

## EXAMINING THE BODY OF SCHOLARSHIP IN SPORT MANAGEMENT: A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE *JOURNAL OF SPORT MANAGEMENT*

BRENDA G. PITTS, EDD, GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY, PAUL M. PEDERSEN, PHD, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

KEYWORDS: SPORT MANAGEMENT, ACADEMIA, CONTENT ANALYSIS

### ABSTRACT

Sport management scholars have called for examination of the literature in sport management to explore its state in relation to its representation of the field of study and the industry. The purpose of this study was to examine the *Journal of Sport Management (JSM)*. Content analysis methodology was used. Findings reveal that the 52 issues examined in this study contain 233 peer reviewed empirical research articles authored by 435 authors. The field of study, as measured against sport management curriculum standards content areas, was found to have unequal coverage with a high level of content in Management and Organizational Skills, Sport Marketing, and Sport Business in the Social Context. Additionally, the sport business industry is inequitably represented with a majority of research involving intercollegiate athletics (40%).

### INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Many scholars and academic leaders in the rising academic discipline of sport management, at its early inception and today, note that the profession must have a comprehensive body of literature with a foundation of knowledge that will prepare individuals with a solid and appropriate education for their career endeavors in the sport business industry (Cuneen & Parks, 1997; Fielding, Pitts, & Miller, 1991; Mahony & Pitts, 1998; Parkhouse,

Ulrich, & Soucie, 1982; Parks, 1992; Paton, 1987; Zeigler, 1987). Indeed, a body of knowledge ought to represent the defined field of study. As Hancher stated, a body of literature should consist of “a minimum body of basic and fundamental knowledge that is commonly possessed by members of the profession” (1944, as cited in Fielding et al., 1991, p. 1). The sport management field of study and the sport business industry are defined by the sport management curriculum standards and sport management textbooks (Sport Management Program Review Council, 1993; 2000) (see, for example, Parkhouse & Pitts, 2001; Parks & Quarterman, 2003; Parks, Zanger, & Quarterman, 1998).

Nonetheless, sport management scholars have also pointed out that the state of sport management literature does not sufficiently reflect the defined field of study or the sport business industry (Olafson, 1990; Paton, 1987; Pitts, 2001; Slack, 1996; Soucie & Doherty, 1996). For

*Sport management scholars have called for examination of the literature in sport management to explore its state in relation to its representation of the field of study and the industry.*

instance, Slack stated that “sport management has not kept pace with the type of changes that have occurred in the world of sport” and that “our research is still very much dominated by studies of physical education and athletic programs” (p. 97). Pitts (2001) stated that “when one reads the totality of our literature, one gets the distinct impression that sport management is nothing more than the study of managing college athletics and some professional sports” (p. 3). In a study on one journal, the *Sport Marketing Quarterly (SMQ)*, Pedersen and Pitts (2001) stated that the journal should make changes in order to ensure its relevance to the field of sport management because they found that there are “uneven amounts of coverage of the basic sport marketing components, sport industry segments, and different sports” (p. 23).

These statements are supported by findings of other studies and reviews of the body of literature in sport management. In the earliest known study, Parkhouse et al. (1982) examined 336 sport management doctoral studies reported in *Dissertation Abstracts International* between 1950 and 1980. It was concluded that the studies that were conducted dealt almost exclusively with physical education and athletics at the collegiate level. Lambrecht (1991) conducted an examination of 45 articles published in the *Journal of Sport Management (JSM)* from 1987-1990. Lambrecht noted that 35% of the articles focused on college, university, and school issues while the remaining 65% covered numerous other topics. However, no single topic was represented more often than the college, university, and school setting. Paton (1987) conducted an examination of 122 sport management studies reported in *Completed Research in Health, Physical Education, and Recreation* and found that 60% focused on the college and university setting. Soucie and Doherty (1996) conducted a study whose stated purpose was “to identify past research endeavors in sport management and examine...the topics and areas of concern that have preoccupied research in this field (p. 142).” They examined 288 North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) conference abstracts and 207 sport management articles in seven journals from 1983-93. The

findings revealed that the highest cluster (20%) of articles/abstracts focused on sport management curriculum and professional preparation issues. In a study by Barber, Parkhouse, and Tedrick (2001) in which 42 empirical studies published from 1991 to 1995 in *JSM* were examined, the findings revealed that most studies focused on personnel management, curriculum, organizational structure, and Title IX, gender, and race issues.

In two studies conducted recently, examination of singular sport management journals was the focus. Pedersen and Pitts (2001) investigated the *SMQ* and Mondello and Pedersen (2003) examined the *Journal of Sports Economics (JSE)*. The Pedersen and Pitts study used a sport marketing management model (Pitts & Stotlar, 1996) against which to determine the extent of the coverage of sport marketing elements. Further, they looked at the extent of the coverage of the sport business industry by using a model designed by Parks et al. (1998). The results showed that the bulk of the sport marketing elements covered in the research was marketing management (22%) and consumer analyses of spectators (17%). The Mondello and Pedersen (2003) study revealed that the highest percentages of articles focused on professional sport team performance and payrolls (20%) and labor market research (12.9%).

In another study, Mowrey (2003) examined conference proceedings published in 2000, 2001, and 2002 for the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM), the European Association for Sport Management (EASM), and the Sport Management Association of Australia and New Zealand (SMAANZ). Similar to the two other studies, Mowrey’s findings revealed uneven coverage of sport management content areas (Mowrey also used the sport management curriculum standards for categorization). In addition, Mowrey’s findings showed seemingly different interests in sport industry segments between the three associations. Whereas EASM papers were focused on governance and SMAANZ papers were focused on tourism and leisure based sport management, the NASSM papers were centered around intercollegiate sport.

One fairly consistent finding of these studies was that research in sport management has failed to involve full representation of sport management content areas and of segments of the sport business industry: There is a disproportionate focus on intercollegiate athletics and a few professional sports and on some management and some marketing topics. In relation to the frequently investigated area of intercollegiate athletics, Pitts pointed out in 2001, and Soucie and Doherty (1996) earlier stated, "This is not to suggest that in-depth research on some important topics is not warranted, but [both pointed out this phenomenon] simply to make the case that the scope of research options in sport management is almost limitless" (p. 498). While intercollegiate athletics administration is clearly a segment of sport management, sport management and its accompanying research should be much broader than athletics administration.

Analyzing the content of the academic publications in the field of sport management, while not new, is not comprehensive, and therefore, more research is warranted. While not excusable, the limited self-examination is understandable because of the relatively young and developing nature of this area of academic study. A reflection of this youth is revealed in the fact that the field of sport management has only produced journals over the past two decades while other disciplines of study have journals dating back to the early part of the twentieth century. Currently, there are over a dozen outlets for theoretical literature within the field of sport management, most of which began in the 1990's. These sport management journals, with their inception dates, are shown in Table 1.

