

9-1-2025

A Content Analysis of the Journal of Applied Sport Management from 2009 to 2024

Jeffrey Petersen

Baylor University, jeffrey_petersen@baylor.edu

Marshall Magnusen

Baylor University, Marshall_Magnusen@baylor.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/jasm>



Part of the [Education Commons](#), [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), and the [Sports Management Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Petersen, Jeffrey and Magnusen, Marshall (2025) "A Content Analysis of the Journal of Applied Sport Management from 2009 to 2024," *Journal of Applied Sport Management*. Vol. 17 : Iss. 3.

<https://doi.org/10.7290/jasm17nFT1>

Available at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/jasm/vol17/iss3/2>

This article is brought to you freely and openly by Volunteer, Open-access, Library-hosted Journals (VOL Journals), published in partnership with The University of Tennessee (UT) University Libraries. This article has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Applied Sport Management by an authorized editor. For more information, please visit <https://trace.tennessee.edu/jasm>.

A Content Analysis of the *Journal of Applied Sport Management* from 2009 to 2024

Jeffrey C. Petersen

Marshall J. Magnusen
Baylor University

Please send correspondence to Jeffrey C. Petersen, jeffrey_peterson@baylor.edu

Abstract

The Journal of Applied Sport Management (JASM), originally launched as the Journal of Sport Administration and Supervision in 2009, has published a total of 231 peer-reviewed manuscripts during its first 16 years. Although many other journals within this field have been studied to better understand research topics, types, and impact, JASM has yet to be examined. This content analysis study explored 19 variables related to the research topics, methods, authorship, and impact of these articles, and provided important insights from descriptive and inferential statistics regarding existing trends and opportunities for development for both the journal as a whole and its contributing scholars.

Keywords: academic journal, authorship, impact, methodology, review

Academic and scientific journals form the foundational element for the dissemination of new concepts and knowledge dating back to the 1660s in France's *Le Journal des Sçavans* and England's *Philosophical Transactions* (Ghasemi et al., 2022). The use and prevalence of academic journals have grown tremendously since the 17th century, now including more than 35,000 peer-reviewed English language journals and 47,500 journals across all languages (STM, 2021). Furthermore, the considerable influence of and our human reliance upon the written word has contributed to the development of numerous beneficial analysis techniques and methodologies. For instance, content analysis, which is a systematic methodology for the examination of documents, has proven to be extremely helpful in revealing data patterns and insights from both quantitative and qualitative information.

Although the term *content analysis* entered the English language lexicon in 1941, this systematic review of texts, images, and symbolic content traces back to religious applications in the 1690s and expanded greatly in the 1890s with newspaper analyses from a sociological perspective (Krippendorff, 2004). Within academic journals, the first application of content analysis occurred within the discipline of physics in 1929. This was then followed by more comprehensive journal content analyses in the field of sociology in the 1930s and 1940s before spreading to numerous disciplines across the academy (Krippendorff, 2004), including sport management.

Journal development within the discipline of sport management began shortly after the formation of professional organizations by sport scholars. Across three global regions, the establishment of the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) in 1985, the European Association for Sport Management (EASM) in 1992, and the Sport Management Association of Australia and New Zealand (SMAANZ) in 1995 were quickly followed by the launching of peer-reviewed journals. Respective journals launched by these associations include the *Journal of Sport Management* (JSM) by NASSM in 1987, the *European Journal for Sport Management* by EASM in 1994 (this became *European Sport Management Quarterly* [ESMQ] in 2000), and *Sport Management Review* (SMR) by SMAANZ in 1998 (Shilbury & Rentschler, 2007). As the sport management discipline grew, so did the opportunities for scholars to publish sport-related research. Numerous publishing outlets emerged, including multidisciplinary and generalist options like the *International Journal of Sport Management* (IJSM) and the *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing* (IJSMM) as well as subdisciplinary or topical journals like *Sport Marketing Quarterly* (SMQ), the *Journal of Sport Economics*, the *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* (IRSS), and the *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport* (JIS). Indeed, the most recent journal listing by NASSM (2020) highlights 100 scholarly outlets serving both the general discipline of sport along with specific facets of the field.

