Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

ARTICLES

Check for updates

Event management research over the past 12 years: What are the current trends in research methods, data collection, data analysis procedures, and event types?

Jason Draper[a], Lisa Young Thomas[b], and George G. Fenich[c]

[a]Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Management, University of Houston, Houston, Texas, United States of America; [b]School of Hospitality Leadership, DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois, United States of America; [c]School of Hospitality Leadership, East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina, United States of America

ABSTRACT
The meetings, expositions, events, and conventions sector has gained recognition as an academic field by growth in higher education programs including courses, programs, and textbooks, as well as research. The purpose of the extant research is to review event, tourism, and hospitality journals from 2004 to 2016 to provide insight into the current state of research in terms of data collection and data analysis procedures. Results can assist researchers identify the type of journal to target for publication with consideration of the type of event, methods, and data analysis procedures.

Introduction

The meetings, expositions, events, and convention (MEEC) industry is a relatively new sector in terms of acknowledged practice (e.g., meeting planning) and as an academic discipline (e.g., teaching and research). MEEC as an acknowledged profession appears to have occurred with the founding of Meeting Professionals International (MPI) in the early 1970s and the first recognized academic program for meeting planning began at 1976 at the Metropolitan State College in Denver, Colorado (Fenich, 2012), although the following two decades were the foundation years for the event education sector. It would take approximately three decades before the first Bachelor of Science in event management (EM) program would be offered in the United States at Central Florida University (Rosen College of Hospitality Management, n.d.). Getz and Page (2016) identify "The mid-to-late-1990s were the 'take-off' years for academic institutionalization of EM, and with it a more legitimized advancement of scholarship on event tourism and event studies" (p. 602).

The study of events is a relatively recent phenomenon, as both industry and academic research of events have grown and evolved over the past five decades (Getz &

Page, 2016; Park & Park 2017; Russell, 2017). Although Getz and Page (2016) suggest the growth in the number of event academics in the 1990s spurred growth in event research, there was modest prior research in the field. The 1990s were pivotal years as several event-related textbooks were introduced and George Washington University pioneered an EM Master's degree along with many other hospitality, leisure, and tourism programs creating event-specific courses (Getz & Page, 2016). The mid-to-late 1990s saw the scope of event research expand to include essential elements from the hospitality discipline to ensure that planned events were a welcoming experience, to gain a better understanding the businesses involved in the event process (i.e., venues and catering), and to determine how an event impacts a destination's lodging accommodations.

In the 21st century, global social media coverage of mega celebrations, festivals, sports competitions, and vibrant private sector events pushed the event industry into center stage, making events a staple of mainstream contemporary lifestyle (Getz & Page, 2016). Event attendees bring enormous income to a destination's event facilities along with direct and indirect economic impact throughout the local communities (Baloglu & Love, 2005). Additionally, word of mouth from satisfied event attendees helps promote the destination to others and increase repeat business. This global exposure to the wide variety of event sectors has created an increased demand in event courses with over 200 event-related university degree programs identified in the United States alone (Cecil, Reed, & Reed, 2011).

McKercher and Tung (2015) identified that the growth of event research gained substantial momentum in the 2000s. During this timeframe, studies began to examine MEEC research through content analysis of published papers. There are two distinct observations of research reviews in the event literature: statistical review (Lee & Back, 2005a) and thematic review (Carlsen, 1999; Crouch & Ritchie, 1998; Elston & Draper, 2012; Getz, 2008; Getz, 2010; Getz & Page, 2016; Hede, Jago, & Deery, 2003; Kim, Boo, & Kim, 2013; Lee & Back, 2005b; Li & Petrick, 2006; Park & Park, 2017; Sox, Kline, Crews, Strick, & Campbell, Online first), with a few studies combining aspects of both approaches in the same article (Crawford-Welch & McCleary, 1992; Formica, 1998; Mair, 2012; Yoo & Weber, 2005).

Literature review

Event research: Leisure versus business

Regardless of the purpose, all events focus on creating a temporary community with a meaningful experience for attendees (Fenich, 2012). In general, there are two categories of event research: leisure and business events. Leisure events are attended primarily by consumers for social and/or leisure activities, such as cultural, arts, or musical festivals; sports and recreational competitions; and private events (e.g., birthdays and weddings). Many public consumer events are planned by convention and visitors bureaus (CVBs) to increase consumer tourism demand for the destination (Li & Petrick, 2006). Therefore, leisure event research has focused on consumer

motivation to attend various themed events and, in turn, the impact the event has on the destination (Formica, 1998; Getz & Page, 2016; Li & Petrick, 2006).

Business events are created by associations, companies, and governments for educating, motivating, selling, and/or networking with their employees, members, and/or customers to achieve certain business goals (Fenich, 2012). These event formats include client appreciation events, conferences, congresses, conventions, incentive trips, meetings, product launches, tradeshows, and training sessions. A unique feature of business events is that the decision making process is extremely complex. For example, Fenich (2012) indicates associations' board of directors typically make the destination decision based on recommendations by their meeting planner. For corporate meetings, destinations and venues are typically selected at the discretion of personnel in key positions, such as company officers or managers who oversee the area (e.g., sales, marketing) of focus for the meeting. Therefore, business event research has focused on event buyers' site selection criteria and the destination suppliers' efforts to attract event planners (Crouch & Ritchie, 1998; Elston & Draper, 2012). Individual attendance numbers are important for event buyers as their financial success depends on a large attendee turnout (Fenich, 2012). Annual income from conventions, exhibits, and meetings is the largest income source for many event buyers with corporations indicating that 48% and associations noting that 32% of their annual income is brought in from business events (Russell, 2017). As such, business events are viewed as a valuable component for driving revenue to organizations and an important area for event research.

Event academic journals

The growth in event research has fueled a demand for academic journals focused solely on events. The first journal to focus on event research was *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, which began publication in 1993. In 2000, the journal changed its name to EM. The second journal focusing on events, the JCET, was founded in 1997 as the *Journal of Convention and Exhibition Management* and changed to its current name in 2004. The *International Journal of Event and Festival Management* (IJEFM) began publication in 2010. The latest event journal is the *International Journal of Hospitality and Event Management* (IJHEM), with its first issue debuting in 2014.

There are two journals that have produced event research during the time period reviewed for this study but have since discontinued publication. In 2005, the *International Journal of Event Management Research* (IJEMR) began publication but its most recent published volume was 2015. The *Journal of Venue and Event Management* (JVEM) began in 2009 and in 2013 the journal changed its focus and was renamed the *Sport and Entertainment Review*, which created a focus more peripheral to the events discipline than the other journals identified above.

Two hospitality journals have shown their increased interest in event research by creating special issues, indicating the growth and diversification in research approaches and topics under investigation in the event field. In 2010, the

International Journal of Hospitality Management's (IJHM) special issue on events included a wide range of articles, both quantitative and qualitative, from major regions around the globe on topics covering consumer leisure event research on sports, festivals, and weddings. The special issue did not include articles on business events (e.g., conventions, meetings). In 2017, the *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* (IJCHM) published a special issue with quantitative and qualitative articles focusing on a wide variety of research topics on business and consumer events, including festivals, exhibit booth design, sports competitions, and destination management.

MEEC literature reviews

As an emerging discipline, event research has sought acceptance via the more established tourism and hospitality fields by attempting to produce sound research conceptually and in terms of methods used (i.e., study design and analysis) (Lee & Back, 2005a). Academic journal articles are a key indicator of the nature and direction of research within a discipline as the articles are built on theory and previous works in the effort to extend the body of knowledge (Crawford-Welch & McCleary, 1992). Scholars in the hospitality and tourism fields have attempted to determine the progress in the event discipline by using content analysis of academic journal articles to determine the event discipline's research progress, development, and future direction (Park & Park, 2017). However, much of this stream of research tends to have a relatively narrow focus on relatively specific themes.

