University of Jerusalem; UNLV = University of Nevada, Las Vegas; ULPGC = University of Las Palmas de Grad Canaria. Total score is the sum of "fractional scores" from hospitality and tourism research. Weighted score is the "weighted fractional score," which is calculated as total score divided by the number of faculty members.

Table 7 shows that the United States has contributed most actively to tourism research (476.57 points) in past decade. The United Kingdom was second, followed by Australia. The United States contributed to all tourism research topics, but the United Kingdom showed strength in crisis and safety management, tourism education, and politics, policy, legal, and governmental issues. Australia focused on special interests in tourism and sustainable tourism and ecotourism, whereas Spain and Hong Kong focused on economic impact and econometrics. Thus, the major research focus was different among 20 countries, possibly because of the unique characteristics of each country.

Research Rankings in Hospitality and Tourism Combined

The 100 most prolific authors in both hospitality and tourism research are presented in Table 8. The sum of the fractional score of these 100 authors totaled 647.11 points, 22.8% of the hospitality and tourism research published in these six journals during the sample period. This means that these 100 authors published at least one in five articles in hospitality and tourism. The results revealed that SooCheong (Shawn) Jang (Purdue University) had the most articles, with 41 published articles and a stronger focus on hospitality research than tourism research (hospitality: 12.50; tourism: 6.17). SooCheong (Shawn) Jang was followed by Anna S. Mattila, who also focused more on hospitality research (hospitality: 16.33; tourism: 0.87), and then Rob Law (hospitality: 8.03; tourism: 7.58). One of the most useful items in Table 8 is the list of research fields for each author. For example, Bob McKercher, Cathy H. C. Hsu, and James F. Petrick could be categorized as tourism researchers, whereas Cathy A. Enz, Woo Gon Kim, and Sheryl E. Kimes could be classified as hospitality researchers. Among the 100 authors listed, 13 authors were affiliated with Cornell University, 12 with The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, 5 with Griffith University, and 4 each with Ben-Gurion University and Pennsylvania State University.

Table 9 shows the 100 universities contributing the most to hospitality and tourism research. The sum of the 100 universities' fractional scores was 1770.65, or 62.5% of hospitality and tourism articles published in the six journals during the sample period. In terms of fractional scores, Cornell University ranked first with a strong focus on hospitality research. Cornell University received 140.88 points, which means that Cornell University contributed about 5.0% of the hospitality research during the sample period (out of 2,834 hospitality and tourism articles). Interestingly, Cornell University received about 85.0% of their total points from the *CHQ*, which means that Cornell University has seriously concentrated on publishing in their own journal (*CHQ*). On the other hand, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University and Purdue University were well balanced between hospitality and tourism research. Also, Pennsylvania State University, University of Nevada (Las Vegas), and Virginia Technical Institute focused more on hospitality research, whereas Griffith University, University of Surrey, and Texas A&M University focused more on tourism research. Thus, some universities could be called hospitality schools or tourism schools, whereas others are well balanced between the two. In terms of the weighted

Table 7
Tourism Research Rankings by Country

Country	Total Score	ATT	CSM	DMKT	DVP	ECO	EDU	GEO	GMKT	IMG	IT	MICE	PLN	PPL	SCM	SEG	SIT	SMT	SUT	TPB	OTH	Total Appeared Number
1 United States	476.57	7.33	8.50	19.33	45.50	46.50		1.00	44.83	32.70	35.67	16.83	7.83	11.92		19.50	45.80	17.17	23.33	48.51	44.32	1,041
2 United Kingdom	242.07	4.00	10.58	8.67	15.50	25.03	4.67	1.75	14.67	7.87	3.58	3.83	3.00	18.67	1.00	1.00	35.42	8.33	18.50	16.09	39.92	451
3 Australia	218.53	0.33	8.83	6.17	15.17	24.17	1.00		22.00	4.50	8.00	5.50	3.17	6.17	1.00	8.60	39.60	4.67	20.33	10.58	28.75	446
4 Spain	111.76	1.00		3.00	8.50	20.00		1.00	10.00	12.50	5.50	2.50	2.50	3.00	1.00	5.00	4.50	14.67	8.17	2.09	9.33	257
5 Hong Kong	87.35	1.33	1.00	3.83	3.33	17.67		1.00	7.67	2.83	7.83	3.33	0.67	0.50	1.75	2.67	5.08	4.33	0.50	14.08	7.93	199
6 Canada	81.07	0.33	1.00	7.17	10.50	3.50	0.50	0.67	3.00	5.03	2.33	2.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	3.50	12.87	1.00	4.50	2.33	13.83	175
7 Taiwan	72.33		1.33			13.83	1.50		7.58	1.50	10.00	1.00	1.00	1.42	1.00	1.00	6.33	11.00	2.33	3.00	8.50	161
8 New Zealand	71.73		4.08	3.83	6.17	0.50		0.50	6.83	4.50	1.67	3.67	1.33	0.50	1.00	2.00	10.73	0.33	9.83	5.50	8.75	136
9 South Korea	55.99			2.00	3.50	3.92			7.33	5.17	2.67	4.33	1.33	2.75		5.82	4.83	3.67	2.67	5.01	1.00	141
10 Israel	43.42		1.67		4.00	2.50			2.50	1.33	1.00	1.00		1.00		2.00	6.33	1.67	0.67	5.26	12.50	88
11 Turkey	43.08	3.50		3.00	7.00	4.67	2.00		3.83	1.67	1.50			1.33		1.50	1.25	3.50	2.33	4.00	5.50	73
12 Netherlands	22.58			1.50	1.33				5.75	0.67			0.50	1.00			2.50		2.00	2.50	1.33	49
13 Singapore	19.50	0.67	1.00	1.00	1.67	2.33			0.50	0.50				1.67			2.50	1.00		2.00	4.67	37
14 Norway	17.25	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.25	0.33	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00				0.67	0.83		1.00	2.00	6.00	33
15 China	17.08			0.33	4.67	5.00	1.00		0.50	0.33	2.58	1.00	0.83	0.75	0.25	0.25	1.33	0.33	2.50	2.00	0.67	38
16 Austria	16.68		0.50	2.50					1.60	1.00						1.50		1.00				36
17 Greece	12.08			1.00	4.50	1.00	0.33				1.25					0.50			2.00		2.00	18
18 Denmark	11.83			1.00	1.00	2.00			1.00		0.33			0.50		2.00					3.50	17
19 Germany	9.92		0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00				1.00	0.25								1.75	0.09	1.33	16
20 Sweden	9.90		1.00		0.67					0.40		0.50	0.33				0.50		2.50	1.00	3.00	17

