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ABSTRACT

Several scholars have expressed their concerns regarding both the quality and the quantity of research done in the field of sport management (Boucher, 1998; Olafson, 1990, 1995; Mahony & Pitts, 1998; Slack, 1991, 1996; and Zeigler, 1987). Although there are different perspectives on its present status, there is agreement on the need to set specific directions to foster the strong and systematic growth of the body of knowledge in sport management (e.g., Olafson, 1995; Paton, 1987). Following this line of reasoning, this study employed the Delphi technique with selected experts to assess the extent to which they agreed on specific general directions and strategies to promote the field’s research.

A purposive sample of 17 experts (senior and junior professors of sport management) participated in the three-stage Delphi process. In the first stage, the investigator posed seven open-ended questions, derived from a strategic management perspective. These questions were: (a) what successes in sport management should be sustained?, (b) what are the current events and trends impacting research in sport management?, (c) what qualities would you use to describe a best case scenario for sport management research in five to seven years?, (d) what qualities would you use to describe a realistic scenario for sport management research in five to seven years?, (e) what general directions should
sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?; (f) what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in those general directions?; and (g) what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards those general directions? The responses of the experts to these questions and follow-up questionnaires were content analyzed and synthesized by a Content Analysis Panel. The comments made by the experts were the source of items for the questionnaire administered in the second stage. The experts were asked to rate each of the items under each question in terms of importance and probability of occurrence. The process was repeated in the third stage with a revised questionnaire.

The Delphi Panel reached a consensus on the need to (1) enhance the quality of doctoral programs (emphasis on research); (2) increase standards for research publications and the quality of research outlets; (3) recognize the field as a context for both theory testing and theory building; (4) increase quality in research designs; (5) increase faculty development, time and funding for research and (6) increase collaboration in research. The paper discussed the implications of this research in terms of planning for the academic field, scholars' awareness and sensitivity to the field's present and future developments, and future challenges in sport management research and practice.
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How the scales of vice or virtue balance at the present time is a matter for each of us to judge for [ourselves]; it is not really a crucial matter. What is crucial, for ourselves and for future generations of researchers, is that we try to estimate where the scales now lie, and try to move them, deliberately, in directions that we value as worthwhile. (McGrath & Altman, 1966, p. 92)

These were the words of Joseph E. McGrath and Irwin Altman who attempted to describe and shed some light into the status and future of the small group research field 34 years ago. This researcher hopes to achieve the same overall purpose after concluding the present study in the field of sport management.

There are several definitions and conceptions of sport management. For the purposes of the present study, Chelladurai's (1999) conception of sport management as the management of organizations that are involved in the production and marketing of sport related services is accepted. In this perspective, one set of services, labeled participant services, are oriented toward pursuit of pleasure, health and fitness, and excellence in a chosen sport or physical activity. Another set of services focus on providing entertainment through organizing contests between excellent athletes and/or teams in the more
popular sports in a given country. These two major classes of services spawn other related services such as sponsorship services, hospitality services, donor services, concessions, etc.

The organizations involved in producing these services may be categorized on the basis of their profit orientation (profit organizations such as professional sport franchises and commercial fitness clubs versus nonprofit organizations such as scholastic athletic departments, city recreation departments). It should also be noted that several organizations that are not designated as sport organizations may also provide sport services (e.g., YMCA organizing basketball competitions for the local youth and a business enterprise maintaining a fitness facility and organizing fitness classes for its employees). Thus, sport management research would encompass all operations that deal with sport and/or physical activity services.

The field of sport management has grown rapidly since Ohio University instituted the first formal sport management graduate program in 1966. By 1985, 19 years later, there were 83 North American colleges and universities offering sport management programs (Slack, 1998). By 1993, the total number of programs offered was over 200 (Parkhouse, 1996; Weese, 1995). These numbers reflect interest and enthusiasm among both students and educators. This rapid development of the field, however, has not been followed by an agreed minimum body of knowledge that would serve as the basis for curriculum content for professional preparation in sport management.
As Mahony and Pitts (1998) and Boucher (1998) noted, the field of sport management developed significantly in the last 10 to 15 years. As the authors noted, these developments include: (a) the existence of almost 200 new programs; (b) the establishment of the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) and the Journal of Sport Management, respectively, the main scholarly organization and the main journal of the field; (c) the development of the sport management program standards and an accreditation system; (d) the development of some specialized journals (e.g., Sport Marketing Quarterly and the Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport) as well as specialized conferences; and (e) the development and establishment of professional sport management associations throughout the world (e.g., European Association for Sport Management – EASM).

Sport Management Field's Ongoing Issues

As in the case of many other emerging fields, there is some evidence of growing pains in sport management (see chapter 2 for an elaborated treatment of these issues). For instance, one of the ongoing concerns relates to the definition of the field itself. Several authors offer different perspectives, both regarding the field's definition and the field's boundaries, which consequently creates great confusion (Chelladurai, 1992; DeSensi, Kelley, Blanton, & Beitel, 1990; Hardy, 1987; Mullin, 1980; NASP-NASSM Joint Task Force, 1993; Parks, Zanger and Quarterman, 1998; Parkhouse, 1996; Slack, 1998; and Zakrajsek, 1993). The discussion refers to what is unique about the field of sport management, what
sets it apart from other academic disciplines and what unique aspects justify its
development as a distinct sub-discipline. Some authors seem to question if, in
fact, there is anything unique about the field (e.g. Slack, 1998).

The field has also been challenged with curricular related concerns, which
may be divided into four main themes: (a) whether the focus has been on how to
"do" versus how "to think critically" (e.g., Boucher, 1998; and Parks, 1992), (b)
accreditation (e.g., Boucher, 1998; Slack, 1998), (c) content (e.g., Boucher,
1998; Masteralexis & McDonald, 1997), and (d) quality (e.g., Masteralexis &
McDonald, 1997; Slack, 1991; 1998). Direction (potential future scenarios) is
another issue often debated in the field by authors who have divergent opinions
(Boucher, 1998; Cuneen & Parks, 1997; Danylchuck & Boucher, 1999; Mahony &
Pitts, 1998; Olafson, 1990; Parks, 1992; Slack, 1996; Weese, 1995).

In later years the North American sport management professional
association, NASSM, and the field's primary scientific publication, JSM, have
been the central issue on many discussions (e.g., Cuneen & Parks, 1997;
Mahony & Pitts, 1998; and Weese, 1995). Topics primarily deal with original
purposes of those entities and whether they are being met. Also, some authors
are asking for a re-assessment of both NASSM's and JSM's missions.

The foregoing comments relate to the field of sport management as a
whole. For the purpose of this study the field is defined as encompassing the
professional practice of sport management and the discipline of sport
management. The profession is more concerned with the application of sport
management knowledge while the discipline is concerned with the generation, propagation and teaching of sport management knowledge acquired mainly through research.

The focus of the present study is on the discipline and most specifically on the research, where there are concerns challenging the field. First, there is a debate whether research conducted in sport management should be mainly practitioner or academically oriented. Many authors discuss their positions regarding this topic (Boucher, 1998; Chalip, 1997; Chelladurai, 1992; Cuneen & Parks, 1997; Mahony & Pitts, 1998; Paton, 1987; Slack, 1996; and Weese, 1995). Second, there are concerns regarding both the quality and the quantity of research done in the field (Boucher, 1998; Olafson, 1990, 1995; Mahony & Pitts, 1998; Slack, 1991, 1996; and Zeigler, 1987). Different authors seem to have different perceptions regarding its present status.

Unfortunately, as Slack (1996) (p. 97) writes, “sport management [research] has not kept pace with the type of changes that have occurred in the world of sport” (p. 97). The facts that the basic research design has not changed over the years and the descriptive approach is still favored are points of concern for many researchers (Olafson, 1990; Paton, 1987; Slack, 1991, 1998). Consequently, Paton (1987, p. 30) suggested that “our research may need a new direction” and Olafson (1995) reassured that a change in direction is required. Further, Olafson (1990) called for the use of more rigorous and sophisticated research designs and analyses.
In summary, the literature indicates that there is an ongoing discussion about the future of the field of sport management, especially about the future of sport management research, and it also indicates an urgent need for decisions to be made in this regard. Authors agree that essential directions must be established if the sport management body of knowledge is to expand in a strong, systematic, and coherent way.

Significance of Research for an Academic Field

Several authors consider a systematic body of knowledge as a distinguishing attribute of a profession (Benveniste, 1987; Chelladurai, 1999; Goode, 1969; Jackson, 1970). As a consequence, academic fields have acquired a responsibility for the development of their body of knowledge (Benveniste, 1987). The structure of the body of knowledge relevant for each profession may, however, differ. For instance, applied fields such as medicine and engineering rely substantially on scientific advances while other fields, such as law, rely more on various skills such as analytical skills and knowledge such as significant aspects of the law (Benveniste, 1987). However, these fields have a commonality - they base their practice on their body of knowledge, which allows them to (a) generate more knowledge, (b) transmit the specialized knowledge, and (c) develop specific skills and competencies (Chelladurai, 1999). As noted in the previous section, several researchers in sport management have voiced the need for the field to develop a systematic body of knowledge (Boucher, 1998;
Chelladurai, 1999; Paton, 1987; Slack, 1996). As Zakrajsek (1993, p. 4) noted, "[w]ithout an organized body of knowledge based on research, sport management will flounder in the academic community."

The development of a systematic body of knowledge will assist the field in gaining recognition and authority both within the profession (Benveniste, 1987) and within the academe. As in all emergent fields, sport management researchers need to determine and develop research competencies to advance the sport management field's body of knowledge. Determining the appropriate methodologies and the topics most relevant to the field are two of the significant issues researchers in the field need to explore and determine before its body of knowledge can develop in a systematic way.

Therefore, the major research purpose of the present study was to explore and assess the status and future of research in the sport management field. Several reasons supported this decision: (a) The timing – sport management is an emergent field and therefore is still attempting to find its place within academe; (b) the opportunity to establish a baseline documenting the status of research in the field; (c) the urgency implied in the literature for a study of this kind (i.e., assessment of status and establishment of future directions); and finally, (d) the personal interest of the researcher in the topic.

Based on the research purpose, three guiding questions were considered in designing the framework of the study. These are incorporated in Figure 1, which illustrates the researcher's mental model of this study. The top part of the
Figure 1.
Researcher's Mental Model of the Study
model represents the overall concerns/issues challenging sport management. These were derived from the literature and were briefly covered in the previous pages. The figure also illustrates the researcher's intention to focus on research, more specifically on the future of sport management research. Next, the researcher explores the guiding questions of the present study. The first question was: What types of questions to ask? Based on the needs of the field (i.e., directions and aligned strategies and actions), the logical step was to derive a set of questions from both forecasting, also called futures studies, and strategic management/planning literatures. Very briefly, strategic management emphasizes an externally oriented, issue focused, and opportunity seeking method (Koteen, 1997). On the other hand, futures studies is a "new field of inquiry that involves systematic and explicit thinking about alternative futures" (Bell, 1997, p. 2). Its aims are to "demystify the future, to make possibilities for the future more known to us, and to increase human control over the future" (Bell, 1997, p. 2).

Based on these two literatures, seven topics were selected and sequenced: (a) successes, (b) events/trends, (c) ideal scenario, (d) realistic scenario, (e) general directions, (f) strategies/actions, and (g) challenges. Later in this chapter a detailed rationale for the questions is presented.

The second question was: Who are the best people to ask about the future of research in the field? Here the focus was to determine experts whose judgment should be used in the forecast and strategic planning of the field's research. Forecasting literature (e.g., Stewart, 1987) suggests that experts who
have the knowledge and/or experience to handle the degree of uncertainty about the future should constitute the panel of participants. Thus, for this study, sport management expert researchers were selected. Finally the third question focused on the method(s) most appropriate for this study. The next section presents the rationale for the method selection.

**Delphi Method**

In order to reach a higher level of understanding regarding the status and future of the field of sport management, it is important to avoid centering the analysis on the mindset or framework of only one or two group members. Instead it is crucial to develop an effective dialogue among the heterogeneous group of academicians in sport management so the issues in question (future directions for the research in the field) are analyzed through a new and creative frame.

There are several methodological approaches that one could use to carry out the present study, such as nominal group technique (NGT), focus groups, survey, face-to-face or Delphi technique. It is extremely important, however, to differentiate between these different group communication processes. Interactive group processes (i.e., face-to-face and focus group) differ in that the group tends to focus their attention and energy on one perspective (Delbecq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975) instead of exploring several trains of thought that may arise within the group. There is also the potential for peer, political and professional pressures.
Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson (1975, p. 4) very simply characterized Delphi and NGT as "special-purpose techniques useful for situations where individual judgments must be tapped and combined to arrive at decisions which cannot be calculated by one person." Therefore, the main point deals with "judgmental decision making" (Delbecq et al., 1975, p. 5) or more simply as the authors called it "creative decision making" (p. 5). Further, the authors clearly explained:

The central element of [the] situation is the lack of agreement or incomplete state of knowledge concerning either the nature of the problem or the components which must be included in a successful solution. As a result, heterogeneous group members must pool their judgments to invent or discover a satisfactory course of action. (Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson, 1975, p. 5)

As several authors noted (e.g.: Scholters, 1990, and Ziglio, 1996) NGT is very similar to the Delphi procedure in that both involve stages of independent idea generation (i.e., what Delbecq et al., 1975, p. 23), referred to as a "proactive search process which facilitates problem-mindedness by increasing the time panel members focus on the problem at hand), structured feedback as well as individualized mathematical judgment.

However, these two methods also differ substantially. First, the Delphi Method has an asynchronous interaction property which allows participants to intervene when they feel it is most appropriate during the process (Turoff & Hiltz, 1996). Second, NGT uses a similar structure to Delphi but in a face-to-face context. This was not considered the best situation for the present study since
anonymity was very important, mainly because the objective was to provide a
safe space for experts to voice their opinions without external pressures.

Bell (1997) generally described the Delphi method and purpose as follows:

...RAND researchers invented the Delphi method specifically to assess
the future...they did so, apparently, quite independently of the advances in
survey methodology then becoming standard procedure in psychology,
sociology, and economics. Fundamentally, the Delphi method is a version
of survey analysis, particularly that form of survey research that involves
repetitive questioning of respondents, sometimes referred to as 'the panel
method' in the social sciences (Glock 1955). It is similar, for example, to
what Judd et al. (1991:112-18) refer to as 'one-group pretest-posttest
design' and 'interrupted time-series design.
But the purpose is quite different. Panel studies in the social sciences,
...aim to investigate some change in the subjects being studied .... To the
contrary, Delphi researchers, ... aim to predict and explore alternative
future possibilities, their probabilities of occurrence, and their desirability
by tapping the expertise of respondents. Moreover, nearly all Delphi
studies are action-oriented." (p. 261-2)

In summary, Delphi's structure aims to incorporate the positive qualities of
interacting groups (e.g.: creative thinking, gathering knowledge from a variety of
sources and perspectives) and at the same time precluding the negative facets of
interacting group processes such as social, professional and political pressures
and divergences (Rowe & Wright, 1999).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to develop a consensus among experts in
the field on the status and future of research in sport management. In the
process, the study will also identify the areas in which there will be divergence of
opinion. It will be a descriptive and exploratory study of what experts perceive is the core positive status and the future of research in sport management.

Research Objectives

Within the general thrust of the study's research question - to explore and assess sport management researchers' perceptions regarding the status and future of research in the field - the objectives of this dissertation are to gain an understanding on the following:

1. What the experts in the field perceive to have been successes in sport management research.
2. What successes experts in the field perceive should be sustained or become successes in the future.
3. What do experts in the field perceive to be the current events and trends impacting research in sport management.
4. What impact the experts in the field perceive current events/trends will continue to have on sport management research.
5. What ideal qualities experts in the field perceive will best describe sport management research five to seven years from now.
6. What are experts' perceptions regarding the probability of the specified ideal qualities describing sport management research in five to seven years.
7. What realistic qualities experts in the field perceive will describe sport management research five to seven years from now.
8. What are experts' perceptions regarding the probability of the specified realistic qualities to describing sport management research in five to seven years.

9. What general directions do experts in the field perceive the sport management field should emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future.

10. What are experts' perceptions regarding the probability the field will emphasize the general directions proposed.

11. What specific actions and/or strategies do experts in the field perceive sport management should emphasize to move its research towards the general directions proposed.

12. What are experts' perceptions regarding the probability of occurrence of the specific actions and/or strategies in the next five to seven years.

