

January 2021

A Content Analysis of the Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics : 2008-2019

Dylan P. Williams
The University of Alabama

Jessica R. Murfree
University of Louisville

Jolyon Hawley
The University of Alabama

Patrick Tutka
Niagara University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/jiia>

Recommended Citation

Williams, Dylan P.; Murfree, Jessica R.; Hawley, Jolyon; and Tutka, Patrick (2021) "A Content Analysis of the Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics : 2008-2019," *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*: Vol. 14: Iss. 1, Article 1.

Available at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/jiia/vol14/iss1/1>

This Original Research is brought to you by the Hospitality, Retail and Sports Management, College of at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.



A Content Analysis of the *Journal of Issues* in *Intercollegiate Athletics*: 2008-2019

Dylan P. Williams, Ph.D.
The University of Alabama

Jessica R. Murfree, M.A.
University of Louisville

Jolyon Hawley, M.A.
The University of Alabama

Patrick Tutka, Ph.D.
Niagara University

Within academic disciplines, it is crucial to conduct periodical examinations of the field's literature to identify research that has been conducted and to reveal strengths, weaknesses, and gaps. This type of analysis provides scholars and educators with information regarding completed areas of research as well as potential gaps on a particular subject. While these studies discovered various trends and issues in numerous journals, there has not been a complete and formal analysis of the College Sport Research Institute's Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics (JIIA). Beginning in 2008, JIIA has published more than 200 manuscripts since its inception. Though the journal has grown during the past decade, it is necessary to examine the content of the journal to determine what trends and issues are missing from recent studies. Thus, the purpose of this project is to examine JIIA content from 2008 to 2019 to reveal its strengths, weaknesses, and areas where it can improve in the future.

Keywords: college-sport focused research, content analysis, management, methods

Over the last 15 years, the college sport industry has grown and evolved greatly. As an example, numerous schools engaged in conference realignment to create conference-focused television networks such as the Big Ten Network and SEC Network (Bernstein, 2014; Schlabach, 2010). This alignment also established a new autonomy model for schools aligned in one of the Power Five conference, separate from the other Division I schools (Solomon, 2014). The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) extended its broadcast deals in 2016 with CBS Sports and Turner Networks to broadcast the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Tournament until 2032 for just over \$1 billion annually (Tracy, 2016). Additionally, in 2019, California Governor Gavin Newsom signed into law the Fair Pay to Play Act, which permits college athletes in California to hire agents and receive compensation for endorsements (Kelly, 2019).

The growth and depth of these elements have been discussed and debated from an academic perspective within the *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics (JIIA)*. Recognized as one of the leading publications for conceptual and empirical studies on intercollegiate sports primarily based in the United States since its inception in 2008, *JIIA* (n.d.) centers its focus on interdisciplinary and interuniversity college-sport research for academics, intercollegiate athletic practitioners, and the general public. It provides scholars with opportunities to publish their college-sport research results within a peer-reviewed academic process and encourages the presentation of studies (e.g., in-progress or completed) through a national conference (College Sport Research Institute [CSRI]). Further, the journal supports the institute's following goals:

1. Create public awareness of socio-cultural, economic, and political issues in college sport.
2. Provide a forum for open discussion of relevant issues within the college-sport community
3. Build relationships within local, regional and national communities to generate funding for independent critical research into college sport.
4. Generate local, regional and national awareness of the College Sport Research Institute as a leader in college-sport research.
5. Educate students, scholars, athletic administrators, college athletes, coaches and the general public on college-sport issues (*JIIA*, n.d., para. 5).

Though the journal has developed as a premier academic journal for college sport-focused research and published more than 200 manuscripts, a complete analysis of *JIIA*'s content has never been conducted. Such an analysis may provide critical information regarding the diversity of topics researched, the various research methodologies used, demographic information regarding published authors, and potentially identify any gaps that may exist within the current literature base. Thus, the purpose of the present study is to examine the content of the *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics* from 2008 to 2019 to reveal its strengths, weaknesses, and areas where it can improve in the future. This research adheres to past scholars within the sport management academic discipline who advocate for the ongoing process of analyzing publications of pertinent studies to cultivate the discipline's growth (Ciomaga, 2013; de Wilde & Seifried, 2012; Oddy & Bason, 2017; Peetz & Reams, 2011; Pitts, 2016; Pitts & Pedersen, 2005; Pitts et al., 2014; Quarterman et al., 2006a, 2006b; Shapiro & Pitts, 2014).

Specifically, this research examines the content focus of *JIIA* manuscripts, industry segments studied, gender focus of research, and research methods utilized. Because of *JIIA*'s focus, the present work analyzes content in terms of intercollegiate athletic governing body and sport emphasis with the overall goal of identifying current and future trends of article topics and encouraging increased submissions from scholars who focus within this area.

Literature Review

The desire to build on the quantity and quality of sport management scholarly activity is essential to establish the field's credibility in the academic landscape (Parks & Bartley, 1996). Though scholarly activity includes numerous activities such as teaching and pedagogy, experiential learning, and networking opportunities, the largest contribution is centered on the publication of research articles in academic journals (Pitts, 2016). These articles help produce the body of knowledge or ontology that represents the field of study and consists of rudimentary and fundamental knowledge commonly possessed by all in the profession (Fielding et al., 1991; Pitts et al., 2014; Quatman & Chelladurai, 2008; Shapiro & Pitts, 2014). Academic journals operate as forums to introduce and present new research as well as to scrutinize and critique existing works (Miller et al., 2019). In many disciplines, the knowledge crafted from academic journals is constantly expanding and developing as new elements are introduced, creating continual evolution of ontology (Pitts, 2016). Specifically, academic journals serve multiple roles within the scholarly community by communicating information and creating conversations among scholars, building information archives, facilitating scholarly relationships, and offering current practical and theoretical implications within a scholarly discipline (Schaffner, 1994).

For fields that are still developing, the discipline's ontology may be incomplete as certain areas are underdeveloped or missing. As a result, an assessment of the knowledge found in academic journals within the field is necessary to determine the discipline's strengths and weaknesses, topic over-saturation, and subjects that researchers are not studying (Pitts et al., 2014). Pitts (2016) argued journal assessment is vital to our field as "it produces information needed for editors of journals, authors of textbooks, researchers, and others who are responsible for or interested in building an accurate and appropriate body of knowledge for the field" (p. 2).