Note: ATT = attraction management; CSM = crisis and safety management; DMKT = destination marketing and management; DVP = tourism development; ECO = economic impact and econometrics; EDU = education; GEO = geographical issue; GMKT = general marketing; IMG = image and branding; IT = information technology; MICE = meetings, incentives, conventions, and exhibitions including festival and fair; PLN = tourism planning; PPL = politics, policy, legal, and governmental issue; SCM = supply chain management; SEG = segmentation; SIT = special interests tourism such as heritage, farm, cultural, wine, or food tourism; SMT = service management; SUT = sustainable tourism and ecotourism; TPB = tourists' perception and behavior; OTH = others.

Table 8
Hospitality and Tourism Research Rankings by Author

	Authors	Current Affiliation	Total Score	Research				Journal				Total Number of Articles
				HSP	TOU	JHTR	IJHM	CHQ	TM	ATR	JTR	
1	SooCheong (Shawn) Jang	Purdue	18.67	12.50	6.17	4.67	8.08		3.92	1.00	1.00	41
2	Anna S. Mattila	Penn State	17.20	16.33	0.87	7.33	4.17	4.83	0.50	0.17	0.20	31
3	Rob Law	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	15.62	8.03	7.58	2.70	5.17		5.42	1.00	1.33	33
4	Bob McKercher	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	12.12	0.87	11.25	0.20	0.33		4.75	3.50	3.33	23
5	Cathy A. Enz	Cornell	11.92	11.25	0.67		0.33	11.25			0.33	21
6	Woo Gon Kim	Florida State	11.17	9.83	1.33	3.33	4.67	1.33	1.83			28
7	Cathy H. C. Hsu	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	11.03	1.37	9.67	4.70	0.33		1.67	1.00	3.33	22
8	James F. Petrick	Texas A&M	10.92		10.92				3.08	2.33	5.50	19
8	Sheryl E. Kimes	Cornell	10.92	10.92			0.33	10.58				17
10	Dogan Gursoy	Washington State	10.75	3.67	7.08	1.67	3.33		2.08	3.17	0.50	26
11	Chris Ryan	Univ. of Waikato	10.42	1.00	9.42		0.50	0.50	4.50	2.33	2.58	20
12	Haemoon Oh	Univ. of Massachusetts	9.67	7.50	2.17	3.83	1.67	1.00	2.33	0.50	0.33	15
13	Samuel Seongseop Kim	Sejong Univ.	9.50	0.58	8.92		0.33		5.17	2.67	1.33	24
13	Michael Lynn	Cornell	9.50	9.50		0.50	5.00	4.00				12
15	Joseph S. Chen	Indiana Univ.	9.17	0.50	8.67	4.00	0.50		2.17	2.00	0.50	13
16	Stephen W. Litvin	College of Charleston	8.92	0.33	8.58			1.00	2.33	2.50	3.08	14
17	Daniel R. Fesenmaier	Temple	8.75	0.25	8.50		0.25		1.67	1.33	5.50	22
18	Carla Almeida Santos	UIUC	8.67	0.50	8.17	0.50			0.33	5.83	2.00	16
19	Karin Weber	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	8.03	3.20	4.83	1.70	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.50	1.83	12
20	Gary M. Thompson	Cornell	8.00	8.00			0.50	7.50				10
21	Stephen J. Page	Univ. of Stirling	7.62		7.62	0.95	0.33		6.12	1.17	0.33	15
22	Choong-Ki Lee	Kyung Hee Univ.	7.25		7.25	0.50			5.42	1.83		17
23	Haiyan Song	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	7.20	0.70	6.50				2.25		3.67	20
24	Ercan Sirakaya-Turk	Univ. of South Carolina	7.17		7.17	0.50	0.33		1.33	2.50	2.83	16
24	John W. O'Neill	Penn State	7.17	7.17		1.50	0.33	5.08		0.25		15

(continued)

Table 8. (continued)