The influence of a journal can be far-reaching. According to Danylchuk and Judd (1996), scholarly journals are a significant resource and source of information for academicians. This information is most likely used in the classroom, field, and further research. Because scholars attend the same conferences and read the same journals, they are, according to Soucie and Doherty (1996), "considerably influenced by what

other researchers are doing in the same field...and there is often a temptation to pursue similar investigations" (p. 498). Therefore, it is imperative that literature represents the field of study and its industry.

Recently, several noted sport management scholars have challenged their colleagues to assess the current state of research literature in the field. Scholars such as Parks (1992), Paton (1987), Pitts (2001), and Slack (1993; 1996) have challenged the research in the field. Olafson (1990) and Chelladurai (1992) questioned and challenged the frequent lack of scope in the research. There is a need for sport management scholars to reflect on their literature in an effort to determine what has been published, where the field is right now, and what future directions might be taken. Critical self examination such as this reveal the advances that have been made, identify the areas within the literature that could use improvement, and determine the extent to which the literature accurately reflects the field of study and the sport industry. As Parks (1992) noted, there is a need to attempt to determine, "what knowledge is needed in sport management" (p. 224). As Pitts (2001) noted, "in the near future, I challenge us to critically examine the state of our literature and begin the work toward expansion" (p. 4). Furthermore, Pedersen and Pitts (2001) noted that, "the advancement of the discipline requires that the field of sport management take an inward look [at] scholarly publications" (p. 23).

In addition, examining the role that gender plays in determining content in academic journals is warranted (Aitchison, 2001; Spender, 1981). There are politics in relation to gender at play in every boardroom, including editorial boards (Aitchison, 2001). Gender has the potential to influence what is happening with academic journals.

*JSM* was launched in January of 1987 by the scholars of the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM), which was formed in 1985. Parks and Olafson (1987), in their initial comments regarding the publishing of a new sport management journal stated, "launching a new professional publication designed to meet the

needs of academicians, practitioners, and students is an exhilarating and challenging experience” (p. 1). *JSM*, according to Weese (1995), “garnered a high standard of scholarship in a relatively short period of time” (p. 239). Furthermore, Parkhouse and Pitts (2001) stated that the journal, “has become the major source for disseminating significant knowledge in the field” (p. 7).

To date, *JSM* has not been examined to determine the extent of its coverage of contributions to the sport management literature, its coverage of sport management content areas, its coverage of the segments of the sport business industry, and other similar factors. In an earlier study on the *JSM*, Barber, Parkhouse, & Tedrick (2001) examined one aspect of the journal: the research methodologies used by authors. Therefore, it was the aim of this study to conduct such an examination. Specifically, an investigation, through content analysis, was conducted into the publishing history of the *JSM*. As was the intent of Soucie and Doherty’s (1996) analysis, the intention of this research effort is not, “to dictate where research should focus at this time” (p. 494) but rather to stimulate thought and discussion regarding the body of knowledge in the field of sport management. The ultimate goal was, similar to the quest by Olafson (1990), to determine objective evidence – and thus support or reject subjective opinions – regarding the research (and those associated with that research) published in the *Journal of Sport Management*.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine *JSM* to provide a research based descriptive analysis of the journal. This type of research will reveal the state of this journal and provide a basis of information that could be used in regards to future decision-making. For instance, if it is found that there actually is a large and inordinate amount of research on intercollegiate athletics, decisions made by researchers and journal editors could be guided toward increasing attention to and emphasis on those areas with little or no research coverage.

Specifically, the following questions guided this examination: What is the status of editorship for

this journal? How many and what type of papers have been published? Who are the authors in regards to gender, institutional or organizational affiliation, and country? What types of research methods have been used? Does the body of literature in this journal reflect the range of content areas as outlined in sport management curriculum standards? Does the literature in this journal reflect the depth and breadth of the sport business industry?

#### METHODOLOGY

Using the content analytic research methodology, this study was an examination of *JSM* from its inception in January of 1987 (Volume 1, Issue 1) through the April issue of 2003 (Volume 17, Issue 2). Content analysis, also referred to as the analysis of communication, is an unobtrusive or non-reactive research method employed by social scientists. A content analytic method is unobtrusive or non-reactive because it has no effect on the subject being studied as what is being analyzed has been already written or broadcast (Babbie, 1995). While content analysis has been applied to virtually every form of communication (books, magazines, periodicals, poems, letters, newspapers, radio broadcasts, and the Internet), this study applied content analysis to the articles published in a leading academic journal.

#### RESEARCH DESIGN

Quantitative content analysis is the systematic and replicable examination of symbols of communication, which have been assigned numeric values, and the analysis of relationships involving those values, in order to describe the communication and draw inferences about its meaning (Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 1998). Similarly, a half-century earlier, Berelson (1952) stated that the aim of content analysis is to objectively, systematically, and quantitatively describe the manifest content of communication. Stempel (1981) suggested a broader view of content analysis when he called it, “a formal system for doing something that we all do informally rather frequently, drawing conclusions from observations of content” (p. 119). Content analysis is simply a systematic and replicable way of formally doing something we informally do all the time. A content

analytic method is a more formal process as it involves the objective, systematic, replicable, valid, and quantitative discovery of communication content (Berelson, 1952; Holsti, 1969; Krippendorff, 1980; Riffe et al., 1998).

## MEASURES

As the purpose of this study was to examine *JSM* to provide a research based descriptive analysis of the journal, and specifically, to determine the status of editorship, how many and what type of papers have been published, who the authors are, what types of research methods have been used, does the literature reflect the range of content areas in sport management, and does the literature reflect the depth and breadth of the sport business industry, measures for the analysis were developed based on these areas of inquiry. For this study, those measures included the following categories and individual measures: (1) Articles: number of research articles per issue, length of article; (2) Authors: number of authors, gender of authors, author credit, institutional affiliation of author, location of author, academic/professional level, type of research (qualitative or quantitative); (3) Editorship: number of editor/reviewer opportunities, gender of editors and editorial board; (4) Research Methods: research category and methodology; (5) Sport Management Content Areas: management content area focus of article (based on ten sport management curriculum standards content areas and two added areas); (6) Sport Industry Segment: segment of the sport industry in the study; and (7) Gender Focus of Article. The following provide a description of each measure.