Within sport management, many scholars advocate for the continual assessment of the field's journals, textbooks, and other materials to craft a comprehensive ontology centered on relevant and topical issues in sport (Cuneen & Parks, 1997; Fielding et al., 1991; Mahony & Pitts, 1998; Pedersen & Pitts, 2003; Pedersen & Thibault, 2018; Pitts et al., 2014). Further, journal articles in the sport management academy should provide up-to-date theoretical constructs as well as practical applications to ensure its relevance to professional and academic communities (Miller et al., 2019; Pedersen & Pitts, 2003). This assessment is particularly vital in the discipline as new journals continue to emerge, each with a tangential relationship to sport management. For example, the North American Society of Sport Management (NASSM; 2019) provides a comprehensive list of 95 academic journals that serve sport management and related domains. However, Shapiro and Pitts (2014) argued there are over 140 journals that develop and cultivate knowledge within the field, which is necessary due to the young age of the sport management discipline.

While the total number of sport-based journals continues to evolve, Pitts (2016) acknowledged only a few have been critically examined. These journals include the *European Sport Management Quarterly* (*ESMQ*; Pitts et al., 2014; Shilbury, 2011a, 2011b), the *Journal of*

Legal Aspects of Sport (JLAS; Miller et al., 2019), the *Journal of Sports Economics* (JSE; Mondello & Pedersen, 2003), the *Journal of Sport Management* (JSM; Barber et al., 2001; Pitts & Pedersen, 2005; Quarterman et al., 2006a, 2006b; Shilbury, 2011a, 2011b), the *International Journal of Sport Management* (IJSM; Pitts, 2016; Quarterman et al., 2013), *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal* (SBM; Oddy & Bason, 2017), *Sport Management Review* (SMR; Balduck et al., 2004; Shilbury, 2011a, 2011b), and *Sport Marketing Quarterly* (SMQ; Peetz & Reams, 2011; Pedersen & Pitts, 2001; Quarterman et al., 2005). Similarly, several works explored multiple academic journals for specific criteria such as trends and issues (Ciomaga, 2013), detailed topics (Shapiro & Pitts, 2014; Shilbury, 2011a), author collaboration (Quarterman et al., 2006a; Quatman & Chelladurai, 2008; Smucker & Grappendorf, 2008), and methodologies utilized in studies (Barber et al., 2001; Balduck et al., 2004; de Wilde & Seifried, 2012; Quarterman et al., 2005, 2006b).

These works have identified numerous trends and issues for the field's journals as well as interesting quirks related to their focused content. For example, Pitts et al. (2014) analyzed all *ESMQ* issues as well as the issues of its predecessor, the *European Journal of Sport Management*, from 1994 to 2013. They discovered a substantial increase on papers focused on international sport when the journal became *ESMQ*, though focus on professional sport and participant sport were the most popular industry segments for articles. Miller et al. (2019) found 21% of the articles published in *JLAS* between 1992 and 2016 utilized the BlueBook citation guideline format opposed to American Psychological Association (APA) guidelines. Using sport marketing components outlined by Pitts and Stotlar (2007), Peetz and Reams (2011) identified 33.2% of articles published in all *SMQ* volumes between 1992 and 2011 concentrated on spectator analysis while an additional 25.4% studied marketing research. In analyzing all *IJSM* issues, Pitts (2016) noted the use of quantitative methodology increased from 61% between 2000 and 2006 to 82% between 2006 and 2013. Concurrently, the results from *IJSM* tie with de Wilde and Seifried's (2012) discovery that quantitative (45.43%) and qualitative (20.05%) article types were popular among papers published *ESMQ*, *JSM*, *SMR*, and *SMQ* between 2005 and 2009. During this same time frame, only 10% of these manuscripts combined featured a legal analysis, content analysis, or historical study.

Most notably, however, many of these assessments identify a heavy focus of studies conducted within the intercollegiate athletics business setting (Barber et al., 1998; Pitts, 2016; Pitts & Pedersen, 2005). The popularity of this industry segment has led to the creation of academic journals (e.g., *JIIA*, *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*) whose primary focus is college sport. It has also established the desire for many scholars to engage in intercollegiate athletics related research, particularly if they are employed by institutions that emphasize and value college sport. Because of the popularity of college-sport focused research as well as the journal's growth, it is necessary to examine *JIIA*'s contributions to determine how the journal provides a body of knowledge and shapes the overall field of intercollegiate athletics. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to conduct an examination of the *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*. Such analysis offers scholars an inventory of the body of literature that will reveal the general state of college sport-focused research, authorship attributes, research methodology use, and under-represented topics. It will also provide researchers, editorial board, and scholarly organizations a general concept in planning for future research in addressing gaps within the current body of knowledge and improve the outlet's quality for future submissions.

Methodology

To properly assess the general characteristics of *JIIA*'s publications, a content analysis methodology was utilized. Content analysis is a systematic and replicable research methodology that allows for the compression of large amounts of text into categories for examination (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Krippendorff, 1980; Krippendorff & Bock, 2008; Stemler, 2000; Weber, 1990). The overall goal of a content analysis is to "provide knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon under study" (Downe-Wamboldt, 1992, p. 314). The appropriate use for this methodology is not to simply count words for the purpose of classification but rather to uncover and depict the focus of individual, group, institutional, or social attention (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Weber, 1990). This method has been utilized in prior studies analyzing scholarly journals within the sport management field as well as a variety of social science disciplines (de Wilde & Seifried, 2012; Miller et al., 2019; Mondello & Pedersen, 2003; Pedersen & Pitts, 2001; Peetz & Reams, 2011; Pitts, 2016; Pitts et al., 2014; Pitts & Pedersen, 2005). Riffe et al. (2005) argued when researchers identify a study construct, a content analysis can be conducted by selecting a representative content sample, training coders to use developed categories to determine content differences, and assessing coder reliability within the agreed-upon category rules. From these procedures, the collected data can be analyzed to identify typical patterns and recognize significant relationships among the content characteristics.