Upon the development of a critical mass of journal article publications, content analysis of journals in sport management began with journal-by-journal analyses. Examples include *JSM* (Pitts & Pedersen, 2005); *SMQ* (Moradi, 2023; Peetz & Reams, 2011); *ESMQ* (Pitts et al., 2014); *IRSS* (Dart, 2014); *IJSM* (Pitts, 2016); *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport* (Miller et al., 2019); *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal* (Oddy & Bason, 2017); *Journal of Issues Intercollegiate Athletics* (Williams et al., 2021); *JIS* (Williams et al., 2024); and the *Sport Management Education Journal* (SMEJ; Miller et al., 2025). In addition to these journal-by-journal efforts, other content analysis techniques across journals have been conducted. These efforts include citation analysis (Shilbury, 2011), computer assisted text

mining (Anagnostopoulos & Bason, 2015; Chiu & Tseng, 2018), statistical methods and mistakes (Byon & Zhang, 2019; Kim & Lee, 2019), and population/theme-based analysis such as disability sport (Pitts & Shapiro, 2017). Content analysis enables disciplinary self-reflection on scholarly trends, methodological rigor, and evolving topical emphases to better define their trajectory.

Although existing since 2009 and including almost 250 peer-reviewed research articles, the *Journal of Applied Sport Management (JASM)* has not benefited from a content analysis. Despite the proliferation of journal content analyses across sport management, no study has yet systematically examined *JASM*'s publication trends, scope, or scholarly evolution thereby limiting our understanding of its disciplinary impact. *JASM* publishes high-quality sport business-focused research and conceptual contributions that narrow the gap between scholarship and practice. In 2025, *JASM* was accepted for indexing in Scopus after being reviewed by the Scopus Content Selection and Advisory Board (CBAB). This positions *JASM* as a high-quality outlet with an impact factor for scholars to consider for disseminating their research. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to conduct a content analysis of relevant articles published in *JASM* from 2009–2024.

Journal of Applied Sport Management

With its first publication in April of 2009, the *Journal of Sport Administration and Supervision (JSAS)* began with a vision to better connect academic theory and industry practices (Jubenville, 2009). Through their shared connections from the doctoral program at the University of Southern Mississippi, Dr. Colby Jubenville (Middle Tennessee State University) and Dr. Benjamin Goss (Missouri State University), along with some technical assistance from then-doctoral-student J. Michael Martinez (now at Louisiana State University), crafted a new and innovative journal. *JSAS* included scholarly research paired with a sport industry practitioner-friendly white paper (Jubenville, 2009). This dual-format approach positioned *JSAS* as an early exemplar of translational scholarship in sport management.

In 2013, *JSAS* rebranded as *JASM* and entered a publishing contract with Sagamore that ran from 2013–2019 before switching to the Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange (TRACE) in 2020. Style guidelines were updated in 2016, which saw the elimination of white papers and a focus on more concise research communications of 3,500 words that provided an opportunity for scholars to more quickly convey quantitative and qualitative research pieces in an applied fashion. Additionally, the shift to TRACE in 2020 allowed *JASM* to become an open access (OA) journal without submission or publishing fees. This was not attainable with traditional publishing outlets, which often require library subscriptions or considerable fees for OA. As the official publication of the Applied Sport Management Association (ASMA), an organization focused on openness, educator and practitioner connectivity, and developing young scholars and professionals, the pivot to OA without costs, fees, or accessibility restrictions better positioned the journal to reflect the long-standing mission and values of ASMA.

In 2021, the first topical special issue in *JASM* was published entitled “Thoughts on the NIL Era.” This collection of “think pieces” featured eight manuscripts from more than a dozen contributing authors who provided peer-reviewed thought pieces to integrate existing and inspire new lines of inquiry and impact. The special issue of short, insightful perspectives from scholars then became an annual *JASM* issue. The inaugural special issue was followed by other innovative topics, including “The Sports Analytics

Revolution” in 2022, “Sport Facilities Planning, Design, Operation and Management Trends” in 2023, and “Perspectives on Passion in Sport Management Research” in 2024. In a similar vein to the original white papers of *JSAS*, these special issue think pieces were designed to inspire conversations and spur the connection and application between the academic and professional practitioner realms of sport management.