## THE ARTICLES

The papers (articles) were examined to reveal the state of the literature in this journal. The study involved a descriptive analysis of the material included in the research sections in the journal's 52 issues over the prescribed timeframe. The investigation focused solely on peer-revised, empirical research articles. Such articles are located in the "Research and Review" section as well as the "Research Notes" section of the journal. For all the data, the unit of analysis was the written material (i.e., the research article).

Analysis did not include articles in such sections as journal introductions, commentaries, perspectives (e.g., the official section which was launched in the journal's third year), invited articles (e.g., the contents of the first issue), and book reviews. Measures included number of articles per issue, and number of pages per article.

## THE AUTHORS

In an attempt to identify the authors and their research endeavors in the published articles of *JSM*, measures were developed to ascertain number, gender, author credit (how many authors per paper, and in what order), institutional affiliation, academic or professional level, and location of author.

## EDITORSHIP

To examine the status of editorship for this journal, all editor and editing opportunities were investigated. That included Editor, Associate Editor, Guest Editor, Section Editors, and Editorial Board Members (reviewers). Measures included number, gender, and type of editorial opportunity. Aitchison (2001) and Spender (1981) examined the key role that gender plays in determining content in academic journals. Aitchison emphasized, "the significance of editorial boards in relation to the politics of gender and knowledge" (p. 13). That is, gender of editors and reviewers might prejudice view of articles submitted. Based upon such research, the coders in this study were asked to determine the gender of the editorial and review boards.

## RESEARCH METHODS

To identify what research methods have been utilized, the category of research (qualitative or quantitative) and the research methodology were identified. This information will provide a synopsis of what research methodologies have been used thus far in *JSM* and show which methods are utilized less.

## SPORT MANAGEMENT CONTENT AREAS

To identify the content area on which *JSM* authors focused, the content areas as identified and categorized in the NASPE-NASSM Sport Management Program Standards and Review

Protocol were used (see Sport Management Program Review Council, 2000) (see Table 2). In addition, two content area categories were added: "sport management education," and "other." This was done because the primary researchers knew that there were some research articles that focused on some aspects of sport management education, such as curriculum and accreditation issues, and some articles that focused on areas that were outside of the prescribed content areas.

#### SPORT INDUSTRY SEGMENT

To examine the coverage of the sport business industry, measures were developed based on industry segments as delineated by Parks et al. (1998) (see Table 3). Coders were asked to fit each article into the most appropriate ("best fitting") segment. (Note: Because we limited the sport industry segments to the Parks et al. work, some segments were not included, such as, the fitness industry, and governing organizations.)

Those segments included the following: Intercollegiate Athletics (any affiliation with college sports), Professional Sport (any affiliation with pro sport), Participant Sport, Campus Recreation (i.e., Outdoors, Intramurals, Fitness Center), Sport Communication (i.e., media, public relations), Sport Marketing (i.e., marketing director, operations), Sport Event and Facility Management (i.e., coordinator, manager), Sports Medicine (i.e., trainer, fitness director, physiologist), Health Promotion (i.e., wellness director, health educator), Sport Tourism (i.e., tour guide, planner, convention specialist), Sport Management and Marketing Agencies (i.e., agent, research), International Sport (i.e., Olympics, Women's World Cup), and Other (specify/explain).

#### GENDER FOCUS OF ARTICLE

To determine if the authors published in *JSM* are focusing on women's or men's sports or sport businesses, we measured the gender focus of the articles. Because females make up roughly half of the population and have made significant gains in sports participation rates, spectator rates, as consumers of sport, as managers and owners of sport businesses, and in all other areas, we examined to what extent authors who have

published in *JSM* reflect this (Pitts & Stotlar, 2002; "Female Executive," 2002). For example, if an article examined a sport organization such as the Ladies Professional Golf Association (LPGA), that article was coded as being focused on female sports. Similarly, if the article included an analysis of the National Football League (NFL) or a similar organization, it was coded as being focused on male sports.

#### CODERS

This study required four trained individuals (two sport management professors [one female and one male] and two sport management doctoral students [one female and one male]) who worked independently of each other to code every issue of the *Journal of Sport Management*. Depending on time and financial constraints, a content analytic method can use one, two, or several coders (Riffe et al., 1998). The rationale for using these four coders for this study was that the four coders, because of their involvement in the field of sport management and the coding for the pilot study, were comfortable and familiar with the definitions of the protocol and codebook (Riffe et al., 1998). For this study, the four coders first independently examined five issues of *JSM* (9.6% of the total number of issues) to test intercoder reliability. This is further explained in the section on reliability below. After intercoder reliability coding was completed, the entire collection of issues (52) was randomly divided into four groups (one for each of the four coders).

#### PRE-CODING AND PILOT TEST

In an effort to test the coding system, train the coders, and determine any problematic areas overall, a pilot study was conducted using randomly selected issues of *JSM*. For this preliminary analysis, the four coders each coded five issues of the journal. This pre-coding process revealed several problems that were addressed before the actual study was performed. Through the pilot study process it was determined that four additional variables needed to be added to the codebook. Furthermore, four initial categories were modified and two initial categories were determined to be too problematic and were thus removed. Additional pilot study changes involved

clarification of the coding protocol, expansion of descriptors, and the addition of coding options to the coding list.

#### INTERCODER RELIABILITY TESTING

Reliability in content analysis measures how consistent the coders make decisions. This measurement in content analysis determines if the coders, working independently of each other, are measuring the variables consistently. "Reliability requires that different coders applying the same classification rules to the same content will assign the same numbers" (Riffe et al. 1998, p. 54). Therefore, reliability in content analysis relies on the concept of intercoder reliability. Intercoder reliability tests in content analysis should involve both a simple agreement figure and a statistic (usually Scott's Pi [1955]) that takes chance into consideration.

In order to test reliability in content analysis, there must be a selected overlap whereby the coders may code the same information. In the first stage of reliability testing, the researchers are looking for simple percentage agreement. This is determined through the tabulation of the number of times the coders agree. This percentage can be the result of accurate coding, or simply can be the result of agreeing by chance alone. The second stage in computing a reliability assessment takes out the agreement by chance alone. This stage involves turning the percentage of agreement to a reliability coefficient. This is done through the Pi statistic invented by Scott (1955). Scott's Pi is an index of reliability that takes into account that some coding agreement occurs strictly by chance alone. The coefficient arrived at through Scott's Pi represents a comparison of the frequency of agreements found to those agreements that one would expect by chance alone.