Coding Procedures

Following the steps recommended by Riffe et al. (2005), the present study identified all articles published within *JIIA* from 2008 to 2019 including three special issues in 2009, 2013, and 2017 ($N = 206$). The researchers were able to access all of the articles through the journal's website (www.csri-jiiia.org). Since its inception, *JIIA* has been an open-access journal, with all issues freely available to anyone. Three researchers (one professor and two doctoral students) independently coded every regular and special issue of *JIIA*. The rationale for using these three coders was they were involved in the sport management field, the coding process was similar to prior studies, and they were comfortable examining the content due to extensive time spent in college-sport focused scholarship. The primary author checked for coding reliability and consistency using Cohen's Kappa. Cohen's Kappa is a popular index for measuring chance-corrected agreement between observers analyzing nominal data (Berry & Mielke, 1988; Riffe et al., 2005). This calculation was $K = .964$, which corresponds with Landis and Koch's (1997) "Almost Perfect" category of their strength of agreement scale.

Measures

Authorship and Editors. Similar to past analyses of sport management journals, the researchers examined the demographics of authors contributing to the journal. Elements included the number of authors per article, gender of lead author, and Carnegie Classification of lead author's institution. This information provides an assessment of the number of authors actively publishing in this journal and contributing to the college-sport focused literature, an analysis of gender, and an analysis of the research activity level of the authors. When gender could not be determined by name, the researchers searched for the author based upon their institution affiliation (i.e., an author biography on university's website). Regarding Carnegie Classification,

both Parks and Bartley (1996) and Seifried et al. (2019) examined variables in relation to productivity and found that Carnegie Classification was a strong predictor of scholarly output. This information may be vital to authors considering the journal for submission and for journal managers in planning for diversity enhancement if needed. Moreover, editorial positions were analyzed including editor, associate/section editor, guest editor, and editorial board members. These positions were measured by number, gender, and type of editorial position. An investigation into this information provides a better understanding of the leadership and decision makers connected with *JIIA*.

Content and Methods. The total population of manuscripts was examined to reveal the state of the literature in the journal. In terms of content, selected elements of the published manuscripts were examined. These items include a determination of the research's content area, sport industry segment, college and sport emphasis, and gender of focus. According to Pitts (2016), determining what sport management activities have been studied provides a view of areas receiving high focus and those needing attention. Content areas were based on the Commission on Sport Management Accreditation's (COSMA) curriculum guidelines to determine what is being studied (COSMA, 2016). These categories include communication and media; economics; education; ethics; field experience; governance and policy; management and organizational skills; marketing; law; sport business in the social context; and other areas not categorized by COSMA.

Furthermore, this research also analyzed the various studies based on the sport industry segments established by Pedersen and Thibault (2018). Because the scope of *JIIA* is focused on U.S. intercollegiate athletics, we only included industry segments that exist within a collegiate setting. As a result, the following segments are analyzed: (a) campus recreation; (b) coaching and administration; (c) communication; (d) education; (e) event and facility management; (f) health promotion; (g) participant sport; (h) sport law; (i) sport marketing and sales; and (j) sport sociology. We also reviewed the athletic governing body/division focus and college sport focus of each article. For association/division focus, we determined if authors focused on an NCAA division (e.g., Division I, Division II, or Division III) or subdivision (e.g., Division I-Football Bowl Subdivision; Division I-Football Championship Subdivision) as well as the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) or other college sport governing body. Finally, for gender focus of an article, the researchers determined if *JIIA* authors are focusing on men's or women's sport or sport businesses.

Likewise, this process involved a descriptive analysis of the research methodology utilized in each article over the prescribed timeframe. The investigation focused solely on peer-reviewed, research articles in original and special issues of the journal. These articles are located on the *JIIA* website under the "Publications" section. The unit of analysis was the written material (i.e., the research article). The researchers did not include any journal introductions, editorial notes, commentaries, or book reviews. Measures included the year an article was published and the number of pages per article. Additionally, this analysis identified the overall category of research (i.e., qualitative, quantitative, mixed) and the type of research methodology. In terms of research methodologies, we identified common qualitative (e.g., interviews, observations, case study, historical, legal) and quantitative (e.g., descriptive; factor analysis, t-test/ANOVA, chi-square, correlation, regression, MANOVA, ANCOVA) methods. This information provides a rundown of the research methodologies used by *JIIA* publications and identify methods that are not as utilized.

Findings

In total, there have been 12 annual volumes and three special issues of *JIIA*, comprising of 206 total articles. Table 1 provides an annual distribution of the number of articles and their length. Due to its open-access style, the journal does not publish multiple issues of a volume each year nor does it publish a consistent number of articles annually. On average, *JIIA* publishes 17.2 articles each year, with the lowest amount published in 2008 (8) and highest amount in 2019 (28). Twenty articles were published in special issues, with each special issue producing 6.67 articles on average. The average length of the research articles was 20.3 pages, with articles ranging from 7 to 39 pages. A total of 4,184 pages of original research have been produced during the journal's lifespan. Furthermore, the journal's content is well cited in the field as articles published in *JIIA* have been cited 3,271 times, averaging 15.96 citations per article according to Harzing's (2007) *Publish or Perish*.

Table 1
Scholarly Material Published in JIIA 2008-2019

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total	
Number of Papers	8	9	15	23	18	17	21	9	14	12	12	28	186	206
Special Issue	---	4	---	---	---	6	---	---	---	10	---	---	20	
Number of Pages	144	176	295	440	353	331	444	182	302	260	286	634	3,847	4,184
Special Issue	---	77	---	---	---	89	---	---	---	171	---	---	337	
Average Pages	18.0	19.6	19.7	19.1	19.6	19.8	21.1	20.2	21.6	21.7	23.8	22.6	20.7	20.3
Special Issue	---	19.3	---	---	---	14.8	---	---	---	17.1	---	---	16.9	

Authorship

The 206 research articles of *JIIA* represented the work of 390 unique authors. The number of authors for each article ranged from one to six. Approximately 90% of the articles were authored by either one, two, three, or four authors. Sixty-one articles (29.6%) were collaborations between three authors, 57 (27.7%) articles had two authors, 29 (14.1%) had four authors, and 38 (18.4%) articles were sole authorships. Sixteen articles (7.8%) had five contributing authors while a combination of six authors occurred five times (2.4%). The high amount of articles with multiple authors match collaboration trends in authorship found by Quatman and Chelladurai (2008), who noted a substantial decrease in solo authorship in the sport management field while papers with two to three authors increased since the 1990s.