The leadership of *JASM* remains a pivotal aspect of the journal’s growth and development. To date, six individuals have served as editor including Benjamin B. Goss (2009–10), J. Michael Martinez (2011–2013), Damon Andrew (2013–2015), Matt Walker (2015–2017), Erianne Weight (2018–2019), and Marshall Magnusen (2020–2025; Jubenville & Goss, 2011; J. M. Martinez, personal communication, September 15, 2025). Building upon this foundation of leadership, the journal continues to evolve under the current editorial team, which includes editor Marshall Magnusen, Lawrence Judge (Senior Associate Editor) and Jun Woo Kim (Associate Editor). *JASM* leadership is also contingent upon the editorial board that currently accounts for 30 members (73% male and 27% female) representing 27 universities, spanning the rank of assistant to full professor, with international representation from Australia, Canada, China, Japan, and Saudi Arabia.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to provide a research-based descriptive and inferential analysis of *JASM* to explore the topics, methods, authorship, and impact of the manuscripts published and to assess the impact of differences in topics, methods, and authorship on the impact of these articles.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What was the distribution of *JASM* paper type and statistical methodology, and how did these factors influence impact (downloads and citations)?
2. What was the distribution of *JASM* paper topic and study subject population, and how did these factors influence impact?
3. What was the distribution of *JASM* authorship (e.g., institutional affiliation, author number, gender), and how did these factors influence impact?

Methodology

Content analysis methodology was employed to systematically examine the 231 peer-reviewed manuscripts published in *JASM* from 2009 through 2024. A total of 19 variables were included within this study. These variables included the year of manuscript publication, issue number, page count, manuscript citations and downloads, authorship information, subject population sex and sport level, topic analysis via sport industry segment, and sport management curricular area. Author information included the collection of author names, author order, total authors, author institutions, institution Carnegie research classification, and institution international status. Although most of the variables and data points would be considered manifest within the primary source of the manuscript itself or the journal host website, several variables required the use of additional web-based resources to verify author gender,

institutional Carnegie classification, and Google Scholar citations.

The determination of variables selected for this study was steeped heavily in prior sport management journal content analysis research. The identification of the 18 sport industry segments used for topic classification was adapted from the 14 segments used by Pitts and Pedersen (2005). The four new categories added were adaptive/disability sport, sport for development, sport analytics, and management (including organizational behavior and human resource management). The use of sport management curricular standards with journal content dates to the use of the original NASPE/NASSM standards. More recent research (e.g., Miller et al., 2025), including this current study, used the Commission on Sport Management Accreditation's (COSMA, 2024) 13 Common Components (CPCs) for curricular alignment within sport management programs, along with the added category of "other" for topics not aligned with typical curriculum elements.

Although the use of manuscript citations has been a common measure of impact, this study collected both citation and download data. Given that all *JASM* manuscripts have been made available on an OA online platform since shifting to TRACE in 2020, instantaneously updated manuscript download data are provided for every paper. The Carnegie classifications for author institutions were based upon the four newly released research classifications (Riskind & Cetrulo, 2025) of R1, R2, Research Colleges and Universities (RCU), and Non-Research Colleges and Universities, with the addition of International University and Sport Industry categories, which are both outside of the Carnegie system. All data were maintained within shared-access file amongst researchers on the Box system, which is a Cloud-based content management system. Finally, data analyses included descriptive statistics, ANOVA analyses with Tukey HSD post hoc testing, and reliability testing conducted with SPSS (version 29.0) with a .05 alpha level established for significance.

Coding and Reliability

This study utilized four trained coders (two sport management professors and two sport management graduate student research assistants) who independently reviewed and coded all *JASM* issues. Coders were trained with a standardized protocol and codebook, and all coders conducted an initial review of the most recent volume, including 19 manuscripts (8.2% of the total sample) to assess intercoder reliability. Upon completing the training and reliability assessment, the entire sample of 48 issues were equitably divided for review among the four reviewers.

Data for the following variables were collected directly from the *JASM* website or manuscript download including article title, year, volume and issue of publication, page length, article downloads, author names, author institutional affiliations, statistical methodology (for quantitative and mixed methods studies), study population gender, study population sport/activity, study topic by COSMA (2024) curricular area CPCs, and sport industry segment adapted from Pitts and Pedersen (2005). Additional data collection from institutional websites and Google Scholar assisted with the collection of author gender, article citation count, and institutional Carnegie Classification data (American Council on Education, 2025).