Thematic research reviews concentrate on a specific sector (e.g., festivals, conventions), region (e.g., Asia, Australia), or functional area (e.g., marketing, technology, site-selection process) within the broad event field. For example, two studies focused on the site selection criteria for meeting and/or convention planners (Crouch & Ritchie, 1998; Elston & Draper, 2012). From a regional perspective, Carlsen (1999) reviewed articles that originated in Asia and Australia. Research reviews that take a thematic approach conduct a rigorous categorization process of research themes in the articles under investigation by identifying the core themes and diagnosing possible reasons for missing themes. In both thematic and statistical approaches, researchers examine the changes in the event discipline over time, revealing areas of growth and decline, identifying the field's current boundaries, and recommending future research direction as the field matures.

Multiple studies over the past three decades have used content analysis to examine event research to reveal research methods and analysis techniques with the goal of providing insight into the growth and development of the event discipline. Crawford-Welch and McCleary (1992) analyzed 653 articles in five leading tourism and hospitality journals and observed that none of the 137 convention-related articles used inferential statistical analysis methods, with only a few articles using descriptive statistics, such as means, ranking, or frequencies. Crouch and Ritchie (1998) reviewed 64 articles on the convention site selection process and Formica (1998) classified 83 articles on festivals and special events. Both studies came to similar conclusions: event research represents a young academic field with

limited rigor, which is a handicap to industry decision makers but is a promising opportunity for researchers. Future research recommendations from these early event research reviews include applying inferential statistical methods to help explain the observations and/or to predict possible relationships among the variables studied with the goal of reaching a conclusion to make an impactful addition to the discipline's development (Crawford-Welch & McCleary, 1992; Crouch & Ritchie, 1997; Formica, 1998).

Yoo and Weber (2005) analyzed 14 academic journals in the fields of tourism (seven journals), hospitality (five journals), and events (two journals) to investigate convention tourism. In total, 115 journal articles were examined to capture convention tourism research trends over a 21-year period (1983 to 2003). Each article was classified as conceptual (i.e., creating a theoretical base through an extensive literature review) or empirical (i.e., testing a theory or hypothesis by employing inferential statistical analysis), a process similar to Crawford–Welch and McCleary's (1992) article classification system. Conceptual articles represented 37% of Yoo and Weber's (2005) articles studied and 63% were empirical. They further sorted the empirical articles by the statistical methods used: 43% used descriptive statistics, 15% used factor analysis, 8% used analysis of variance (ANOVA), and 6% used regression, with some articles using more than one statistical method. The academic journal with the largest number of convention tourism articles was JCET for a total of 52 articles: 60% empirical and 40% conceptual. The next two journals with the most convention tourism articles were IJHM with 12 articles and the Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly (now Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, [CHQ]) with 10 articles each; both had 50% conceptual and 50% empirical articles.

Lee and Back (2005a) conducted a content analysis of 137 articles on the meeting and convention sector from 1990 to 2003. They categorized each article's nature (i.e., quantitative or qualitative), research design (e.g., survey, experiment, description, discussion, or case study), statistical technique, research focus (e.g., meeting supplier, meeting buyers, attendees, or general industry), and functional area (e.g., site-selection process, CVB operations, meeting participation factors, or economic impact). Of the articles reviewed, 63% used some form of statistical technique. Almost all of the 86 empirical articles used descriptive statistics. Articles that used only descriptive statistics (43%) were categorized separately from studies that used inferential statistical methods, with the top methods noted as factor analysis (19%), t-test (13%), regression (9%), correlation (9%), important-performance analysis (9%), and ANOVA (8%). Lee and Back's (2005a) findings were similar to that of Yoo and Weber (2005) with descriptive research dominating the articles reviewed, yet both studies observed a noticeable upwards trend toward more sophisticated quantitative methods as time progressed. In a complimentary article, Lee and Back (2005b) conducted a thematic review of these same articles, identifying the five core research themes in convention research during the 14-year time period.

Getz (2010) compiled an extensive annotated bibliography of 423 festival-related studies from the 1960s through 2008 to create a thematic literature review to determine the impact, meanings, and roles of festivals. Of the 422 articles, 266 were from core tourism journals. EM had the most festival articles (125), Journal of Tourism

Research was second with 31 articles, and TM with 17 articles. Journal of Convention Event Tourism was ranked ninth with seven festival articles.

Mair (2012) investigated 144 business event research articles from 2000 to 2009. Business events, often called by its acronym, MICE, primarily in Asia but in other regions of the world as well, stands for meetings, incentives, conventions/conferences, and exhibitions. About half (76) of the articles were categorized as quantitative, with 56 using a multivariate statistics approach and 20 using only descriptive statistics. Of the remaining 68 articles analyzed, 34 were categorized as using a qualitative approach, 18 used a descriptive analysis of secondary data, and 16 were conceptual articles that built upon theory and proposed a model for business events. The author noted a lack of rigor in many of the quantitative articles. In addition, it was noted that only five qualitative methods articles were published in top ranked journals. JCET was the journal with the largest number (98) of business event articles during this 10-year period, with *Tourism Management (TM)* ranking second with 10 articles, and *EM* in third place with seven articles. Mair (2012) strongly urged that future business event researchers use in-depth qualitative methods, such as ethnographic or discourse analysis, to better understand the meanings that individuals attach to business events to truly progress this important research stream.

Kim et al. (2013) investigated 178 event studies retrieved from three tourism journals, (*Annals of Tourism Research* [ATR], *Journal of Travel Research* [JTR], and TM), from 1980 to 2010 with a focus on determining the event trends and patterns during the 30-year period. The percentage of event research retrieved from ATR was 3.8%, 5.0% in JTR, and 5.4% in TM. As with most thematic research reviews, researchers have called for future research that investigates areas that their thematic research lacked, such as investigating the research design and statistical methods in event research, including event research from a larger number of tourism, hospitality, and event-specific journals, and monitoring trends and patterns as the event discipline matures (Carlsen, 1999; Elston & Draper, 2012; Hede et al., 2003; Kim et al., 2013; Park & Park, 2017).

Need for updated study and study purpose

The aim of this manuscript is to serve as a "state-of-the-art" article in the event discipline by expanding on the previous statistical research reviews in the event field (Crawford-Welch & McCleary, 1992; Lee & Back, 2005a). The current research study builds on the Lee and Back (2005a) meeting and convention literature review study by conducting an analysis of event research from 2004 to 2016, with this study expanding the data collection to include both business and leisure event studies. In addition, the extant research strengthens previous reviews of the literature by comparing event research from a larger pool of academic journals than previous studies, by including event journals from 2004 to 2016, as well as the top tourism and hospitality journals as ranked in a study by Gursoy and Sandstrom (2016). The study examines the following characteristics by year and type of journal (i.e., event, tourism, hospitality): study method (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, mixed method,

conceptual), type of event (i.e., leisure, business, other), data collection (e.g., onsite, email/online), and data analysis procedures. The study does not examine or analyze article content.

Methods

Data for this study were collected by reviewing and coding a number of characteristics of event-related academic journal articles published from 2004 through the most recently available issue at the time of data collection, which in many instances was during 2016. As noted in later sections of this paper, not all articles published in 2015 and 2016 were available for download as a result of delayed online publishing. However, articles that were available were included because the primary purpose(s) of the study is not a ranking by year, but an assessment of data collection and data analysis techniques. In order to identify MEEC-related articles, the following journals with a title that emphasizes this sector were collected: *EM, IJMER, IJEFM, International Journal of Hospitality & Event Management, Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, and *JVEM* (2009–2013, then became *Sport and Entertainment Review*). In addition, articles in hospitality and tourism journals were included in the study.