13. What do experts in the field perceive as currently manageable challenges to move sport management research towards the proposed general directions.

14. What are experts' perceptions regarding the probability of the field managing its current 'manageable' challenges in the next five to seven years.

15. To determine if the Delphi technique is an adequate methodology to explore futures in the sport management field.

Rationale for Questions in the Delphi Round I Questionnaire

As Bell (1997) noted, researchers conducting Delphi usually do not limit themselves to questions regarding what events might occur and when; they tend
to expand their questions as to the desirability, probability and timing of certain events. Additionally, researchers may ask about alternative strategies or policy responses regarding a specific problem and even experts' beliefs about the effectiveness of those strategies and policies.

Overall the questions for this study intended to assist the Delphi Panel members in actively thinking at a deeper level about several aspects of the future of research in sport management. The issues addressed in the questions (i.e., successes, events/trends, ideal and realistic qualities, directions, strategies/actions and manageable challenges) were derived fundamentally from the strategic management/planning and forecasting literatures. Throughout the literature these appear as important issues to address when assessing an organization strategically (e.g.: Bryson, 1995; Nutt & Backoff, 1992). There are, however, other issues that could have been used in the questionnaire, for example, assessing the weaknesses of research in the field or its threats. Yet, for the purpose of this study, the researcher decided to adopt a future forward approach that focused on attempting to touch what Delphi Panel members perceive as the ‘positive core’ of sport management research.

This influence derived from appreciative inquiry, a philosophy of change originated by David Cooperrider and his colleagues (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Cooperrider & Whitney, 1999). Quinn (2000, p. 220) defined appreciative inquiry as "a process of search and discovery designed to value, prize and honor. ...The objective...is to touch the ‘positive core’ of organizational life." The first step in appreciative inquiry is a discovery phase, which mainly focuses on
the positive capabilities of the system, on the ‘positive present.’ As Elliot (1999, p. vi) noted “appreciative inquiry creates a development pathway based on what is right rather than what is wrong,” which is exactly the pathway the researcher intends to follow in studying the future of research in sport management.

Thus, one of the central issues regarding the study’s instrument was to create a safe shared space through: 1) the focus/intent of the questions, 2) the sequence of the questions, and 3) the language choice of each question that would facilitate implementation of the future forward approach mentioned above.

Following are the seven questions that constituted the Delphi Round I questionnaire:

1. What are the successes in sport management research that should be sustained?

This question intends to draw upon what Delphi Panel members’ perceive as strengths in the sport management research. General business literature indicates that when organizations emerge there is a need for them to identify their competencies. Assessing an organization’s successes or strengths enables the organization to capitalize on them (Nutt & Backoff, 1992).

In this case, the intent is that Delphi Panel members engage in a positive line of thoughts (mind frame). Thus, the first question emphasizes a positive assessment. Regarding reinforcing processes, Senge (1990) noted that the introduction of a development is amplified and as a result produces more movement in the same direction. Senge (1990, p. 81) talks about virtuous cycles as “processes that reinforce in desired direction.” In the same vein, reinforcement
theory of learning reveals that if one gets a positive reinforcement it is more likely that one can and will repeat it. If the focus question emphasized a negative assessment, there would be a stronger chance of Delphi Panel members being caught up in a negative loop, which could be carried on toward the rest of the questionnaire. That would contradict the fundamental intent of the process, which is to focus on a positive, future forward approach.

Furthermore, focusing on the successes tends to produce a positive association with history without grounding the respondent there, and the resulting discussion highlights a potential for future growth and development (Bell, 1997).

2. What are the current events and trends impacting research in sport management?

This question is derived from both organizational and change theories, which assume that no part of the system operates in isolation (Senge, 1990). Therefore, the environment creates limits and boundaries and opportunities for the field. Assessing the trends becomes important since one of the intentions is to explore Delphi Panel members' perceptions of long-term directions for research in sport management. Long-term directions are set by trends, and assessing trends is the same as knowing where “the stream is flowing.”

Senge (1990) noted that two types of trends, field trends and environmental trends, influence future developments and that it is essential to assess what they are so they can be considered when developing future strategic decisions. Assessing trends will allow for conscious decisions regarding future directions. After becoming aware of the presence of a trend, as, for
example, the increase of studies using qualitative approaches, researchers and managers may choose whether: 1) to strengthen the trend, or 2) to break the trend by choosing a different direction. The choice will depend on how the trend is perceived to influence the development of the field.

On the other hand, it was also very relevant to identify what events Delphi Panel members perceive are impacting the field’s research. This is mainly important to anticipate critical circumstances that could influence the unfolding of the development of the field’s research. Trends and events influencing the field can either constrain it or facilitate its development.

3. **What qualities and characteristics would you use to describe a best-case scenario for sport management research in five to seven years?**

This question’s main intent was to invite creativity, future time perspective and positive motivation in Delphi Panel members regarding the future of sport management research. Another decision was to purposefully ask for detail (i.e. qualities and characteristics). The intent was to use it as a strategy to invoke an experience of the ideal for each Delphi Panel member. As explained in the visioning literature (e.g.: Collins & Porras, 1997), it is easier to create a future if one experiences it even if just by a detailed mental description. The objective is to bring it from a purely conceptual form to a more concrete, realistic form.

4. **What qualities and characteristics would you use to realistically describe sport management research in five to seven years?**

A realistic scenario marries the successes, the events/trends impacting research in the field, and the ideal scenario. With this particular question the
researcher intends to assess the Delphi Panel members’ perception of the best future possible given the field’s successes, limits and boundaries.

The question about the ideal was posed before the question about the realistic as an attempt to keep Delphi Panel members’ creative mind open. Posing the question about the realistic first would potentially allow them to self-impose barriers and boundaries, thus limiting creativity. The logic applied was to reach the unconstrained scenario before the constrained one.

Asking these two questions (i.e., Question four and five) will articulate the gap between real and ideal. The gap will point out space for growth, innovation and new development.

5. In your opinion, what directions should sport management research take to move it towards the best-case scenario?

The main intent with this question was to activate Delphi Panel members’ intentional choice mechanism. If there is a gap between their ideal and real scenarios for research in sport management in the next five to seven years, where do they believe the field should be heading?

6. In your opinion, what actions and/or strategies will contribute to the movement of sport management research in these directions?

Questions five and six are closely interrelated and sequential. In the previous question the main purpose was to establish the direction for sport management research. The purpose of this question was to move Delphi Panel members deeper into their cognitive structures to assess the means for sport
management research to get there. Thus, the question focuses on specific strategies (i.e., approaches) and actions (i.e., specific steps).

7. **In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research in these directions?**

   Question 7 basically asks: Given the general directions, strategies and actions, what can the field deal with now? The main purpose of the question is to bring the future (i.e., general directions) into the present. More specifically, the main goal is to have the future influencing the present. Asking about challenges is a way of having Delphi Panel members come back to the present after having been grounded in the future (i.e., with the previous two questions) rather than in the past. This way of maintaining a future forward focus was the main purpose of the process.

   **Rationale for the use of Scales in Rounds II and III**

   As stated in the beginning of the previous section researchers conducting Delphi tend to expand their questions as to the desirability, probability and timing of certain events (Bell, 1997). For the purpose of this study the researcher introduced Likert-type scales in Rounds II and III as a way for Delphi Panel members to refine their responses. Overall, four scales measuring different constructs were used:


Probability scale (1 to 10): “1”- 0-10%, “2”- 11-20%, “3”- 21-30%, “4”- 31-40%, “5”- 41-50%, “6”- 51-60%, “7”- 61-70%, “8”- 71-80%, “9”- 81-90%, “10”- 91-100%.

The first three scales are 7-point scales; similar descriptors were used to characterize each value as a matter of consistency and for the ease of participants. Only the probability scale is a 10-point scale because it is easier to think of percentages in a decimal than in a hepta-base system.

Not all scales were used in all the questions. The measurement construct used (i.e., degree of importance, degree of success, degree of impact and probability level) was chosen based on the main purpose/intent of each question, which were explained earlier. The main concern was to select measurement constructs that would invite Delphi Panel members to share the most pertinent type of information on each of the issues addressed in this study. To better direct Delphi Panel members, every time a scale was used, a specific sub-question involving the scale was formulated. There is also a synthesis of the scales used in each of the seven question as well as the specific sub-questions for each scale:
Question 1: What are the successes in sport management research that should be sustained?
Success scale: On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the extent to which each of the following items has been a success in sport management research.
Importance scale: On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance for each of the following items to be sustained or become a success in the future.

Question 2: What are the current events and trends impacting research in sport management?
Impact scale: On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of impact each of the following events/trends will continue to have on sport management research.

Question 3: In your view, ideally what qualities would best describe sport management research five to seven years from now?
Importance scale: On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance for the following ideal qualities.
Probability scale: On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of each of the following ideal qualities.

Question 4: In your view, realistically what qualities will actually describe sport management research five to seven years from now?
Importance scale: On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance of the following realistic qualities.
Probability scale: On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of each of the following realistic qualities.

Question 5: In your opinion, what general directions should sport management research emphasize to move it towards an ideal future?
Importance scale: On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate how important are each of the following directions.
Probability scale: On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of the field emphasizing each of the following directions.

Question 6: In your opinion and drawing on question number 5, what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions?
Importance scale: On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate how important are each of the following actions and/or strategies.
Probability scale: On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of occurrence of each of the following actions and/or strategies in the next five to seven years.
Question 7: In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards general directions?

Importance scale: On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance for each of the following challenges to be managed now.

Probability scale: On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of the field managing each of the following challenges in the next five to seven years.

Significance of the Study

It is important to realize that the questions being asked in the sport management field are relevant. It is crucial to ask these questions and not assume we already know the answers. Other fields seem to go through similar phases. For instance, researchers in applied sport psychology are asking the question: "Does the need for applied sport psychology really exist?" (Hale & Danish, 1999, p. 322).

The study is timely for the emergent field of sport management; it has a descriptive component that will allow for later comparisons regarding research developments, and it has an exploratory component, which will contribute in shaping a desired future for the field's research.

McGrath and Altman (1966, p. 93) noted that a researcher in the small groups research field "must recognize that as 'agents of history,' [they] can alter the present status and future course of the small group field, and set it upon any course [they] collectively and distributively deem worthwhile." Following the same line, a main assumption of this study is that one (individual or group) can intervene to create a desired future.
Summary

The researcher believes that the best research method for the present study is the Delphi technique. This method provides the necessary structure to bring together the perceptions reported in the literature and the expertise of the scholars included in the Delphi Panel. The main goal for using the Delphi technique is to facilitate a consensus by the Delphi Panel in assessing their perceptions of the future of research in the sport management field. Ziglio (1996, p. 9) explained that the Delphi Method "is an exercise in group communication among a panel of geographically dispersed experts." As the author further added, the technique allows experts to study/work with complex problem or tasks in a systematic way. In basic terms the method consists of a purposefully predetermined group of experts who are asked to respond to a series of questionnaires. These may be sent via mail, fax or using computerized systems. The overall purpose of the series of questionnaires is to "elicit and develop individual responses to the problems posed and to enable the experts to refine their views as the group's work progresses in accordance with the assigned tasks" (Ziglio, 1996, p. 9).

The Delphi technique is the best-suited methodology for this study for several reasons. First, as the proposed study is exploratory and descriptive in nature, the Delphi method allows for such exploration of means and synthesis of such views. In some fields, such as economics and demographics, it is common to conduct forecasting studies (Bijl, 1996). The same trend is not true for the field of sport management. However, it is crucial to explore and proactively participate
in designing the future of the academic field by, for example, creating alternative scenarios of possible or desirable futures/strategic directions, as well as exploring potential strategies to accomplish them. This is what this study proposes to explore. Its foremost goal is to improve long-term planning for the academic field, to stress the need for scholars to be aware of and sensitive to the field's present and future developments, to enhance the ability of scholars to anticipate challenges in the next decades, and to encourage them to develop an appreciation for futures thinking.

The specific issues to be addressed in this study were derived from strategic management elements. Specifically, the study covered seven topics/issues: (1) perceived successes in sport management research, (2) events/trends impacting sport management research, (3) ideal characteristics for sport management research in five to seven years from now, (4) realistic characteristics for sport management research in five to seven years from now, (5) general directions the field should emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future, (6) specific actions/strategies that will move sport management research towards these general directions, and (7) challenges that can be managed now to move sport management research towards an ideal future.

Limitations

A limitation of this study relates to the fact that the Delphi Method is a very challenging research design; therefore implementation is greatly dependent on
researchers' capabilities throughout all the iterations. Also the success of the process is dependent on the experts motivation and patience.

Another limitation of this study has to do with human judgment at every level of the Delphi process. This is particularly critical at the stage of content analyzing the responses from the participants. Even though the four Content panelists were highly qualified, the possibility existed that different group of panelists might have analyzed the responses differently and, accordingly, developed different sets of items for the two rounds. This in fact could have lead to different conclusions.

**Delimitations**

This study represents the perceptions of 17 sport management research experts, purposefully selected as representative of the best in the field (including senior and junior researchers) regarding the status and future of the field’s research at this point in time. The researcher does not intend to generalize to other populations.

**Overview of the Chapters**

The present study is divided into 6 chapters. Chapter 1 includes background information, the field’s ongoing issues, significance of research, Delphi Method, research objectives, rationale for questions and scales constituting the Delphi questionnaires, significance of the study, the study’s limitations and delimitations.
Chapter 2 includes an overview of the literature. Mainly, it presents an overview on the evolution of sport management programs, an overview on strategic management and futures studies, and, finally, a discussion of the Delphi Method theoretical framework.

Chapter 3 provides a detailed overview of the methodological procedures and techniques used to carry out the present study. It is divided into 10 sections which include: (a) research design; (b) content analysis, (c) principles underlying collection and analysis of data, (d) study population; (e) validity; (f) reliability; (g) instrumentation; (h) time requirement; (i) data collection procedures; and (j) data analysis procedures.

Chapter 4 includes the presentations of the results. It includes 3 major sections, results for Rounds I, II and III of the study. Chapter 5 presents critical comments by the Delphi Panel and finally Chapter 6 provides the discussion of the research findings. Specifically, it includes a discussion of the results, conclusions, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter starts with a brief literature review on the evolution of the field of sport management, some of the major concerns impacting its research, and a section on cultural forces impacting the field. Then, a brief introduction to strategic planning with applied examples from the sport management literature. Next, a brief introduction to futures studies. Finally, the review includes an extensive discourse on several aspects of the Delphi Method.

Evolution of Sport Management Programs – An Overview

As a consequence of the importance of sport for American society there was an urgent need for a specific specialist – the sport manager (DeSensi et al., 1990; Parkhouse, 1978, 1987; Parkhouse & Ulrich, 1979; Parkhouse, Ulrich, & Soucie, 1982). After the implementation of the first sport management degree, the number of colleges and universities offering sport management programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels increased greatly. Since then, consistent efforts were made to establish sport management professional preparation programs as a “respected sport/business cross-discipline” (Desensi et al, 1990, p. 32).
In the first years, colleges and universities offered mainly graduate level programs (Parks & Quain, 1986), which normally had as a prerequisite an undergraduate degree in physical education. With the expansion of the sport management body of knowledge, as well as the development of the graduate programs, there seemed to be a need for an undergraduate preparation in sport management. “The fact that sport management opportunities proliferated during the 1980s and 1990 facilitated the growth and increased sophistication of the academic discipline” (Danylchuck & Boucher, 1999, p. 85).

Parks and Quain (1986) attributed the high number of sport management programs to: (1) acknowledgment that the depth and breadth of sport management was sufficient to justify a four year degree preparation, and (2) the dropping number in student enrollment in physical education programs. The first reason denoted the stage of maturation and acceptance achieved by the field of sport management. The second reason related closely to the popularity of sport management program. Some physical education and recreation departments decided to add this new option to their curricula as an attempt to increase enrollment mainly because their overall enrollment was low. However, as DeSensi et al (1990) noted “Whatever the reasons for establishing sport management programs, educators must accept the responsibility and become more accountable for the varied courses of study offered in our colleges and universities” (p.32).
This rapid development of sport management as an area of study, however, was not paralleled by the development of a core body of knowledge that would serve as the basis for professional preparation in sport management.