	Authors	Current Affiliation	Total Score	Research				Journal				Total Number of Articles
				HSP	TOU	JHTR	IJHM	CHQ	TM	ATR	JTR	
24	Zheng Gu	UNLV	7.17	7.17		3.83	2.33		1.00			13
24	Metin Kozak	Mugla Univ.	7.17		7.17	1.00	0.33		2.33	3.00	0.50	9
28	Kevin K. F. Wong	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	7.04	2.96	4.08	2.08	0.96	0.50	1.75		1.75	18
29	Stephen L. J. Smith	Univ. of Waterloo	7.00	0.50	6.50		0.50		1.83	2.67	2.00	13
29	John T. Coshall	London Metropolitan Univ.	7.00		7.00				1.00	2.00	4.00	7
31	David S. Sherwyn	Cornell	6.78	6.78				6.78				15
32	Atila Yüksel	Adnan Menderes Univ.	6.67	0.83	5.83	1.50			4.83	0.33		11
33	John C. Crotts	College of Charleston	6.58	1.33	5.25	1.83	0.50		1.33	0.50	2.42	14
34	Bruce Prideaux	James Cook Univ.	6.50		6.50				4.67	1.83		11
34	Douglas G. Pearce	Victoria Univ. of Wellington	6.50		6.50				1.00	2.00	3.50	8
36	Michael C. Sturman	Cornell	6.37	6.37			0.50	5.87				10
37	Peter O'Connor	Essec Business School, FR	6.25	6.25			1.00	5.25				9
38	Terry Lam	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	6.17	4.83	1.33	2.17	2.17		1.17	0.33	0.33	14
38	Seoki Lee	Temple	6.17	6.17		1.50	4.17	0.50				11
38	Dennis Reynolds	Washington State	6.17	6.17		2.33	2.00	1.83				10
41	Alastair M. Morrison	Purdue[a]	6.12	0.75	5.37	0.25	0.50		3.42	0.83	1.12	17
42	Arie Reichel	Ben-Gurion Univ.	6.09	1.17	4.92	0.67	0.83		1.17	2.00	1.42	17
43	Robert J. Harrington	Univ. of Arkansas	6.08	6.08		3.83	2.25					9
44	Beverley A. Sparks	Griffith	6.00	2.83	3.17	1.83	0.67	0.33	2.00	0.50	0.67	13
44	Ki-Joon Back	Univ. of Houston	6.00	4.00	2.00	3.67	0.33		1.00	0.50	0.50	12
44	Seyhmus Baloglu	UNLV	6.00	1.83	4.17	0.50	0.33	1.00	2.83	0.33	1.00	11
47	Zvi Schwartz	UIUC	5.83	4.83	1.00	2.33	1.00	1.00	0.50		1.00	10
48	Osman M. Karatepe	E. Mediterranean Univ.	5.70	5.70			3.50	0.50	1.70			11
49	Ming-Hsiang Chen	National Chung Cheng Univ.	5.50	3.00	2.50	0.33	3.00		2.17			10
49	Yaniv Poria	Ben-Gurion Univ.	5.50		5.50	1.00				2.50	2.00	10
49	David B. Weaver	Griffith	5.50		5.50			1.00	2.00	1.50	1.00	8

(continued)

Table 8. (continued)

	Authors	Current Affiliation	Total Score	Research				Journal				Total Number of Articles
				HSP	TOU	JHTR	IJHM	CHQ	TM	ATR	JTR	
49	Juan L. Nicolau	Univ. of Alicante	5.50	1.00	4.50				3.00	1.50	1.00	7
49	Joan C. Henderson	Nanyang Tech Univ.	5.50	1.50	4.00		1.00	0.50	3.00	1.00		6
49	Konstantinos Andriotis	Cyprus Univ. of Technology	5.50		5.50				2.00	2.00	0.50	6
55	J. Bruce Tracey	Cornell	5.33	5.33		1.00		4.83				11
55	Michael D. Olsen[a]	Virginia Tech[a]	5.33	4.83	0.50	0.50	3.33	1.00		0.50		10
55	Vincent P. Magnini	Virginia Tech	5.33	5.33			4.00	1.33				8
55	Cevat Tosun	Mustafa Kernal Univ.	5.33	0.50			0.50		3.50	1.33		7
55	John Tribe	Univ. of Surrey	5.33		4.83					3.33	2.00	6
60	Youcheng Wang	UCF	5.25	0.50	5.33		0.50		1.92		2.83	11
61	Arch G. Woodside	Boston College	5.17	1.00	4.75				1.83	0.50	2.83	9
62	Alex M. Susskind	Cornell	5.00	4.67	4.17	2.25	0.25	2.17		1.00	0.33	9
62	John L. Crompton	Texas A&M	5.00		0.33				0.33	1.00	3.67	9
62	Aviad A. Israeli	Ben-Gurion Univ.	5.00	2.83	2.17	0.33	2.83		0.50	0.33	1.00	8
62	Honggen Xiao	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	5.00		5.00				1.50	3.00	0.50	8
62	Robert J. Kwortnik, Jr.	Cornell	5.00	4.50	0.50			5.00				6
67	Chekitan S. Dev	Cornell	4.83	3.83	1.00			4.50			0.33	12
67	Natan Uriely	Ben-Gurion Univ.	4.83		4.83	0.33			0.33	3.00	1.17	11
67	Donald Getz	Univ. of Queensland	4.83	0.50	4.33		0.50		3.00	0.50	0.83	9
70	Stephen F. Witt	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	4.75		4.75	0.25			1.25	0.50	2.75	12
71	Graham A. Miller	Univ. of Surrey	4.67		4.67				2.83	1.25	0.58	10
71	Aliza Fleischer	Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem	4.67		4.67	1.00	1.00		0.50	1.00	2.17	9
71	Deepak Chhabra	Arizona State	4.67		4.67					1.33	2.33	6
74	Joanne Connell	Univ. of Stirling	4.53		4.53				4.53			7
75	Karthik Namasivayam	Penn State	4.50	4.17	0.33	2.50	0.33	0.83	0.50		0.33	9
75	Kate Walsh	Cornell	4.50	4.50			0.33	4.17				7
75	Laura J. Lawton	Griffith	4.50		4.50				1.00	0.50	3.00	7
75	Egon Smeral	Austrian Institute of Economic Research	4.50	1.00	3.50					0.50	4.00	6

