

5-2004

## Two New Changes to the Reviewing Process

Michael C. Sturman

*Cornell University*, [mcs5@cornell.edu](mailto:mcs5@cornell.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.sha.cornell.edu/articles>



Part of the [Hospitality Administration and Management Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Sturman, M. C. (2004). Two new changes to the reviewing process [Electronic version]. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 106-107. Retrieved [insert date], from Cornell University, School of Hospitality Administration site: <http://scholarship.sha.cornell.edu/articles/84/>

This Article or Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Hotel Administration Collection at The Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles and Chapters by an authorized administrator of The Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [hlmdigital@cornell.edu](mailto:hlmdigital@cornell.edu).

---

## Two New Changes to the Reviewing Process

### **Abstract**

[Excerpt] I am using this issue's editorial to describe some of the changes I have made to the review process for the *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*. I have come to the decision to make these changes based on feedback I have received from my editorial board, comments from authors, letters and phone calls from readers, and remarks made by my colleagues here at the Hotel School at Cornell. While, like any editor, I constantly reevaluate the way articles go through the submission process, the nature of the changes I am making do merit some particular mention. All of these changes went into effect in the beginning of 2004.

### **Keywords**

changes, reviewing process

### **Disciplines**

Hospitality Administration and Management

### **Comments**

#### **Required Publisher Statement**

© [Cornell University](http://www.cornell.edu). Reprinted with permission. All rights reserved.

---

From the Editor

---

# Two New Changes to the Reviewing Process

I am using this issue's editorial to describe some of the changes I have made to the review process for the *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*. I have come to the decision to make these changes based on feedback I have received from my editorial board, comments from authors, letters and phone calls from readers, and remarks made by my colleagues here at the Hotel School at Cornell. While, like any editor, I constantly reevaluate the way articles go through the submission process, the nature of the changes I am making do merit some particular mention. All of these changes went into effect in the beginning of 2004.

First, I am beginning a process of rating each review that is performed for the *Cornell Quarterly*. While this information will not be made public, by systematically giving a rating to every review that is returned, I will be able to make better judgments as to who remains on the editorial board, which ad hoc reviewers will be invited onto the editorial board, from whom to solicit reviews, and the like. To some extent, I have always done such evaluations; however, they were always informal and were not recorded. By systematically collecting this



information, I feel I will be able to make better decisions and, ultimately, to function more effectively as editor.

Second, I am changing the number of reviewers and the composition of such reviewers for each paper. Previously, papers submitted to the *Cornell Quarterly* that were sent out to review were sent to two reviewers. Reviewers are chosen based on the topic of the paper and, to some extent, on the style or approach used by the paper (e.g., if it could benefit from a more practitioner perspective or needed someone more knowledgeable of a specific methodological technique). Now, each paper will be sent to three reviewers, of whom at least one will be a hospitality practitioner and at least one will be an academic. This approach will help ensure that the paper is both relevant to practice and methodologically rigorous. The third reviewer could be either an academic or a practitioner, as dictated by the nature of the paper, the topic, or where I feel I need more advice.

To make the second change described above, I have had to enlist the help of a large number of practitioner reviewers. So far, forty-five practitioners have agreed to serve as ad hoc reviewers. As part of signing on, they

have agreed to review up to two papers a year and to return their reviews within thirty-five days. For many of these practitioners, the process of reviewing a paper for a journal will be a new experience, but I am looking forward to building this stronger tie with the practitioners who read the *Cornell Quarterly*. However, to accomplish my goals, I will likely need at least seventy practitioners over the course of the year to cover all of the papers that are reviewed. I am thus still in the process of looking for practitioner reviewers, and I hope some of you reading this editorial will be willing to volunteer. While there is little compensation for such work (you receive nothing more than my gratitude and a special thanks in the *Cornell Quarterly* once a year), I am hoping that involvement in the process will be inter-

esting and educational enough to maintain and expand interest in this area. If you are interested in being a reviewer, please contact me (e-mail: Michael.sturman@cornell.edu; or call 607-255-5383).

The goal of these changes is to further improve the quality of the *Cornell Quarterly*. With roughly 150 papers being submitted each year, even a small change to the review process requires that substantial systematic changes be implemented. While it has taken me longer than I hoped to make these changes, I am hopeful that evaluating reviews and including more practitioner feedback will allow the *Cornell Quarterly* to continuously improve itself and, ultimately, to better fulfill its mission of providing research-based insights to the practice of hospitality.—  
*M.C.S.*