For this study, the same coders who coded the data in the pilot study performed the coding for the main study. Reliability in content analysis looks at how consistent the coders make decisions. In an effort to assess intercoder reliability, five issues were randomly selected to provide a reasonable size (9.6%) for an overlap (Potter & Levine-Donnerstein, 1999; Riffe, Lacy, & Fico,

1998). The study's four coders independently analyzed the same five issues. Defining an acceptable level for reliability is not easily accomplished in content analysis (Holsti, 1969). A reasonable standard number for acceptable percentage of agreement is anything above 80% (Riffe et al., 1998). The standard number for corrections for chance agreement (Scott's Pi) is around .70. Content analysis research, "with reliability assessment below .70 becomes hard to interpret and the method of dubious value to replicate" (Riffe et al., 1998, p. 131). This study had very high numbers (mostly in the middle 90s) relating to percentage of agreement and correction for chance agreement. These numbers are understandable as most of the material coded for this study was manifest content in nature (i.e., location, color, gender, and sport). Furthermore, the intercoder reliability percentages and numbers for this study confirm that the five coders had become thoroughly familiar with the coding protocol and codebook by the time this study was conducted.

#### VALIDITY

Validity must be established in addition to reliability because a measure can be reliable in its application but still wrong in what the researcher assumes it is really measuring (Riffe et al., 1998). While reliability is a necessary and vital condition for arriving at valid inferences from content analysis, it is not totally sufficient. Validity is necessary to determine if a study's methods produce the desired information. Direct or face validity is the most commonly accepted form of validity assessment in content analysis (Riffe et al., 1998). Face validity can be defined as an assessment in which the categories are clearly defined with a logical and consistent coding scheme (Folger, Hewes, & Poole, 1984). The presumption that is made with face validity is that if the measurement categories have been clearly defined and there is strong reliability in the coding, the measures will self-evidently measure what they are supposed to measure (Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967). Face validity is simply a matter of a particular measure making sense on its face. In other words, on the face of it, the measure works and the adequacy of the measure

is obvious to all.

## RESULTS

The data gathered in this study were used to investigate specific aspects of the state of the research literature published in the *Journal of Sport Management* and other aspects of the journal. The following are the findings in this examination.

### THE ARTICLES

Fifty-two issues of *JSM* were included for examination in this study – from its inception in January of 1987 (Volume 1, Issue 1) through the April issue of 2003 (Volume 17, Issue 2) (the study was conducted during the Fall of 2003 and Spring 2004).

The 52 issues in this study yielded for examination 217 research articles over the 17-year (Volumes 1-17) timeframe. The journal was published twice a year through its first five years in existence. With volumes six through nine, it was published three times a year. Beginning with Volume 10, *JSM* was published four times a year. Overall, for this study, the journal averaged just over three issues and 13 peer-reviewed empirical research articles each year.

There was an average of just under five (4.5) research articles published each issue. The number of articles in each issue ranged from zero to seven. Thirteen issues (25%) contained four articles and 12 (23%) had five articles. Ten issues (19%) had three articles while seven issues (14%) had seven articles and six issues (12%) had six articles. Three issues had two articles each and one issue had no research articles. The issue without any research articles was the inaugural issue (Vol. 1, No. 1), published in January of 1987. This initial issue was a collection of nine invited articles.

The 233 research articles combined for a total of 3,701 pages. The articles ranged in length from six pages (four times) to 41 pages (one time). Over the 17-year period, the articles averaged 15.9 pages each. At the bottom end, 23 (10%) of the 233 articles were 13 pages long. There were 21 (9%) articles in both the 11-page and the 12-page

categories. At the top end, one article was 41 pages in length, another had 33 pages, and one other was 32 pages in length

### AUTHORSHIP OF ARTICLES

The 52 issues in this study contained 233 research articles that were the work of 435 authors. The number of authors for each article varied from one to six. The 101 articles that were written by two co-authors made up the highest percentage (43%) of articles. The second highest category, solo authorship, included 86 research articles (37%). Thirty-nine articles (17%) had three co-authors and six articles (3%) had four co-authors. There were no articles authored by five co-authors, but there was one article authored by six co-authors.

The 435 authors came from 139 different academic or corporate settings. A total of 67 (48%) of the institutions and organizations had at least two authors affiliated with them. A vast majority (92% or 128) of the 139 different affiliations were universities and colleges. The remaining 11 were coded with affiliations to consulting companies (i. e., Navigant Consulting), public entities (i.e., State of California), or sport organizations such as the National Basketball Association (NBA), Kamloops Parks and Recreation Services, Sport Canada, and the Amateur Softball Association.

There were 16 countries represented by the 435 authors who were included in this study. The majority (58% or 250) of the authors came from the United States. There were 118 (27%) authors from Canada, 17 (3.9%) from the United Kingdom, 15 (3.5%) from Australia, and 11 (2.5%) from South Korea. The numerical and percentage breakdown of the 16 countries can be found in Table 4. The authors within the United States represented 34 states while the authors from Canada were situated in Alberta, Ontario, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, Quebec, and Newfoundland.

The coders were asked to next identify the academic or professional level of the each of the 435 authors. Most (94% or 409 authors) of the authors were listed as unspecified faculty. Thirteen (3%) were coded as corporate or athletic



identity and five (1%) as graduate students. The remaining identified with such titles as lecturers and government or civic identity. Overall, 419 (96%) authors were identified as having some affiliation or employment with the academy.

Regarding the gender makeup of the 435 authors, 263 (61%) were male, 158 (36%) were female, and the gender of the remaining 14 (3%) authors could not be identified as male or female (see Table 5). Of the 86 single-authored articles, 46 (54%) were by male authors and 34 (40%) were by female authors. The gender of the remaining five authors could not be identified. Of the 209 authors who were secondary authors (their names were listed second, third, fourth, or sixth on the authorship byline), 140 (67%) were male authors, 64 (31%) were female authors, and five (2%) could not be identified as either male or female.

#### EDITORS AND REVIEWERS

For each of the 52 issues of *JSM*, the gender makeup of the editorial staff and review board was determined (see Table 5). Throughout the history of the journal, each issue has had equal gender representation with respect to main editors as there has always been one female editor and one male editor for each issue.

Of the 52 issues included in this study, three (6%) were theme issues. The first themed issue did not arrive until January of 1997 in the eleventh year of the journal's existence. This issue (Vol. 11, No. 1) was titled, "In search of relevance: Social change strategies in sport organizations." The second themed issue (Vol. 14, No. 2) was titled, "University athletics: Cultural, strategic, and economic perspectives." The third themed issue (Vol. 15, No. 4) was titled, "Sport in the third millennium (1990-2000 era sport)." As for the editors of the theme issues, all three had at least one male theme editor. Two of the three had a solo male theme editor while one issue (Vol. 15, No. 4) listed one female and one male as co-editors of the themed issue. In total, there were three male theme editors and one female theme editor for the journal's three theme issues.