(continued)

Table 8. (continued)

	Authors	Current Affiliation	Total Score	Research		JHTR	IJHM	Journal				Total Number of Articles
				HSP	TOU			CHQ	TM	ATR	JTR	
79	Wilco W. Chan	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	4.46	4.46		1.83	2.63					9
80	Duarte B. Morais	Penn State	4.42		4.42				0.33	1.67	2.42	12
80	Ralf Buckley	Griffith	4.42		4.42				2.00	1.92	0.50	7
82	Hyun Jeong Kim	Washington State	4.33	3.33	1.00	0.67	2.67		1.00			11
82	Geoffrey Wall	Univ. of Waterloo	4.33		4.33				2.83	1.50		10
82	Fevzi Okumus	UCF	4.33	2.50	1.83		2.50		0.67	1.17		8
82	Bill Bramwell	Sheffield Hallam Univ.	4.33		4.33					3.83	0.50	7
82	Neil Carr	Univ. of Otago	4.33		4.33				3.33	1.00		5
87	Judy A. Siguaw	Cornell	4.25	3.08	1.17			3.42			0.83	10
88	Hailin Qu	Oklahoma State	4.17	1.33	2.83	0.33	1.00	0.67	2.17			12
89	Clark Hu	Temple	4.08	3.33	0.75	0.50	2.58	0.50	0.50			11
89	Linda Canina	Cornell	4.08	4.08		0.75	0.33	3.00				9
89	Prakash K. Chathoth	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	4.08	4.08		0.75	3.33					8
92	Bill Faulkner	Griffith[a]	4.00		4.00				2.17	1.50	0.33	8
92	Michael Riley	Univ. of Surrey[a]	4.00	2.83	1.17		2.00			1.67	0.33	8
92	Simon C.K. Wong	Hong Kong Poly Univ.	4.00	2.00	2.00		1.00		2.50	0.50		7
92	Ching-Fu Chen	National Cheng Kung Univ.	4.00	2.00	2.00				3.00		1.00	6
92	Richard Prentice	Univ. of Sunderland	4.00		4.00				1.50	2.50		6
92	Sunmee Choi	Yonsei Univ.	4.00	4.00		1.00	0.50	2.50				6
92	Andrew Holden	Univ. of Bedfordshire	4.00		4.00				1.00	3.00		4
92	Fong-Lin Chu	National Taiwan Univ.	4.00		4.00				4.00			4
100	Ken W. McCleary	Virginia Tech	3.95	2.42	1.53	2.17	0.25	0.50	0.20	0.50	0.33	11

Note: Univ. = university; JHTR = Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research; IJHM = Journal of International Journal of Hospitality Management; CHQ = Cornell Hospitality Quarterly; TM = Tourism Management; ATR = Annals of Tourism Research; JTR = Journal of Travel Research; HSP = hospitality; TOU = tourism.
a. The author is now retired from the university.