The reliability for the four coders was assessed for all applicable variables via both percent agreement and intraclass correlation coefficient analysis (ICC). The percentage agreement ranged from

87.5% to 100% with only one variable (page count) falling below 92% agreement, thereby surpassing the commonly accepted level of 80% or higher for content analysis research (Riffe et al., 2019). Cod-er reliability was further assessed via ICC with values ranging from 0.784 to 1.000, and with only one variable (study population gender) falling below the 0.960 level, these results all fall within the excellent range of > 0.75 established by Cichetti (1994). The downloads variable was not included in the rater agreement analysis, as the download total updated as each coder accessed the manuscripts for data collection; however, the ICC for the downloads variable was 0.997, supporting the overall reliability of this measurement.

Results

The 48 *JASM* issues from 2009 through 2024 included a total of 231 peer-reviewed manuscripts. Editor introductions and other nonrefereed elements of the issues were removed from the analysis. The 16 volumes of *JASM* included a single issue for the first 4 years, and it expanded to four issues per year from 2013 through 2019. During the Covid era, the issues dropped to two per year in 2020 and 2021, and the annual issues returned to the four-per-year-level for 2022 through 2024.

The average number of articles per issue was 4.81 ($SD = 1.27$) with a range of 4 to 8 and a median of 4 articles per issue. These 231 articles comprised a total of 3,300 pages with a mean article length of 14.28 pages ($SD = 6.18$). Metrics of impact included the downloads of these articles that are archived on the TRACE open accesses repository of the University of Tennessee and the Google Scholar citations count. The article downloads ranged from 13 to 11,014 with a mean of 530.4 ($SD = 1150.8$), and the citations ranged from 0 to 218 with a mean of 15.4 ($SD = 26.3$).

Article Type

Article content was assessed in multiple contexts including research methodology, statistical techniques (for quantitative studies and mixed methods studies), gender focus of the topic, sport industry segment, curriculum category, and sport level. For research methodology, Quantitative Studies accounted for 44.6% of the manuscripts, followed by Think Pieces (16.5%), Qualitative Studies (15.6%), Mixed Methods (10.0%), Case Studies (7.8%), and Conceptual Models (5.6%). ANOVA analyses did not demonstrate any significant differences in impact via manuscript citations ($F_{(5, 225)} = 0.64$, $p = .66$) for these six categories of research methodology. However, there is a significant difference in mean downloads ($F_{(5, 225)} = 3.00$, $p = .012$) with Tukey HSD testing revealing that Think Piece manuscripts ($M = 1183.5$, $SEM = 412.7$) were more downloaded than both Qualitative ($M = 398.6$, $SEM = 85.6$) and Quantitative ($M = 435.2$, $SEM = 50.1$) manuscripts.

For the 126 articles that employed either quantitative or mixed methods, regression analysis was the most employed tool and accounted for 23.8% of these manuscripts. The distribution of the most complex statistical technique utilized for these 126 studies is summarized in Table 1. Other non-categorized techniques included non-parametric analyses like Mann-Whitney U and Data Envelopment Analysis, Bayesian analyses like Latent Dirichlet Allocation, and unsupervised learning algorithms like K-means cluster analysis. ANOVA analyses for the mean values of impact in both citations ($F_{(7, 118)} = 1.61$, $p = .14$) and downloads ($F_{(7, 118)} = 1.10$, $p = .37$) for these methods of analysis did not prove to be

significant.

Table 1

Statistical Analysis Distribution for Quantitative and Mixed Methods Articles

Technique	Frequency	Percent
ANOVA/t-tests	24	19.0%
Chi Square	10	7.9%
Correlation	4	3.2%
Descriptives	23	18.3%
Factor Analysis	19	15.1%
MANOVA	11	8.7%
Regression Analysis	30	23.8%
Other	5	4.0%

Study Topics

The topical focus of the 231 manuscripts analyzed was assessed in two ways: sport industry segment and COSMA curricular area. The sport industry segment analysis initially included 18 possible classifications, but the variable of “other”—originally employed in Pitts and Pedersen (2005)—had no entries, resulting in 17 viable categories. The four most prevalent topics included Intercollegiate Sport (20.3%), Sport Marketing (15.2%), Management (11.7%), and Sport Event/Facility Management (11.3%); a full display of these topics is shown in Table 2. ANOVA analyses of impact factors did not indicate any significant differences in mean Google citations ($F_{(16, 214)} = 0.70, p = .79$) or in downloads ($F_{(16, 214)} = 0.49, p = .95$) within these 17 sport industry segments.