In response, in 1986, the National Association of Sports and Physical Education (NASPE) formed a task force to develop curricular guidelines for sport management, and consequently a guideline document was published in 1987. Two years later, the task force was extended to include members from both the NASPE and the North American Association for Sport Management (NASSM) professional associations. As a result several changes to the guidelines were introduced. The new document included: (a) a comprehensive set of minimum competency areas for the 3 degree levels (i.e., baccalaureate, master and doctorate degrees in sport management), (b) standards for the critical mass of sport management offerings, and (c) standards for the critical mass of sport management faculty.

The Joint Task Force on Sport Management Curriculum and Accreditation was formed primarily to address the lack of an identified and recognized base of common knowledge for sport management (NASSM-NASPE, 1993). The goal was to develop a competency-based minimum body of knowledge for baccalaureate, master and doctoral levels. In order to achieve the goal, the Task Force based their assessment on previous curricular research as well as consultation with academicians, professionals and professional associations. The end result was a document that was presented to and approved by the professionals in June 1992.
Several authors have studied curricular contents in Sport Management degree programs. Examples are the works of Ulrich and Parkhouse (1982), Hardy (1987), Jamieson (1987), Parkhouse (1987), DeSensi et al. (1990), Kelley, Beitel, DeSensi, and Blanton (1994), Li and Cotten (1996), and Gouws (1993). One of the articles reported that "[i]t is imperative that colleges and universities provide the best and most appropriate sport management curriculum in order for sport management students to become the best qualified and most highly trained professionals possible" (Kelley, et al, 1994, p. 93). Also, several authors (e.g., Kelley et al, 1994) developed and presented curricular models to help implement the NASPE-NASSM guidelines (1993). As the authors explained (Kelley, et al, 1994) their perspective attempted to "package the content to meet the objectives of various sport management program areas" (p. 93). At this point in time scholars seemed to be seriously addressing curricular issues, which were perceived (e.g., Parkhouse, 1979) as a weakness of the sport management field.

There is no longer room for the provincial sport management programs that are housed in physical education, leisure studies, or business. Now is the time for bold, assertive sport management programs to enlist academicians from many departments, for example, law, business, journalism, marketing, and sport and leisure studies. In addition, it is critical for the sport management curriculum to maintain a strong foundation in sport studies that provide depth and breadth of knowledge and understanding of the societal and cultural context of sport. (Kelley, et al, 1994, p. 100)

Meanwhile, DeSensi et al (1990, p.32) referred to "a struggle" for academic acceptance. They also reinforce that "it is imperative that faculty accept the responsibility to examine the credibility of these programs" (DeSensi et al,1990, p.32). The authors suggested that as the programs are examined
needs must be assessed and programs ought to be evaluated from different perspectives. More specifically, evaluations should include faculty, students’ and potential employers’ perceptions.

Another major issue is the field’s definition (or lack thereof) and identity. Quain and Parks (1986) referred to the field of sport management as still lacking an understanding of its goals and objectives. During the same period, Hardy (1987) described the politics and frustration in attempting to accurately define and label the profession:

The term sport management is not always used to describe the domain, although it has probably become the preferred term. Relatively older programs have undergone several name changes in an effort to match title with curriculum. For instance, Robert Morris College began a management major option in Athletics Administration in 1978. By 1981 the college had a separate department of Sports Management. And in 1984, after many debates with the provost over proper usage, an s was dropped, resulting in Sport Management. Colleagues ask which letter will be dropped next. One suspects that many old hands in this field have suffered similar queries of curiosity or disdain" (p. xx).

Throughout the years, different scholars offered several other definitions. In 1990, DeSensi et al. defined sport management as “any combination of skills related to planning, organizing, directing, controlling, budgeting, leading, and evaluating within the context of an organization or department whose primary product or service is related to sport and/or physical activity” (p. 33).

In 1993, the NASPE-NASSM Joint Task Force of Sport Management Curriculum and Accreditation (p. 159) defined sport management as “the field of study offering the specialized training and education necessary for individuals seeking careers in any of the many segments of the industry.”
time Zakajsek (1993) highlighted that the “term sport management orders the sequence of study, putting sport in the enviable position of first. A grounding in sport as a social phenomenon and as a political and economic institution is a foundational imperative for the study of sport management.” Zakajsek (1993) emphasized that “our unique subject matter resides in sport” therefore the importance of making sport the cornerstone of sport management” (p. 4). The study of sport is ours and unless it is academically embedded in our programs, we are sawing off the limb upon which we are standing” (Zakajsek, 1993, p. 4)

Later, in 1996, Parkhouse noted that “technically, the term sport management is misleading”( p. 5). Further, the author stated that “[s]port business is perhaps a more accurate term to describe both applied and academic aspects of this industry. Unfortunately, ‘business’ to many, particularly those involved in school-related sports suggests entrepreneurial, for-profit, and exploitive motives” (Parkhouse, 1996, p. 5). The author also stated that “[s]port management is composed of two basic elements—sport and management.” Slack (1998) followed Parkhouse’s (1996) assessment of the term analyzing it in its two parts: sport and management. While analyzing the first term, Slack (1998) reminded that since sport management scholars focus mainly on specific sections of the sport industry perhaps the term “physical education and athletic management” (p. 22), would describe more precisely the faculty in this area. The author reinforced how the term sport management is misleading since it implies a more extended area of study, more specifically the study of more organizational settings that make up the sport industry. Referring to the term management in
the sport management title, Slack (1998) noted that it is composed by several sub-disciplinary areas such as: organizational theory, strategy, organizational behavior, economics, marketing, and human resources just to mention some.

In a different plane, Parks et al. (1998, p. 3), noted that "[s]port management exists in two forms. First, it is an area of professional endeavor in which a variety of sport-related managerial careers exist. It is also an area of academic professional preparation—a major—in many institutions of higher education."

Also as Chelladurai (1992) pointed out, the reference to several industries or its segments in the NASPE-NASSM Joint Task Force of Sport Management Curriculum and Accreditation definition "does lead to different conceptions of what sport management is" (p. 1). Also, as the author stressed later in the same article, it is crucial to clarify "the various subareas within the broader field we call sport management" (p. 218).

In summary, there is not a common agreement among researchers on what specifically constitutes sport management and how one should define the field.

Parallel with curricular and definition/identity concerns, the field has also been characterized by the existence of research concerns. For example, based on a major study assessing the status of research in sport management, Spaeth (1967) concluded that a lack of methodological rigor characterized research in the field. Twenty years later, Paton (1987) reported what seemed to be contradictory opinions about the status of research in the field. The author further
noted, however, that these opinions might have referred to two different points of view. On one side some people in the academe seemed to be pleased with the quantity of research done in the field, ‘substantial’ as Paton (1987) described it, while others voiced their concern regarding the lack of quality of the existing research (e.g., Slack, 1998).

As mentioned in chapter one, the fact that the basic research design, descriptive, remains the same is for many researchers a point of concern (Olafson, 1990; Paton, 1987; Slack, 1991, 1998). Also, the frequently emphasized lack of empirical evidence (DeSensi et al., 1990; Parkhouse & Ulrich, 1979; Zeigler, 1979) and the suggestion that research in sport management has not been systematic in focus constitute other concerns. Consequently, several authors voiced a need for more rigor and sophistication in design and methodology (e.g., Olafson, 1990).

On a more positive note, some change in sport management research should be reported. A stronger theoretical base is starting to emerge (Olafson, 1995). Nonetheless, many challenges still remain. Olafson (1995, p.341) urges researchers and graduate students in sport management to take “the road less traveled” and “explore the unknown.”

It is not clear if all this turmoil is just part of the, as Chelladurai (1992, p. 215) called it, “growing pains we go through” or if it has a deeper meaning. Maybe it is time that the academic field of sport management revisits its mission and defines broad priorities for its future. Several sport management authors have recognized the need for decisive action to ensure a stable and strong
development of the field (e.g., Paton, 1987; Olafson, 1995). During his recent Earle F. Ziegler Award lecture, Robert Boucher (1998, p. 77) noted

It can be safely said that we have emerged from a decade of unfettered growth, increased recognition, and, in some people's opinion, academic/professional respectability. In short, we are in the midst of a prosperous time for our field (...) Even though I am generally optimistic about the future of Sport Management and genuinely pleased with the developments of our field over the past few years, I feel it prudent to stop and reassess the direction we are taking. (...) Somewhere along the way 'our path of progress' we came to a fork in the road and we took it! The only problem now is that we are on different paths, which are in some cases not even parallel, and will become more divergent, the greater the time we travel on them. (...) What I am suggesting is that from time to time, and now is particularly appropriate, we make some effort to refocus what we are doing in order that the next 10 years of progress can be as satisfying and meaningful as the first 10 years.

In summary, the literature indicates that there is an ongoing discussion about the future of the field of sport management and it also indicates an urgent need for decisions to be made in this regard. Authors agree that for the sport management body of knowledge to expand in a strong systematic and coherent way it is essential that directions be established.

The development of sport management research is also influenced by higher education institutional forces. The next section introduces two forces too relevant to be ignored.

**Some Cultural Forces Influencing Sport Management Field**

The vast majority of sport management researchers share a strong and important reference: they are members of universities. Universities are organizations that have their own values and norms, and sport management researchers, as with researchers of all other fields, are subject to their influence.
Therefore, it is important to present some of the most prominent norms and/or values of universities currently influencing the field of sport management.

As McGrath and Altman (1966, p. 81) noted 24 years ago “The university as a community has many traditions, norms, and ideals, but the two most important ones ... are epitomized in the phrases ‘publish or perish’ and ‘money is power.’ The first of these refers to the idea that the worth of the scientist—as reflected in salary, rank, job offers, colleague assessments, not to mention self-esteem—is to be reckoned in terms of the number of publications he has generated.” Sadly or not, the same values and norms seem to still hold true.

McGrath and Altman (1966, p. 82) noticed that the “publish or perish” norm had some positive and negative consequences for the small group research field:

On the positive side, the importance of publishing in acceptable journal sources has led to a sharp competition among authors that results in anywhere from 50 percent to a 70 percent rejection of submitted manuscripts for the more highly reputed journals. One effect of this sharpened competition has been an increased methodological rigor in studies that results in better design and more foresight in planning and conducting research, more thorough and sophisticated analysis of data, and, to forestall the editorial consultant's ax, better anticipation of and sensitivity to criticism.

One negative effect ... is that few researchers nowadays seem to conduct research without the intent to end with something that is publishable. ... Another negative effect is frequent exploitation of a single piece of work. ... Thus, one important consequence of the ‘publish or perish’ norm is a highly competitive interest by researchers in publishing their work to satisfy the norm, as well as to communicate contributions to the field.

The other significant university norm is contained in the axiom "money is power." Mainly in major research institutions, faculty who bring in funds wield
influence and gain leverage (McGrath & Altman, 1966). The authors point to the
fact that these faculty will have greater access to student assistance for their
research. Also, these faculty increase their chances of acquiring better quality
student assistance as well as students who are specifically interested in their
research line. Further, if the faculty member publishes significantly she may
attract other grants or funds. Therefore, these faculty may in fact slowly reshape
an entire curriculum. Consequently, “the cycle of influence, facility acquisition,
student recruitment, and curriculum influence will be perpetuated and intensified”
(McGrath & Altman, 1966, p. 83). The authors, however, point out that a potential
concern may arise if the “original intent of using the new dollars for important and
dedicated research gradually [recedes] into the background” (p. 83).

Strategic Management – An Overview

In the 1960s the term “strategic” was usually used to describe long-range,
long-term, or comprehensive planning, therefore an incomplete definition
(Koteen, 1997). In the 1970s, the definition began to incorporate the external
environment emphasizing the specific relationship between an organization and
its environment. Mainly, “strategic analyses often read events and trends in the
environment and made assumptions about what would likely occur.” (Koteen,
1997, p.23). To attain competitive advantage was their main goal. In addition,
the main objective of studies on the public sector and non-profit organizations
was to analyze the “needs” of the target clientele as well as the quality of the
“service delivery”.
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Currently, strategic management is considered the most modern form of planning in organizations (Koteen, 1997). Even though organizations only use it partially (i.e. not to the ideal full extent) it has influenced how organizations plan and implement their strategies (Koteen, 1997). “Strategic management has become an essential tool for organizations to learn and develop if they wish to forge a state of excellence and respond constructively to a rapidly changing world” (Koteen, 1997, p.20).

As mentioned previously, strategic management emphasizes an externally oriented, issue focused, and opportunity seeking method (Koteen, 1997). It stimulates decentralization within a long-term directional framework. Strategic management practice originates mainly from private-sector corporate experience. Over the last several decades, realizing that large scale organizational decisions could not be solely based on present operating practices, top management began to see the need to manage strategically (Koteen, 1997). “From analyses of real-world events and patterns, they began to detect threats and opportunities that required current decisions to be made for the future [i.e., forecasting]. Corporate leaders struggled to understand and create a clear vision of what the future could be; mainly undertook bold strategic initiatives to get there and were successful” (Koteen, 1997, p.21).

Today there is a belief that top executives are strategic thinkers as should be their key subordinates (Koteen, 1997). In sport management each department
and each academician has to be (or become) a strategic thinker and contribute to the successful development of the field’s research as well as the overall field as an academic discipline.

**Characteristics and Aims of Strategic Management**

Koteen (1997) indicated that there is often some confusion regarding the definition of strategic management and planning. He called our attention to the fact that even though some people seem to associate the word “strategic” to “important” this is not a complete definition of the term. Since there is no exact, universally accepted definition of strategic management the best would be to define it operationally (i.e., what it is, what it aims to do, how it benefits the organization).

The following are characteristics of strategic management (Koteen, 1997, p.26):

- Oriented for the future.
- A way of thinking and behaving to make a difference
- Continuous and recurring.
- Sets a framework for guiding other phases of management.
- It is difficult and demanding.

This list includes the aims of strategic management, specifically what it seeks to accomplish:

- Provide strategic direction.
- Guide priority use of resources.
- Set standards of excellence.
- Cope with environmental uncertainty and change.
- Provide objective basis for control and evaluation.

Finally, these items describe the benefits of strategic management:

- Discharges the most important top management responsibility.
- Sharply asks and answers questions of major importance.
- Introduces a new set of tools for making decisions.
Compels the setting of directional goals and objectives.
Aids in reading the future.
Reveals future opportunities and constraints.
Uses the essence of the systems approach.
Forces more objective performance assessment.
Exerts positive influence on organizational behavior.

In addition to understanding what strategic planning and management is, it is also very important to understand when it should be applied. Nutt and Backoff (1992) noted that the need for strategic planning may be triggered by several situations. The authors describe several developments that may apply to sport management: (a) new or growing organizations; (b) need to stabilize funding; (c) desire to grow services; (d) leadership changes; (e) demands for integration, (f) coordination of action; (g) being caught in a rut; (h) political [institutional] threats; and (i) visions of what might be. These developments may be seen as strategic challenges facing the sport management field and its research; however, they may also be seen as opportunities for innovation depending on the perspective one chooses to use.

In the next section, several strategic management concepts are introduced and examples from sport management literature were incorporated as an attempt to gain a better understanding of the status of research in the field.

**SWOT**

Nutt and Backoff (1992, 1993) referred to SWOTs (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) as tension-field elements. They indicated that in order to influence a future situation one should focus on developing and taking actions that “build on strengths, capitalize on
opportunities, blunt threats, and overcome weaknesses" (1992, p. 159). There are some differences in the conceptualization of SWOTs among researchers. Nutt and Backoff conceptualize the tension-field elements in a time frame where Strengths and Weaknesses refer to the present while Opportunities and Threats refer to the future. This is in contrast to private sector models which use an internal (usually including Strengths and Weaknesses) and external (usually including Opportunities and Threats) dynamic. Also, in Nutt and Backoff's (1992) conceptualization there is a greater emphasis on the future vision than there is on issues. If one focuses on past trends (issues), one is solving past problems and not fully capitalizing on the opportunities in designing the future.

Usually these elements are identified and ranked which allows for insightful assessment of developments and pressures in the organizational situation without attribution of blame. Nutt and Backoff (1992) emphasized that the clarification of strengths has a two-fold purpose. It allows capabilities of the organization to emerge and emphasizes a sense of competence in managing its weaknesses and threats. For this study, the focus will be strengths and to some extent, opportunities (as reflected in Question 1: Successes, of the instrument).

The sport management literature indicates some developments scholars have perceived as strengths and opportunities for the field. For example, the increased number of faculty as compared to previous years, mainly because of the new programs, may be seen as strength for the discipline (Mahony & Pitts, 1998). Additionally, Chelladurai (1992) noted that the sport management domain "overlaps those of allied fields of management/administration" (p. 217), which can
positively influence the development of sport management research by opening opportunities for sharing, transferring, and integrating knowledge and theories from their already grounded field.