After reviewing options to identify appropriate hospitality and tourism journals to include, a study conducted to rank the top hospitality and tourism journals was utilized (Gursoy & Sandstrom, 2016). Gursoy and Sandstrom (2016) presented the results of their study in terms of rankings of journals according to the top 100 researchers and then other researchers. The study also provided a combined ranking of the two groups, which was used to identify top tourism and top hospitality journals, which are included in this study. The tourism journals were *ATR, TM, JTR, Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, Tourism Analysis, Current Issues in Tourism, International Journal of Tourism Research, Tourism Geographies*, and *Tourism Economics*. The hospitality journals were *IJHM, Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, IJCHM, Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management, Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, and *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*. In total, the current study includes six Event Management, ten tourism, and eight hospitality journals for a total of 24.

A database was created to track the relevant elements or characteristics of the articles reviewed for this study. First, elements of the article (e.g., journal name, year, title, volume, issue, page numbers, and keywords) were entered into the database. This allowed tracking and comparisons over time (i.e., year) and by journal, as well as identify each article in case of possible miscoding or the need to verify coding. In addition, a variable was created to track the type of journal (i.e., events, tourism, hospitality). Author names and affiliations were not included as the study does not focus on who conducted the studies, but more so about the type of research and events, data collection, and data analysis procedures.

Variables were also created for the type of paper (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, conceptual), and whether the event was leisure (e.g., festival), business (e.g., conference, group meeting, tradeshow), or other. A series of data

Table 1. Frequency of event articles in journals.

	Frequency	Percentage
Event journals		
Event Management	289	47.0%
Journal of Convention & Event Tourism	153	24.9%
International Journal of Event and Festival Management (began 2010)	96	15.6%
International Journal of Event Management Research (2005–15)	45	7.3%
Journal of Venue and Event Management (2009–13)	25	4.1%
International Journal of Hospitality & Event Management (began 2014)	7	1.1%
	615	100.0%
Tourism journals		
Tourism Management	31	15.5%
Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing	29	14.5%
International Journal of Tourism Research	28	14.0%
Tourism Economics	25	12.5%
Journal of Travel Research	21	10.5%
Current Issues in Tourism	19	9.5%
Tourism Analysis	19	9.5%
Journal of Sustainable Tourism	13	6.5%
Annals of Tourism Research	8	4.0%
Tourism Geographies	7	3.5%
	200	100.0%
Hospitality journals		
International Journal of Hospitality Management	24	32.0%
International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management	17	22.7%
Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management	15	20.0%
International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration	6	8.0%
Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research	6	8.0%
Cornell Hospitality Quarterly	2	2.7%
Journal of Foodservice Business Research	2	2.7%
	75	100.0%

collection techniques were created and coded with a "1" if used in each study. The same procedure was used to track data analysis procedures.

The study included full-length research-oriented articles and excluded published materials such as conference reports, letters to the editor, and book reviews. Since the tourism and hospitality journals included non-event-related articles, each article's title, abstract, and keywords were reviewed to determine if it was MEEC related.

Results

A total of 890 MEEC articles were reviewed for this study (Table 1). As would be expected, most (69.1%) of the articles were from the event-related journals. Almost one-fourth (22.5%) were in the top tourism journals and 8.4% in the top hospitality journals using rankings by Gursoy and Sandstrom (2016). However, this study and display of the frequencies and percentages is not intended to provide any sort of ranking of the journals. It is also important to recognize that not all of the journals were in existence throughout the timeframe examined in this study and some changed names and/or focus. Such details are documented in parentheses after each journal in Table 1.

Analyses by year

MEEC articles in the journals used in this study peaked overall in 2013 with 108, driven by 73 in event journals (Table 2). It is important to recognize there were

Table 2. Type of journal by year.

	Frequency (Percentage within type of event) (Percentage within year)			
	Event journals	Tourism journals	Hospitality journals	Total (Percentage of total)
2004	37 (6.0) (80.4)	8 (4.0) (17.4)	1 (1.3) (2.2)	46 (5.2)
2005	26 (4.2) (61.9)	12 (6.0) (28.6)	4 (5.3) (9.5)	42 (4.7)
2006	30 (4.9) (75.0)	9 (4.5) (22.5)	1 (1.3) (2.5)	40 (4.5)
2007	31 (5.0) (70.5)	12 (6.0) (27.3)	1 (1.3) (2.3)	44 (4.9)
2008	46 (7.5) (70.8)	12 (6.0) (18.5)	7 (9.3) (10.8)	65 (7.3)
2009	40 (6.5) (71.4)	11 (5.5) (19.6)	5 (6.7) (8.9)	56 (6.3)
2010	63 (10.2) (67.0)	13 (6.5) (13.8)	18 (24.0) (19.1)	94 (10.5)
2011	65 (10.6) (69.9)	19 (9.5) (20.4)	9 (12.0) (9.7)	93 (10.4)
2012	66 (10.7) (64.7)	31 (15.5) (30.4)	5 (6.7) (4.9)	102 (11.5)
2013	73 (11.9) (67.6)	29 (14.5) (26.9)	6 (8.0) (5.6)	108 (12.1)
2014	69 (11.2) (75.0)	16 (8.0) (17.4)	7 (9.3) (7.6)	92 (10.3)
2015[a]	61 (9.9) (74.4)	17 (8.5) (20.7)	4 (5.3) (4.9)	82 (9.2)
2016[a]	8 (1.3) (30.8)	11 (5.5) (42.3)	7 (9.3) (26.9)	26 (2.9)
	615 (100.0) (69.1)	200 (100.0) (22.5)	75 (100.0) (8.4)	890 (100.0)

[a]*Not* all 2015–2016 articles available for download due to online publishing delays.

a number of articles published in 2012 and 2013 related to mega events (e.g., Olympics, FIFA World Cup) that occurred within a few years prior to the publication of such articles. The large increase in hospitality journals publishing MEEC articles in 2010 was the result of the *IJHM* publishing a special issue with 18 event-related articles. The online publishing delay for numerous journals is reflected in the number of event-related articles included in this study for 2015 and 2016. However, since the purpose of the study goes well beyond just tracking the number by year all articles since 2014 that could be retrieved were included.

Table 3 presents the method of study (e.g., quantitative, qualitative) by year. Quantitative articles peaked in 2012 and 2013. From 2010 through 2015, the qualitative articles published steadily remained about 20 per year, after being approximately half that many between 2004 and 2009. In 2014 and 2015, mixed methods articles became more prominent.

Table 3. Study method by year.

	Frequency (Percentage within method) (Percentage within year)				
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Mixed methods	Conceptual	Total (Percentage of total)
2004	23 (4.8) (50.0)	8 (4.3) (17.4)	3 (3.5) (6.5)	12 (8.7) (26.1)	46 (5.2)
2005	23 (4.8) (54.8)	11 (5.9) (26.2)	3 (3.5) (7.1)	5 (3.6) (11.9)	42 (4.7)
2006	15 (3.1) (37.5)	10 (5.3) (25.0)	2 (2.3) (5.0)	13 (9.4) (32.5)	40 (4.5)
2007	16 (3.3) (36.4)	15 (8.0) (34.1)	3 (3.5) (6.8)	10 (7.2) (22.7)	44 (4.9)
2008	37 (7.7) (56.9)	11 (5.9) (16.9)	6 (7.0) (9.2)	11 (8.0) (16.9)	65 (7.3)
2009	37 (7.7) (66.1)	7 (3.7) (12.5)	3 (3.5) (5.4)	9 (6.5) (16.1)	56 (6.3)
2010	54 (11.3) (57.4)	20 (10.7) 21.3)	8 (9.3) (8.5)	12 (8.7) (12.8)	94 (10.6)
2011	54 (11.3) (58.1)	18 (9.6) (19.4)	9 (10.5) (9.7)	12 (8.7) 12.9)	93 (10.4)
2012	62 (12.9) (60.8)	19 (10.2) (18.6)	5 (5.8) (4.9)	16 (11.6) (15.7)	102 (11.5)
2013	67 (14.0) (62.0)	20 (10.7) (18.5)	8 (9.3) (7.4)	13 (9.4) (12.0)	108 (12.1)
2014	36 (7.5) (39.1)	26 (13.9) (28.3)	18 (20.9) (19.6)	12 (8.7) (13.0)	92 (10.3)
2015[a]	38 (7.9) (46.3)	19 (10.2) (23.2)	13 (15.1) (15.9)	12 (8.7) (14.6)	82 (9.2)
2016[a]	17 (3.5) (65.4)	3 (1.6) (11.5)	5 (5.8) (19.2)	1 (0.7) (3.8)	26 (2.9)
	479 (53.8)[a]	187 (21.0)	86 (9.7)	138 (15.5)	890 (100.0)

Note. The last row represents the frequency by method and, in parentheses, percentage of total articles.
[a]Not all 2015–2016 articles available for download due to online publishing delays.