Table 2

Sport Industry Segment Distribution of Manuscript Topics

Sport Level	Frequency	Percent
Adaptive/Disability Sport/Recreation	3	1.3%
Campus Recreation	2	0.9%
Health Promotion	2	0.9%
Intercollegiate Sport	47	20.3%
International	7	3.0%
Participant Sport	15	6.5%
Professional Sport	21	9.1%
Management	27	11.7%
Sport Analytics	13	5.6%
Sport Event/Facility Management	26	11.3%
Sport Communication/Media	14	6.1%
Sport for Development	2	0.9%
Sport Management Education	9	3.9%

Sport Management/Marketing Agencies	6	2.6%
Sport Marketing	35	15.2%
Sport Medicine	1	0.4%
Sport Tourism	1	0.4%

The COSMA curriculum included the 13 COSMA CPCs as potential areas of fit for the manuscript content along with the “Other” category to account for areas outside the COSMA curricular areas. The three areas covered to the highest degree (and also surpassing a 10% threshold) were Marketing/PR/Sales at 23.4%, Management at 19.5%, and Diversity/Sport Sociology at 10.8% with manuscript coverage of all topics represented within *JASM* (see Table 3). Although there was no significant difference in mean downloads ($F_{(13,217)} = 1.22, p = .27$) for manuscripts topic by COSMA curriculum area, the impact factor of Google citations was found to be significant ($F_{(13,217)} = 2.23, p = .009$). The ANOVA with Tukey HSD testing revealed that the citations for Media/Communications manuscripts ($M = 42.7, SEM = 13.9$) were significantly higher than Management ($M = 10.0, SEM = 2.1$), Finance/Accounting/Economics ($M = 6.8, SEM = 2.3$), and Other ($M = 2.3, SEM = 1.3$).

Table 3*COSMA Curriculum Topic Distribution of Manuscript Topics*

Sport Level	Frequency	Percent
Foundations/History	5	2.2%
Management	45	19.5%
Governance/Policy	14	6.1%
International Sport	2	0.9%
Facilities/Operations	25	10.8%
Marketing/PR/Sales	54	23.4%
Media/Communications	11	4.8%
Finance/Accounting/Economics	17	7.4%
Legal/Risk Management	7	3.0%
Ethics	6	2.6%
Diversity/Sport Sociology	25	10.8%
Technology	10	4.3%
Internship	2	0.9%
Other	8	3.5%

Study Populations

The subjects for this research were assessed in two distinct ways. First, the subjects of the studies were classified by the sex of the subject population. The second was classification of the study population by sport level. The gender focus of the manuscripts for population studied was most common for males and females combined, representing 61.0% of these *JASM* papers. Male-only studies accounted for 17.3% of these articles, and female-only studies accounted for 3.0% of these articles. The remaining

18.6% did not include any gender applicable population such as studies with a primary focus on financial or facility aspects of sport. No significant differences in manuscript impact were found for manuscript downloads. However, the ANOVA with Tukey post hoc testing showed significantly higher ($F_{(3, 227)} = 3.31, p = .02$) mean citation counts for manuscripts covering both sexes ($M = 19.2, SEM = 2.7$) than for manuscripts without an applicable gender focus ($M = 5.5, SEM = 1.7$).

The subjects of these manuscripts were also classified by the level of sport examined. All nine sport levels, as well as those not applicable, were included in the JASM content analysis. The Intercollegiate Sport (39.0%) and Professional Sport (29.9%) categories were the most predominantly represented sport levels. Table 4 provides a comprehensive summary for the sport level variable. ANOVA analyses did not reveal any significant difference in mean values for either Google citations ($F_{(9, 221)} = 1.87, p = .06$) or downloads ($F_{(9, 221)} = 0.55, p = .84$) for sport level.

Table 4

Sport Level Distribution of Manuscript Topics

Sport Level	Frequency	Percent
Youth	6	2.6%
Interscholastic	3	1.3%
Intercollegiate	90	39.0%
Professional	69	29.9%
Olympic	1	0.4%
Community Recreation/Sport	15	6.5%
Campus Recreation/Club	2	0.9%
International	10	4.3%
Adaptive Sport/Recreation	2	0.9%
Not Applicable	33	14.3%

Authorship

An exploration of the 620 JASM manuscript authors forms a vital component of this content analysis. Overall authorship was distributed 75.3% male and 24.7% female. Male authors accounted for most of the authorship in author order categories as well. These authors ranged from first to ninth in number of contributors, with a full distribution by gender and author order detailed in Table 5. An analysis of impact by lead author gender revealed no significant differences in means for males and female for both citations ($F_{(1, 229)} = 3.37, p = .07$) and downloads ($F_{(1, 229)} = 3.63, p = .06$). Although the authors hailed primarily from the United States, there was a notable international contribution of authors (10.8%), including representation from 15 other countries (see Table 6).