A recent study by Danylchuck and Boucher (1999) revealed some opportunities for the field. The authors referred to the most positive catalysts influencing sport management in the next ten years. From their findings, increased quality in research and quality of graduates will have direct influence on the development of the field’s research.

Issues (Challenges) as Tensions

Nutt and Backoff (1992, p. 119) defined an issue as a “trend or event, arising inside or outside an organization, that can have an important influence on the organization’s ability to reach its desired future.” The authors further added that in strategic management “issues are used to direct the search for strategic responses” (p. 119). Therefore, if an issue fails to represent important developments, it can potentially create divergent strategic decisions; if decision makers focus only on part of the issue the resulting strategic direction is weakened. To increase the odds of uncovering all the significant existing issues, Nutt and Backoff (1992) used a tension format to describe issues. In this context an issue is defined “as a tension between two developments that represent polar opposites or contradictions within the organization or between the organization and its environment” (p. 127). The authors indicated that to create an issue
tension from a development one should focus "on the most significant factor that
is pulling in the opposite direction" (Nutt & Backoff, 1992, p. 160). The authors
make a note that tensions are organization specific.

Some of the topics in the field of sport management where scholars seem
to have divergent opinion could be considered and analyzed under the
perspective just briefly presented. However, since this is not the central purpose
of this study, no further elaboration is necessary. Following are some examples
of sport management issues posed as tensions: a) theory versus the practice
oriented research and more specifically the need for publication versus need to
serve practitioners (Boucher, 1998; Cuneen & Parks, 1997; Parks, 1992; Slack,
1996; Weese, 1995; Zakrajsek, 1993); b) publishing and presenting inside or
outside the field's journals and conferences (Slack, 1996; Zakrajsek, 1993); and
c) business bottom line versus sport bottom line (Boucher, 1998; Parks, 1992).

**Strategies and Actions**

Strategy is the "vision by which the organization joins its past and its
present to some desired future" (Backoff & Catana, 1998). Throughout the sport
management literature, different scholars present different strategies. Mainly
these strategies are attempts to shed some light on what they perceive as the
most beneficial direction for the development of the field. One can easily divide
proposed strategies into two groups: the ones regarding the development of the
sport management academic field of study in general, and the ones with primary
focus on the development of the quality of research (i.e., design, methodology
and, conceptual frameworks) conducted in the field. Since the purpose of this study is to address the field's research, the next paragraphs focus on these second group of strategies.

Slack (1996) suggested that sport management researchers should publish and present their work at the most recognized conferences and the leading journals in the field of management. This would assist sport management faculty in becoming "leading experts on the management of the sport industry" (Slack, 1996, p. 100) and consequently heighten the quality of research. Slack (1996) explained that this move would benefit the field's researchers twofold: on one hand sport management researchers would gain feedback from researcher in mainstream management, while on the other hand, sport management scholars would have the possibility of validating the thoroughness of their research to scholars that might question its credibility.

Another strategy was to draw scholars from mainstream management to present at sport management conferences (e.g.: NASSM, EASM) and also to publish in sport management journals (Slack, 1996). Slack (1996, p. 100) proposed sport management researchers "do this by demonstrating the viability of [the] field and the utility of sport organizations as a site for testing and extending theories on a wide variety of managerial topics." The same author also proposed that more sport management faculty teaching in business schools and more business faculty teaching in sport management departments would certainly increase the credibility of the field.
Addressing a different concern, Parks (1992) proposed the use of the scholarship of application to bridge the gap between theory and practice. The author suggested that sport management faculty can and should use it in two ways. First, they can use their graduates as knowledge carriers into the sport organizations and second, faculty can transmit the knowledge acquired from their research through consulting activities with the sport industry.

Parks (1992) emphasized the important role consulting faculty plays on the overall development of the field by helping “sport managers make theory-based decisions that reflect an awareness of contemporary social thought” (p. 227). In summary, Parks (1992, p. 227) suggested:

that through the scholarship of application, [sport management faculty] can take into the sport industry a synthesis of the scholarship of discovery, integration, and teaching. At that point, the two bottom lines of sport management will merge...will inform the other, and we can take advantage of yet another opportunity to express our independence.

Slack (1996) proposed another strategic direction, this time attempting to address graduate level education. “In the future [sport management] has to specialize more at the graduate level” (Slack, 1991, p. 96). The author argued that this would allow for a deeper understanding of research topics and areas and a concentration of focused graduate students around those topics, thus contributing for a faster development of the field. Creating better and stronger links with other academic areas was also suggested by Slack (1991), specifically, to create and strengthen research links with other disciplines, participating in joint projects, attending and presenting at their conferences or publishing in their journals.
Zakrjsek (1993) also proposed a direction for the field. The author called for more collaborative research among faculty in sport management, professionals and organizations in the field, and other disciplines as a way to contribute to the field’s development.

Recently, Slack (1998) suggested another strategy to improve research in the field. The author believed sport management scholars have to be reflexive and self-critical towards their own work. He argued that if the scholars in the field do not do it, someone else will, making the field very vulnerable to the external environment. The self-analysis and self-questioning will allow for awareness and recognition about "the theoretical and practical voids that exist, [and] this in many ways will be the first step towards filling these gaps" (Slack, 1998, p. 27).

Additionally, Chalip (1997) suggested some strategies/actions to improve the overall quality of research in sport management: a) integration in action research of qualitative and quantitative methodologies; b) need for revisiting and redefining concepts such as “applied” and “basic” research and their differences; and c) increase collaboration and communication between researchers and participants. In the same line, Boucher (1998) proposed the integration of an alternative research method—appreciative inquiry, which is “fundamentally an approach to organizational analysis that is uniquely intended to discover, to understand, to foster organizational learning and innovation” (p. 81).

Addressing a different aspect—the field’s professional association and available research outlets—Mahony and Pitts, (1998, p. 259) noted that “NASSM
needs to encourage increased specialization within sport management-related research." Further, the field should also develop more specialized journals (Mahony & Pitts, 1998, p. 262).

Specifically related to research, Slack (1991) suggested that, in the future, sport management scholars need to develop their work using theoretical perspectives from the extensive field of management. This will broaden their understanding of the phenomena at study, and will help better design and manage organizations in the sport industry. Additionally, Slack (1991) recommend that sport management scholars adopt major intellectual perspectives already in use by the social and behavioral sciences. Some examples are: feminism, postmodernism, and Marxism.

Olafson (1990, p. 116) took a different perspective and urged that sport management researchers “must become more attuned to the advances and expectations in [research] design, methodology, and analysis." A way to accomplish this would be to encourage faculty to retool in these areas. Finally, Parks, Shewokis, and Costa (1999) suggested that journal editors and reviewers insist on authors reporting sufficient statistics, statistical power as well as effect sizes and their meaningfulness.

As demonstrated in the last few pages, sport management scholars have proposed some strategies or actions that they believe the field should emphasize. The following section will briefly address Futures Studies.
Futures Studies

As noted in chapter 1, futures studies are a "new field of inquiry that involves systematic and explicit thinking about alternative futures" (Bell, 1997, p. 2). Further, "it is a growing body of work that is based on distinctive perspectives and assumptions and that utilizes specific theories, methods, and values" (Bell, 1997, p. 2). Some of the central questions of this field of inquiry (Bell, 1997, p. 2) are: a) What procedures do we use when we think about the future? b) How do we prepare to carry out our plans and projects? c) What makes us successful in shaping or adapting to the coming future? d) At any given time, what alternative courses of action are open to us? e) What will be the future consequences of choosing to do one thing rather than others? and f) What ought we to want the future to be?

The last three central questions are of extreme relevance to the field of sport management, taking into account the field's present phase. As noted earlier several authors as well as speakers at the NASSM conference (e.g.; Dr. Boucher during his Ziegler Award) argued for the need to establish new directions for the field in general and research in particular.

A distinguishing role of futures studies researchers is 'prospective thinking'. They search and explore alternative futures (i.e., the possible, the probable as well as the preferable) (Bell, 1997). Drawing from other futurists' work and the key ideas they emphasize, Bell (1997) succinctly stated:
The purposes of futures studies are to discover or invent, examine and evaluate, and propose possible, probable and preferable futures. Futurists seek to know: what can or could be (the possible), what is likely to be (the probable), and what ought to be (the preferable). (p. 73)

Futures studies researchers, as all other scientific groups, make many assumptions in order to carry out their futures studies. There are a number of assumptions of futures studies that are of special relevance to the field of sport management and of particular importance for this study. One of those assumptions is the "belief in the reality of present possibilities for the future" (Bell, 1997, p. 115). In his book "The foundation of future studies," Bell (1997) attempted to selectively choose the assumptions of the field based on a three-fold requirement: the assumption was distinctive, and contributed substantially to the understanding of the futures field, and would assist in the conduct of futures studies. Following are some of the futures studies assumptions considered by Bell (1997) and that will also be considered in the present study:

- The possible singularity of the future.
- Futures thinking is essential for human action.
- Every conscious and goal-oriented decision-making process depends on knowledge about the future.
- The future is non-evidential and cannot be observed; therefore there are no facts about the future.
- The future is not totally predetermined.
To a greater or lesser degree future outcomes can be influenced by individual and collective action.

Some futures are better than others.

Having described futures studies, identified some of its central questions, and purposes, and listed predominant assumptions, the only aspect that still needs to be addressed relates to the methodology. The next paragraphs will succinctly address that aspect which is of major relevance for this study.

"Since no method has a monopoly on producing good—or bad—work" (Bell, 1997, p. 241) methodological diversity does not seem to be a concern for the field of futures studies. The author confirmed that each method has its advantages and disadvantages and that the nature of the research problem will determine the appropriateness of a method. Further Bell (1997, p. 241) reminded that good or bad futures research is dependent on "the skills, talent, ingenuity, insight, diligence, and even luck of the futures researcher him- or herself. ...it depends on the adeptness of the user of a particular method and the appropriateness of its application to a specific research question."

Futures studies researchers choose from a wide range of methods when conducting their research. They borrowed many techniques from other disciplines. However, some of the methods have a "legitimate claim to being primarily futures research methods, having been invented by futurists for the specific purpose of studying the future" (Bell, 1997, p. 242). One of these is the Delphi technique, described in the following section.
Delphi Method Theoretical Framework

The Delphi Method (i.e., elementary notions, theoretical assumptions and methodological procedures) originated in the 1950s and 1960s, at the Rand Corporation, as a forecasting tool (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963; Ziglio, 1996). It was first developed with the purpose of estimating the effects of a massive atomic bombing attack on the US (Helmer, 1975) as well as to improve methods of forecasting. Recently, Jonassen, Tessmer and Hannum (1999, p. 267) noted the method was named after “the Greek oracle at Delphi who was frequently consulted for its expert opinions and forecasts.” The original authors (Helmer and Dalkey) were never particularly satisfied with the designation of the method (Ziglio, 1996) mainly because its designation was somewhat misleading and lent itself to dubious interpretations.

In 1975, two important books on the Delphi Method were published, one by Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson and the other by Lindstone and Turoff (Adler & Ziglio, 1996). These books primarily addressed theoretical and methodological issues regarding the method. Also during this same period of time, two other authors (Sackman, 1975 and Goldschmidt, 1975) engaged in a “critique–response” type of dialogue which contributed to a better understanding of the method. Even not much studied from a methodological standpoint since mid-1970s, “the Delphi Method has found a wide range of applications in planning, evaluation, forecasting and issue-exploration in many areas” (Adler & Ziglio, 1996, p. ix). More recently, in 1996, Adler and Ziglio edited a book on the Delphi Method with a focus on its application to social policy and public health.
The fact that there have been very few using this method in the field of sport management (e.g., Danylchuck & Boucher, 1999) may be explained by the fact that the method is just not well known among researchers in the field.

Ziglio (1996) noted that the first studies using Delphi were “in the area of technological forecasting and aimed to forecast likely inventions, new technologies and the social and economic impact of the technological change” (p. 5).

Hostrop (1975, p.68, 69) described how Helmer, one of the Delphi developers, envisioned the method:

1. Participants (who usually remain anonymous) are asked to state their opinion on a specific topic in the form of brief written responses to prepared questionnaires, such as recommended activities or predictions for the future.

2. Participants are then asked to evaluate their responses against some criterion, such as importance, and chance of success.

3. Next the statements made by the participants are received and clarified by the investigator.

4. Each participant then receives the refined list and a summary of responses to the items and, if in the minority, is asked to revise his [or her] opinion or to indicate reason(s) for remaining in the minority.

5. The statements made by the participants are again received by the investigator who further clarifies, refines, and summarizes the responses.
6. Each participant then receives the further refined topical list which includes both an updated summary of responses and a summary of minority opinions. Each participant is also given a final chance to revise his [hers] opinions.

7. Finally, the investigator receives the last round of the questionnaires which he [she] then summarizes in a final report. The successive, individual, and independent process of re-questioning each of the experts, combined with feedback supplied separately from each of the other experts, via the investigator, is designed to eliminate misinterpretation of the question and the feedback, and to bring to light knowledge available to one or a few members of the group, but not all of them.

For a better visualization of all the stages involved, Dybas (1980), presented a schematic illustration of the Delphi process, which is adapted in Figure 2. In the original version the review of literature regarding the problem was the fifth step while in the adapted version, it is the first. The reasoning behind the change is that one should become an expert in the specific topic before carrying out the field part of the research.

One of the basic theoretical assumptions of the Delphi is that individual judgments are less reliable than informed group judgments assessed through the Delphi procedures (Ziglio, 1996). As reported by Ziglio (1996, p.15) several studies conducted during the 1960s and 1970s reported that “the Delphi has distinct advantages over traditional group discussion, conferences, brainstorming and other interactive group processes” if the best available information to address the problem is the informed opinions of knowledgeable individuals.
Figure 2. Dybas' (1980) adapted Delphi Study Procedure.
As all other research methods, Delphi has advantages and disadvantages.

Some of the advantages of the Delphi Method compiled by Gupta and Clarke (1996) follow:

- Relies on structured and yet indirect approach to acquire expert group responses.
- Simultaneously promotes learning among panel members.
- Captures a variety of interrelated variables as well as multidimensional issues common to complex problems.
- Allows for documentation of fact and experts’ opinions.
- Avoids challenges such as individual dominance or group conflict.
- Can be used simultaneously as a learning and research tool.
- Can facilitate group decision-making when panelists are strategic decision makers.
- Embraces the philosophy that the whole is greater than the sum of its part, which will promote teamwork and group decision-making.
- Motivates independent thought and gradual formation of group decision which is appropriate for open-ended problems.
- Relatively inexpensive method.

Some of the disadvantages of the Delphi Method compiled by Gupta and Clarke (1996) are presented below:

- Conceptual and methodological limitations.
- Potential for poor implementation.
• Potential for poorly designed questionnaires.
• Potential for deficient choice of experts.
• Potential for unreliable analysis of results.
• Potential for limited value of feedback and consensus.
• Potential for instability of responses on consecutive rounds.
• Panel members can potentially influence desired outcomes.
• Lack of criteria for expert selection.
• Anonymity (which is also an advantage) may reflect individuals’ compromises instead of genuine consensus by the group.

As Rowe and Wright (1999, p. 354) clearly explained:

Delphi is not a procedure intended to challenge statistical or model-based procedures, against which human judgment is generally shown to be inferior; it is intended for use in judgment and forecasting situations in which pure model-based statistical methods are not practical or possible because of the lack of appropriate historical/economic/technical data, and thus where some form of human judgmental input is necessary. Such input needs to be used as efficiently as possible, and for this purpose the Delphi technique might serve a role.

More than two decades ago Linstone and Turoff (1975, p. 4) noted some situations or characteristics that may lead to the need for employing Delphi:

1. The problem does not lend itself to precise analytical methods, but benefits can be derived from subjective judgments on a collective basis.
2. The individuals needed to contribute to the examination of a broad or complex problem have no history of adequate communication and may represent diverse backgrounds with respect to experience or expertise.

3. More individuals are needed than can effectively interact in a face-to-face exchange.

4. Time and cost make frequent group meetings infeasible.

5. Disagreements among individuals are so severe or politically unpalatable that the communication process must be referred and/or anonymity assured.