Table 9
Hospitality and Tourism Research Rankings by University

	University	Total Score	Research		Journal						Weighted Score	Total Appeared Number
			HSP	TOU	JHTR	IJHM	CHQ	TM	ATR	JTR		
1	Cornell Univ.	140.88	134.88	6.00	8.08	11.42	119.72	35.68	9.08	1.67	2.04	263
2	Hong Kong Polytechnic Univ.	137.01	64.41	72.60	26.45	39.88	2.83	4.33	6.42	23.08	2.40	303
3	Pennsylvania State Univ.	67.82	50.17	17.65	21.83	13.33	13.25	19.33	6.42	8.65	2.06	146
4	Griffith Univ.	60.92	23.58	37.33	10.42	13.17	2.00	19.33	10.08	5.92	1.60	127
5	Univ. of Nevada, Las Vegas	52.67	41.67	11.00	12.75	11.92	17.33	5.17	2.67	2.83	0.91	121
6	Purdue Univ.	47.65	25.92	21.73	8.67	13.25	4.00	10.92	3.67	7.15	2.17	118
7	Univ. of Surrey	46.77	13.27	33.50	2.00	8.10	1.00	4.92	18.08	12.67	2.13	108
8	Virginia Tech Univ.	41.87	23.08	18.78	10.17	12.58	3.33	6.53	3.83	5.42	2.20	91
9	Texas A&M Univ.	39.15	1.17	37.98	0.50	0.33	0.50	13.15	9.17	15.50	1.35	84
10	Univ. of Central Florida	35.67	19.58	16.09	3.50	11.00	5.25	8.00	2.17	5.76	0.89	75
11	Ben-Gurion Univ. of the Negev	34.09	8.83	25.26	4.50	4.33	1.00	4.67	13.17	6.42	n/a	68
12	UIUC	31.92	7.83	24.08	1.50	1.50	3.83	5.00	9.83	10.25	2.13	68
13	Univ. of Queensland	31.70	3.33	28.37	0.50	2.83		18.03	7.00	3.33	1.27	62
14	Washington State Univ.	30.83	19.33	11.50	8.17	13.67		3.00	5.50	0.50	1.93	68
15	Temple Univ.	27.42	16.17	11.25	2.25	12.17	2.00	2.33	1.83	6.83	1.44	64
16	Sejong Univ.	24.92	6.58	18.33	1.33	1.33	0.50	14.58	4.33	2.83	1.47	61
17	Universitat de les Illes Balears	23.13	2.80	20.33		0.33		10.50	10.30	2.00	n/a	59
18	Kansas State Univ.	23.08	14.00	9.08	10.17	4.50	1.17	1.75	2.50	3.00	0.92	48
19	Univ. of Waikato	22.95	4.33	18.62		1.83	1.50	11.58	2.33	5.70	2.30	45
20	Oxford Brookes Univ.	21.25	13.83	7.42	0.50	13.83	0.50	1.75	2.33	2.33	7.08	33
21	Univ. of Waterloo	20.83	0.50	20.33		0.50		9.17	7.67	3.50	1.30	44
22	Michigan State Univ.	20.75	10.83	9.92	1.92	0.92	8.33	1.83	2.25	5.50	0.69	48
23	Oklahoma State Univ.	20.58	12.50	8.08	5.00	6.50	2.00	6.25	0.33	0.50	2.06	53
24	Chinese Univ. of Hong Kong	18.20	14.53	3.67	2.35	9.02	5.42		0.75	0.67	0.49	52
25	La Trobe Univ.	17.60	2.33	15.27		1.33	1.00	7.60	3.00	4.67	1.10	31
26	Iowa State Univ.	17.58	13.08	4.50	5.67	4.83	1.58	2.00	2.00	1.50	0.93	33
27	ULPGC	17.50	7.00	10.50	1.00	2.00	1.00	6.00	6.00	1.50	n/a	38
28	Arizona State Univ.	17.32	2.00	15.32	1.00		2.00	1.75	4.83	7.73	n/a	40

(continued)

Table 9. (continued)

#	University	Total Score	Research		Journal						Weighted Score	Total Appeared Number
			HSP	TOU	JHTR	IJHM	CHQ	TM	ATR	JTR		
29	College of Charleston	17.08	3.17	13.92	2.17	1.33	1.00	3.50	3.00	6.08	2.44	36
30	Victoria Univ.	17.00	4.50	12.50		3.50	1.00	3.17	2.33	7.00	n/a	35
31	Univ. of Otago	15.78	2.50	13.28		1.00	2.50	5.95	5.50	0.83	1.32	28
32	James Cook Univ.	14.62	1.25	13.37	0.25	1.00		2.93	5.83	4.60	1.83	28
33	Univ. of Stirling	14.35	0.33	14.02		0.33		12.18	1.50	0.33	n/a	27
34	Univ. of Western Australia	14.00	4.33	9.67		1.50	1.83	6.67	3.50	0.50	n/a	33
34	Univ. of Hawaii	14.00	5.17	8.83	2.83	0.83	0.50	2.00	1.50	6.33	0.78	30
36	Florida State Univ.	13.70	11.33	2.37	3.83	3.17	4.00	1.00	0.50	1.20	1.52	38
37	Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem	13.67		13.67		1.00		2.50	6.00	4.17	n/a	26
38	Univ. of Calgary	13.62	1.00	12.62		0.50		5.03	3.00	5.08	n/a	29
39	Eastern Mediterranean Univ.	13.17	10.50	2.67		6.00	1.00	6.17			0.47	28
40	Manchester Metropolitan Univ.	12.83	7.83	5.00		7.83		4.00	1.00		n/a	23
41	Monash Univ.	12.45	1.00	11.45	1.00	1.00	0.67	5.03	1.00	4.42	n/a	29
42	Kyung Hee Univ.	12.33	4.33	8.00	1.50	1.83		7.00	1.33		0.40	31
43	Univ. of Alicante	12.00	2.00	10.00				7.00	4.00	1.00	n/a	19
44	Nanyang Technological Univ.	11.33	2.83	8.50		1.00	1.83	4.50	3.00	1.00	0.45	17
45	Sheffield Hallam Univ.	11.17	1.00	10.17	1.00	1.50		1.50	6.67	0.50	n/a	20
46	NKHC	10.92	5.00	5.92	0.33	1.00		9.33	0.25		n/a	18
47	Victoria Univ. of Wellington	10.67	0.33	10.33	0.33			0.33	5.00	5.00	n/a	16
48	Univ. of New South Wales	10.65	1.17	9.48	0.67			5.65	1.50	2.83	0.37	25
49	Univ. of South Carolina	10.50	1.83	8.67	0.83	1.00		3.75	2.00	2.92	0.58	19
50	Univ. of Nottingham	10.36		10.36				1.94	8.42		2.07	25
51	Univ. of Florida	10.33	1.33	9.00	0.33		1.00	0.83	5.50	2.67	0.32	22
51	Northern Arizona Univ.	10.33	3.50	6.83	2.50		1.00	2.50	2.33	2.00	0.47	21
53	National Univ. of Singapore	10.25	1.75	8.50	1.00		1.08	2.00	4.83	1.33	n/a	22
54	Univ. of Valencia	10.17	1.33	8.83		1.33		4.17	4.67		n/a	27
55	Univ. of Houston	10.10	7.10	3.00	2.83	2.83	1.43	1.00			0.33	21
56	Bournemouth Univ.	10.08	2.00	8.08	0.50	0.50		3.33	3.75	2.00	0.28	20
57	Univ. of Stavanger	10.00	7.67	2.33		3.00	1.00	5.17	0.50	0.33	n/a	22
57	Univ. of Strathclyde	10.00	6.67	3.33	1.00	2.50		4.50	1.33	0.67	0.48	20