Table 5*Gender Distribution of Editors and Authors*

Position	Men (%)	Women (%)	Total
Editor	4 (80.0%)	1 (20.0%)	5
First Author	177 (76.6%)	54 (23.4%)	231
Second Author	143 (74.5%)	49 (25.5%)	192
Third Author	88 (75.8%)	28 (24.2%)	116
Fourth Author	33 (66.0%)	17 (34.0%)	50
Fifth Author	15 (88.2%)	2 (11.8%)	17
Sixth and Beyond Author	11 (78.5%)	3 (21.4%)	14

Table 6*Authors' National Representation*

Nation	Frequency	Percentage
United States	553	89.2%
Canada	20	3.2%
United Kingdom	11	1.8%
Japan	6	1.0%
New Zealand	6	1.0%
South Korea	5	0.8%
Australia	4	0.6%
Greece	4	0.6%
China	3	0.5%
Italy	2	0.3%
Denmark	1	0.2%
Germany	1	0.2%
Portugal	1	0.2%
Qatar	1	0.2%
Singapore	1	0.2%
United Arab Emirates	1	0.2%
Total	620	100%

It is also important to consider the distribution of these authors by the institutions represented. This distribution encompasses the four general Carnegie research classifications along with international universities and sport industry practitioners. Whereas the R1 highest research category represents the top level of authorship (53.5%), there is a robust distribution of institution types represented in *JASM* authorship (see Table 7). ANOVA analyses for impact indicated no significant differences in the means for the institutional affiliation of the lead authors in either citations ($F_{(5, 225)} = 0.75$, $p = .59$) or downloads ($F_{(5, 225)} = 0.64$, $p = .67$).

Table 7*Institutional Affiliation by Author Order*

Position	R1	R2	Research Colleges Colleges & Universities	Schools not classified research	International Schools	Sport Industry	Total
First Author	116	37	21	27	26	4	231
Second Author	110	21	11	23	20	7	192
Third Author	60	17	8	11	16	4	116
Fourth Author	28	11	2	2	4	3	50
Fifth Author	11	1	0	2	2	1	17
Sixth and Beyond Author	7	2	1	3	0	2	14
Total	332	89	43	68	67	21	620

Discussion

The results of the *JASM* content analysis provide valuable insights into the journal as well as how it compares to other sport management research outlets. For instance, from 2009–2024 *JASM* averaged 14.4 peer-reviewed manuscripts per year, and this far exceeded the annual publication levels for *SMEJ* at 5.9 (Miller et al., 2025), along with being relatively comparable to the annual publication levels of *ESMQ* at 18.5 (Pitts et al., 2014), *SMQ* at 17.3 (Peatz & Reams, 2011) and *JIIA* at 17.2 (Williams et al., 2021). When considering the number of publications per issue, *JASM* averaged 4.8, which is comparable to journals such as *ESMQ* at 5.1 (Pitts et al., 2014), *SMQ* at 4.6 (Peatz & Reams, 2011), and *JSM* at 4.5 (Pitts & Pedersen, 2005), all of which benefit from affiliation with professional associations notably larger than ASMA.

In terms of article type, quantitative research accounted for 44.6% of *JASM* articles whereas qualitative research and mixed method research accounted for 15.6% and 10% respectively. Conceptual models also accounted for 5.6% of the manuscripts published in *JASM*. Although *JASM* currently requires shorter submission lengths than outlets such as *ESMQ*, *JSM*, *SMEJ*, *SMQ*, *IJSMS*, and *IJSMM*, it still includes a respectable balance of quantitative, qualitative, and mixed method approaches. Indeed, just more than 40% of the articles in *JASM* were purely empirical; thus, despite the applied focus and low word count requirements of *JASM*, the journal is still able to publish a diverse array of methodologies.