Table 2 identifies the gender and affiliation of authors for the published articles. Most manuscripts had male authors (60.3%; $n = 235$) while female authorship accounted for 155 researchers (39.7%). As noted, the gender of each author was verified by the researchers through each author's university affiliation and website. In terms of lead authorship, a large majority of male researchers were listed as first author (70.9%, $n = 146$) while only 60 female researchers (29.1%) served as the lead on a project. Of the 38 articles with one author, 32 (84.2%) were by

men and six (15.8%) were by women. Additionally, 168 individuals were listed as second author with 100 (48.3%) being male and 68 being female (32.9%). Finally, 187 researchers were named secondary authors (i.e., third, fourth, fifth, or sixth) with 115 (61.5%) listed as men and 72 (38.5%) listed as women.

Table 2
Authorship Gender and Affiliation in JIIA 2008-2019

	First		Second		Third		Fourth		Fifth		Sixth	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender												
Male	146	70.9	100	59.5	65	58.6	35	70.0	11	52.4	4	80.0
Female	60	29.1	68	40.5	46	41.4	15	30.0	10	47.6	1	20.0
Carnegie Classification												
Research Level 1	103	50.0	91	54.2	65	58.0	23	46.0	11	52.4	3	60.0
Research Level 2	40	19.4	33	19.6	19	17.0	9	18.0	8	38.1	2	40.0
Research Level 3	16	7.8	14	8.3	8	7.1	6	12.0	1	4.8	--	--
Masters Level 1	31	15.0	19	11.3	12	10.7	6	12.0	1	4.8	--	--
Masters Level 2	2	1.0	--	--	3	2.7	--	--	--	--	--	--
Masters Level 3	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2.0	--	--	--	--
Non-Ranked	14	7.8	11	6.5	5	4.5	5	10.0	--	--	--	--

For Carnegie Classification, authors were placed into one of seven categories to describe academic institution affiliation. Lead authors claiming Research Level 1 (R1) University affiliation was the most represented (50.0%; n = 103), followed by Research Level 2 (R2) University (19.4%; n = 40) and Master's Level 1 (M1) Universities (15.0%; n = 31). Research Level 3 (R3) Universities (7.8%; n = 16), Master's Level 2 (M2) Universities (1.0%; n = 2), and non-ranked institutions (e.g., consulting firms, sport organizations, etc.; 6.8%; n = 14) were the other categories included. Similarly, individuals named as second author were affiliated primarily with R1 Universities (44.0%; n = 91) followed by R2 Universities (15.9%; n = 33), M1 Universities (9.2%; n = 19), R3 Universities (6.8%; n = 14), and non-ranked institutions (5.3%; n = 11). Also, secondary authors were primarily listed with R1 Universities (54.3%; n = 102) followed by R2 Universities (20.2%; n = 38), M1 Universities (10.1%; n = 19), R3 Universities (8.0%; n = 15), and non-ranked institutions (5.3%; n = 10).

Editors

This content analysis determined the gender make-up of editors, associate editors, review.¹ We also analyzed whether current and past board members as well as guest reviewers have published in the journal as some editors have made that a point of emphasis. Over the

¹ This information was obtained by current co-editors Drs. Thomas Aicher and Joseph Cooper. We would like to thank them for their help in this process.

course of the journal's history, nine individuals have served as either editor or co-editor of *JIIA*. Eight of the nine editors (88.9%) have been male. Interestingly, *JIIA* has maintained co-editors for all but three years of its existence (2008, 2016, and 2017). During these years, the editor was male. Additionally, four individuals have served as associate editor (i.e., Acquisitions Editor and Book Review Editor) and are all male. Further, six guest editors have contributed to *JIIA*'s special issues, four men (66.7%) and two women (33.3%). The current editorial board is comprised of 51 members, 41 men (80.4%) and 10 women (19.6%). Moreover, 39 (76.4%) current members have published manuscripts in the journal. An additional 43 individuals (33 men or 76.7%; 10 women or 23.3%) were past members of the board with 27 having published in the journal at least once (62.7%). Finally, 44 researchers have served in a guest reviewer capacity, 27 men (61.4%) and 17 women (38.6%), and 17 (38.6%) of which are published in the journal.

Content

Analysis of the focus areas of research including sport management content area, sport business industry segments, association/division, and college sport focus is shown in Table 3. In terms of sport management content area, the results mirror past findings from Oddy and Bason (2017) and Pitts (2016) where Sport Business in the Social Context and Management/Organizational Behavior & Theory are the most popular content areas for the journal. In particular, articles with a Social Context focus comprised 33% (n=68) of the published manuscripts while a Management/Organizational Behavior & Theory focus was recognized in 21.4% of articles (n = 44). Other areas receiving attention in the journal were Education (12.6%; n = 26) and Marketing (10.2%; n = 21). All other content areas received minimal focus.

As noted earlier, the focus of the journal is on collegiate athletics and common categories found in other sport management content analyses will not be found such as College Sport and Professional Sport (Peetz & Reams, 2011; Pitts, 2016). Thus, the most studied segment within the journal is Coaching and Administration (38.3%; n = 79) followed by Participant Sport (16.0%; n = 33). Education (11.7%; n = 24) and Sport Marketing (9.7%; n = 20) were also prominent industry segments studied. All other industry segments received minimal to no focus. Similarly, many of the articles published by the journal are based upon the NCAA and its divisions (82.0%; n = 169). Only one article (0.5%) focuses on the NAIA while 36 articles are based on multiple or other collegiate associations (17.5%). In terms of NCAA divisions, Division I has the primary emphasis (75.7%; n = 156) with the FBS subdivision having the second highest focus (32.0%; n = 66). All other divisions and subdivision receive minimal focus. In terms of college sport, a large majority of papers do not focus on one particular sport (69.9%; n = 144). For the ones that do focus on a sport, football is the most common emphasis (23.8%; n = 49). All other intercollegiate sports received minimal to no coverage.