(continued)

Table 9. (continued)

	University	Total Score	Research		Journal						Weighted Score	Total Appeared Number
			HSP	TOU	JHTR	IJHM	CHQ	TM	ATR	JTR		
59	Univ. of Wollongong	9.67		9.67				1.83	3.50	4.33	n/a	20
59	Mugla Univ.	9.67	1.00	8.67	1.33	1.00		2.33	4.00	1.00	n/a	15
61	Massey Univ.	9.42		9.42				5.75	3.00	0.67	0.36	19
62	Adnan Menderes Univ.	9.33	2.50	6.83	2.50	0.50		6.00	0.33		0.31	17
63	George Washington Univ.	9.25	4.17	5.08	0.50	1.00	1.17	2.00	0.75	3.83	0.49	19
64	Chinese Culture Univ.	8.83	2.00	6.83	0.50	0.50		7.17	0.67		0.52	23
64	Univ. of Guelph	8.83	3.50	5.33	1.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.50	0.83	0.40	17
66	The Ohio State Univ.	8.67	8.42	0.25	3.67	2.17	2.58	0.25			0.48	21
67	Lincoln Univ.	8.33		8.33				5.33	1.50	1.50	n/a	16
68	Univ. of Brighton	8.20	1.20	7.00		1.20		3.00	4.00		0.17	12
69	Ming Chuan Univ.	8.17	2.00	6.17				6.83	1.00	1.00	0.39	19
70	Texas Tech Univ.	8.00	3.67	4.33	2.75		0.67	0.50	1.33	2.75	0.44	20
70	Leeds Metropolitan Univ.	8.00	3.50	4.50		3.50		2.00	2.50		0.53	13
70	Univ. of Massachusetts	8.00	5.83	2.17	1.33	0.50	4.00	0.33		1.83	0.67	13
70	Univ. of Sunderland	8.00		8.00				4.50	3.50		1.14	13
74	Seattle Univ.	7.67	6.00	1.67		3.00	3.33		0.33	1.00	n/a	22
74	Univ. of Hong Kong	7.67	1.25	6.42	0.33		0.92	3.83	1.33	1.25	n/a	18
76	Univ. of Málaga	7.33	2.00	5.33	1.00			4.00	1.33	1.00	n/a	24
77	Colorado State Univ.	7.25	0.83	6.42	0.83		0.83	2.92	0.33	2.33	n/a	18
78	San Diego State Univ.	7.20	6.33	0.87	1.00	2.00	3.33	0.67		0.20	0.60	13
79	Erasmus Univ.	7.17		7.17				3.00	3.83	0.33	n/a	16
80	Univ. of Technology, Sydney	7.12	0.33	6.78			0.33	2.62	3.50	0.67	0.27	16
81	Queen Margaret Univ.	7.00	4.00	3.00		4.50	0.50		1.00	1.00	0.29	12
82	George Mason Univ.	6.83	0.50	6.33				1.50	1.33	3.50	0.20	13
82	Univ. of Westminster	6.83		6.83		0.50		4.58	2.00	0.25	0.85	11
84	RMIT Univ.	6.58		6.58				4.33	2.00	0.25	n/a	16
85	Univ. of Denver	6.50	5.50	1.00	1.50	2.33	1.67			1.00	0.50	11
86	Vienna Univ.	6.33		6.33				2.00	1.00	3.33	n/a	11

(continued)

Table 9. (continued)

		Research		Journal						Weighted Score	Total Appeared Number
	University	Total Score	HSP	TOU	JHTR	IJHM	CHQ	TM	ATR	JTR	Weighted Score	Total Appeared Number
87	National Chiayi Univ.	6.25	2.25	4.00	0.33	1.00		3.25	0.33	1.33	1.56	15
87	France's IMHI	6.25	6.25				3.25				0.57	9
87	Northumbria Univ.	6.25	1.25	5.00	0.25	1.00		4.00	1.00		n/a	8
90	National Chung Cheng Univ.	6.17	3.33	2.83	1.00	3.00		2.17			n/a	12
90	Florida International Univ.	6.17	3.83	2.33	0.33	1.00	2.50	1.00	1.33		0.26	11
90	Glasgow Caledonian Univ.	6.17	2.00	4.17		2.00		3.17	1.00		0.28	11
93	Univ. of St. Gallen	6.03	1.00	5.03		1.00		0.50		4.53	n/a	15
94	Univ. of Missouri	6.00	2.25	3.75	0.50	1.08	0.67	1.58		2.17	0.86	15
94	Univ. of Wales Institute	6.00	2.00	4.00		1.50		3.00	1.50		0.46	14
94	Buckinghamshire Chilterns Univ. College	6.00		6.00				2.00	3.00	1.00	n/a	7
94	London Metropolitan Univ.	6.00	0.50	5.50		0.50		1.50	3.00	1.00	1.20	7
98	Clemson Univ.	5.50		5.50				0.33	0.67	4.50	0.16	15
98	National Cheng Kung Univ.	5.50	2.67	2.83			0.67	3.83		1.00	0.61	10
98	Univ. of Exeter	5.50		5.50				4.50	1.00		n/a	9
98	Univ. of South Australia	5.50	1.00	4.50		1.00		3.50		1.00	n/a	8