In terms of sport industry segment distribution, the most prevalent categories covered in *JASM* were Intercollegiate Sport (20.3%), Sport Marketing (15.2%), Management (11.7%), and Sport Event/Facility Management (11.3%). This diverges from *SMEJ*, which primarily focuses on sport pedagogy and employment competencies (Miller et al., 2025), but bears some similarity to *JSM* and *ESMQ*, which tend to focus on management, organizational skills, and sport marketing (Pitts et al., 2014; Pitts & Pedersen, 2005). Interestingly, the prior research on *JSM* for sport industry segment by Pitts and Pedersen (2005) included 14 topics with several topics not being covered by *JSM* (i.e., sport medicine, sport tourism, and sport management and marketing agencies). *JASM* manuscripts included topic content for all original segment topics along with topic content coverage of four additional areas (i.e., adaptive sport, sport for development, sport analytics, and management). These results indicate a broader scope of topics with *JASM*. Specific to the COSMA curriculum, the most prevalent top-

ics within *JASM* were Marketing/PR Sales (23.4%), Management (19.5%), Diversity/Sport Sociology (10.8%), and Finance/Accounting/Economics (7.4%). There was also a good balance between sport levels, with Intercollegiate Sport and Professional Sport accounting for 39% and 29.9% respectively. Thus, when compared to other sport publishing outlets, *JASM* provides overall comprehensive coverage of a wide array of topics relevant to the study and practice of sport management.

Next, authorship in *JASM* was shown to be diverse across author gender and institutional affiliation. Males represented approximately 75% of the authors whereas females accounted for 25%. This distribution was consistent across first, second, third, and fourth authorship. Although Miller et al.'s (2025) analysis of *SMEJ* revealed that women were more often first authors than men, analysis of outlets such as *ESMQ* (Pitts et al., 2014), *JSM* (Pitts & Pedersen, 2005), and *SMQ* (Peetz & Reems, 2011) showed that men were more likely to be lead authors than women. Second and third authors in *SMEJ*, no differently than *JASM*, *ESMQ*, *JSM*, or *SMQ*, were more male than female.

Just more than half (53.5%) of *JASM* authors were affiliated with R1 institutions, with a wide array hailing from institutions outside of R1. In fact, whereas most academic journals in the field of sport management cater almost exclusively to scholars in the academy, *JASM* has included sport industry practitioners in almost 5% of its publications since 2009 compared to roughly 2.5% practitioner authorship within *JSM* (Pitts & Pedersen, 2005). This demonstrates sport professionals abiding connection to the applied nature of *JASM* and its content. Additionally, although not explicitly marketed as an international journal, approximately 11% of the journal's authors hailed from outside the United States, including representation from Canada, the United Kingdom, Japan, New Zealand, South Korea, Australia, Greece, and China. This shows an international interest in *JASM* as well as the ability of scholars to adapt their research and its applications to North American audiences, and this representation approaches that of *IJSM* at 15% with its noted international emphasis (Pitts, 2016).

Limitations and Future Research

Scopus indexing can influence the quantity and quality of research submissions to a journal (Niles et al., 2020). For example, *SMEJ*, like *JASM*, is a relatively new journal and has an impact factor of 1.7. The range of this study was 2009-2024, and *JASM* was not accepted for indexing in Scopus until the fall of 2025. Thus, it would be helpful to compare *JASM* to journals such as *SMEJ*, *SMQ*, *IJSM*, and *IJSM* once an impact factor is determined. Additionally, downloads have become another measure of manuscript impact; however, this is a relatively new phenomenon. For *JASM* downloads could be determined, but free downloads were not available and tracked until 2020 when the journal became hosted by TRACE. Thus, a time-based impact variable would be beneficial to explore in future content analysis research. This study echoes the call for continued application of journal content analysis on a regular basis not only for *JASM* but for all journals across the discipline on a 5-year basis (Miller et al., 2025) to more routinely refresh the understanding of the literature underpinning the foundations of this field.

Conclusion

In sum, the present content analysis of *JASM* provides another key data set for the growing collection of journals within the discipline of sport management. As this field continues to develop and mature, it remains vital to establish and maintain standards and expectations of quality and rigor within these publications. The continued application of content analysis for both established and emerging journals provides feedback regard-

ing these outlets to foster a balanced approach to the research topics, subjects, methodologies, and authorship for sport management.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to commend the contributions of Rachel Hickey and Isaac Laddusaw in their roles as graduate assistants in aiding in the data collection process of this study.