Table 4. Type of event article by year.

	Frequency (Percentage within type of event) (Percentage within year)			
	Leisure/consumer[a]	Business[b]	Other[c]	Total
2004	30 (4.4) (65.2)	14 (9.5) (30.4)	2 (3.1) (4.3)	46 (5.2)
2005	17 (2.5) (40.5)	20 (13.6) (47.6)	5 (7.7) (11.9)	42 (4.7)
2006	25 (3.7) (62.5)	4 (2.7) (10.0)	11 (16.9) (27.5)	40 (4.5)
2007	39 (5.8) (88.6)	4 (2.7) (9.1)	1 (1.5) (2.3)	44 (4.9)
2008	41 (6.0) (63.1)	18 (12.2) (27.7)	6 (9.2) (9.2)	65 (7.3)
2009	38 (5.6) (67.9)	13 (8.8) (23.2)	5 (7.7) (8.9)	56 (6.3)
2010	70 (10.3) (74.5)	20 (13.6) (21.3)	4 (6.2) (4.3)	94 (10.6)
2011	71 (10.5) (76.3)	12 (8.2) (12.9)	10 (15.4) (10.8)	93 (10.4)
2012	87 (12.8) (85.3)	13 (8.8) (12.7)	2 (3.1) (2.0)	102 (11.5)
2013	90 (13.3) (83.3)	13 (8.8) (12.0)	5 (7.7) (4.6)	108 (12.1)
2014	78 (11.5) (84.8)	8 (5.4) (8.7)	6 (9.2) (6.5)	92 (10.3)
2015[d]	72 (10.6) (87.8)	3 (2.0) (3.7)	7 (10.8) (8.5)	82 (9.2)
2016[d]	20 (2.9) (76.9)	5 (3.4) (19.2)	1 (1.5) (3.8)	26 (2.9)
	678 (76.2)	147 (16.5)	65 (7.3)	890 (100.0)

[a]Leisure/consumer events included sporting events, festivals, and other public events.
[b]Business events included meetings, conventions, and tradeshows.
[c]Other included articles where the topic was not type of event specific (e.g., sustainability, technology) and looked at the overall MEEC industry overall rather than a more specific type of event.
[d]Not all 2015–2016 articles available for download due to online publishing delays.

Table 4 displays the articles according to the type of event (e.g., leisure, business) by year. More than three-fourths (76.2%) of the articles were based on leisure/consumer events, followed by 16.5% business events.

Table 5 includes the data collection procedure(s) for quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods articles, representing 752 of the papers reviewed for this study. About one-third (32.6%) of the 752 studies used on-site data collection, followed by 29.4% based on interviews. A limited number of studies also mentioned using the Delphi technique.

Table 6 displays the data analysis procedures used by the years included in the study. Besides descriptive statistics (60.6%), the top data analysis techniques used included exploratory analysis/principal components analysis (21.3%), t-tests (14.6%), and ANOVA (13.8%). Other techniques that have gained popularity since 2010 include confirmatory factors analysis (CFA) (11.2%) and structural equation modeling (SEM) (9.7%).

Analysis by type of journal

Table 7 presents the frequencies and percentages for each of the three types of journals, as well as total, by the type of method used to conduct the study. Over half (53.8%) of the total studies were quantitative, 21.0% qualitative, and 15.5% conceptual. The remaining 9.7% were conducted using mixed methods. A chi-square test ($\chi^2 = 37.05$, $p < .001$) of independence was significant. Tourism journals (72.0%) had a higher likelihood of publishing quantitative papers than event (47.6%) and hospitality (56.0%) journals. Event journals were more likely to publish qualitative (23.7%) mixed methods (11.2%) and conceptual (17.4%) articles compared to tourism and hospitality journals.

Table 5. Data collection procedures by year.

	Frequency (Percentage within method) (Percentage within year)							
	Mail/fax	Email/online	On-site	Interviews	Secondary data	Experiment	Case study	Total
2004	6 (10.9) (17.6)	2 (1.3) (5.9)	10 (4.1) (29.4)	10 (4.5) (29.4)	12 (7.8) (35.3)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	4 (4.9) (11.8)	34 (4.5)
2005	7 (12.7) (18.9)	3 (1.9) (8.1)	10 (4.1) (27.0)	12 (5.4) (32.4)	8 (5.2) (21.6)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (1.2) (2.7)	37 (4.9)
2006	3 (5.5) (11.1)	2 (1.3) (7.4)	7 (2.9) (25.9)	10 (4.5) (37.0)	11 (7.2) (40.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	5 (6.2) (18.5)	27 (3.6)
2007	2 (3.6) (5.9)	4 (2.5) (11.8)	10 (4.1) (29.4)	14 (6.3) (41.2)	9 (5.9) (26.5)	2 (16.7) (5.9)	9 (11.1) (26.5)	34 (4.5)
2008	8 (14.5) (14.8)	10 (6.4) (18.5)	18 (7.3) (33.3)	14 (6.3) (25.9)	15 (9.8) (27.8)	3 (25.0) (5.6)	6 (7.4) (11.1)	54 (7.2)
2009	4 (7.3) (8.5)	14 (8.9) (29.8)	13 (5.3) (27.7)	11 (5.0) (23.4)	12 (7.8) (25.5)	1 (8.3) (2.1)	3 (3.7) (6.4)	47 (6.3)
2010	6 (10.9) (7.3)	18 (11.5) (22.0)	24 (9.8) (29.3)	23 (10.4) (28.0)	12 (7.8) (14.6)	2 (16.7) (2.4)	9 (11.1) (11.0)	82 (10.9)
2011	2 (3.6) (2.5)	16 (10.2) (19.8)	25 (10.2) (30.9)	30 (13.6) (37.0)	18 (11.8) (22.2)	2 (16.7) (2.5)	9 (11.1) (11.1)	81 (10.8)
2012	7 (12.7) (8.1)	21 (13.4) (24.4)	39 (15.9) (45.3)	20 (9.0) (23.3)	12 (7.8) (14.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	6 (7.4) (7.0)	86 (11.4)
2013	3 (5.5) (3.2)	28 (17.8) (29.5)	31 (12.7) (32.6)	28 (12.7) (29.5)	11 (7.2) (11.6)	1 (8.3) (1.1)	9 (11.1) (9.5)	95 (12.6)
2014	6 (10.9) (7.5)	19 (12.1) (23.8)	27 (11.0) (33.8)	20 (9.0) (25.0)	11 (7.2) (13.8)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	8 (9.9) (10.0)	80 (10.6)
2015[a]	0 (0.0) (0.0)	17 (10.8) (24.3)	19 (7.8) (27.1)	22 (10.0) (31.4)	19 (12.4) (27.1)	1 (8.3) (1.4)	10 (12.3) (14.3)	70 (9.3)
2016[a]	1 (1.8) (4.0)	3 (1.9) (12.0)	12 (4.9) (48.0)	7 (3.2) (28.0)	3 (2.0) (12.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	2 (2.5) (8.0)	25 (3.3)
	55 (7.3)	157 (20.9)	245 (32.6)	221 (29.4)	153 (20.3)	12 (1.6)	81 (10.8)	752 (100.0)

Note. The total for each year is based on sum of quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods papers. It excludes conceptual papers. Totals do not add to 752 since articles can use more than one method for data collection. Percentages of total within method is the frequency divided by total number of articles ($n = 752$) included in the analysis for this table.
[a]Not all 2015–2016 articles available for download due to online publishing delays.

