

CQ: From the (New) Editor

Cornell Hospitality Quarterly
2018, Vol. 59(2) 98–99
© The Author(s) 2018
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1938965518765356
journals.sagepub.com/home/cqx



Great to be back!

I am delighted to have the opportunity to take the reins of the *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly* (CQ) for a second term. I offer a huge and heartfelt thanks to Mike Lynn for his service and leadership. Mike has had a very successful 3 years at the helm, and his efforts have had an increasingly positive impact on the journal's standing. The numbers look great, so the transition will be easy.

After I accepted the role, I sat down with Mike to discuss my vision for the journal and the extent to which I would maintain or modify the journal's vision and the editorial policies and publishing expectations. My vision is simple. We will aim to publish empirical, conceptual, and case study papers that provide new insights about important industry challenges and issues. All articles will be clearly grounded within an appropriate conceptual foundation, and authors will be able to demonstrate how the current paper extends that which we already know about the focal topic. Only methodologically rigorous studies will be considered, and all submissions must present actionable and prescriptive insights that can be used to guide real-world decision making.

In terms of editorial policies and publication expectations, I initially referred to the results from Mike's assessment of CQ author reactions to his specific editorial policies and practices, which were reported in Issue 4 of Volume 58 (2017). There were two primary takeaways for me. First, the authors who submitted their manuscripts to the CQ during Mike's term were quite supportive of his "active-editor" policies. As such, I will continue to utilize many of these policies and practices because they make sense to me, and happy authors is a good thing. Second, the results also demonstrated that none of Mike's efforts to be an active and independent editor or the journal's acceptance rates explained the increase in the total number of submissions that were submitted to the journal during Mike's time as editor. Thus, I believe I have a little license to make (and potentially experiment with) a few changes that will hopefully keep this and related positive trends going in the same direction.

The first and most substantive change is that I will revert to a decision-making structure that I enacted during my first editorial term. I share Mike's aspiration to be an active and independent editor. However, I know my limitations. As such, I am recruiting a group of outstanding hospitality scholars to serve as Associate Editors to assist me in the review process. All submissions judged to merit further consideration and external review will be assigned to one of

the Associate Editors. The Associate Editors will then review the reviewer feedback, and then based on their own assessment and the input provided by the reviewers, they will present a recommendation and accompanying rationale to me for a final decision. Although this added layer in the decision-making process may lengthen (and hopefully only slightly) the review process, the trade-off is that by exploiting the expertise of the Associate Editor group, we ensure that only the highest quality manuscripts are published in the CQ.

I will also be modifying two other policies and practices:

1. I will no longer accept or use reviews and editorial decisions from other journals. If the CQ is not the primary outlet of choice, scholars should integrate previous feedback and ensure the revised paper is consistent with the vision statement presented above.
2. I will relax the high desk rejection rate and instead, utilize the Associate Editor team as needed to help me determine if a paper will be sent for external review.

No other changes to the policies and practices that Mike adopted are planned at this time. Specifically,

1. There will be no specific formatting or style requirements for initial submissions to reduce the amount of time, effort, and in some cases, costs for submitting to CQ.
2. We will provide clear, honest, and explicit (though succinct) reasons for all decisions, and particularly rejections, to inform all authors about the requirements for future publishing success.
3. Reviewers will be asked to submit their reviews within 21 days.
4. The Associate Editors and I will consider reviewer comments as input for making our own judgments about papers rather than as determinative votes to insure well-justified decisions.
5. I will provide clarity and updates regarding our editorial policies and publication expectations, as well as summaries regarding our decisions and publishing processes, to inform prospective authors about the journal's status and the appropriateness of the CQ as an outlet for their work.

Two final items: First, I welcome your feedback and appreciate all feedback and suggestions. Please let me know how we are doing! Second, I would like to thank all members of the editorial board and reviewers for their service to the journal. I am truly grateful for your dedication and

support, and I look forward to our continued work together to advance hospitality research and practice.

Warmest regards,

J. Bruce Tracey