6. The heterogeneity of the participants must be preserved to assure validity of the results, i.e., avoidance of domination by quantity or by strength of personality [bandwagon effect].

To some extent all the conditions described above apply to the present study, therefore reinforcing the choice of the Delphi Method as the most appropriate method to address this study’s research question. Following are some of the features and advantages that weighed heavily in the study’s methodology selection process. As Bell (1997) stressed the Delphi is a fine way to structure group communication. It allows for the gathering of opinions of groups that are either big and/or diverse and therefore would not function effectively in a face-to-face communications process (Bell, 1997, Ziglio, 1996). Allowing for panel diversity was a big consideration for this study. Also, it allows all panel members involved an equal opportunity of participation (Ziglio, 1996), which was a considered very important for this study’s success.
Moreover, a Delphi technique diminishes social biases and pressures commonly present in face-to-face interactions because of the anonymity and isolation of respondents, which provides freedom from conformity pressures. Further, it decreases the “tendency to follow-the-leader and other psychological and professional barriers to communication” (Ziglio, 1996, p. 22). This was a concern in this study since one of the aims was to include senior and non-senior experts in the Delphi panel.

Another feature of the Delphi is that “the repetitive rounds and feedback to respondents allow the respondents to refine and further inform their opinions and encourages them to think more deeply about the subject of research and to give reasons to justify their opinions” (Bell, 1997, p. 270). Finally, Ziglio (1996, p. 22) highlighted another merit of the Delphi procedure: “it produces precise documented records of the distillation process through which informed judgment has been achieved.”

**Classical Delphi versus Adapted/Modified Delphi**

Rowe and Wright (1999) affirmed that to define a procedure as a Delphi four main featured need to be present: anonymity, iteration, controlled feedback and statistical aggregation of group responses. Further, the authors noted that these features might be applied in numerous ways.

Utilizing questionnaires achieves the first feature, anonymity. By using questionnaires, individual participants can privately express their opinions and judgments, eliminating undue social pressures from either dominant or dogmatic panel members or from a majority. Iteration, another major feature of a Delphi
procedure, allows for panel members to change or refine their opinions or judgments without having to worry about what others in the group might think of them (i.e., because it is done anonymously). Controlled feedback is a characteristic feature of Delphi procedures that takes place between each round's questionnaires. Usually it may consist of either a simple statistical summary including a mean, a median or a mode value and sometimes a frequency table or it may include a summary of comments by the panel members in addition to the statistical summary. Controlled feedback allows for each panel member to be informed about the group's overall opinions and judgments regarding each of the topics being assessed. Rowe and Wright (1999, p. 354) noted that “The final judgment may thus be seen as an equal weighing of the members of a staticized group.”

Bell (1997, p. 262-3) suggested that at least eight steps are included in the Delphi method:

1. The specification of some topic or subject whose possible, probable, and preferable futures are to be investigated.
2. The construction of a questionnaire as an instrument of data collection.
3. The selection of some individuals (respondents) whose opinions are to be studied, usually experts on the topic being investigated.
4. The initial measurement of the opinions of the respondents by means of a questionnaire.
5. The preliminary organization and summary of the data resulting from the initial measurement.
6. The communication of the results of the initial measurement of opinions as feedback to all the respondents (reminiscent of the stimulus or ‘treatment’ in standard pretest-posttest designs).

7. A re-measurement of the opinions of the respondents as they have been informed and may have been changed by their knowledge of earlier results including other respondents’ supporting comments for their opinions.

8. An analysis, interpretation, and presentation of the data and the writing of a final report.

The author cautioned that there may be more steps than the ones mentioned above since there are usually several iterations.

Several authors noted that Round I of a classical Delphi procedure is unstructured (e.g., Martino, 1983; Rowe & Wright, 1999). The main purpose is to allow individual expert panel members to determine, choose or elaborate on what are, in their opinion, the relevant issues. All the comments from Round I are then combined into one document by the researcher and undergo content analysis. The ultimate result of the content analysis is a structured questionnaire: Round II’s Questionnaire. This structured questionnaire allows for views, judgments and opinions from panel members to be elicited in a quantitative manner (Rowe & Wright, 1999).

After each subsequent round, “responses are analyzed and statistically summarized…, which are then presented to the panelists for further consideration” (Rowe & Wright, 1999, p. 354). An important feature of the procedure is the fact that during each round, panel members are given the opportunity to refine prior opinions or judgments based on the feedback provided.

Another feature of the classical Delphi is that if panel members’ comments fall outside the middle range (e.g., fall outside the upper or the lower quartiles)
they may be asked to clarify their position by sharing the reasons underlying their selection. As Rowe and Wright (1999, p. 354) stated “This procedure continues until a certain stability in panellists' [sic] responses is achieved.” After the final round, the forecast or assessment for each of the items contained in the Delphi are usually represented by its median. In addition to the above mentioned characteristics, the classical Delphi usually uses a paper and pencil type of data collection method. Also, generally large distances geographically separate the panel members. Another characteristic is that panel members work separately when answering the Delphi questionnaire and do not know who answered what in the previous rounds.

Many variations have been made through the years to the classical Delphi invented by Helmer and Dalkey in the 1950s and later reintroduced by Gordon and Helmer during the 1960s. Delbecq et al. (1975, p. 11) noted that “considerable variance is possible in Delphi formats relative to design and implementation.” Even though in contradiction to Rowe and Wright's (1999) affirmation regarding the necessity for the anonymity feature in order for the procedure to be considered Delphi, researchers usually decide:

1) Whether the respondent group is anonymous.

2) Whether open-ended or structured questions are used to obtain information from the respondent group.

3) How many interactions of questionnaires and feedback reports are needed.
4) What decision rules are used to aggregate the judgments of the respondent group (Delbecq et al., 1975, p. 11).

Face-to-face interactions among panel members are one of the method’s variations. In the instances where experts are face-to-face, the group dynamics can influence the outcomes (Holden, Peel, & Thompson, 1990) since anonymity is no longer present. Another variation of the method are the computer Delphi studies which are characterized by the initial processing and analysis of data being carried out electronically and returned to the panel members nearly immediately. Linstone and Turoff (1975) noted this specific variations’ similarity to computer teleconferencing. Also, many times Round I is already structured, as Rowe and Wright (1999) suggested, to make it easier for both panelists and researcher. Also another major difference has to do with the nature of the feedback provided to panel members. The classical Delphi recommends researchers report a measure of central tendency and/or the distribution in addition to comments from panelists whose estimates are far from the majority’s central estimate. However, as Rowe and Wright (1999) reported, panel member’s comments are rarely reported in modified Delphis. Rowe and Wright (1999, p. 355), reminded researchers that “these simplifications…have important consequences for the generalizability of research findings.” The author further noted that the existing differences between the classical and modified Delphis “make generalizations about ‘Delphi’ per se difficult” (Rowe & Wright, 1999, p. 355). Further, when deciding for modified versions, researchers must be aware that many time the method’s quality and credibility is undermined, especially if
modifications are random and arbitrary. As Gupta and Clarke (1996) concluded, "the versatility of Delphi is both its power and its fallibility" (p. 190). Therefore, researchers must be certain their modifications add meaningfulness and contribute to a better understanding of the method.

For the present study the researcher chose to keep the great majority of the classical Delphi features in order to draw from its strengths. The only alteration occurred regarding the means of delivery of the questionnaires. Instead of using paper and pencil and sending the questionnaires through the mail service, the researcher decided to use electronic mail, sending and receiving the questionnaires as attachments. This reduced the turn around time between iterations. Several authors noted that a lengthy time span between iterations may make it difficult for panel members to maintain their motivations as well as their focus on the problem being addressed (Rotondi & Gustafson, 1996), thus decreasing the method's effectiveness.

**Research on Delphi**

The Delphi technique has been both used and studied from a variety of perspectives. It has become "a widely used tool for measuring and aiding forecasting and decision making in a variety of disciplines" (Rowe & Wright, 1999, p. 353). Much of the research using the Delphi technique has come from researchers who attempted to forecast or study the future of a specific phenomenon in their own academic disciplines. Some examples are the use of the method to generate future scenarios for the fields of mental health care (e.g.:
Bijl, 1996), government planning (e.g.: Jillson, 1975; Jones, 1975; Ludlow, 1975; Turoff, 1975) and social services planning (e.g.: Bertin, 1996).

Gupta and Clarke's (1996) bibliography on Delphi Method indicated that 463 publications used the method between 1975 and 1994. More specifically, 254 of the papers used Delphi as a primary method, whereas on the other 209 the method was treated as a secondary method. The authors further report that since its development, Delphi has been applied in a large variety of contexts including but not limited to academia, administration, education, higher education (e.g., Kruus, 1983), management, and strategic planning. For example, the public health and social policy field have mainly used the method to generate future scenarios in the areas of social services, health care, accidents, AIDS/HIV as well as to assess the potential impact of environmental, economic, social and urban policies on the population's health (Ziglio, 1996). On the other hand, social work, nursing and medical education fields have mainly used the method to create new curricula as well as to forecast how socio-economic factors will influence future school systems, training and research needs (Ziglio, 1996). Also, in the sport-related area of adult fitness, Murray and Jarman (1987) conducted a study using Delphi to examine the future of adult fitness.

Additionally, in a very recent article, Rowe and Wright (1999) attempted to gather information regarding all English-language published articles comprising the assessment of the Delphi technique. Since their objective was to gather only published studies involving evaluation of the Delphi only a total of 27 studies were included in their analysis. Rowe and Wright's (1999) classification system
included three categories: Application, Process and Technique-comparison. Application type studies are studies where the primary focus is on assessing expert opinions regarding a particular problem and the technique's process or quality issues are considered as a secondary focus. Dalkey and Helmer (1963) and Spinelli (1983) were examples of Application studies.

Process type studies are studies were the Delphi was the primary focus, meaning that their primary intent was to assess or measure one or several internal aspects of the technique. Some examples were: Dietz (1987), Parenté, Anderson, Myers, & O'Brien (1984) and Rowe and Wright (1996). Thirdly, Technique-comparison type included studies comparing the technique to other techniques. Van de Ven and Delbecq (1974), Rohrbaugh (1979), and Sniezek (1990) were some of the examples listed. From their review of studies that have attempted to evaluate Delphi, Rowe and Wright (1999) concluded that these attempts have been "largely inappropriate" (p. 353), mainly because the majority of these studies have failed in the attempt to fully specify or describe the characteristics of the task, panel or situations. The authors further noted that knowledge about the methodology's potential is still poor. Rowe and Wright (1999) stressed a need for a different methodological approach to study the potential benefits of Delphi.

One can also find in the literature several studies that focused mainly on the theoretical underlying assumptions or philosophies of the approach (e.g.: Mitroff & Turoff, 1975, and Rotondi & Gustafson, 1996). In addition to all these,
there are also studies that just use the Delphi technique as a methodology without really elaborating on it.

Independently of the perspective used, in all these studies, researchers had to (or should have) consider threats that could potentially weaken their studies. The following section will briefly address this issue.

Evaluation of the Delphi Methodology

Throughout the literature one can find bad and good examples of the Delphi technique, as is the case for every other methodology. At every step of a Delphi study, the researcher may threaten the reliability or validity of the results if something is done ineptly (Bell, 1997).

Bell (1997) used a few examples to illustrate some of the stages where threats may occur. One example relates to the experts, they may not be truly experts on the areas the study focuses on or they may not be random or representative of all the experts in the field. The questions themselves are another area where researchers must pay special attention to avoid threats to reliability or validity. For instance, the questions may be ambiguous, not pertinent, or even irrelevant and biased. Also, the questionnaire may not even include the most enlightening, informative and pertinent questions. Thus these were never asked because they did not seem important at the time (Simmonds, 1977).

Another threat deserving special attention is the nature of the questionnaires themselves because they may be constructed poorly and be too lengthy so that panel members could potentially lose interest. Also, another
contaminating factor would be if one set of questions contaminated another. Moreover, panel members' reactive responses to the second or following rounds may be invalidated if the data integration and summary from Round I is done inaccurately and/or communicated in an ambiguous way to the panel in Round II or subsequent rounds. Participants dropouts are another source of bias. As Bell (1997) noted, these examples illustrate errors that are not "inherent in the Delphi technique itself" (p. 270), instead they originate from incompetent work.

Finally, an important point was discussed by Bell (1997) regarding the term "objective" in relationship to the Delphi method. The author noted that the term "objective" usually is brought up when considering the Delphi method. He further clarified:

For if it is carried out correctly, it can be completely objective and scientific as far as the various research steps are concerned, from specifying a sample and writing questions to statistically analyzing data and reporting the results. But the data themselves, of course, are basically the subjective beliefs and judgments of the expert respondents, even though such beliefs and judgments may be based on the respondents' individual objective knowledge of their fields. The objective measurement of such subjective beliefs and judgments are commonplace in the social sciences. (p. 263-4)
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the procedures used to investigate sport management experts' perceptions of the future of the field's research. The chapter is divided into 11 sections which include: (a) Research Design; (b) Content Analysis; (c) Basic Principles Underlying the Study's Collection and Analysis of Data; (d) Study Population; (e) Validity; (f) Reliability; (g) Instrumentation; (h) Time Requirement; (i) Data Collection Procedures; and (j) Data Analysis Procedures.

Research Design

Authors should select the most appropriate method for their research problem and the specific context where their study is to take place. Several reasons can be advanced to justify the selection of the Delphi Method for the present study. When confronted with a problem characterized by uncertainty, either because of insufficient information on the problem or incomplete theory to explain it, authors in the past (e.g., Pill, 1971) have suggested the research follow one of two paths. The first one is to wait "until we have an adequate theory based on tested scientific knowledge" (Ziglio, 1996, p. 4), which most of the time,
especially in social sciences is not a feasible solution if there is some urgency to the problem. The second option "is to make the most of what is, admittedly, an unsatisfactory situation, and try to obtain the relevant intuitive insights of experts and use their informed judgments as systematically as possible" (Ziglio, 1996, p. 4).

As argued by Dalkey (1969) "wisdom", "insight", and 'informed judgment" are types of information that one can place between scientific knowledge and speculation, which would be the two extreme ends of an information continuum. Ziglio (1996, p. 6) effectively explained:

Informed judgment is central to the theoretical assumptions of the Delphi Method. According to the pioneering work of Dalkey (1968, 1969) and Rescher (1969), the theoretical assumptions of the Delphi Method make it impossible to label everything that is not [scientific] knowledge as mere speculation. The methodological procedure used in the Delphi Method aims at structuring and distilling the vast mass of information for which there is some evidence (but not yet knowledge) in order to achieve and improve informed judgment and decision-making.

As several authors have suggested (e.g., Ziglio, 1996), the Delphi Method is a representation of this second option. This suggests that the method be used more often in the field of sport management and that it is appropriate in this study as a mean to produce new insights and future scenarios as well as contributing to informed decision-making and design of strategic directions.

Further, the use of Delphi Method can demonstrate what may occur if developments in the field stay the same, or what could happen if the field was taken under by another academic field/discipline, or what could take place if the academic field decided to change educational strategy and went corporate (i.e., a
department would prepare students, or conduct research for a specific sport organizations), or even what could potentially arise if the gap between theory and practice was effectively bridged. In addition, the benefits associated with the process of iteration and feedback complemented with anonymity constituted other reasons for the researcher to choose the use of this methodology.

Referring to the method and its objective, Linstone and Turoff (1975) explained: “Delphi may be characterized as a method for structuring a group communication process, so that the process is effective in allowing a group of individuals, as a whole, to deal with complex problems” (p. 3).

There are debatable opinions regarding which broad research method (i.e., quantitative, quantitative and historical research) includes Delphi. Gupta and Clarke (1996) describe Delphi as a qualitative forecasting Method. However, usually this Method falls into the specific category of descriptive survey research (Hughes, 1993; Ludwig, 1994), which is a part of the broad category of quantitative research. Fraenkel and Wallen (1996) describe descriptive survey research as “… an attempt to obtain data from members of a population (or sample) to determine the current status of that sample with respect to one or more variables” (p. 590).

The researcher recognizes some limitations in the method chosen for this study, including limited generalizability, which, however, is not a central aim in this study. When designing and deciding on methodology and implementation procedures for the present study, the researcher focused on maximizing the
strengths of the Method and overcoming its limitations. Thus attention to detail was present in all planning stages as will be reflected in the remainder of the paper.