The editorial board of *JSM* has consistently been a

collection of some of the leading scholars in sport management. As Weese (1995) noted, "the [*JSM*] editorial review board has always read as a 'who's who' in sport management scholarship and research" (p. 239).

Regarding the gender representation on this editorial board over the 52 issues in this study, there was an average of 8.2 female reviewers and 10 male reviewers for each issue. Female reviewers for each issue ranged from a low of three reviewers in four issues to a high of 13 in one issue. Male reviewers for each issue ranged from a low of seven in three issues to a high of 12 in eight issues. Therefore, the fewest number of female reviewers for an individual issue was three while the fewest number of males was seven. A combined total of 950 opportunities for reviewers existed over the 52 issues. The breakdown according to gender revealed that of the 950, 428 (45%) were female and 522 (55%) were male (see Table 5). Further, Table 5 offers a comparison of gender of editors of *JSM* to the gender of editors of two other sport management journals. As the results show, *JSM* has a more equitable representation of gender than the other two.

#### RESEARCH METHODS

Based on the previous work by Olafson (1990) and Barber et al. (2001), the research articles were first analyzed and coded according to research methodology. For each of the articles the coders were asked to identify the most appropriate type of research that had been used in the study. Over two thirds (68% or 158 articles) of the articles used quantitative methods of research. A total of 74 (32%) articles used qualitative methods of research while one article was coded as using a combination of quantitative and qualitative.

For the 74 research articles that were coded as qualitative, over half (38 articles or 51%) were coded as descriptive in nature. Twenty-two articles (30%) were theoretical, seven (10%) were interview methodology. There were two articles each (3%) in ethnographical, philosophical, and focus groups, and one article which fit the definition of historical qualitative research methodology according to the study's codebook.

For the 158 articles that used quantitative data analysis, the majority used various approaches to multivariate analysis. The highest percentage (21%) of such approaches consisted of research involving factor analysis. There were 33 articles coded as fitting this category. Twenty-nine articles (18%) used descriptive statistics to summarize the data. This meant that 29 of the 158 quantitative articles used univariate and bi-variate analyses (e. g., measures of central tendency, frequencies, z-scores, and similar descriptive statistics). Another 18% (29 articles) used t-tests and simple Analyses of Variance (ANOVA). Regression analysis, in its various forms within this approach to multivariate analysis, was used in 25 articles (16%) while other forms of Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) (9%) were used in 14 articles and Chi Square (8%) was used in 13 articles. The remaining quantitative articles consisted of various statistical and methodological categories such as those using measures of relationship such as correlational analysis (e.g., The Spearman Rho and Pearson Product Moment), discriminate analysis, Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA), and meta-analysis.

#### SPORT MANAGEMENT CONTENT AREA FOCUS

The results revealed that there was at least one article that fit each content area. The highest percentage of articles (38%) was coded as fitting into the Management and Organizational Skills in Sport content area. Included in these 89 research articles were topics ranging from management to leadership, from organizational culture to motivation, and from organizational theory to organizational behavior. Sport marketing had the second highest percentage (18%) with 41 articles. The only other content area with at least 10% was Sport Business in the Social Context (Behavioral Dimensions in Sport). This area had 24 articles (10%). There were 20 articles (9%) on Sport Management Education. This area included topics that dealt with such issues as education, curriculum, research, and sport management graduates. The complete breakdown of all the categories can be found in Table 6.

#### SPORT INDUSTRY SEGMENT FOCUS

The findings show that every segment used in this study had at least one article except for the segments of Sports Medicine, Sport Tourism, and Sport Management and Marketing Agencies.

Intercollegiate Athletics (see Table 7) was the most written about segment with 92 articles (40%) of all the articles included in this study. Within this segment were topics related to intercollegiate athletics, physical education, interscholastic athletics, coaches, and interuniversity physical educational and sport. The second and third highest segments were Participant Sport with 31 articles (13.3%) and Professional Sport with 30 articles (12.8%). Participant sport articles included such topics as participation, leisure activities, and health clubs. These segments were followed by a miscellaneous section labeled "Other" that included 19 (8%) articles that could not be placed in any specific segment (i.e., article on combined segments, all sports, mass sport at all levels of competition, general organizational theory, employment, women in sport, sport law). Sport Management Education had 16 articles (7%) on such topics as sport management graduates, academic research, curriculum, and scholarship. The coders identified no articles in three distinct segments of the sport industry (Sports Medicine, Sport Tourism, and Sport Management and Marketing Agencies). While there were most likely articles closely related to these segments, the coders were forced to place each article coded into the "best fitting" segment in their codebook. Therefore, because there were no articles identified in the three above mentioned segments, this meant that any articles related to those segments were coded in another better fitting and appropriate segment.

#### GENDER FOCUS OF ARTICLES

The findings reveal that there were 110 articles (47%) that were coded as not having an identifiable gender focus. However, of those 123 articles that did have an identifiable gender focus, 38 (31%) were focused on male sports and 14 (11%) were focused on female sports (see Table 8). Furthermore, 71 (58%) of the 123 articles with identifiable gender focus were focused on both

female and male sports. Table 8 also shows how these results compare to two other studies on sport management journals.

### CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn. First, this journal has contributed 233 peer-reviewed empirical research articles to the body of literature in sport management since its inception in 1987. Indeed, some have praised the journal stating that it “garnered a high standard of scholarship in a relatively short period of time” (Weese, 1995, p. 239) and that it “has become the major source for disseminating significant knowledge in the field” (Parkhouse & Pitts, 2001, p. 7). However, the sport management literature, with this journal included, has received criticism for its lack of full representation of sport management content areas and sport business industry segments (Olafson, 1990; Paton, 1987; Pedersen & Pitts, 2001; Pitts, 2001; Slack, 1996; Soucie & Doherty, 1996). The findings of the current study provide empirical evidence that supports these claims. Although there was at least one article whose content was categorized into each of the content areas identified, there was a disproportionate number of articles on each area, and a wide margin between the content area with the most number of articles (38% of the articles focused on management and organizational skills in sport) and the second most number of articles (18% focused on sport marketing). Beyond those two categories, the percent of articles focused on a content area was 10 percent and lower. Therefore, it can be concluded that there has been an inequitable amount of focus on the sport management content areas.

Second, the findings of this study are similar to the findings of other studies on singular journals in sport management and another study on conference proceedings topics. Taken individually, each study cannot be inferred to the whole population with a high degree of confidence. However, when the findings of all four studies are considered together, that degree of confidence rises. Given that four studies represent a greater percentage of the whole body of literature, there

is more evidence that the sport management literature appears to be heavily lopsided.