Table 6. Data analysis procedures by year.

	Descriptive statistics	Crosstabs	Chi-square	t-test	ANOVA	MANOVA	ANCOVA	MANCOVA
	Frequency (Percentage within analysis procedure) (Percentage within year)							
2004	21 (4.6) (61.8)	1 (4.8) (2.9)	6 (6.6) (17.6)	2 (1.8) (5.9)	4 (3.8) (11.8)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2005	27 (5.9) (73.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (1.1) (2.7)	6 (5.5) (16.2)	4 (3.8) (10.8)	1 (3.3) (2.7)	1 (33.3) (2.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2006	17 (3.7) (63.0)	1 (4.8) (3.7)	2 (2.2) (7.4)	2 (1.8) (7.4)	1 (1.0) 3.7	1 (3.3) (3.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2007	17 (3.7) (50.0)	1 (4.8) (2.9)	2 (2.2) (5.9)	4 (3.6) (11.8)	3 (2.9) (8.8)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (33.3) 2.9
2008	29 (6.4) (53.7)	1 (4.8) (1.9)	8 (8.8) (14.8)	9 (8.2) (16.7)	8 (7.7) (14.8)	2 (6.7) (3.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2009	36 (7.9) (76.6)	1 (4.8) (2.1)	10 (11.0) (21.3)	9 (8.2) (19.1)	7 (6.7) (14.9)	3 (10.0) (6.4)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2010	54 (11.8) (65.9)	3 (14.3) (3.7)	12 (13.2) (14.6)	16 (14.5) (19.5)	15 (14.4) (18.3)	3 (10.0) (3.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2011	46 (10.1) (56.8)	3 (14.3) (3.7)	8 (8.8) (9.9)	9 (8.2) (11.1)	10 (9.6) (12.3)	6 (20.0) (7.4)	1 (33.3) (1.2)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2012	56 (12.3) (65.1)	5 (23.8) (5.8)	14 (15.4) (16.3)	11 (10.0) (12.8)	12 (11.5) (14.0)	5 (16.7) (5.8)	1 (33.3) 1.2	1 (33.3) (1.2)
2013	60 (13.2) (63.2)	3 (14.3) (3.2)	9 (9.9) (9.5)	19 (17.3) (20.0)	17 (16.3) (17.9)	4 (13.3) (4.2)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (33.3) (1.1)
2014	43 (9.4) (53.8)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	5 (5.5) (6.3)	10 (9.1) (12.5)	9 (8.7) (11.3)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2015[a]	35 (7.7) (50.0)	2 (9.5) (2.9)	10 (11.0) (14.3)	10 (9.1) 14.3	8 (7.7) (11.4)	3 (10.0) (4.3)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2016[a]	15 (3.3) (60.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	4 (4.4) (46.0)	3 (2.7) (12.0)	6 (5.8) (24.0)	2 (6.7) (8.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
	456 (60.6)	21 (2.8)	91 (12.1)	110 (14.6)	104 (13.8)	30 (4.0)	3 (0.4)	3 (0.4)

	EFA/PCA	Discriminant analysis	Conjoint analysis	Cluster analysis	Importance-performance/gap analysis	Correlation	Univariate/multivariate regression	Logistic regression
	Frequency (Percentage within analysis procedure) (Percentage within year)							
2004	5 (3.1) (14.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (2.8) (2.9)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	3 (2.9) (8.8)	1 (4.0) (2.9)
2005	7 (4.4) (18.9)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (2.8) (2.7)	1 (7.7) (2.7)	3 (4.8) (8.1)	1 (1.0) (2.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2006	4 (2.5) (14.8)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (7.7) 3.7	0 (0.0) (0.0)	3 (2.9) (11.1)	1 (4.0) (3.7)
2007	6 (3.8) (17.6)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	3 (8.3) (8.8)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	2 (3.2) (5.9)	7 (6.8) (20.6)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2008	16 (10.0) (29.6)	2 (25.0) (4.3)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	2 (5.6) (3.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	3 (4.8) (5.6)	5 (4.9) (9.3)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
2009	11 (6.9) (23.4)	1 (12.5) (1.2)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	5 (13.9) (10.6)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	3 (4.8) (6.4)	9 (8.7) (19.1)	1 (4.0) (2.1)
2010	21 (13.1) (25.6)	1 (12.5) (1.2)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	4 (11.1) (4.9)	4 (30.8) (4.9)	9 (14.5) (11.0)	15 (14.6) (18.3)	3 (12.0) (3.7)
2011	11 (6.9) (13.6)	1 (12.5) (1.2)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	3 (8.3) (3.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	4 (6.5) (4.9)	8 (7.8) (9.9)	2 (8.0) (2.5)
2012	21 (13.1) (24.4)	2 (25.0) (2.1)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	5 (13.9) (5.8)	2 (15.4) (2.3)	11 (17.7) (12.8)	11 (10.7) (12.8)	3 (12.0) (3.5)
2013	21 (13.1) (22.1)	1 (12.5) (1.3)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	9 (25.0) (9.5)	1 (7.7) (1.1)	10 (16.1) (10.5)	14 (13.6) (14.7)	5 (20.0) (5.3)
2014	12 (7.5) (15.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (2.8) (1.3)	3 (23.1) (3.8)	6 (9.7) (7.5)	14 (13.6) (17.5)	2 (8.0) (2.5)
2015[a]	18 (11.3) (25.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	2 (5.6) (2.9)	1 (7.7) (1.4)	5 (8.1) (7.1)	9 (8.7) (12.9)	6 (24.0) (8.6)
2016[a]	7 (4.4) (28.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	6 (9.7) (24.0)	4 (3.9) (16.0)	1 (4.0) (4.0)
	160 (21.3)	8 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	36 (4.8)	13 (1.7)	62 (8.2)	103 (13.7)	25 (3.3)

	Confirmatory factor analysis	Structural equation modeling	Path analysis	Economic impact	Phenomenology	Grounded theory	Ethnography	Total
2004	1 (1.2) (2.9)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	5 (12.2) (14.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (14.3) (2.9)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	34 (4.5)
2005	3 (3.6) (8.1)	3 (4.1) (8.1)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	5 (12.2) (13.5)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (14.3) (2.7)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	37 (4.9)
2006	1 (1.2) (3.7)	2 (2.7) (7.4)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	2 (4.9) (7.4)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (7.1) (3.7)	27 (3.6)
2007	3 (3.6) (8.8)	1 (1.4) (2.9)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (2.4) (2.9)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (7.1) (2.9)	34 (4.5)
2008	6 (7.1) (11.1)	4 (5.5) (7.4)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	3 (7.3) (5.6)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	54 (7.2)
2009	5 (6.0) (10.6)	4 (5.5) (8.5)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	47 (6.3)
2010	4 (4.8) (4.9)	5 (6.8) (6.1)	2 (50.0) (2.4)	2 (4.9) (2.4)	1 (20.0) (1.2)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	82 (10.9)
2011	11 (13.1) (13.6)	6 (8.2) (7.4)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	6 (14.6) (7.4)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	81 (10.8)
2012	8 (9.5) (9.3)	11 (15.1) (12.8)	1 (25.0) (1.2)	5 (12.2) (5.8)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	2 (14.3) (2.3)	86 (11.4)
2013	16 (19.0) (16.8)	12 (16.4) (12.6)	1 (25.0) (1.1)	5 (12.2) (5.3)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	2 (28.6) (2.1)	3 (21.4) (3.2)	95 (12.6)
2014	9 (10.7) (11.3)	7 (9.6) (8.8)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	4 (9.8) (5.0)	1 (20.0) 1.3	1 (14.3) (1.3)	3 (21.4) (3.8)	80 (10.6)
2015[a]	10 (11.9) (14.3)	10 (13.7) (14.3)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	2 (4.9) (2.9)	2 (40.0) (2.9)	1 (14.3) (1.4)	3 (21.4) (4.3)	70 (9.3)
2016[a]	7 (8.3) (28.0)	8 (11.0) (32.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (2.4) (4.0)	1 (20.0) (4.0)	1 (14.3) (4.0)	1 (7.1) (4.0)	25 (3.3)
	84 (11.2)	73 (9.7)	4 (0.5)	41 (5.5)	5 (0.7)	7 (0.9)	14 (1.9)	752 (100.0)