References

- American Council on Education. (2025). The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 2025 edition. Author.
- Anagnostopoulos, C., & Bason, T. (2015). Mapping the first 10 years with Leximancer: Themes and concepts in the Sports Management International Journal Choregia. *Choregia: Sport Management International Journal*, 11(1), 25-41.
- Byon, K. K., & Zhang, J. J. (2019). Critical statistical and methodological issues in sport management research. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 23(4), 291–300.
- Chiu, W., & Tseng, W. (2018). What is in a concept? Mapping the history of sport management research in Taiwan and Korea using Leximancer text mining analysis. *Physical Education Journal*, 51(1), 1-11.
- Cicchetti, D.V. (1994). Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology. *Psychological Assessment*, 6(4), 284-290.
- Commission on Sport Management Accreditation. (2024). Accreditation principles manual and guidelines for self-study preparation. www.cosmaweb.org/uploads/2/4/9/4/24949946/accreditation_principles_february_2024.pdf
- Dart, J. (2014). Sports review: A content analysis of the International Review for the Sociology of Sport, the Journal of Sport and Social Issues and the Sociology of Sport Journal across 25 years. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 49(6), 645–668.
- Ghasemi, A., Mirmiran, P., Kashfi, K., & Bahadoran, Z. (2022). Scientific publishing in biomedicine: A brief history of scientific journals. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 21(1), e131812.
- Jubenville, C. B. (2009). Publisher's welcome. *Journal of Applied Sport Management*, 1(1), 2–3.
- Jubenville, C. B., & Goss, B. D. (2011). Publisher's welcome. *Journal of Applied Sport Management*, 3(1), 2–3. <https://doi.org/10.7290/jasm03bamh>
- Kim, Y., & Lee, J. L. (2019). Common mistakes in statistical and methodological practices of sport management research. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 23(4), 314–324.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to the methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Miller, J. 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 Sport*, 29, 139-151.
- Miller, J., Pierce, D., Gregg, E., & Price, B. (2025). A content analysis of the Sport Management Education Journal: 2007–2023. *Sport Management Education Journal*, 19(2), 107-117. <https://doi.org/10.1123/smej.2024-0012>
- Moradi, E. (2023). An updated overview of research published in *Sport Marketing Quarterly* (2012 to 2022): A tri-method approach. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 32(4), 343–369.
- North American Society for Sport Management. (2020). Journals serving the community of sport management scholarship. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/60e9b0857a840f4c07b5d4f4/t/61324713e2b44862b-b75e46a/1630684947436/Sport+Management+Journals+List+-+2020c.pdf>
- Niles, M. T., Schimanski, L. A., McKiernan, E. C., & Alperin, J. P. (2020). Why we publish where we do: Faculty publishing values and their relationship to review, promotion, and tenure expectations. *PLOS ONE*, 15, e0228914. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0228914>
- Oddy, R. E., & 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.
- Peetz, T. B., & Reams, L. (2011). A content analysis of *Sport Marketing Quarterly*: 1992–2011. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 20(4), 209-218.
- Pitts, B. G. (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. M. (2005). Examining the body of knowledge in sport management: A content analysis of the *Journal of Sport Management*. *Sport Management and Related Topics Journal*, 2(1), 33–52.
- Pitts, B. G., & Shapiro, D. R. (2017). People with disabilities and sport: An exploration of topic inclusion in sport management. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 21, 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.1123/JSM.2013-0258>
- Riffe, D., Lacy, S., Watson, B., & Fico, F. (2019). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Riskind, J., & Cetrulo, K. (2025, February 13). Carnegie classifications release 2025 research activity designations, debut updated methodology. <https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/news/carnegie-classifications-release-2025-research-activity-designations-debut-updated-methodology/>
- Shilbury, D. (2011). A bibliometric analysis of four sport management journals. *Sport Management Review*, 14(4), 434–452.

- Shilbury, D., & Rentschler, R. (2007). Assessing sport management journals: A multi-dimensional examination. *Sport Management Review*, 10(1), 31–44.
- STM. (2021). STM Global brief 2021-economics and market size. https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/stm.offloadmedia/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/10032814/2022_08_24_STM_White_Report_a4_v15.pdf
- Williams, D. P., Murfree, J. R., Hawley, J., & Tutka, P. (2021). A content analysis of the *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*: 2008–2019. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 14(1), 466-484.
- Williams, D., Rich, G., Durham, O., & Doran, K. (2024). A content analysis of the *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*: 2008–2022. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 17(3).1-24.