Therefore, there is increasing evidence to support the claims that sport management literature does not yet reflect or represent the many different segments of the sport business industry, and are disproportionately focused on intercollegiate athletics and a few professional sports. As noted, the findings of this study are similar to the results of the Pedersen & Pitts (2001) study on another sport management journal, the *Sport Marketing Quarterly*. However, the current study found a slightly higher focus on “participant sport” (13.3%) than “professional sport” (12.8%). Pedersen and Pitts found that the segments of the industry on which most articles were focused included professional sport (36%), sport marketing (19%), intercollegiate athletics (12%), participant sport (8%), sport management and marketing agencies (7%), and sport communication (7%). The results of the current study show that the largest percent of articles were studies on intercollegiate athletics (92 articles, 40%) and that the next largest percent was a distant 13.3% and was participant sport, with professional sport at 12.8%. In addition, these results are similar to the findings of Mondello and Pedersen (2003) in their study on another sport management journal, the *Journal of Sports Economics*. Yet, the results of that study show an overwhelming disparity. Mondello & Pedersen reported that the industry segment focus breakdown was 80% on professional sports (and that that broke down into 51.8% on the men’s ‘big four’ sports while 28.2% was on other professional sports) and 7.1% on college athletics.

Third, although females make up roughly half of the population in general and increasing numbers in sports, the results of this study reveals that this cannot be said for the gender focus of the articles in *JSM*. Of those articles with an identifiable gender focus, more than twice the number and percent of articles were focused on male sports; however, the largest percent (58%) focused on both genders. This finding is also similar to previous research findings. Pedersen and Pitts (2001) reported that the gender focus of articles in the *SMQ* was 28% on male sports and 8% on female

sports while 24% focused on both genders. Alarming, the results of the analysis of the *JSE* (Mondello & Pedersen, 2003) show that the disparity between gender focus was extreme: 81.2% on male sports, 14.1% on both genders, 4.7% with no gender focus, and zero articles on female sports. It is perplexing, if not discouraging, that there is such disparity between the number of male sports and female sports as a focus of the articles because the opportunities to study girls' and women's sports are numerous.

Fourth, in regard to authorship, the following conclusions can be drawn. The number (and percent) of peer-reviewed empirical research articles authored by female and male authors was 36% and 61%, respectively. This finding is similar to the findings of the earlier studies. Pedersen and Pitts, in the study on the *SMQ*, reported that there appeared to be "an alarming disparity in the number of authors in relation to gender" (p. 22). Similarly, the findings of the Mondello and Pedersen study on the *JSE* show a much larger disparity: 95.3% male authors, and 4.7% female authors (Mondello and Pedersen did not comment on this finding). Although there is disparity in the number of articles by female and male authors in the *JSM*, it is not as great as the journals in the other two studies.

The authors of the current study and the authors of the other two studies did not attempt to determine the reasons for these disparities. However, it is common knowledge that there is a difference in the number of female and male faculty in the sport management professoriate. That is, the number of males is slightly higher than the number of females. Therefore, perhaps a partial explanation of the difference in the numbers of the genders of authors in these journals is that the numbers are somewhat reflective of the gender make-up of the professoriate. (It would be interesting if future research could be conducted and offer some actual numbers and explanations of this.)

Fifth, this journal has a more positive record in relation to gender of editors and reviewers than those numbers reported in the two other studies.

In the current study, *JSM's* editor makeup has been 50-50 female/male. Compared to the other two journals, *JSM's* record is tremendous. The findings of the studies on *Sport Marketing Quarterly* and the *Journal of Sports Economics* revealed an alarming number of zero of female editors. In addition, *JSM* also has a much better record in relation to the gender difference in reviewers. *JSM's* gender makeup has been 45% female and 55% male, whereas the *SMQ* has been 35% female and 65% male and the *JSE* has been an alarming 3% female and 97% male.

Certainly, research is warranted in this area in two prongs. First, research is needed to examine the reasons why there is disparity in gender makeup of editorial staff. Second, research is needed to determine if there is gender bias in relation to the types and topics of papers that are submitted and that get published. In other words, at first glance at the numbers provided in Tables 6 and 7, it could be estimated that there is a correlation between the gender makeup of editors and reviewers and the gender of author and gender focus of paper. As Aitchison (2001) notes, "In most cases, there is a close correlation between the percentage of men on the editorial board and the percentage of articles authored by men" (p. 13).

#### IMPLICATIONS AND AREAS OF CONCERN FOR SPORT MANAGEMENT

The implications of the current study have the potential to be far reaching. The results provide empirical evidence that this journal is falling short of providing literature representative of the sport management content areas and the sport industry segments. However, when compared to two journals included for study in two previous studies, *JSM* has made more positive progress. While these statements are based solely on these results only, it was not the purpose of this study to attempt to examine why this is so. For instance, the topics in the journal probably reflect the interests of its authors. Certainly, editors of journals have no or little control over authors' research interests and, therefore, no control over material that is submitted. Personal interests alone, however, does not relieve one's professional

responsibility to provide the field with an appropriate body of literature. This, then, raises a question that begs consideration: Who is responsible for monitoring and adjusting the sport management body of literature? The stakeholders in sport management perhaps include academics, students, journal editors/owners, book authors, and industry practitioners. We submit that the primary responsibility falls on the shoulders of academics because they are responsible for sport management education: providing the appropriate education for individuals to work in the sport business industry.

Journal editors are also academics. However, they have the added responsibility as gatekeepers of some of the literature. Discourse in the academic setting is most often shaped by publishing and “involvement with the gatekeeping institutions in publishing” (Aitchison, 2001, p. 2). Power and control reside with the gatekeepers whom Aitchison (2001) and Spender (1981) identified as journal editors and reviewers and publishing advisors. These people “set the parameters in which individuals are encouraged to work if they wish to be at the center of issues in their discipline” (Spender, 1981, p. 186). Although editors have no control over researchers’ interests, editors can influence research in specific areas that could impact the coverage of topics in the journal. For example, this can be done with special theme issues: journal editors could specify specific themes that cover the missing or low percentage topics and invite guest editors to manage those issues. This would be far more productive and progressive than relying on the traditional method of waiting for submitted ideas for theme issues.

There is concern that needs examination in relation to gender. Even with better numbers than the previous studies on other journals, the material in *JSM* does not appropriately reflect the industry in relation to women in sport. There could be much improvement in this area. *JSM* editors, as well as the owners of the journal, NASSM, would be wise to investigate this and other gender related issues. As noted by Aichison (2001), “academic associations that have direct links with academic journals have a duty to

ensure that their journals are accountable to their members” (p. 17).