Finally, manuscripts were also examined to determine if research focused on one primary gender. Specifically, papers with a focus on male sport or activities (e.g., football; men's basketball) were recognized as "male." Conversely, works dedicated to female sport or activities (e.g., softball; women's basketball) were coded as "female." Papers with no identifiable gender bias were categorized as "neither/both." A high majority of the studies do not have a focus on one gender over another or focused on both genders combined (56.3%; n = 116). However, a

sizable portion of manuscripts do have a male focus (34.5%; $n = 71$) while few articles contain a female focus (9.2%; $n = 19$).

Table 3
Focus Areas of Research

Item	<i>N</i>	%
Sport Management Content Area		
Social Context	68	33.0
Management/Organizational Behavior & Theory	44	21.4
Education	26	12.6
Marketing	21	10.2
Finance/Accounting	12	5.8
Governance/Policy	12	5.8
Communication and Media	10	4.9
Ethics	7	3.4
Law	3	1.5
Field Experience	2	1.0
Economics	1	0.5
Industry Segment		
Coaching and Administration	79	38.3
Participant Sport	33	16.0
Education	24	11.7
Sport Marketing	20	9.7
Sport Law	12	5.8
Communication	11	5.3
Event and Facility Management	11	5.3
Health Promotion	9	4.4
Sport Tourism	7	3.4
Campus Recreation	---	---
Association/Division		
NCAA Division I General	84	40.8
NCAA Division I-FBS	66	32.0
Other/Multiple	36	17.5
NCAA Division II	7	3.4
NCAA Division I-FCS	6	2.9
NCAA Division III	6	2.9
NAIA	1	0.5
Sport		
No Focus	144	69.9
Football	49	23.8
Men's Basketball	10	4.9
Women's Basketball	1	0.5
Baseball	1	0.5

Methods

The 206 research articles were analyzed based on methodology used, which can be found in Table 4. The scholarly works were first coded based on the general category of methodology (e.g., quantitative, qualitative, mixed) and then identified for methodology type within the general type. Although there is a strong representation of qualitative methods (39.8%; $n = 82$), the majority of articles published utilized a quantitative methodology (52.4%; $n = 108$).. Sixteen articles (7.7%) used both qualitative and quantitative methods and were labeled as mixed methods. In terms of type of quantitative methodology, the most popular research method was descriptive methods ($n = 89$) followed by regression analysis ($n = 53$) and t-Tests/ANOVAs ($n = 43$). For qualitative research projects, interviews ($n = 26$) was the most frequent methodology type utilized followed by observations ($n = 19$) and case studies ($n = 18$).

Table 4
Research Methods

Research Method	<i>N</i>	% of Total	% of Type of Research
Quantitative*	108	52.4	
Descriptive	89	43.2	82.4
Regression	53	25.7	49.1
t-Test/ANOVA	43	20.9	39.8
Correlation	34	16.5	31.5
Factor Analysis	22	10.7	20.4
Other	22	10.7	20.4
Chi-Square	21	10.1	19.4
MANOVA	13	6.3	12.0
ANCOVA	---	---	---
Qualitative	82	39.8	
Interviews	26	12.6	31.7
Observations	19	9.2	23.2
Case Studies	18	8.7	22.0
Historical	10	4.9	12.1
Other	6	2.9	7.3
Legal	3	1.5	3.7
Mixed Methods	16	7.7	
*Note - Quantitative articles may contain more than one type of analysis. As such, these figures will not equal 100%			

Discussion

In terms of the amount of content produced by *JIIA* over the 12 years analyzed in this study, it appears to produce articles at an annual pace (17.2 articles per year) similar to other contemporary journals in the sport management discipline. For example, Pitts and Danylchuk (2014) noted the *European Sport Management Quarterly* produced an average of 18.4 articles

annually between 2001 and 2012. Similarly, *Sport Marketing Quarterly* averaged 17.3 manuscripts during its first 20 years as a publication (1992-2011; Peetz & Reams, 2011). It also outpaces the annual contributions from the *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport* from 1992 to 2016 (10.3; Miller et al., 2019) and the *Journal of Sport Management* from 1987 to 2004 (13.0; Pitts & Pedersen, 2005). This information is important to acknowledge and understand how journals began and carried forward through their early developmental years. Each journal has an initial growth plan to improve the quality of articles received and, in turn, the articles published. The specific examples of other content analyses show that *JIIA* followed a similar pattern as other journals of similar backgrounds with this initial growth in mind. Specially, *JIIA* began with few annual publications but grew in popularity as more scholars became familiar with the outlet as well as the growth of the CSRI Conference as a forum for intercollegiate athletic research.

The results for author gender in *JIIA* are similar to past findings for *JSM* (61% male and 36% female) and *JLAS* (65% male and 35% female), slightly lower than *ESMQ* (78% male and 22% female) and *SMQ* (79% male and 20%), and substantially lower than *JSE* (95.3% male and 4.7% female). *JIIA*'s authorship numbers are also similar to the *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*'s gender figures (59% male and 41% female). Pitts (2016) suggested this composition of author gender is parallel to the percentage of male and female academics in the field that conduct and publish research in these areas. This suggestion may also explain why a higher percentage of articles have a male as lead author versus a female. Regardless of this inference, it is an area in need of further analysis.

Similarly, the editorial board has a large male presence as 80% of the current makeup of the editorial board is male, and only one woman has served as co-editor in the journal's lifetime. While the journal's decision makers do not have direct control over article submissions, they can influence the editorial positions/publication decisions. As an example, Peetz and Reams (2011) reported *SMQ* made significant increases "with regard to female representation in *SMQ*'s editorial ranks, yet efforts need to continue to ensure both genders have an opportunity to contribute to the decision-making process of the journal" (p. 216). Though it will take time to accomplish this goal, increasing female representation for editorial and associate editorial positions should be a point of emphasis for the CSRI Executive Board as the association that owns the journal.

In terms of author affiliation, Yamamoto (2004) argued authors affiliated with a higher Carnegie Classification ranking institution have a greater likelihood to have their work published. Scholarly productivity is a general expectation for faculty at any institution to achieve tenure and promotion, though research intensive universities have higher demands from its faculty members regarding promotion (Bok, 1992; Fairweather, 2005). Further, Seifried et al. (2019) argued scholars housed in research intensive universities produce significantly more publications during the tenure-track and tenured career stages. As such, it is not a surprising result most lead authors (69.4%) and second authors (73.8%) were associated with either an R1 or R2 institution. Likewise, according to *JIIA* (2020), the most recent 5-year impact factor was 2.37. This score is just under impact factors for *ESMQ* (2.78), *JSM* (2.69), and *SMR* (2.97) and higher than *Communication in Sport* (2.144), *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship* (1.177), and *JSE* (1.39) among others (NASSM, 2019). As noted by Seifried et al. (2019), R1 and R2 scholars tend to submit more publications to journals like *JIIA* due to its high quality and impact within the field.