Note. Totals do not add to 752 since articles can use more than one data analysis procedure. Percentages of total within method is the frequency divided by total number of articles ($n = 752$) included in the analysis for this table.
[a]Not all 2015–2016 articles available for download due to online publishing delays.

Table 7. Study method by type of journal.

	Frequency (Percentage within method) (Percentage within journal type)				
	Quantitative	Qualitative	Mixed methods	Conceptual	Total
Event	293 (61.2) (47.6)	146 (78.1) (23.7)	69 (80.2) (11.2)	107 (77.5) (17.4)	615 (69.1)
Tourism	144 (30.1) (72.0)	26 (13.9) (13.0)	9 (10.5) (4.5)	21 (15.2) (10.5)	200 (22.5)
Hospitality	42 (8.8) (56.0)	15 (8.0) (20.0)	8 (9.3) (10.7)	10 (7.2) (13.3)	75 (8.4)
	479 (53.8)	187 (21.0)	86 (9.7)	138 (15.5)	890 (100.0)

Next, articles in each type of journal were examined according to the type of event (Table 8). The event types were classified into leisure/consumer (e.g., sports, cultural, musical) and business (e.g., conference, group meeting, tradeshow). There was also a category coded "other," which included papers where the type of event was not clearly identified. The chi-square test of independence was significant ($\chi^2 = 45.20$, $p < .001$). Just over three-fourths (76.2%) of all articles were classified as leisure/consumer, followed by 16.5% business events. Tourism (83.5%) and event (76.4%) journals were more likely to publish leisure/consumer articles while hospitality (38.7%) journals were more likely to publish business event articles compared to event (14.1%) and tourism (15.5%) journals.

Table 9 displays the crosstabs for method of data collection within each type of journal for empirical studies. A chi-square test was not conducted since each type of data collection was a separate variable as a result of multiple data collection techniques within a given study (e.g., intercepting on-site to collect email address for a follow-up email/online procedure to complete a survey). The most common data collection procedure was on-site (32.6%), followed by interviews (29.0%) and email/online (20.9%). For event journals, the most common data collection procedures included interviews (32.7%), on-site (26.2%), and email/online (22.4%). Interviews were also the most common procedure in hospitality journals (33.8%), while on-site was the most common for tourism journals (52.0%).

Table 10 displays the data analysis procedures by type of journal. After descriptive statistics (60.6%), EFA/PCA (21.3%) was the most common procedure, followed by t-test (14.6%), ANOVA (13.8%), and univariate/multivariate regression (13.7%). However, when examining papers that performed EFA/PCA, the most

Table 8. Type of event by type of journal.

	Frequency (Percentage within type of event) (Percentage within type of journal)			
	Leisure/consumer[a]	Business[b]	Other[c]	Total
Event	470 (69.3) (76.4)	87 (59.2) (14.1)	58 (89.2) (9.4)	615 (69.1)
Tourism	167 (24.6) (83.5)	31 (21.1) (15.5)	2 (3.1) (1.0)	200 (22.5)
Hospitality	41 (6.0) (54.7)	29 (19.7) (38.7)	5 (7.7) (6.7)	75 (8.4)
	678 (76.2)	147 (16.5)	65 (7.3)	890 (100.0)

[a]Leisure/consumer events included sporting events, festivals, and other public events.
[b]Business events included meetings, conventions, and tradeshows.
[c]Other included articles where the topic was not type of event specific (e.g., sustainability, technology) and looked at the overall MEEC industry overall rather than a more specific type of event.

Table 9. Data collection procedures by type of journal.

	Frequency (Percentage within method) (Percentage within type of journal)						
	Mail/fax	Email/online	On-site	Interviews	Secondary data	Experiment	Case study	Total
Event	37 (67.3) (7.3)	114 (72.6) (22.4)	133 (54.3) (26.2)	166 (76.1) (32.7)	67 (71.3) (13.2)	11 (1.5) (91.7)	68 (84.0) (13.4)	508 (67.6)
Tourism	13 (23.6) (7.3)	31 (19.7) (17.3)	93 (38.0) (52.0)	30 (13.8) (16.8)	20 (21.3) (11.2)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	6 (7.4) (3.4)	179 (23.8)
Hospitality	5 (9.1) (7.7)	12 (7.6) (18.5)	19 (7.8) (29.2)	22 (10.1) (33.8)	7 (7.4) (10.8)	1 (8.3) (1.5)	7 (8.6) (10.8)	65 (8.6)
Total	55 (7.3)	157 (20.9)	245 (32.6)	218 (29.0)	94 (12.5)	12 (1.6)	81 (10.8)	752 (100.0)
				Frequency (Percentage of total within method)			

Note. Totals do not add to 752 since articles can use more than one data analysis procedure. Percentages of total within method is the frequency divided by total number of articles (*n* = 752) included in the analysis for this table.

Table 10. Data analysis procedures by type of journal.

	Frequency (Percentage within analysis procedure) (Percentage within type of journal)						
	Descriptive statistics	Crosstabs	Chi-square	t-test	ANOVA	MANOVA	ANCOVA
Events	270 (59.2) (53.1)	18 (85.7) (3.5)	57 (62.6) (11.2)	63 (57.3) (12.4)	65 (62.5) (12.8)	22 (73.3) (4.3)	1 (33.3) (0.2)
Tourism	145 (31.8) 81.0	3 (14.3) (1.7)	19 (20.9) (10.6)	25 (22.7) (14.0)	32 (30.8) (17.9)	5 (16.7) (2.8)	2 (66.7) (1.1)
Hospitality	41 (9.0) (63.1)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	15 (16.5) (23.1)	22 (20.0) (33.8)	7 (6.7) (10.8)	3 (10.0) (4.6)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
Total	456 (60.6)	21 (2.8)	91 (12.1)	110 (14.6)	104 (13.8)	30 (4.0)	3 (0.4)

	Frequency (Percentage within analysis procedure) (Percentage within type of journal)							
	MANCOVA	Exploratory factor analysis/principal components analysis	Discriminant analysis	Conjoint analysis	Cluster analysis	Importance-performance analysis/gap analysis	Correlation
Events	1 (33.3) (0.2)	96 (60.0) (18.9)	6 (75.0) (1.2)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	25 (69.4) (4.9)	10 (76.9) (2.0)	36 (58.1) (7.1)
Tourism	2 (66.7) (1.1)	49 (30.6) (27.4)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	9 (25.0) (5.0)	3 (23.1) (1.7)	12 (19.4) (6.7)
Hospitality	0 (0.0) (0.0)	15 (9.4) (23.1)	2 (25.0) (3.1)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	2 (5.6) (3.1)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	14 (22.6) (21.5)
Total	3 (0.4)	160 (21.3)	8 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	36 (4.8)	13 (1.7)	62 (8.2)