The findings of this study lend empirical evidence to the accusations and concerns of leaders in sport management in relation to the disparity of coverage and representation of sport management content areas, sport industry segments, and women’s sports. Therefore, it appears that there is room for improvement of the depth and breadth of our research literature. Scholars such as Parks, Paton, Pitts, Olafson, Chelladurai, and Slack have questioned and challenged the frequent lack of scope in the research in the field of sport management. There is more often than not an impression given from the literature in our field that the study of sport management is mainly just the study of managing college athletics and some professional sports. Paton (1987) challenged sport management researchers to broaden their scope after he reported that the sport management literature had a heavy focus on careers in higher education and college athletics. Slack (1996) added that the *JSM* devoted 65% of its articles to the subjects of physical education and intercollegiate athletics. A cursory evaluation by Pitts (2001) of sport management journals, conference proceedings, and sport management textbooks only to further report that little had changed with this heavy focus on college athletics. Pitts (2001) challenged sport management researchers, publishers, and editors to not ignore college athletics and professional sports, but to take on the responsibility of expanding the scope of their publications to include more aspects of the vast under-explored aspects of the sport management field. As Soucie and Doherty (1996) stated, while multiple studies on some key topics are warranted and cause scholars to often feel a strong pull toward pursuing similar investigations, “the scope of research options in sport management is almost limitless” (p. 498).

It appears that the body of knowledge in sport management research is in need of researchers with a vision and scholarship that can enhance the literature and fill the gaps. This will ensure that the field’s literature reflects what scholars in the field claim to be the sport business industry.

The literature influences the definitions of a field. Most importantly, the researchers must identify where improvements are needed and strive to make progress.

Sport Management was an outgrowth of the field of Physical Education. Many early sport management programs were so connected with physical education and athletics that they were named, appropriately, athletic administration. But the field of sport management, today, is one that is much larger than athletic administration. In fact, this component of sport management is a relatively small part of the \$195 billion (Broughton, 2002) sport industry. With this in mind, why does it appear that athletic administration is still the main emphasis in the programs of higher learning and academic literature of sport management? In order for academia to catch up with reality, there is a need for this young academic field of sport management to move beyond the boundaries of athletics administration. As Soucie and Doherty (1996) noted, "sport management researchers have only begun to scratch the surface and many more pertinent topics and relationships that bear on the efficient and effective management of sport need to be investigated" (p. 498). Furthermore, Barber et al. (2001) also stated, "it does appear that a number of topics are ripe for exploration" (p. 230).

#### NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There is a need for this study to be replicated in a number of years and compared to the results of this study to look for changes in future issues of the journal. Additionally, There is a need for further critical self-examination of the other journals in this relatively young and developing nature of this area of academic study. The field of sport management has only produced academic journals over the past two decades while other disciplines of study have journals dating back to the early part of twentieth century. Currently, there are over a dozen outlets for theoretical literature within the field of sport management, most of which began in the 1990's. With this in mind, in order to determine the advancement of the discipline, there is a need for the field of sport management to take an inward look at these

scholarly publications. In addition to determining if the current state of literature is reflecting what sport management scholars believe to be the sport business industry, this critical self-examination is needed in order to identify what advances have been made and where improvements need to be made.

#### REFERENCES

- Aitchison, C. (2001). Gender and leisure research: The "codification of knowledge." *Leisure Sciences*, 23, 1-19.
- Babbie, E. (1995). *The practice of social research* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Barber, E. H., Parkhouse, B. L., & Tedrick, T. (2001). A critical review of the methodology of published research in the *Journal of Sport Management* from 1991 through 1995 as measured by selected criteria. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 2(3), 216-236.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis of communication research*. New York: Free Press.
- Broughton, D. (2002, March 11). Passion that can't be counted puts billions of dollars in play. *SportsBusiness Journal*, 4 (47), 25-26.
- Budd, R. W., Thorp, R. K., & Donohew, L. (1967). *Content analysis of communication*. New York: Macmillan.
- Chelladurai, P. (1992). Sport management: Opportunities and obstacles. *Journal of Sport Management*, 6, 215-219.
- Cuneen, J., & Parks, J.B. (1997). Should we serve sport management practice or sport management education? A response to Weese's perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 11, 125-132.
- Danylchuk, K. E. & Judd, M. R. (1996). *Journal of Sport Management* readership survey. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 188-196.
- Female executive is opening doors. (2002, April 14). *New York Times*, p. H2.

- Fielding, L. W., Pitts, B. G., & Miller, L. K. (1991). Defining quality: Why should educators in sport management programs be concerned about accreditation? *Journal of Sport Management*, 5, 1-17.
- Folger, J. P., Hewes, D. E., & Poole, M. S. (1984). Coding social interaction. In B. Dervin & M. J. Voigt (Eds.). *Progress in communication sciences, Vol. IV* (pp. 115-161). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lambrecht, K. W. (1991). Research, theory, and practice. In B. L. Parkhouse (Ed.), *The management of sport: Its foundation and application* (pp. 27-38). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Mahony, D. F. & Pitts, B. G. (1998). Research outlets in sport marketing: The need for increased specialization. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12, 259-272.
- Mondello, M.J. & Pedersen, P.M. (2003). A content analysis of the *Journal of Sports Economics*. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 4 (1), 64-73.
- Mowrey, R. J. (2003). An examination of international sport management research: Content analysis of NASSM, EASM, and SMAANZ conference presentations 2000-2002. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance,
- Olafson, G. A. (1990). Research design in sport management: What's missing, what's needed? *Journal of Sport Management*, 4, 103-120.
- Parkhouse, B. L. & Pitts, B. G. (2001). Definition, evolution, and curriculum. In B. L. Parkhouse (Ed.), *The Management of sport: Its foundation and application*. (pp. 2-14). (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Parkhouse, B. L., Ulrich, D. O., & Soucie, D. (1982). Research in sport management: A vital rung of this new corporate ladder. *Quest*, 34, 176-186.
- Parks, J. B. (1992). Scholarship: The other "bottom line" in sport management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 6 (3), 220-229.
- Parks, J. B. & Olafson, G. A. (1987). Sport management and a new journal. *Journal of Sport Management*, 1(1), 1-3.
- Parks, J.B. & Quarterman, J. (2003). *Contemporary sport management*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Parks, J. B., Zanger, B., & Quarterman, J. (1998). *Contemporary sport management*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Paton, G. (1987). Sport management research – What progress has been made? *Journal of Sport Management*, 1(1), 25-31.
- Pedersen, P. M. & Pitts, B. G. (2001). Investigating the body of knowledge in sport management: A content analysis of the *Sport Marketing Quarterly*. *The Chronicle of Physical Education in Higher Education*, 12(3), 8-9, 22-23.
- Pitts, B. G. (2001). Sport management at the Millennium: A defining moment. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15, 1-9.
- Pitts, B. G. & Stotlar, D. K. (1996). *Fundamentals of sport marketing*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Pitts, B. G. & Stotlar, D. K. (2002). *Fundamentals of sport marketing (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Potter, W. J. & Levine-Donnerstein, D. (1999). Rethinking validity and reliability in content analysis. *Journal of Applied Communication*