Content Analysis

The main function of content analysis is to provide a means to classify textual material, reducing it to more relevant, manageable pieces of information (Weber, 1990). It "is a research method that uses a set of procedures to make valid inferences from text" (Weber, 1990, p. 9). It can be used for varied purposes, one of them being coding open-ended questions in surveys (Weber, 1990).

Krippendorff (1980) noted that three types of reliability are relevant to content analysis. They are stability, reproducibility and accuracy. Stability, refers "to the extent to which the results of content classification are invariant over time" (Weber, 1990, p. 17). It can be assessed when the same coder codes the same content more than once. Unreliability will result from coding inconsistencies. Stability constitutes the "weakest form of reliability" (Weber, 1990, p. 17), since the content is only coded by one coder. Overall one may say that stability measures "the consistency of the individual coder's private understandings" (Weber, 1990, p. 17).

Reproducibility, also called intercoder reliability, refers "to the extent to which content classification produces the same results when the same text is coded by more than one coder" (Weber, 1990, p. 17). The author noted several
reasons that might potentially result in conflicting codings: coders' cognitive differences, coding instructions that are ambiguous or random recording errors.

High reproducibility constitutes a minimum standard for content analysis (Weber, 1990). Overall one may say that reproducibility measures "the consistency of shared understandings (or meaning) held by two or more coders" (Weber, 1990, p. 17).

Accuracy refers "to the extent to which the classification of text corresponds to a standard or norm" (Weber, 1990, p. 17) and constitutes "the strongest form of reliability" (p. 17). The author further clarified that this type of reliability is very seldom used for text analysis. The most common use is for training purposes.

"There is no simple right way to do content analysis" (Weber, 1990, p.13). However, there are some basic steps to conduct a content analysis procedure that were suggested by several authors (e.g., Weber, 1990) and have previously proven to be useful. These were:

- Test coding on sample of text – This step's purpose is mainly to reveal the rules' ambiguities and integrate any suggestions coders may have regarding the efficiency of the content analysis process.
- Establish coder stability and intercoder reliability.
- If reliability is low – revise coding rules.
- Redo a test coding on a new sample of text – until sufficient reliability is achieved.
- Code all text – applying the coding rules just established by the previous process.

- Assess achieved reliability – As Weber (1990) noted, after the text is content analyzed the reliability of human coders should be assessed. He advised never to assume that high reliability on sample texts directly implied high reliability of the entire text. The author further noted that fatigue is a factor on human coders and also that coders’ may alter slightly their understanding of the coding rules and consequently become less reliable.

Thus, based on the guidelines suggested above and for the specific purpose of this study, the researcher developed the following content analysis protocol. It was first used by the Content Analysis Panel to analyze the qualitative comments from the Delphi Panel members to the Round I questionnaire.

Content Analysis Protocol

1. Everyone will have a full package of all the responses.
2. For each question read the Delphi Panel member’s answer and pick out key ideas that respond to the question.
3. All members will work through at least one example together and at least one more individually, with checking immediately afterwards (3 examples will be available).
4. Rules:
   - Count “and” as two separate items.
   - Be cognizant of “time” – e.g. in questions #1 time is a relevant factor – consider past and present successes (NOT future); question # 3 and 4 the time span is 5 to 7 years.
   - Events and Trends encompass both “positive and negative.”
   - Questions # 3 and 4 differentiate between best case scenario and realistic scenario.
   - In question # 6 keep actions and strategies together.
   - In question # 2 keep events and trends together.
5. Definitions:
   In Question #2:
Events – an important occurrence, especially one that is particularly significant.
Trends – a general tendency, movement, or direction.

After clarifying all the instructions above the content analysis panel worked through their first example as a group. There were some rule clarifications resulting from this first exercise which were:

- List also sub-topics.
- Categorize the different field’s journal (every time several journals are mentioned).
- Categorize outside journals.
- Capture the direction of the trend (more, less, increase, decrease, ...)
- Note the intensity of the comments. Make a note if panel members express a topic with a particular intensity or depth of feeling.
- Make note of comments that are discussed by more panel members (extensiveness) and the comments that are discussed more often (frequency) than others.

After understanding the additional rules, Content Panel members worked through the second example (their first individually). The researcher's intent was to establish stability and intercoder's reliability a priori as recommended by Weber (1990, p. 23) who noted that "reliability of the coding process should be estimated before resolving disputes among coders."

After Content Panel members concluded their analysis, their individual answers and comments were compared to assess the degree of intercoder reliability. This proved to be very high; coders had very similar results. Also, there were no additional rule clarifications. For confirmation purposes, the Content Analysis Panel decided to work through the third example individually. Again there were no additional rule clarifications and the degree of intercoder reliability remains to be very high.
The examples provided for the establishment of intercoder reliability were from the pilot test which exposed the content panel members to very similar situations as they would encounter during the rest of the process.

For each round’s questionnaire the content panel members checked their degree of intercoder reliability before starting their coding by working through a portion of the data and comparing it.

Principles Underlying Collection and Analysis of Data

In the present study some basic principles, adapted from Krueger (1994), were considered in collecting and analyzing the data. These were intended to guide the researcher’s actions as well as to aid in determining particular decision rules needed during the data collection and analysis processes. As Krueger (1994) noted, some of these principles derived from the qualitative oriented research field. They are described below:

**Analysis must be systematic.**

Krueger (1994) noted that two dimensions are associated with systematic analysis. First is the way data are gathered and handled; second, the specific methods chosen by the analyst. In both instances the major purpose of systematic analysis procedures is to "help ensure that results will be as error-free as possible" (Krueger, 1994, p. 127). Therefore, the researcher should follow a prescribed and sequential process, one that is "deliberate and planned and not capricious, arbitrary, or spontaneous" (Krueger, 1994, p. 127). As the same
author further noted "Systematic analysis processes force the researcher to examine and challenge his or her assumptions" (p. 129).

For the purpose of this study a systematic protocol underlying all important phases involved in the collection and analysis of data was delineated. The purpose was to minimize human errors, to remind the researcher of upcoming steps and major concerns to avoid, as well as to help keep in mind the overall purpose of this phase of the research study.

**Systematic protocol followed in the present study:**

1. Selection of the Delphi Panel described under the Study Population section.

2. Capturing and handling data described under the Instrumentation section.
   a) Sequence of open ended questions on Round I questionnaire to allow for maximum insight.
   b) Definition of specific data collection procedures and respective timing.
   c) Decision rules
      i. Minimal participation requirements to be considered a Panel member – Participate in at least 2 rounds.
      ii. Consensus rule - considered that the Delphi Panel reached consensus on an item if 80% of the ratings fell within two categories on a seven-point scale (i.e., importance, success and, impact scales) or within three categories on a 10-point scale (i.e., probability scale).
iii. Minimum of 3 rounds.

d) Keep a written record of all communications and unsuccessful attempts by the researcher with Panel Members (phone, email, and fax).

e) Keep a written record of all raw data for each round by question.

3. Data reduction – Content Analysis Protocol described under Content Analysis section.

4. Sharing of preliminary and later reports.

   This step's main purpose is to assure a member checking by other participants in the research team. Therefore, drafts of earlier reports were shared with the members of the content analysis panel for review, comments and verification.

   Analysis must be verifiable.

   Mainly this means that if the raw data and complementary documents were given to another researcher, she would be able to arrive at similar results. Keeping all the data as a "trail of evidence" counters the human tendency to selectively pay attention to information. As Krueger (1994, p. 130) noted "Researchers must continually be careful to avoid the trap of selective perception." Some of the preventive steps taken in this study were:

   • Creation of a document incorporating all the full length comments by Delphi Panel members to all rounds.

   • Independent assessment of full length comments from Delphi Panel members by the 4 Content Panel Members in each of the 3 rounds.
Debriefing with Content Analysis Panel following each individual assessment of full-length comments from Delphi Panel members.

Sharing of recordings of all communications with Content Analysis Panel members at each scheduled meeting.

**Analysis must be focused.**

Even though this assumption as well as several of the following ones relate more closely to the Data Analysis chapter, they will still be presented here because the collection and analysis of data are so interrelated in the Delphi Method.

In Delphi studies there is the propensity to gather a significant amount of data. Jointly, the qualitative type (i.e., comments made by Delphi Panel members) and the quantitative type (descriptive statistics resulting from scales' analysis) add to the richness of information regarding the phenomena under study. After becoming intimately acquainted with the overall data, the researcher needs, however, to keep his/her focus on the issues that are the basis of the study, at times the length and breath of the information gathered may seem overwhelming for the researcher.

**Analysis must have the appropriate level of interpretation.**

Krueger (1994, p. 131) provided a continuum of analysis that varied from accumulation of raw data to its interpretation.
The author explained that the left end of the continuum represents the accumulated raw data, meaning, in the case of the Delphi Method, the verbatim record of each and all Panel members' comments for each of the three rounds. In the case of this study, Panel members' comments were ordered first by round, then by question and ultimately by item. As Krueger (1994, p. 131) noted, "the distinctive feature of raw data is that it contains all of the information...the length is usually enormous and often frustrating for the [reader]." Thus, in this study, the researcher decided not to present it in this format.

A more elaborate level of interpretation is represented in the middle of the continuum: descriptive statements. These are summary statements organized by the researcher. The descriptive method "seeks to simplify the task of the reader by providing typical and illuminating quotes" (Krueger, 1994, p. 131). Mainly the researcher supplies brief summaries based on the raw data and complements them with informative or illuminating examples from the raw data. Sometimes the challenging part of choosing the descriptive method is the selection of quotes to include as examples. A guideline should be the purpose of the study. Because the present study intended to explore the future of sport management research as perceived by expert researchers in the field, it was decided early on that comments illustrating both convergence and divergence of opinions should be included throughout the data analysis chapter of this document.
Finally, in the right end of the continuum there is interpretation, which constitutes the "most complex role for the researcher" (Krueger, 1994, p. 132). Here, the main purpose is to present the meaning of the data, to provide understanding. This level of interpretation takes into account not only information from the raw data but also from other communications with the Panel members during the study and also background information. The researcher attempts to interpret the meaning of the data and draw conclusions from it in the last chapter of this document.

**Analysis must be practical.**

In this context, practical refers to appropriateness of the content to the situation. This is particularly true for Round I questionnaire, since there was no way to know how much information Panel members would return nor how diverse it would be. In the specific case of this study, adjustments had to be made regarding the Content Analysis Panel because of the lengthy and diverse amount of information returned following Round I. The process (i.e., meetings) ended up taking much longer than initially planned.

**Analysis requires time.**

A very distinctive characteristic of the Delphi Method is that the development of Round II and subsequent rounds are based on Panel members' responses to previous rounds. This implied a great time requirement both from the researcher and Content Analysis Panel in between rounds. Therefore, it was essential that plenty of time was allocated for this a before starting.
Analysis should seek to enlighten.

Krueger (1994, p. 135) noted that "a guiding principle of analysis is to provide enlightenment, to lift the level of understanding to a new plateau."

Moreover, he noted that furthering the understanding is a purpose of the overall study, not just of the analysis phase. This assumption was a guiding principle when designing the study, focusing on selection rules for the Delphi Panel and developing and deciding the questions to include on Round I. Also, the researcher followed this principle when discussing the study's results mainly by keeping the following 3 questions in mind (Krueger, 1994, p. 136):

1) What was known and then confirmed or challenged by this study?
2) What was suspected and then confirmed or challenged by this study?
3) What was new that wasn't previously suspected?

Study Population

The participants of this study were selected mainly on the basis of their expertise in the field of sport management. Delphi's underlying principles are that several heads are better than one in making subjective inferences about the future and that panelists, i.e. experts, will use rational judgment in making such inferences.

There is no set formula to calculate the ideal number of participants on a Delphi study. Most studies have used 15 to 20 participants (Ludwig, 1994). In determining the total number of panel members the researcher should take into consideration two aspects: (a) the number of respondents necessary to
constitute a representative pool of judgments and (b) the information processing capability of the researcher (Ludwig, 1994; Johnson, Miller, Miller, & Summers, 1987; Ulschak, 1983). In this study the main intention of the researcher was to establish a Delphi panel with a high level of expertise in the academic discipline of sport management.

As Ludwig (1994) noted, Delphi requires highly self-motivated participants, because the level of knowledge, interest and commitment are thought to influence the quality of the participants' contributions. The researcher believed that all the selected participants were highly motivated to be involved because the present study refers to a topic in which each of them had a high investment (their academic and professional careers).

As Fraenkel and Wallen (1996) noted, the first tasks in selecting a sample for a study is defining the population. The study's target (or actual) population was fairly heterogeneous (i.e., diverse backgrounds, diverse levels of experience in both teaching and research, employed in different types of institutions, diverse areas, etc.) and consisted of sport management professors/researchers. To the researcher's best knowledge, there was not an existing document (list) that included all sport management academicians. Therefore, the best way to identify the frame seemed to be to use sport management professional associations' professional membership lists. For instance, if a researcher wanted to focus on North America a good option would be the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) professional membership list that included the majority of
sport management professors/researchers. For the purpose of this study there was no real need of gathering such a list, therefore, one was never compiled.

The next step as recommend by Fraenkel and Wallen (1996) is to identify an accessible population from the target population. Since the accessible population is the portion of the population to which the researcher has access, this is the group to which the researcher might cautiously limit her generalizations.

From the accessible population, a purposeful sample of 17 experts and 3 alternates (should any of the selected experts decline to participate in the study) was selected. A purposeful sample implies that it is not randomly selected from the accessible population; instead its members are selected because the researcher and review panels believe that these are the subjects that can better contribute to the study. In this case, the researcher opted for this type of nonrandom sample because it allowed selecting those who had the needed information.

The following process describes how the study’s purposeful sample—the Delphi Panel members—was selected:

1. The researcher and review panel, consisting of 3 sport management faculty (2 of them senior faculty), decided who they perceived were the 5 most established and active research experts in the field.

2. The researcher contacted these 5 senior experts by email and after briefly explaining the scope and purposes of the study asked them who in their opinion should be included in the Delphi Panel based on (a) their high
level of knowledge and understanding related to the philosophy of sport management, (b) their knowledge of research in sport management, and (c) experience in research. One of the requests was that they included both junior and senior level researchers.

3. After all the five senior experts provided their recommendation, the researcher compiled a list of the recommended names ranked by frequency (most to least). Because there were many ties the researcher submitted this list back to the review panel for them to individually rank within the ties.

4. After compiling the ranking by the review panel the researcher arrived at the final ordered list of potential Delphi Panel members.

5. The next step was to gather contact information for the selected researchers. First the researcher asked the review panel for any information they had available as a starting point and then used mostly public means such as web pages of the department where these researchers were employed.

By using this procedure the researcher was confident that she guarded against researcher selection bias, which happens when choices regarding the sample are made based on a reasoning other than the pre-established selection criteria (mentioned above under item number 2).

Once the Delphi Panel was selected, the researcher contacted the first 17 researchers in the final list, and a few days later contacted the next 3 researchers. This first contact involved a letter sent by email. Specifically, the
letter was incorporated in the body of the email, instead of as an attachment, to increase the chances of participants being able to read it without any inconvenience. Primarily, the letter explained the need for the expert’s assistance, outlined the implications of the results and described the Delphi Method, and also invited participants to reply to the email independently regarding their wish or availability to participate in the study.

The second contact closely followed the letter and was in the form of a phone call. The two purposes of the phone call were to clarify the study’s objectives and importance of participation. The researcher followed a script which included: (a) identification of the caller; (b) explanation of the study; (c) the nature of the panel, (d) the Delphi process’s length of time, (e) participants’ obligations, (f) the nature of information to be shared during the process, (g) solicitation of questions and comments; (h) participants’ availability, and (i) plea for participants’ commitment. Ludwig (1994) reported that such details might be perceived by participants as an indication of high regard for their position and status thus fostering their willingness to participate and commit. The researcher called each participant at least three times (at different hours of the day) before leaving a message.

During both contacts, the researcher highlighted the uniqueness and importance of the role each panel member would play as they provided their knowledge to the topic under study.

After participants accepted to be part of the Delphi Panel, both during this first phase (prior to sending out Round I) and also during Round I the researcher
persistently attempted to reach each participant by phone. From this first personal contact, the researcher intended to obtain information on the panel members that would allow for a better level of planning of the entire Delphi process. The information included: (a) verification of email, phone number, fax number and address; (b) verification of preferred software to send the attachments; (c) contact information for the secretary or assistant in the event the participant was unavailable; (d) dates that the participant would not be available; (e) and preference regarding type of communication (email or fax). The phone contact with email follow up was successful in gathering the information from the majority of the participants. Further, this step proved to be extremely valuable, particularly because each member's participation was so crucial and because the study covered such an extended period of time. It certainly decreased the uncertainty regarding individual availability for participation. As a result some adjustments were made to the initial timeline and some other requests were accommodated.