	Frequency (Percentage within analysis procedure) (Percentage within type of journal)							
	Univariate/multivariate regression	Logistic regression	Confirmatory factor analysis	Structural equation modeling	Path analysis	Economic impact	Phenomenology
Events	65 (63.1) (12.8)	16 (64.0) (3.1)	34 (40.5) (6.7)	23 (31.5) (4.5)	3 (75.0) (0.6)	23 (56.1) (4.5)	5 (100.0) (1.0)
Tourism	32 (31.1) (17.9)	5 (20.0) (2.8)	32 (38.1) (17.9)	35 (47.9) (19.6)	1 (25.0) (0.6)	17 (41.5) (9.5)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
Hospitality	6 (5.8) (9.2)	4 (16.0) (6.2)	18 (21.4) (27.7)	15 (20.5) (23.1)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	1 (2.4) (1.5)	0 (0.0) (0.0)
Total	103 (13.7)	25 (3.3)	84 (11.2)	73 (9.7)	4 (0.5)	41 (5.5)	5 (0.7)

	Grounded theory	Ethnography	Total
Events	6 (85.7) (1.2)	10 (71.4) (2.0)	508 (67.6)
Tourism	1 (14.3) (0.6)	4 (28.6) (2.2)	179 (23.8)
Hospitality	0 (0.0) (0.0)	0 (0.0) (0.0)	65 (8.6)
Total	7 (0.9)	14 (1.9)	752 (100.0)

Note. Totals do not add to 752 since articles can use more than one data analysis procedure. Percentages of total within method is the frequency divided by total number of articles ($n = 752$) included in the analysis for this table.

common subsequent procedures were ANOVA (29.2%), *t*-test (26.7%), and univariate/multivariate regression (22.4%).

When examining articles within each type of journal, CFA was popular within tourism (17.9% of all tourism articles) and hospitality (27.7% of all hospitality articles) journals, compared to 6.7% of all of the event journals articles reviewed including the procedure. SEM was also popular within tourism (19.6%) and hospitality (23.1%) journals. Almost all of the economic impact studies were published in event (56.1%) and tourism (41.5%) journals, with only one was identified in a hospitality journal.

Discussion

The overarching purpose of this study was to review the type of event research published in event, tourism, and hospitality journals from 2004 through the time the data were coded. The approach undertaken to conduct the study provides quantitative results, such as the frequencies and percentages of the type of event, data collection procedures, and statistical techniques used by journal and/or by year. The number of event-related articles is classified by year and by journal type in an attempt to identify the larger contributors to the field.

Journals

Among all the journals coded/classified, *EM* (with four annual issues) accounted for 32% of all EM articles, followed by the *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism* (four issues annually) (17%), and the *IJEFM* (IJHM) at 11% (which began publication in 2010 with three annual issues). However, as mentioned, this is not a ranking of event journals and each journal could have different page allotments given by their publishing company that would not allow direct comparisons of the journals based on the number of articles reviewed for this study. The proliferation of event research is not only due to the number of event-specific journals but also due to the increased event articles published in hospitality and tourism journals, which is a reflection of the event field's growth (McKercher & Tung, 2015).

Since the 1970s, event research has been more closely tied to tourism than hospitality (Getz & Page, 2016). Therefore, having a greater quantity of event research being produced by tourism journals, with 200 articles in tourism journals in comparison to 75 in hospitality journals, as identified in this study, is a logical conclusion. Two hospitality journals have indicated their interest in event research by creating special issues, with IJHM in 2010 focusing on articles on consumer event topics and in 2017 IJCHM publishing articles on both business and consumer events. While several scholars (Lee & Back, 2005a; McKercher & Tung, 2015; Yoo & Weber, 2005) noticed substantial momentum in the event research starting in 2004, the current study indicates that another surge in event research (almost double that of previous years) began in 2010, partially as a result of the IJHM 2010 special edition. As the event discipline grows, and the increase in event research trends upward, there

should be the anticipation for a larger number of hospitality journals to continue to increase the number of event research published.

Data collection (research design)

Baloglu and Assante (1999) identified that the survey method was the most frequently used research design (80%). The extant study establishes the same finding, with 60.8% of the research using surveys, 20.3% using secondary data, and 10.8% conducting a case study.

A rapid growth in e-data collection, either via email or online surveys, began in 2008 with a decrease in mail and fax survey collection. On-site surveys and interview methods of data collection doubled and continued to grow, starting in 2010. As identified by previous researchers (Lee & Back, 2005a), experimental design is not a common data collection method in event research, with this study reinforcing that finding with an average rate of 1.6%.

Statistics

McKercher and Tung (2015) identified a trend since 2000 toward more frequent use of sophisticated statistical procedures in event research. Similar to previous studies (Lee & Back, 2005a; Yoo & Weber, 2005), descriptive statistics were the most common technique found in the current study. Lee and Back (2005a) and Yoo and Weber's (2005) results also pointed to more advanced statistics with the primarily multivariate techniques used such as factor analysis (i.e., exploratory, confirmatory), regression, and cluster analysis. Lee and Back (2005a) identified factor analysis as the top inferential statistical procedure at a rate of 19% for convention articles analyzed from 1990 to 2003, with t-test (13%); regression, correlation, and IP analysis each at 9%; and ANOVA at 8%.

The trend toward more sophisticated statistical procedures was also confirmed in this present study of event research from 2004 to 2016. The top inferential statistical method identified was factor analysis/PCA used by 21.3% of the empirical research articles, followed by t-test (14.6%), ANOVA (13.8%), and univariate and multivariate regression (13.7%). Overall, a higher percentage of event articles in this study from 2004 to 2016 used at least one of 22 types of statistical analysis. This is a much wider range of statistics than previous studies, indicating that event research is not stagnating and instead becoming more diversified over time (McKercher & Tung, 2015). Additionally, many studies used multiple statistical analysis methods, springboarding off Kim, Prideaux, and Chon's (2010) suggestion that a singular statistical approach may be inferior to multiple techniques when attempting to understand event participant behaviors. With the extant study's finding of a wider range of data gathering methods and expanded range of data analysis techniques, the event research field is becoming more established and vibrant as it continues to move into new areas of exploration (McKercher & Tung, 2015).

As pointed out by Lee and Back (2005a), qualitative studies are as valuable as quantitative studies, as qualitative data typically provides specific insight for explaining event participant behaviors, which can contribute to building theory. Mair (2012) who studied business event research during 2000–2009 observed that there was a complete lack of rigorous qualitative studies, such as ethnography, to better understand the meanings individuals attach to events and their experiences. The current study identified 14 ethnography, 7 grounded theory, and 5 phenomenology studies primarily published since 2013, indicating that some journals are accepting more in-depth qualitative studies. Identifying opportunities for event scholars to better incorporate these qualitative methods into their research could result in studies with a more rigorous approach, which could lead to findings that are more generalizable.

Implications

As Crawford-Welch and McCleary (1992) concluded, the purpose of an analysis of academic research is to determine where the discipline is now, how far it has progressed, and where it needs to go in the future. An implication of the current research for academics is the emergence of a wide range of qualitative and quantitative methods detected in the past 12 years of event research. Therefore, more robust courses on research methods, both quantitative and qualitative, could be an important emphasis to add to EM curricula, particularly as the student course enrollment continues to grow at both the undergraduate and graduate levels (Cecil et al., 2011). As event research has progressed, the number of empirical articles has increased as observed by Mair (2012), with a steady decrease in the number of conceptual articles over time. The results may serve academics who conduct research to identify a potential type of journal (i.e., event, tourism, hospitality) to submit their manuscripts with consideration to the type of event, method, and data analysis techniques given the trends and comparisons found in this study when comparing the three types of journals.