However, the contributions from members of other types of Carnegie Classifications as well as unaffiliated entities should also be encouraged for the general health of the journal. While

the number of first and second authors from these entities are small (30.6% as first; 26.2% as second), they are substantially higher than other journals in the field. Further, the inclusion of authors from these smaller institutions and unaffiliated entities achieves *JIIA*'s (n.d.) mission "to encourage and support interdisciplinary and interuniversity collaborative college-sport research, [and] serve as a research consortium for college-sport researchers from across the United States" (para. 1). As a result, scholars from these smaller institutions should continue utilizing both *JIIA* and the CSRI Conference to present their research and generate discussion regarding various collegiate issues at all institutions. Additionally, the *JIIA* editors may wish to consider organizing a special issue of the journal that is dedicated to researchers from smaller universities to highlight their particular work as well as an application of various theoretical frameworks on under researched areas of collegiate athletics.

Regarding content, nearly 80% of topic focus in the published articles is on four areas: (a) social context; (b) management/organizational behavior & theory; (c) education; and (d) marketing. This finding is not as surprising as one would believe as many journals in the discipline tend to focus on only a few content areas. For example, *JSM*'s primary content areas are management, organizational behavior, and sport marketing, whereas *ESMQ*'s main areas include management, organizational skills, social contexts, sport marketing, and sport economics (Pitts et al., 2014). However, there should be increased efforts to encourage scholarship in neglected and emerging areas within the sport management discipline. Likewise, the subject of intercollegiate athletics provides numerous opportunities to analyze and explore various theoretical frameworks regarding these areas.

In comparison to sport business industry segment, college sport is heavily researched in our discipline (Miller et al., 2019; Peetz & Reams; Pitts, 2016; Pitts & Pedersen, 2005; Pitts et al., 2014). Because of this high emphasis, it is vital to understand what business segments within the intercollegiate athletic landscape are explored. This analysis finds over 50% of manuscripts cover two industry segments: (a) coaching and administration and (b) participant sport. Additionally, nearly all of the scholarly contributions focus on NCAA athletics opposed to other intercollegiate athletic institutions. Though the NCAA is the premiere association for college sport (Williams et al., 2018), the journal should encourage exploration into other intercollegiate athletic organizations such as the NAIA and the National Junior College Athletic Association. For sport focus, nearly 70% of research is not centered on a sport. For those that are, the majority concentrate on college football (23.8%) with minimal coverage on other important sports. Finally, many articles do not have a particular gender focus (56.3%), but those that do have a focus are primarily men's sports pertaining to male athletes (34.5%).

It is understandable an intercollegiate athletics focused journal contains a large percentage of articles based on popular research areas such as college football, which scholars label as a revenue-generating sport (Fulks, 2017; Wanless et al., 2019; Williams, 2016). While football and men's basketball provide significant resources for athletics, they are not the majority of the athletic departments. Thus, researchers should consider expanding their scope of topics to explore non-revenue generating collegiate sports to allow for a deeper understanding of this field and its various segments. To accomplish this task, Pedersen and Pitts (2001) suggested scholarly journals introduce special issues focused on under researched components such as women in college sport, non-NCAA intercollegiate athletic governing bodies, and other sport business industry segments.

However, potential scholars desiring to research these underrepresented areas should also be cognizant of crafting manuscripts with citation potential. According to Moed (2010), citation

potential indicates how often papers within a subject field cite other papers within a certain time frame. The propensity to cite a particular article depends on general field features (e.g., degree of specialization; social norms) as well as particular features of the citing journal (Zitt & Small, 2008). Stated differently, the popularity of the social context research area in college sport creates a higher citation potential for *JIIA* than other content. Thus, any special issue focused on underrepresented segments should also weigh the citation potential on the subject.

Finally, *JIIA* appears to have a slight preference toward quantitative works but has a sizable portion of qualitative activity. Interestingly, the quantitative-based articles implement a multitude of quantitative methodologies. A vast majority of these articles contained descriptive statistics (i.e., mean, median, standard deviation, etc.) and were commonly paired with regression and ANOVA statistical analysis. Moreover, the journal has a significant amount of qualitative studies with a healthy balance between the common methodologies of interviews, observations, and case studies. The journal should continue to be open and inclusive of various research methodologies but potentially promote a qualitative or mixed method emphasis to encourage more qualitative-based submissions. For example, studies conducting interviews with college sport industry leaders regarding particular subjects would be a great contribution for future content. However, this emphasis in qualitative research should not come at the expense of decreasing quantitative works as there are subject areas that utilize a high amount of quantitative methodology. As an example, the content area of sport economics has the lowest representation within the journal but can be a subject of great importance to college sport researchers. Thus, this journal may want to also consider conducting a special issue focused on sport economics within intercollegiate athletics. These two special issues will allow the journal to continue to have a healthy balance between the two research dimensions.

Conclusion

This study continues to build on past calls to analyze the state of content within the sport management discipline (Mondello & Pedersen, 2003; Pedersen & Pitts, 2001; Pitts et al., 2014; Pitts & Pedersen, 2005). A content analysis is an important research tool for more rigorous study of the empirical results of conventional analyses as they recognize particular patterns that need to be explored further. When conducted appropriately, these analyses provide an opportunity to systematically and objectively document what subject and topic areas have been published over time. Past studies within the sport management discipline acknowledge the popularity of scholarship within the intercollegiate athletic landscape (Lambrecht, 1991; Miller et al., 2019; Peetz & Reams, 2011; Pitts, 2001, 2016). While the area proves to be a fruitful setting to test theories, past research has not detailed what specific content within college sport is highly popular among researchers.