---

*Research, 27, 258-284.*

Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. G. (1998). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Scott, W. A. (1955). Reliability of content analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 19, 321-325.*

Slack, T. (1996). From the locker room to the board room: Changing the domain of sport management. *Journal of Sport Management, 10, 97-105.*

Slack, T. (1993). Morgan and the metaphors: Implications for sport management research. *Journal of Sport Management, 7, 189-193.*

Soucie, D. & Doherty, A. (1996). Past endeavors and future perspectives for sport management research. *Quest, 48, 486-500.*

Spender, D. (Ed.). (1981). *Men's studies modified: The impact of feminism on the academic disciplines*. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Sport Management Program Review Council. (1993; 2000). *Sport management program standards and review protocol*. National Association for Sport and Physical Education and North American Society for Sport Management: Reston, VA.

Stempel, G. H. III. (1981). Content analysis. In G. H. Stempel III & B. H. Westley (Eds.). *Research methods in mass communication* (pp. 119-131). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Weese, W. J. (1995). If we are not serving practitioners, then we're not serving sport management. *Journal of Sport Management, 9 (3), 237-243.*

Zeigler, E. F. (1987). Sport management: Past, present, future. *Journal of Sport Management, 1 (1), 4-24.*



Table 1

*Sport Management and Related Journals and Dates of Inception*

*Cyber Journal of Sports Marketing* — started January, 1997 (ended July, 2000)  
*European Sport Management Quarterly (European Journal of Sport Management)* — 1994  
*ICHPER-SD Journal of Research* — 2005  
*International Journal of Sport Management* — 2000  
*International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing* — 2005  
*International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship* — 2000  
*International Sports Journal* — 1997  
*Japan Journal of the Sports Industry* — 1998  
*Journal of Contemporary Athletics* — 2005  
*Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport and Physical Activity* — 1990  
*Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sport* — 2005  
*Journal of Sports Economics* — 2000  
*Journal of Sport Management* — 1987  
*Journal of Sport Tourism* — 1993  
*Korean Journal of Sport Management* — 1995  
*Marquette Sports Law Review* — 1990  
*Seton Hall Journal of Sport Law* — 1990  
*Sport Management Review* — 1998  
*Sport Marketing Quarterly* — 1992  
*The SMART Journal* — 2004 (previously known as *SMART Online Journal*)  
*The Sports Lawyers Journal* — 1993  
*Villanova Sports and Entertainment Law Journal* — 1994

Table 2

*Content Areas Used in the Current Study as Identified in the NASPE-NASSM Sport Management Program Standards (2002) and the Added Categories*

Sport Business in the Social Context  
 Sport Marketing  
 Finance and Sport  
 Sport Economics  
 Ethics in Sport Management  
 Sport Law  
 Communication in Sport  
 Governance in Sport  
 Management and Organizational Skills in Sport  
 Field Experiences  
 Sport Management Education  
 Other

Table 3

*Sport Business Industry Segments Used in the Current Study as Identified in Parks, Zanger, & Quarterman (1998) and the Added Categories*

Intercollegiate Athletics  
 Professional Sport  
 Participant Sport  
 Campus Recreation  
 Sport Communication  
 Sport Marketing  
 Sport Event and Facility Management  
 Sports Medicine  
 Health Promotion  
 Sport Tourism  
 Sport Management and Marketing Agencies  
 International Sport  
 Sport Management Education  
 Other

Table 4

*Country of Authors in JSM*

Country of Author	<i>f</i>	P
United States	250	58%
Canada	118	27%
United Kingdom	17	3.9%
Australia	15	3.5%
South Korea	11	2.5%
Japan	6	1.4%
South Africa	5	1.2%
China	2	0.5%
France	2	0.5%
Belgium	2	0.5%
Nigeria	1	0.2%
New Zealand	1	0.2%
Greece	1	0.2%
Finland	1	0.2%
Singapore	1	0.2%
India	1	0.2%
Unspecified	1	0.2%

Table 5

*Gender of Authors, Editors, and Editorial Reviewers: A comparison to the previous studies*

Journal	Gender of Author:		Gender of Editors:		Gender of Reviewers:	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
<i>Journal of Sport Management</i> (current study)	36%	61%	50%	50%	45%	55%
<i>Sport Marketing Quarterly</i> (Pedersen & Pitts)	20%	78%	0	100%	35%	65%
<i>Journal of Sports Economics</i> (Mondello & Pedersen)	4.7%	95.3%	0	100%	3%	97%

Table 6

*Results: Sport Management Content Areas*

Content Area	<i>f</i>	P
Management & Organizational Skills in Sport	89	38%
Sport Marketing	41	18%
Sport Business in the Social Context	24	10%
Sport Management Education	20	9%
Finance in Sport	13	6%
Governance in Sport	12	5%
Sport Economics	10	4%
Sport Law	10	4%
Ethics in Sport Management	8	3%
Communication in Sport	4	2%
Field Experience	1	<1%
Other	1	<1%

Table 7

*Results: Sport Business Industry Segments*

Content Area	<i>f</i>	P
Intercollegiate Athletics	92	39.5%
Participant Sports	31	13.3%
Professional Sports	30	12.8%
Other	19	8.2%
Sport Management Education	16	6.9%
Campus Recreation	13	5.6%
Sport Marketing	12	5.2%
International Sport	8	3.4%
Sport Communications	5	2.1%
Sport Event & Facility Management	4	1.7%
Health Promotion	3	1.3%
Sports Medicine	0	0%
Sport Tourism	0	0%
Sport Management & Marketing Agencies	0	0%

Table 8

*Results: Gender Focus of Article*

Journal	Gender Focus of Article:		
	Female	Male	Both
<i>Journal of Sport Management</i> (current study)	11%	31%	58%
<i>Sport Marketing Quarterly</i> (Pedersen & Pitts)	8%	28%	24%
<i>Journal of Sports Economics</i> (Mondello & Pedersen)	0%	81.2%	14.1%