Note: Univ. = university; JHTR = Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research; IJHM = Journal of International Journal of Hospitality Management; CHQ = Cornell Hospitality Quarterly; TM = Tourism Management; ATR = Annals of Tourism Research; JTR = Journal of Travel Research; HSP = hospitality; TOU = tourism; UIUC = University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; ULPGC = University of Las Palmas de Grad Canaria; NKHC = National Kaosiung Hospitality College; IMHI = Institute de Management Hotelier International; n/a = not available. Total score is the sum of "fractional scores" from hospitality and tourism research. Weighted score is the "weighted fractional score," which is calculated as total score divided by the number of faculty members.

fractional score, College of Charleston (2.44) was the most prolific institution based on the individual productivity of each faculty member. Academic administrators now considering new faculty positions may want to use this information to strengthen their programs and further reinforce already strong fields. Also, prospective graduate students may be able to use this information to find the best fit for their research interests.

Finally, Table 10 shows the 30 countries contributing the most to hospitality and tourism research. The United States was dominant, producing a considerable amount of hospitality and tourism research during the past 10 years. Other countries focused more on tourism research than hospitality research. The United States focused more on hospitality research, whereas the United Kingdom, Australia, and Spain focused more on tourism research. Hong Kong was well balanced between the two areas.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the research contributions of hospitality and tourism authors, universities, and countries during the first decade of the new millennium. We adopted fractional and weighted fractional scoring methods to more accurately analyze the research contributions of authors, universities, and countries and to avoid inflating or deflating the research numbers. The results of this study should thus be more objective than previous studies that used instance scores. In addition, this study combined the fractional and weighted fractional scores from research articles in the two areas. Thus, this study provides a detailed picture of both hospitality and tourism research contributions individually as well as collectively.

The results of this study provide information for various academic stakeholders, whether graduate students, faculty, or administrators. In addition, this study could inspire hospitality and tourism researchers to focus on new research opportunities to extend their university's areas of expertise. For example, one hot topic in hospitality and tourism is green and environmental issues, but as of yet, not much research has been published. Although marketing, strategic management, and human resources are the most popular fields within the hospitality literature, research in environmental issues, food service, and legal issues is still lacking. Likewise, the leading tourism authors collectively show some specific areas of interest, such as special interests (heritage, farm, cultural, and food tourism) and economic impact and econometrics, whereas less has been done in attractions management, geographical issues, and supply chain management. Because all these areas are important to tourism, future research could expand in these areas.

Finally, future studies should reevaluate the subcategories of each hospitality and tourism research discipline. Even though this study considered many categories in hospitality and tourism research, they may not accurately cover all types of research in these fields. For instance, this study included a category for foodservice management, yet did not include one for lodging management

Table 10

Hospitality and Tourism Research Rankings by Country

	Country	Total Score	Research					Journal			Total Appeared Number
			HSP	TOU	JHTR	IJHM	CHQ	TM	ATR	JTR	
1	United States	1,115.77	639.20	476.57	159.37	178.83	319.33	132.70	135.50	190.04	2,403
2	United Kingdom	329.85	87.78	242.07	5.75	71.70	3.50	102.73	108.83	37.34	618
3	Australia	273.03	54.50	218.53	16.33	33.00	6.17	108.52	62.75	46.27	564
4	Hong Kong	175.63	88.28	87.35	31.55	53.73	11.00	41.85	12.17	25.33	402
5	Spain	134.42	22.67	111.76	2.00	6.33	3.00	74.50	37.00	11.59	315
6	Taiwan	106.25	33.92	72.33	4.25	12.08	3.25	73.92	8.25	4.50	226
7	Canada	94.15	13.08	81.07	2.00	5.50	4.58	31.48	31.33	19.25	202
8	South Korea	82.57	26.58	55.99	7.33	9.50	3.50	44.23	12.08	5.92	202
9	New Zealand	80.23	8.50	71.73	0.67	3.83	4.00	37.20	19.17	15.37	149
10	Turkey	64.75	21.67	43.08	3.83	11.67	2.00	36.25	9.67	1.33	117
11	Israel	54.26	10.83	43.42	5.50	6.33	1.00	7.67	21.83	11.92	107
12	Norway	27.75	10.50	17.25		5.50		12.17	5.08	5.00	55
13	Netherlands	25.08	2.50	22.58		1.50		10.00	11.17	2.42	55
14	Singapore	23.75	4.25	19.50	1.00	1.00	2.92	6.50	8.83	3.50	44
15	China	23.03	5.94	17.08		3.44	2.25	6.92	4.00	6.42	58
16	Austria	19.43	2.75	16.68	0.25			4.25	3.00	11.93	42
17	France	17.53	12.70	4.83	0.75	8.70		2.00		2.83	35
18	Greece	16.25	4.17	12.08	2.00	2.67	3.25	5.00	5.83	0.75	26
19	Switzerland	14.15	5.58	8.57		4.33	0.75	1.50	2.83	4.73	32
20	Denmark	13.33	1.50	11.83		0.50		3.50	7.83	1.50	19
21	Sweden	12.90	3.00	9.90		1.00	1.67	3.90	5.33	1.00	22
22	Germany	12.86	2.93	9.92	1.33	0.60	1.00	5.00	2.00	2.92	23
23	Italy	11.26	1.75	9.51		1.00	1.25	6.58	1.83	0.59	23
24	South Africa	10.34	1.00	9.34				6.25	4.00	0.09	18
25	Portugal	7.67	3.00	4.67	1.50	1.50	0.50	1.00	3.00	0.67	17
26	Japan	7.50	1.50	6.00		1.00		3.00	2.00	1.00	16
27	Finland	7.00	1.00	6.00		1.00		1.50	4.50		11
28	Thailand	6.83	1.08	5.75	0.58		1.33	2.33	0.58	2.00	13
29	Slovenia	5.50	1.00	4.50		1.00		3.00	1.50		14
30	Brazil	4.92	0.67	4.25		0.67		1.00	2.75	0.50	9