This study also reveals some interesting trends and implications compared to other similar studies conducted prior to the period included in the current study. In particular, one study that focused on hospitality marketing research (Yoo, Lee, & Bai, 2011) and another on hospitality management (Baloglu & Assante, 1999). Baloglu and Assante (1999) conducted a somewhat similar study by reviewing articles published in the early to mid-1990's in five hospitality management journals. The study included various industry segments (e.g., lodging, food service, tourism), but MEEC was excluded. During this time, the Internet was in its relative infancy as indicated by it not being included in the types of research being conducted. Baloglu and Assante (1999) found that more than two-thirds of the research published in hospitality management journals during the early to mid-1990's was done by mail surveys. As found in the current study, the largest proportions of MEEC research includes some sort of on-site effort and interviews. Intuitively, especially for public events (e.g., festivals) this is required in order to intercept attendees and

either interview them on-site and/or send a follow-up questionnaire, which was used almost three times more than mail/fax procedures in the MEEC research reviewed for this study. Another development found in the current study compared to Baloglu and Assante (1999) is the use of CFA and SEM, which has since become more prominent in hospitality and tourism research.

In a more recent study, Yoo et al. (2011) reviewed hospitality marketing research published between 2000 and 2009, which overlaps with the current study's time-frame. Both hospitality marketing and MEEC research most frequently use quanti-tative methods, but MEEC research has utilized mixed methods research more fre-quently than hospitality marketing. Aside from descriptive statistics, EFA/PCA was the most commonly used data analysis technique, which was utilized much less in hospitality marketing research. A number of other data analysis techniques are not easily comparable since the current study separated techniques and (Yoo et al., 2011) combined techniques [e.g., "Analysis of (co)variance (AN(C)OVA, MANOVA)"; "t-test/χ^2/cross-tabulation/correlation"].

Limitations and future research

No study is without limitations, and certainly this study is no different. It was not feasible to identify and include every hospitality and tourism journal in this study. As a result, the authors relied on a recent ranking of hospitality and tourism journals (Gursoy & Sandstrom, 2016). As future hospitality and tourism ranking articles are published, it will be important to re-examine which journals from each area are used in subsequent studies to ensure there is some rigor how such journals are identified and included. Similarly, this study did not include journals outside of the areas of events, hospitality, and tourism. Future studies might consider including journals outside of these three areas as Sox et al. (Online first) determined that multiple dis-ciplines, such as business, technology, geography, and education, were good sources of research on the topic of virtual and hybrid meetings.

Observing previous studies for the past decade may not be enough to recognize the full evolution and development of research methods in the areas of EM. As a result, this is a stream of research that is important to continue in order to moni-tor growth and development in the relatively new MEEC academic discipline and research stream.

The current study also revealed other potential research opportunities. First, this study included both consumer/leisure and business event research. There is an opportunity to further compare the two different sectors within MEEC to determine if there are any differences in the types of data collection methods and data analysis techniques. This could also provide researchers who focus in one area or another with a better understanding of the type of research conducted in the respective area. In addition, more detailed research is inherent within each type of event. For exam-ple, future research could examine the types of events within each sector (e.g., fes-tivals, concerts, sporting events within leisure/consumer events) and the types of theories, results, and future research opportunities that become apparent, a research

design that is similar to Li and Petrick's (2006) study conducted on the motivations to attend festivals.

Although the empirical articles included in this study were conducted for actual events, much of the analysis is focused on data collection methods and data analysis techniques, which is likely of more interest to academics. However, similar studies could focus on variables that would be of more interest to the industry as well. Similar to the recommendations above, practitioners would likely be interested in the trends of the types of events within the business and leisure sector that have been created over time. For example, providing practitioners with such information as trends in motivations to attend different types of events and comparisons of demographics of different types of events. This type of information could help practitioners assess if their event is similar or different than other events and realize potentially where they have advantages and potential opportunities. Future research studies could also update previous work that examined and analyzed the "content" and "subject matter" addressed in research articles.

Conclusion

The MEEC field has changed dramatically since 2004. More publishing opportunities exist for event scholars as more event journals are available, tourism journals continue to accept event research, and periodically hospitality journals publish special issues to showcase MEEC research. Increasing event attendance is the key to both business and consumer successful events. Therefore, maintaining a healthy research agenda in the MEEC sector will benefit not only researchers, but also academics teaching EM courses. It is the hope of the authors that readers of this article will better understand the current state of event research and will use the findings to conceptualize studies that will advance the literature for scholars and practitioners alike.

References

Baloglu, S., & Assante, L. M. (1999). A content analysis of subject areas and research methods used in five hospitality management journals. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *23*(1), 53–70.

Baloglu, S., & Love, C. (2005). Association meeting planners' perceptions and intentions for five major US convention cities: The structured and unstructured images. *Tourism Management*, *26*(5), 743–752.

Carlsen, J. (1999). A review of MICE industry evaluation and research in Asia and Australia 1988–1998. *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management*, *1*(4), 51–66.

Cecil, A. K., Reed, B. J., & Reed, L. R. (2011). US higher education institutions offering meeting and event courses. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, *12*(3), 179–205.

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*(2), 155–167.

Crouch, G. I., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1998). Convention site selection research: A review, conceptual model, and propositional framework. *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management*, *1*(1), 49–69.

Elston, K., & Draper, J. (2012). A review of meeting planner site selection criteria research. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, *13*(3), 203–220.

Fenich, G. G. (2012). *Meetings, expositions, events, and conventions: An introduction to the industry* (3rd ed.). Boston: Prentice Hall.

Formica, S. (1998). The development of festivals and special events studies. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, *5*(3), 131–137.

Getz, D. (2008). Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research. *Tourism Management*, *29*(1), 403–428.

Getz, D. (2010). The nature and scope of festival studies. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, *5*(1), 1–47.

Getz, D., & Page, S. J. (2016). Progress and prospects for event tourism research. *Tourism Management*, *52*(1), 593–631.

Gursoy, D., & Sandstrom, J. K. (2016). An updated ranking of hospitality and tourism journals. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *40*(1), 3–18.

Hede, A.-M., Jago, L. K., & Deery, M. (2003). An agenda for special event research: Lessons from the past and directions for the future. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *10*(3), 1–14.

Kim, J., Boo, S., & Kim, Y. (2013). Patterns and trends in event tourism study topics over 30 sources. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, *4*(1), 66–83.

Kim, S. S., Prideaux, B., & Chon, K. (2010). A comparison of results of three statistical methods to understand the determinants of festival participants' expenditures. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *29*(2), 297–307.

Lee, M. J., & Back, K.-J. (2005a). A review of convention and meeting management research 1990–2003: Identification of statistical methods and subject areas. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, *7*(2), 1–20.

Lee, M. J., & Back, K.-J. (2005b). A review of economic value drivers in convention and meeting management research. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *17*(5), 409–420.

Li, X., & Petrick, J. F. (2006). A review of festival and event motivation studies. *Event Management*, *9*(4), 239–245.

Mair, J. (2012). A review of business events literature. *Event Management*, *16*(2), 133–141.

McKercher, B., & Tung, V. (2015). Publishing in tourism and hospitality journals: Is the past a prelude to the future? *Tourism Management*, *50*, 306–315.

Park, S. B., & Park, K. (2017). Thematic trends in event management research. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *29*(3), 848–861.

Rosen College of Hospitality Management. (n.d.). *Undergraduate programs*. Retrieved from http://hospitality.ucf.edu/degree-programs/undergraduate-programs/

Russell, M. (2017). Convene's 26th annual meetings market survey: Through thick & thin. *Convene*, March 2017, 42–62.

Sox, C. B., Kline, S. F., Crews, T. B., Strick, S. K., & Campbell, J. M. (Online first). Virtual and hybrid meetings: A mixed research synthesis of 2002–2012 research. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *41*(8), 945–984.

Yoo, J., & Weber, K. (2005). Progress in convention tourism research. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *29*(2), 194–222.

Yoo, M., Lee, S., & Bai, B. (2011). Hospitality marketing research from 2000 to 2009: Topics, methods, and trends. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *23*(4), 517–532.