The intent of the *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics* is to “serve as a research consortium for college-sport researchers across the United States” (*JIIA*, n.d., para. 1). The findings from this current study show the journal has met and is continuing to achieve this goal. Additionally, it has been cited by journals in a variety of fields including business, law, education/pedagogy, administration, and marketing. As such, the journal serves a vital role for both researchers and practitioners in the sport management discipline and related fields. However, like other journals in the field, efforts are required to expand the range of content found in *JIIA*. The results highlight that few studies involve the subjects of sport communication, sport economics, sport ethics, and sport law within the intercollegiate athletic landscape. This

finding is curious as there are numerous events occurring within the industry warranting further investigation through theoretical frameworks. For example, the highest sport business industry researched was coaching and administration (38.3%; $n = 79$). However, few studies examining this area did not explore the industry with a communication, economics, ethics, or law framework. With major events impacting coaches and administrators over the last few decades and centered on these content areas, college sport researchers should consider investigating these phenomena through these particular theoretical lenses. The journal could also potentially improve this aspect by having future editors and editorial board members possessing research interests in these non-well-represented content areas. Likewise, the scope of intercollegiate athletic research needs to expand beyond the focus of the NCAA as well as other sport business industry segments.

While this analysis highlights areas where the journal needs to improve, decision makers need to continue their strategies to make the journal a highly respected outlet for publication. As noted earlier, the current 5-year impact factor was 2.37 and is slightly lower than the factors from the top three sport management journals (e.g., *ESMQ*, 2.78; *JSM*, 2.69; and *SMR*, 2.97) (*JIIA*, 2020; NASSM, 2019). To increase citations and improve the journal's impact factor further, *JIIA* should create efforts to attract manuscripts from highly-cited authors (e.g., special issues aimed at interested groups), enlist in reviewers that will provide good and timely editorial work, and promote relevant and timely papers published in the journal (Uzun, 2017). Additionally, the journal may consider soliciting review articles on particular topics within collegiate sport to attract a high number of readers and citations (Garfield, 1996). However, this effort may require the employment of a new, dedicated editor.

Finally, there should be increased effort to attract presenters at the CSRI Conference to submit their work for the potential of publication. While many attendees of the conference have sought publication through *JIIA* and other outlets, there are numerous presentations at the annual conference where presenters do not consider manuscript submission for various reasons. The *JIIA* Editorial Board and CSRI Advisory Board should work to decrease this disconnect by promoting all articles published in *JIIA* that were presented at the annual conference. This item would be particularly helpful for doctoral students and young professors who identify the journal as a potential outlet to submit their work. Further, for presenters who wish to pursue publication but feel they cannot create a full manuscript of their work, the journal should create a special issue focused on conference proceedings. This issue would allow CSRI presenting authors to submit their written record of their presentation to *JIIA* should they wish not to pursue a full manuscript submission. By including a conference proceedings special issue each year, *JIIA* would continue to improve the quality and quantity of manuscripts and increase the number of content areas covered in the journal.

Limitations and Future Research

While this paper offers a descriptive content analysis of *JIIA*, the findings are limited to this method and this journal. The researchers offer potential future research concepts to examine different variables related to intercollegiate sport within this journal and other scholarly publications. For example, authors writing articles for publication hope to see their work referenced in other academic outlets. Thus, future researchers could conduct a citation analysis to determine what types of articles are referenced and where they are cited. Moreover, if authors are aware that work on a particular topic is likely to be cited in mainstream business journals, then

there would be more focus on these. Along with the journal, future research could also analyze CSRI presentations and whether they follow the same pattern as *JIIA*. Additional research could also adopt the social network model utilized by Quatman and Chelladurai (2008) to determine collaboration trends among scholars who research within college sport. Finally, while intercollegiate athletic research is popular within the sport management field, more research is needed to analyze the overall content found in other sport management journals. There are now over 100 journals and only a few have been examined in this capacity. Future research should continue the pursuit of analyzing these trends as our field is still within its infancy stage. By identifying our strengths and weaknesses, we can gain a better understanding and knowledge of the literature within the discipline.

References

- Balduck, A., Paramentier, A., Buelens, M. (2004). Research methodology in the domain of sport management: Preliminary results of the current state. *EASM European Sport Management Congress, 12th, Book of Abstracts*, 261-262.
- Barber, E., Parkhouse, B., & 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.
- Bernstein, V. (2014, August 14). Inside the SEC's new moneymaker. *Bleacher Report*. <https://bleacherreport.com/articles/2159746-the-rise-of-the-sec-network>
- Berry, K., & Mielke, P. (1988). A generalization of Cohen's kappa agreement measure to interval measurement and multiple raters. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48(4), 921-933.
- Bok, D. (1992). Reclaiming the public trust. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 24(4), 12-19.
- Ciomaga, B. (2013). Sport management: A bibliometric study on central themes and trends. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 13(5), 557-578.
- Commission on Sport Management Accreditation. (2016). *COSMA accreditation principles and self-study preparation*. Fort Collins, CO: Author. https://www.cosmaweb.org/uploads/2/4/9/4/24949946/cosma_principles_516.docx
- Cuneen, J., & Parks, J. (1997). Should we serve sport management practice or sport management education? A response to Weese's perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 11(2), 125-132.
- de Wilde, A., & Seifried, C. (2012). An analysis of research methods in leading sport management journals: The absence of historical methods in sport management. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 13(2), 186-202.
- Downe-Wamboldt, B. (1992). Content analysis: Method, applications, and issues. *Health Care for Women International*, 13(3), 313-321.
- Fairweather, J. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(4), 401-422.