Note: JHTR = Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research; IJHM = Journal of International Journal of Hospitality Management; CHQ = Cornell Hospitality Quarterly; TM = Tourism Management; ATR = Annals of Tourism Research; JTR = Journal of Travel Research; HSP = hospitality; TOU = tourism.

under hospitality research. There is currently no consensus on subcategories in either field. Although this study did improve the subcategories in hospitality and tourism research by incorporating new research topics, future studies in hospitality and tourism may need to discuss this still further.

REFERENCES

Airey, D., & Tribe, J. (2000). Education for hospitality. In C. Lashley & A. Morrison (Eds.), *In search of hospitality: Theoretical perspectives and debates* (pp. 276-291). Oxford, England: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Ballantyne, R., Packer, J., & Axelsen, M. (2009). Trends in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*, 149-152.

Baloglu, S., & Assante, L. (1999). A content analysis of subject areas and research methods used in five hospitality management journals. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 23*, 53-70.

Chon, K., Evans, M., & Sutherlin, D. (1989). Trends in hospitality management literature: A content analysis. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *13*, 483-491.

Crawford-Welch, S., & McCleary, K. W. (1992). An identification of the subject areas and research techniques used in five hospitality-related journals. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *11*, 155-167.

Dale, C., & Robinson, N. (2001). The theming of tourism education: A three-domain approach. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *13*, 30-34.

Dann, G., Nash, D., & Pearce, P. (1988). Methodology in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *15*, 1-28.

Eder, R., & Umbreit, W. (1988). Hospitality research: Reassessing our strategy. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*(2), *29*, 54-55.

Ferreira, R., DeFranco, A., & Rappole, C. (1994). Rating the hospitality journals. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *13*, 209-218.

Frechtling, D. (2004). Assessment of tourism/hospitality journals' role in knowledge transfer: An exploratory study. *Journal of Travel Research*, *43*, 100-107.

Harris, P., & Brander Brown, J. (1998). Research and development in hospitality accounting and financial management. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *17*, 161-182.

Jogaratnam, G., Chon, K., McCleary, K., Mena, M., & Yoo, J. (2005). An analysis of institutional contributors to three major academic tourism journals: 1992-2001. *Tourism Management*, *26*, 641-648.

Laband, D., & Wells, J. (1998). The scholarly journal literature of economics: A historical profile of the AER, JPE, and QJE. *American Economist*, *42*(2), 47-48.

McKercher, B. (2005). A case for ranking tourism journals. *Tourism Management*, *26*, 649-651.

McKercher, B. (2008). A citation analysis of tourism scholars. *Tourism Management*, *29*, 1226-1232.

McKercher, B., Law, R., & Lam, T. (2006). Rating tourism and hospitality journals. *Tourism Management*, *27*, 1235-1252.

Page, S. (2005). Academic ranking exercises: Do they achieve anything meaningful? A personal view. *Tourism Management*, *26*, 663-666.

Pechlaner, H., Zehrer, A., Matzler, K., & Abfalter, D. (2004). A ranking of international tourism and hospitality journals. *Journal of Travel Research, 42*, 328-332.

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

Ryan, C. (2005). The ranking and rating of academics and journals in tourism research. *Tourism Management*, *26*, 657-662.

Schmidgall, R., & Woods, R. (1998). Rating the influence scholars have on their field: A citation analysis of hospitality management education, 1989-1996. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, *9*, 74-79.

Severt, D., Tesone, D., Bottorff, T., & Carpenter, M. (2009). A world ranking of the top 100 hospitality and tourism programs. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *33*, 451-470.

Svensson, G., Svaeri, S., & Einarsen, K. (2009a). "Scientific identity" of scholarly journals in hospitality and tourism research: Review and evaluation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*, 631-634.

Svensson, G., Svaeri, S., & Einarsen, K. (2009b). "Empirical characteristics" of scholarly journals in hospitality and tourism research: An assessment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*, 479-483.

Weaver, P., McCleary, K., & Farrar, A. (1990). Academic contributors to four major hospitality journals revisited. *Hospitality and Tourism Educator*, *2*, 30-32.

Kwangmin Park, PhD (e-mail: kmpark@sejong.ac.kr), is a full-time instructor in the Department of Foodservice Management, College of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Sejong University, Seoul, South Korea. **WooMi Jo Phillips**, PhD (e-mail: woomi.phillips@ndsu.edu), is an assistant professor in the Department of Apparel, Design, & Hospitality Management at North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota. **Deborah D. Canter**, PhD, RD, LD (e-mail: canter@k-state.edu), is a professor in the Department of Hospitality Management and Dietetics at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas. **JéAnna Abbott**, JD, LLM, CHE, CMP (e-mail: jlabbott@central.uh.edu), is a professor at Conrad N. Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Management, University of Houston, Houston, Texas.