A particularity of the Delphi Method is that the participants in each Delphi round—the Delphi Panel—can only be determined after reception of each round's instruments (with the exclusion of round one which is determined by the researcher). Only the panel members who provide usable data can continue to participate. Strong efforts were made in order to keep all the members in all rounds. Specifically, the researcher attempted to be flexible within the limits of the classical Delphi procedures to accommodate individual panel members (e.g.: use of fax if preferred).
Validity

Because the target population of this study was heterogeneous (as previously mentioned) and the sampling method used was non-random, generalization to the target population (i.e., sport management professors/researchers) may not be appropriate and if attempted, must be done very cautiously.

Since the Delphi seeks to assess what should be, neither construct nor criterion-related validity are considered.

For this study the only concerns were with face and content validity. Fraenkel and Wallen (1996, p. 580) defined content-related validity "as the degree to which an instrument logically appears to measure an intended variable". Face validity refers to the degree to which an instrument appears or looks appropriate for its intended audience. Face and content validity of the initial instrument was assessed by a panel of experts (constituted of 7 sport management experts). The panelists were introduced to the objectives of the study as well as the purpose of the instrument. Each panelist was asked to revise and refine each question and add additional relevant ones as well as to comment and make suggestions related to the clarity and content. Minor revisions to the instrument were made based on the recommendations of the panel.
Reliability

Fraenkel and Wallen (1996) defined reliability as the degree to which scores obtained with an instrument are consistent measures of whatever the instrument is measuring. Some synonyms for reliability used in the literature are predictability, stability, consistency, accuracy and dependability.

This measure of internal consistency cannot be determined using conventional means in Delphi studies. The Delphi process pre-assumes that responses will be changing from round to round as the panel moves towards consensus and consequently the instrument will be modified in each round. Therefore the underlying nature of the Delphi process differs from the underlying nature of the reliability-estimation procedures which is to look at stability in the measurement over time or across forms.

Regarding the issue of establishing reliability in studies where expert opinion is used Dalkey (1969) stated (as cited in Hughes, 1993):

For the analyst using expert opinion within a study, reliability can be considered to play somewhat the same role as reproducibility in experimental investigations. It is clearly desirable for a study that another analyst using the same approach (and different experts) arrive at similar results .... In general, one would expect in that area of opinion, group responses would be more reliable than individual opinions, in the simple sense that two groups (of equally competent experts) would be more likely to evidence similar answers to a set of related questions than would two individuals. This "similarity" can be measured by the correlation between the answers of the two groups over a set of questions (p. 10-12).
Instrumentation

Maybe the most distinctive characteristic of the Delphi Method is that the development and administration of the instruments is interrelated. Usually the number of Delphi instruments (or the number of rounds) varies between three and five depending on the degree of agreement the researcher intends (Delbecq et al., 1975). In the first study by Gordon and Helmer, the researchers decided to conduct four rounds of questionnaires (Bell, 1997). However, some future studies researchers seem to believe that “three rounds are sufficient to produce stability of responses” (Bell, 1997, p. 263). Earlier, Linstone and Turoff (1975) had noted that more than three rounds could result in boredom by the panel members. In the same line, Ludwig (1994) indicated that in most cases not enough new information is gathered after the third round to justify its cost. Thus, the researcher planned three iterations for the present study. However, the potential decision for a fourth round was left open in case she and the Content Analysis Panel believed that considerable information could be gained by one more round.

In general, instruments in Round I take the form of one or few open-ended type questions. When researchers opt for the use of a modified Delphi, most of the time the instrument takes the form of a structured questionnaire developed from a review of the literature. As earlier stated in chapter one, for this study the Round I questionnaire had open-ended questions (see Appendix E). Overall, Rounds II and III instruments included a total of four 7-point Likert type scales. One was for panel members to indicate the degree of success, the other the
degree of impact, the third one indicated the degree of importance, and the fourth one indicated the probability level of each item. The researcher repeatedly encouraged panel members to comment on any of the questions and or items, especially those they considered to be the most or the least relevant.

If a panel member's response to an item during Round II was outside of the middle range for that item, he or she was instructed to carefully consider the feedback provided and re-rate his/her response during the following round. If the re-rate still did not fall within the middle range then the participant was asked to provide written explanation for the rationale behind his choice. Consensus on an item was considered to be reached when 80% of the Delphi Panel ratings fell within two categories on a seven-point scale (i.e., importance, success and, impact scales) or within three categories on a 10-point scale (i.e., probability scale).

The items where consensus was reached were still included in the next Delphi round, although Panel members were not asked to further rate them. The new suggestions by Panel members were content analyzed by four reviewers (including the researcher) following the content analysis protocol explained earlier in this chapter. The original wording was kept whenever possible.

Rounds II and III instruments included information of previous rounds (feedback), i.e., from Round I and II instruments respectively. The feedback provided was of two types. On the one hand, there was statistical feedback that ended up consisting of modes and frequencies of group responses complemented with the individual's own response on each item. In addition to
these statistics, however, the researcher calculated means, medians, middle ranges and standard deviations for all items. The initial plan was that the researcher would reserve the right to not report some of these measures if she decided that they could be misleading for the panel members based on their dispersion scores. The second type of feedback included the comments by the panel members, which were reported anonymously. The comments were meant to give panelists information they could use to re-think and refine their responses. Therefore, in Rounds II and III, panel members were instructed to consider both forms of feedback prior to re-rating each item.

Time Requirements

Ludwig (1994) noted that participants’ motivation may decrease due to the time required by the questionnaire method used in the Delphi (i.e., several days or even weeks may divide the different rounds). With this in mind the researcher decided to use email as a mean to reduce the time between rounds.

In the present study, each round was sent out on a Sunday night or Monday morning and participants were originally given one week to return each round’s instrument. The researcher and Content Analysis Panel would then analyze and prepare the next round during the following week. However, the researcher extended the returning time by two days on average in both first and second rounds to accommodate Panel members without compromising the analysis and development of the new questionnaire phases. Therefore participants would know beforehand that they would be receiving a round every
other week on Monday morning. The researcher, after a personal communication with Dr. Barbara Ludwig, believes that the establishment of this routine might in fact have contributed to the high response rate as Dr. Ludwig had suggested. Consequently, a minimum time of nine weeks for conducting the Delphi rounds was expected (i.e., two weeks to select the Delphi panel following the procedure described earlier in this chapter, one week to send out the introductory letter and follow up by phone and email and six weeks to complete the three rounds). In order to increase motivation, the researcher made efforts to keep the instruments’ completion time approximately 30 minutes as recommended by Delbecq et al. (1975), however, this was not possible with the third round because of the amount of feedback information contained in the questionnaire; the approximate completion time increased to 50 minutes.

Data Collection Procedures

Hughes (1993) noted that “it is imperative that data collected through the Delphi Method be provided by most competent and committed panelists” (p.117), adding that the input of the panel member who responds within the allotted time would be of most value. For this reason only one email remainder was sent, on the Friday morning of the week they received their round, adding that they could still respond until the following Monday evening. After this extended deadline no more follow-up contacts were made to non-respondents regarding that particular round in any of the three Delphi rounds. To counterbalance this decision, the researcher attempted to stress the importance and value of each Panel.
member's participation in each communication and also attempted to find alternative ways to accommodate individual panel members’ requests.

After a Panel member agreed to participate in the study, a handwritten thank you card and a small gift (metal bookmarks with inspirational quotes) was sent by mail. A second bookmark was also sent when the Panel members’ summary report was completed. Because there were two different bookmarks the researcher randomly assigned one to each participant.

For each round, the Delphi panel was sent an email in Rich Text or Word format, depending on their word processing preference. Each email contained: (a) a personalized message which thanked them for the participation, (b) instructions as well as response deadlines; (c) operational definitions – if there were any; and (d) the instrument.

Three days prior to emailing each round, participants were sent a short email reminding them of its expected arrival and encouraging completion and timely return.

Ludwig (1994) noted that replicated measures, one of the drawbacks of the Delphi, may negatively influence participants’ interest. Therefore, to combat this, on the same day each panel member’s questionnaire was received, an appreciation email was sent to him or her as a strategy to maintain interest. This was accomplished in nearly every case.

After reception of the last round’s questionnaires, panel member received a final email thanking them for participating and assuring them a summary of the results when this study was concluded. Together with the report, they would
receive their second bookmark as sincere appreciation for their participation in the study.

The researcher used some degree of flexibility throughout data collection in case participants were unable to follow the initial plan. This did not, however, compromise the methodology's guidelines and assumptions. Some examples were to pre-arrange another deadline, to use fax instead of email to send and receive the questionnaires or to send one of the rounds to a different email address.

Data Analysis Procedures

The same descriptive statistics were calculated for each round's instrument (i.e., Round's II and III). Therefore, in each round the median, mode, mean, middle range (25th to 75th percentile) and frequency were calculated for each item and analyzed by the researcher who then decided to just include in the round's feedback the modes and frequencies because they were the statistics that better described the groups distribution and would not overwhelm Panel members. Variability was analyzed using standard deviations.

Items where consensus was not reached by the third round were analyzed with special attention since the Delphi Method has a natural tendency to facilitate opinions' centralization. For those items where consensus was not reached, comments of Panel members in all rounds were reviewed to further help explain their positions.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS: ROUND I

The Round I questionnaire was divided into two parts (see Appendix E). The first part was titled Background Information and contained nine questions (seven addressing demographics – personal and professional - and two addressing the Panel members’ future thinking interests). The second part of the questionnaire was the Delphi Questionnaire – ROUND I which contained seven questions that will be presented later in this section.

Delphi Panel – Background Information

Seventeen purposefully selected experts constituted the Delphi Panel. During Round I, Panel members were asked to fill out a brief background demographic section on the questionnaire, and the next paragraphs summarize the information from that section.

There were 11 males and 6 females in the Delphi Panel. Five Panel members held the equivalent to Assistant Professor positions, 5 held Associate Professor positions and 7 held Full Professor positions. Panel members tended to be associated with schools variably named as Kinesiology, Human Movement, Sport and Leisure, 3 Panel members were associated with Business Schools.
Age varied from 32 to 61 years old, with 5 Panel members being younger than 40, 7 Panel members were between 41 and 50 years old, 4 Panel members having between 51 and 60 years old and 1 Panel member were over 60 years old.

A wide variation existed in years of experience as well (based on the year Panel members stated they earned their doctorate degree). Experience ranged from 2 to 31 years of experience, with 5 Panel members having less than 5 years of experience, 1 having between 6 and 10 years of experience, 5 Panel members having between 11 and 15 years of experience, 1 having between 16 and 20 years of experience, 3 having between 21 and 25 years of experience, 1 Panel member having between 26 and 30 years of experience, and 1 Panel member having more than 30 years of experience.

Institutions that granted Panel members’ doctorate degrees are very diverse. Only two institutions were mentioned more than once: The Ohio State University which granted the doctoral degree to 4 Panel members and the University of Alberta which granted doctoral degrees to 2 of the Panel members.

When asked the period(s) in the future in which they are mainly interested (i.e., next week, next month, next year, 2002, 2003-2007, 2008-2013, and 2014-2024 - Panel members could choose all that apply), 12 Panel members responded 3 to 7 years in the future (2003-2007) while 11 Panel members responded the year 2002. Interestingly more respondents seem to have a higher interest in “next week” (chosen by 6 Panel members), “next month” (chosen by 7 Panel members) and definitely in “next year” (chosen by 8 Panel members) than
in 8 to 13 years (2008-2013 - chosen by 5 Panel members) and in 14 to 24 years

To complement the previous information Panel members were asked the
amount of time they spent thinking about the future (i.e., none, very small
amount, moderate amount, and large amount – Panel members could only select
one answer). Eight Panel members reported spending a moderate amount of
time thinking about the future, six reported spending a large amount, only one
reported spending very small amount and nobody reported spending none.

Delphi Questionnaire – ROUND I

The objective of Round I was to gather qualitative information from the
Delphi Panel. Fifteen panel members participated in Round I. Two panel
members were unreachable during the time the first round took place, however,
committed to participate on the following rounds.

The Round I instrument contained seven open-ended questions relating to
different issues regarding the future of sport management research. Chapter 1
contains an extended rationale for the approach and questions included in this
study. These are summarized here:

1. What are the successes in sport management research that should be
   sustained?

This question was posed first to assess what Panel members’ perceive as the
positive things in sport management research. It is important to know what is
working in the field regarding research so that it can be maintained or potentially built on, i.e., capitalize on strengths.

2. What are the current events and trends impacting research in sport management?
   This question was to assess what Panel members' believe is affecting (both constraining and facilitating) the status and development of research in the field.

3. What qualities and characteristics would you use to describe a best-case scenario for sport management research in five to seven years?

4. What qualities and characteristics would you use to realistically describe sport management research in five to seven years?
   These two questions complement each other allowing articulation of the gap between ideal and real. The question about ideal was asked first as an attempt to keep Panel members' creative minds open so they could reach beyond their self-imposed barriers and boundaries for the field's research.

5. In your opinion, what directions should sport management research take to move it towards the best-case scenario?
   This question intended to draw on Delphi Panel members' intentional choice mechanism by asking them where research in sport management should be heading.

6. In your opinion, what actions and/or strategies will contribute to the movement of sport management research in these directions?
This question’s main purpose was to invite Delphi Panel members to express specific actions and/or strategies that will help research in the field to move towards the general directions.

7. In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research in these directions?

As stated previously, the main purpose of this question is to bring the future into the present, so Delphi Panel members can offer their opinions from a future grounded perspective.

Participants were asked to respond to the questionnaire eliciting their vision for sport management research in the future, and the strategies to be undertaken to achieve that vision. Their answers were then content analyzed. The Content Analysis Panel followed the procedures described in chapter 3. They individually analyzed the document containing the full-length comments of all Delphi participants. This document was organized by question, one to seven, and each question had an average of two full single spaced pages of comments. The specific procedure used to reduce the data during this first round was: Content Panel members individually wrote all their items on individual post-it notes and posted them on a wall. Then, as a group they attempted to create items that closely represented the Delphi Panel’s comments. Content Panel members were aware and attempted to accommodate a decision regarding the ideal total number of items to include in Round II under each question which was 10 to 12. During the process the Content Panel slightly altered that decision because it seemed that some of the questions needed more content while others
needed les. The new rule was to keep the total number of items in Round II to a maximum of 84 (7x12). The content analysis for Round I results was the longest process. Following are the representative items developed by the content panel for each of the seven questions. Questions were reworded based on the Delphi Panel's comments and were followed by the original ones.

Question 1: What are the successes in sport management research that should be sustained?

Successes:

1. Developing sport management theory.
2. Use of theory from parent disciplines.
3. Linking theory to practice.
4. Broadening of sport management research to include both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.
5. Diversifying sport management research settings.
6. Adding sophistication to its research designs.
7. Adding rigor to sport management methods of analysis.
8. Increasing the number of research outlets in the sport management field.
9. Increasing the quality of research outlets in the field.
10. Establishing an infrastructure for the new research field of sport management (i.e., NASSM, JSM).
11. Recognizing sport management as a field of study.
12. Developing overall sport management knowledge.
13. Developing specific sport marketing knowledge.
14. Developing specific sport leadership knowledge.

Question 2: What are the current events and trends impacting research in sport management?

Events/trends:


2. Information technology.

3. Increased diversity of sport consumer audience.

4. Increase in legal issues and regulations.

5. Commercialization of amateur and intercollegiate sports.

6. Increase in opportunities for participation in sport (both spectatorship and participation).

7. Increase in professional sport finance related issues (e.g., stadium Arenas, ticket prices, fiscal responsibility)

8. Demand for sport marketing research.

9. Horizontal and vertical integration of the sport industry with other enterprises.

10. Movement of sport management to business schools.

11. Limited funding resources for sport management research.

Question 3: In your view, IDEALLY what qualities would best describe sport management research five to seven years from now?

The original question was: What qualities and characteristics would you use to describe a best-case scenario for sport management research in five to seven years?
Ideal Qualities:

1. Theory developed/tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (e.g., management, marketing, sociology, psychology, etc).
2. Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines’ theories.
3. Sport management research integrated across disciplines.
4. Unique body of knowledge created in sport management.
5. Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.
6. Adequate research resources.
7. Sport management research applied as a useful management tool and one that identifies best practices.
8. High quality doctoral candidates.
9. Sport management research disseminated to the general public.
10. High quality sport management research published in first tier journals.
11. Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians.