- Fielding, L., Pitts, B., & Miller, L. (1991). Defining quality: Should educators in sport management programs be concerned about accreditation? *Journal of Sport Management*, 5(1), 1-7.
- Fulks, D. (2017). *Revenues and expenses, 2004-2016: Division I intercollegiate athletics programs report*. Indianapolis, IN: NCAA. https://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/2017RES_D1-RevExp_Entire_2017_Final_20180123.pdf
- Garfield, E. (1996). Fortnightly review: How can impact factors be improved? *British Medical Journal*, 313(7054), 411-413.
- Harzing, A. (2007). *Publish or perish*. <https://harzing.com/resources/publish-or-perish>
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics. (n.d.). *Mission and vision*. <http://csri-jiia.org/mission-and-vision/>
- Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics. (2020). *JIIA impact factor*. <http://csri-jiia.org/jiia-impact-factor/>
- Kelly, J. (2019, October 1). Newly passed California Fair Pay to Play Act will allow student athletes to receive compensation. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jackkelly/2019/10/01/in-a-revolutionary-change-newly-passed-california-fair-pay-to-play-act-will-allow-student-athletes-to-receive-compensation/#1e99b1c57d02>
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krippendorff, K., & Bock, M. (2008). *The content analysis reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mahony, D., & Pitts, B. (1998). Research outlets in sport marketing: The need for increased specialization. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12(4), 259-272.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miller, J., Gillentine, A., Olinger, A., & Vogt, S. (2019). A content analysis of the *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport: 1992-2016*. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, 29(1), 139-151.
- Moed, H. (2010). Measuring contextual citation impact of scientific journals. *Journal of Infometrics*, 4(3), 265-277.
- Mondello, M., & Pedersen, P. (2003). A content analysis of the *Journal of Sports Economics*. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 4(1), 64-73.
- North American Society for Sport Management. (2019). *Journal serving the community of sport management scholarship*. NASSM. <https://www.nassm.org/sites/default/files/Sport%20Management%20Journals%20List%20-%202019.pdf>
- Oddy, R., & Bason, T. (2017). The first century and beyond: A content analysis of *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, 7(4), 444-458.
- Parks, J., & Bartley, M. (1996). Sport management scholarship: A professoriate in transition? *Journal of Sport Management*, 10(2), 119-130.
- Pedersen, P., & Thibault, L. (Ed.) (2018). *Contemporary sport management* (6th ed.). Human Kinetics.
- Pedersen, P., & Pitts, B. (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.

- Peetz, T., & Reams, L. (2011). A content analysis of *Sport Marketing Quarterly*: 1992-2011. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 20(4), 209-218.
- Pitts, B. (2016). Examining the sport management literature: Content analysis of the *International Journal of Sport Management*. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 17(2), 1-21.
- Pitts, B., Danylchuk, K., & Quarterman, J. (2014). A content analysis of the *European Sport Management Quarterly* and its predecessor the *European Journal for Sport Management*: 1984-2012. *Choregia: Sport Management International Journal*, 10(2), 45-72.
- Pitts, B., & Pedersen, P. (2005). Examining the body of knowledge in sport management: A content analysis of the *Journal of Sport Management*. *The Sport Management and Related Topics Journal*, 2(1), 33-52.
- Pitts, B., & Stotlar, D. (2007). *Fundamental of sport marketing* (3rd ed.). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Quatman, C., & Chelladurai, P. (2008). The social construction of knowledge in the field of sport management: A social network perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(6), 651-676.
- Quarterman, J., Hwang, J., Han, K., Jackson, E., & Pitts, B. (2013). Statistical data analysis techniques utilized in *International Journal of Sport Management*. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 14(3), 296-316.
- Quarterman, J., Jackson, E., & Chen, Y. (2006a). An analysis of leading contributors to the *Journal of Sport Management*: 1987-2002. *The Sport Management and Related Topics Journal*, 2(2), 22-34.
- Quarterman, J., Jackson, E., Kim, K., Yoo, E., Yoo, G., Pruegger, B., & Han, G. (2006b). Statistical data analysis techniques employed in the *Journal of Sport Management*: January 1987 to October 2004. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 7(1), 13-30.
- Quarterman, J., Pitts, B., Jackson, E., Kim, K., & Kim, J. (2005). Statistical data analysis techniques employed in *Sport Marketing Quarterly*: 1992 to 2004. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 14(4), 227-238.
- Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. (2005). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schaffner, A. (1994). The future of scientific journals: Lessons from the past. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 13(4), 239-247.
- Schlabach, M. (2010, June 9). Expansion 101: What's at stake? *ESPN*. https://www.espn.com/college-football/columns/story?columnist=schlabach_mark&id=5268212
- Seifried, C., Barnhill, C., & Martinez, J. M. (2019). Traditional and integrated PhD curricula: A study of knowledge creation produced by sport management programs and their faculty. *Journal of Sport Management*, 33(3), 229-241.
- Shapiro, D., & Pitts, B. (2014). What little do we know: Content analysis of disability sport in sport management literature. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28(6), 657-671.
- Shilbury, D. (2011a). A bibliometric analysis of four sport management journals. *Sport Management Review*, 14(4), 434-452.
- Shilbury, D. (2011b). A bibliometric study of citations to sport management and marketing journals. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25(5), 423-444.
- Smucker, M., & Grappendorf, H. (2008). A content analysis of sport management faculty collaboration: Single versus multiple authorship. *Sport Management and Related Topics Journal*, 4(2), 47-57.

- Solomon, J. (2014, August 7). NCAA adopts new Division I model giving Power 5 autonomy. *CBS Sports*. <https://www.cbssports.com/college-football/news/ncaa-adopts-new-division-i-model-giving-power-5-autonomy/>
- Stemler, S. (2000). An overview of content analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(17). <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1100&context=pars>
- Tracy, M. (2016, April 12). N.C.A.A. extends basketball deal with CBS Sports and Turner through 2032. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/13/sports/ncaabasketball/ncaa-extends-basketball-deal-with-cbs-sports-and-turner-through-2032.html>
- Uzun, C. (2017). Increasing the impact factor in the ethical way. *Balkan Medical Journal*, 34(6), 482-484.
- Wanless, L., Watanabe, N., Lawrence-Benedict, H., & Fodor, A. (2019). Contextualizing the financial disparity discussion: Modeling Power Five and Group of Five athletic revenues. *12*(1), 22-45.
- Weber, R. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Williams, D. (2016). Ticking and tying at the buzzer: An analysis of the NCAA agreed-upon procedures for reporting financial data. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 9(1), 185-207.
- Williams, D., Seifried, C., & Soebbing, B. (2018). Exploring the direct impacts of geography on sport organizations through athletic association movement. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 11(1), 75-97.
- Yamamoto, K. (2004). What's in a name? The letterhead impact project. *Journal of Legal Studies Education*, 22, 65-98.
- Zitt, M., & Small, H. (2008). Modifying the journal impact factor by fractional citation weighting: The audience factor. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 59(11), 1856-1860.