Question 4: In your view, REALISTICALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research five to seven years from now?

The original question was: What qualities and characteristics would you use to realistically describe sport management research in five to seven years?

Realistic Qualities:

1. No significant changes.
2. Research theoretically driven.
3. Research application driven, consumer oriented, and field based.

4. Research focused on current and diverse issues.

5. Scholars recognized and respected.

6. Dedicated, focused research programs.

7. Research rigorous in design, methodology, analysis, and interpretation.

8. Professional associations, research agencies, and universities foster and fund research.


Question 5: In your opinion, what general directions should the sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?

The original question was: In your opinion, what directions should sport management research take to move it towards the best-case scenario?

Directions:

1. Shifting the prevailing paradigm.

2. Becoming more specialized in research focus and diverse in research topics.

3. Recognizing sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.

4. Application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries.

5. Increase research preparation for doctoral students.

6. Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty.

7. Increase interdisciplinary and collaborative research.

8. Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.

9. Increase quality and innovation in research design.

10. Increase standards for research publication.
11. Expand publication outlets.

12. Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration.

Question 6: In your opinion and drawing on question number five, what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions?

Actions and/or strategies:

1. Encourage research specialization.

2. Celebrate research successes.

3. Do collaborative research across disciplines.

4. Present and publish outside sport management field.

5. Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management.

6. Increase publishing outlets.

7. Increase research funding resources.

8. Conduct professional research seminars and workshops.

9. Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.

10. Increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.

11. Facilitate sport management doctoral programs' collaboration across universities.


13. Establish "center(s) of excellence."

14. Promote institutional support for sport management programs.
Question 7: In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards general directions?

Challenges:

1. Engage in interdisciplinary research.
2. Critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (e.g., during conference presentations).
3. Interaction with academic community.
4. Rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals.
5. Quality of doctoral programs.
6. Generalizability of sport management research results.
7. Re-conceptualize breadth and scope of sport management.
8. Faculty time and resources for research.

In summary, the overall purpose of the content analysis was to reduce the raw data (Delphi Panel’s comments) to a manageable number of representative items in order to integrate those in the second Delphi questionnaire so that Panel members could further refine their responses through the use of Likert-type scales (which will be introduced in the next section). Thus, these 81 items became the Round II Delphi instrument (see Appendix F).
RESULTS: ROUND II

All Delphi panel members (seventeen) participated in Round II. This instrument contained a total of 81 items (Question 1 - 14 items, Question 2 - 11 items, Question 3 - 11 items, Question 4 - 9 items, Question 5 - 12 items, Question 6 - 14 items and, finally Question 7 - 10 items) that are listed at the end of the previous section. Please refer to Appendix F for Round II instrument.

In this second round the Delphi Panel members were asked to refine their responses to the seven questions using the scales presented below:


Probability scale (1 to 10): “1”- 0-10%, “2”- 11-20%, “3”- 21-30%, “4”- 31-40%, “5”- 41-50%, “6”- 51-60%, “7”- 61-70%, “8”- 71-80%, “9”- 81-90%, “10”- 91-100%.

As noted in chapter 1 the first three scales are 7-point scales and similar descriptors were used to characterize each value for consistency and ease of use for participants. Only the probability scale is a 10-point scale because it is easier to associate percentages to a decimal than in a hepta-base system. Below are the three 7-point scales used in this study as well as a clarification regarding how the mean value was interpreted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Success scale</th>
<th>Importance scale</th>
<th>Impact scale</th>
<th>For Means' Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not a success</td>
<td>No importance</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>&lt;1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Slight success</td>
<td>Slight importance</td>
<td>Slight impact</td>
<td>[1.5 – 2.49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited success</td>
<td>Limited importance</td>
<td>Limited impact</td>
<td>[2.5 – 3.49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate success</td>
<td>Moderate importance</td>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>[3.5 – 4.49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderately high success</td>
<td>Moderately high importance</td>
<td>Moderately high impact</td>
<td>[4.5 – 5.49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>High success</td>
<td>High importance</td>
<td>High impact</td>
<td>[5.5 – 6.49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Critical success</td>
<td>Critical importance</td>
<td>Critical impact</td>
<td>&gt; 6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1

Seven-point scales and descriptors used in this study.

Furthermore, Delphi Panel members were asked to continue to draw on their understanding and perspectives on the future directions for sport management research, and were encouraged to add any insights they might have regarding each of the specific items or questions in general (i.e., state disagreement, state agreement, make clarifications, ask questions, etc). Space for their comments was not a problem since the vast majority (15) of the panel members responded by email (Word attachment). For the 2 panel members that preferred to use fax, extra space was allocated under each item for comments as well as after each section. The remaining of this chapter is divided in 2 sections: Analysis of Round II and Results of Content Analysis.
Analysis of Round II

This section is organized by question and scale. It contains a brief description of Round II's results, items that attained consensus as well as representative comments by the Delphi Panel and means and standard deviations for each of the consensus items.

As mentioned in chapter 3, it was considered that the Delphi Panel reached consensus on an item if 80% of the ratings (14 votes) fell within two categories on a 7-point scale (i.e., importance, success and, impact scales) or within three categories on a 10-point scale (i.e., probability scale).

Based on the decision rule adopted, consensus was reached on 14 items on the importance scale at the conclusion of Round II. Further, this section also includes summary tables for each question and scale and Table 4.15, at the end of Round II section summarizes the consensus items.

Q 1: Successes in sport management research that should be sustained.

Success Scale

From the 14 successes suggested in Round I, Delphi Panel members did not identify any as critical or high successes in sport management research (see Table 4.2). However they identified 2 as being moderately high (4.5 – 5.49). The Delphi Panel perceived that the field has done moderately well on establishing infrastructures for the new research field (#10) as well as recognizing sport management as a field of study (#11). Finally, Panel members identified developing sport management theory (#1) only as a slight success.
### Question 1: What are the successes in sport management that should be sustained?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Success</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Developing sport management theory.</td>
<td>2 3 7 3 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Use of theory from parent disciplines.</td>
<td>2 2 7 4 2</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Linking theory to practice.</td>
<td>6 3 6 2</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Broadening of sport management research include both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.</td>
<td>2 5 6 1 3</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Diversifying sport management research settings.</td>
<td>1 3 5 2 1</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Adding sophistication to its research designs.</td>
<td>1 3 5 6 1 1</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Adding rigor to sport management methods of analysis.</td>
<td>2 6 4 4 1</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Increasing the number of research outlets in the sport management field.</td>
<td>1 1 2 5 3 3 2</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Increasing the quality of research outlets in the field.</td>
<td>1 1 5 3 5 2</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Establishing an infrastructure for the new research field of sport management (i.e., NASSM, JSM).</td>
<td>2 3 3 8 1</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Recognizing sport management as a field of study.</td>
<td>1 1 1 5 4 5</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Developing overall sport management knowledge.</td>
<td>1 1 1 10 2 1 1</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- Developing specific sport marketing knowledge.</td>
<td>2 1 6 5 2 1</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Developing specific sport leadership knowledge.</td>
<td>5 3 4 3 2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = Not a Success; 2 = Slight Success; 3 = Limited Success; 4 = Moderate Success; 5 = Moderate High Success; 6 = High Success; 7 = Critical Success; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17

Table 4.2

**Delphi Panel’s perceptions of successes in sport management research (R II)**
Importance Scale

Panel member perceived a high importance for sustaining 12 of the 14 successes in the future (see Table 4.3). Use of theory from parent disciplines (#2), developing sport management theory (#1) and developing overall sport management knowledge (#12) were the highest in the list.

Items that Reached Consensus

During Round II, 1 item reached consensus in question 1.

Use of theory from parent disciplines. (2)

The Delphi Panel agreed that the level of importance for this item to be sustained or become a success in the future of sport management research was between high (6) and critical (7). The specific mean value was 6.41 with a standard deviation of .62. Round II comments indicate that “there is no theory that is sport management per se.” Therefore, “until sport specific models/theories are developed, the use of theory from parent disciplines … is extremely important/critical.” Several panel members noted the importance to “borrow” from parent disciplines/fields until we have “firmly established theories.”

Q 2: Current events/trends impacting sport management research.

Nine events/trends were perceived by the Delphi Panel members as moderately impacting sport management research while the other two (#s 6 and 10) were perceived as having moderate impact (see Table 4.4). The event/trend having the highest impact was limited funding resources for sport management
### Question 1: What are the successes in sport management that should be sustained?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Developing sport management theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Use of theory from parent disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Linking theory to practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Broadening of sport management research include both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Diversifying sport management research settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Adding sophistication to its research designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Adding rigor to sport management methods of analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Increasing the number of research outlets in the sport management field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Increasing the quality of research outlets in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Establishing an infrastructure for the new research field of sport management (i.e., NASSM, JSM).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Recognizing sport management as a field of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Developing overall sport management knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- Developing specific sport marketing knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Developing specific sport leadership knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = No Importance; 2 = Slight Importance; 3 = Limited Importance; 4 = Moderate Importance; 5 = Moderately High Importance; 6 = High Importance; 7 = Critical Importance; and MD = Missing Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Round II: N = 17  
C Consensus achieved

**Table 4.3**  
Delphi Panel's perceptions of importance of sustaining the successes, (R II)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Globalization.</td>
<td>2 2 2 4 3 4</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Information technology.</td>
<td>2 1 1 3 5 5</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Increased diversity of sport consumer audience.</td>
<td>4 2 4 5 2</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Increase in legal issues and regulations.</td>
<td>1 2 4 4 3 3</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Commercialization of amateur and intercollegiate sports.</td>
<td>1 2 3 3 6 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Increase in opportunities for participation in sport</td>
<td>3 2 4 2 4 1 1</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(both spectatorship and participation).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Increase in professional sport finance related issues (e.g.,</td>
<td>3 5 3 5 1</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stadium/arenas, ticket prices, fiscal responsibility).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Demand for sport marketing research.</td>
<td>2 1 1 4 5 4</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Horizontal and vertical integration of the sport industry with</td>
<td>1 1 1 6 6 1</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other enterprises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Movement of sport management to business schools.</td>
<td>1 2 5 1 4 2 2</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Limited funding resources for sport management research.</td>
<td>2 1 6 2 6</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No Impact; 2 = Slight Impact; 3 = Limited Impact; 4 = Moderate Impact; 5 = Moderately High Impact; 6 = High Impact; 7 = Critical Impact; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17

Table 4.4

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the impact of current events and trends on sport management research. (R II)
research (#11), followed by information technology (#2) and demand for marketing research (#8).

During Round II no items reached consensus in question 2.

Q 3: Qualities that would ideally best describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now.

**Importance Scale**

Delphi Panel members believed that it was of critical importance that high quality doctoral candidates (#8) become an ideal quality of sport management research (see Table 4.5). In addition, the Panel rated nine other qualities as highly important. Therefore, the second most wanted quality in an ideal future was that sport managers be professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians (#11) and the third was that the field's research was characterized by highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data (#5).

**Probability Scale**

Delphi Panel members believed that there was more than a 50% chance that the ideal qualities of sport management research grounded in parent disciplines (#2) and high quality doctoral candidates (#8) would occur in the next 5 to 7 years (see Table 4.6). The ideal quality that they indicated as having the lowest probability of characterizing the field's research was sport management research disseminated to the general public (#9).
Question 3: In your view, IDEALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research in 5 to 7 years from now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Theory developed/tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (e.g., management, marketing, sociology, psychology, etc.)</td>
<td>2 4 5 6</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines' theories.</td>
<td>C1 1 8 7</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sport management research integrated across disciplines.</td>
<td>2 2 5 7</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unique body of knowledge created in sport management.</td>
<td>3 4 6 3 1</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.</td>
<td>C 2 6 9</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adequate research resources.</td>
<td>1 1 2 4 9</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sport management research applied as a useful management tool and one that identifies best practices.</td>
<td>1 4 6 4 1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. High quality doctoral candidates.</td>
<td>C 3 14</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sport management research disseminated to the general public.</td>
<td>1 4 1 3 4 4</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. High quality sport management research published in first tier journals.</td>
<td>1 2 6 6 2</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians.</td>
<td>C 1 1 7 8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No Importance; 2 = Slight Importance; 3 = Limited Importance; 4 = Moderate Importance; 5 = Moderately High Importance; 6 = High Importance; 7 = Critical Importance; and MD = Missing Data

C Consensus achieved
Round II: N = 17

Table 4.5
Delphi Panel's perceptions of the level of importance of ideal qualities. (R II)
**Question 3:** In your view, IDEALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research in 5 to 7 years from now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Theory developed/tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (e.g., management, marketing, sociology, psychology, etc.)</td>
<td>1 5 4 1 4 1 1</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines' theories.</td>
<td>1 1 4 4 2 2 3</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Sport management research integrated across disciplines.</td>
<td>1 1 2 4 4 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Unique body of knowledge created in sport management.</td>
<td>1 1 4 2 2 1 3 2 1</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.</td>
<td>2 1 3 4 5 2</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Adequate research resources.</td>
<td>1 4 3 4 2 2 1</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Sport management research applied as a useful management tool and one that identifies best practices.</td>
<td>1 3 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 1</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - High quality doctoral candidates.</td>
<td>1 1 2 2 4 2 4 1</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Sport management research disseminated to the general public.</td>
<td>3 3 3 3 1 1 3</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 (continued)

*Delphi Panel's perceptions of the probability level of ideal qualities. (R II)*
Table 4.6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 - High quality sport management research published in first tier journals.</td>
<td>4 1 2 5 1 2 2</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians.</td>
<td>1 1 4 1 1 5 2 2</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = 0 -10%; 2 = 11 - 20%; 3 = 21 - 30%; 4 = 31 - 40%; 5 = 41 - 50%; 6 = 51 - 60%; 7 = 61 - 70%; 8 = 71 - 80%; 9 = 81 - 90%; 10 = 91 - 100%; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17
Items that Reached Consensus

During Round II, 4 items reached consensus in question 3.

**Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines' theories.** (2)
The Delphi Panel agreed on the importance of grounding research in parent
disciplines importance as an ideal quality for sport management research. The
ratings were between high (6) and critical (7). The mean value was 6.24 with a
standard deviation of .83. As one panel member indicated, there was a need to
"be informed by the best other disciplines have to offer" and as another panel
member added, researchers "need to continue to refine this."

**Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.** (5)
The Delphi Panel agreed on the importance of this item for an ideal quality for
sport management research. They rated the item between high (6) and critical
(7). The mean value was 6.29 with a standard deviation of .98. The comments
indicated that the main concern of experts was that researchers "must continue
to get better" and that the field needs to "ensure that young academics have the
rigor will demand the same of their work and of their Ph. D. students."

**High quality doctoral students.** (8)
The Delphi Panel agreed on the importance of high quality of doctoral students
for sport management research. The mean value was 6.82 with a standard
deviation of .39. Basically, comments related to a "need for high quality
programs, ...that have a critical mass of active researchers producing sport
management Ph. D.'s." One panel member stressed that the quality of the Ph. D.
candidates was a "function of the candidate and the environment in which they are being trained, and by whom." Also, another comment referred to the fact that "some doctoral programs are not developing individuals with the necessary tools to become good researchers."

**Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians within the academe.** (12)

The Delphi Panel rated the importance of this item an ideal quality for sport management research between high (6) and critical (7). The mean value was 6.29 with a standard deviation of .85. The comments indicate that essentially researchers in sport management need to produce high quality research "prior to this (researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians within the academe) happening."

Q 4: Qualities that would realistically describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now.

**Importance Scale**

Delphi Panel members believed that it was of critical importance that dedicated, focused programs (#6) and research rigorous in design, methodology, analysis, and interpretation (#7) realistically characterize the future of the field's research in the next five to seven years (see Table 4.7). Also Delphi Panel members rated as highly important that: (a) scholars are recognized and respected (#5); (b) that professional associations, research agencies and universities foster research in the field (#8); (c) that research is published
**Question 4:** In your view, REALISTICALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research in 5 to 7 years from now? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- No significant changes.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 1 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.27 1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Research theoretically driven.</td>
<td>1 1 1 7 6 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Research application drive, consumer oriented, and field based.</td>
<td>1 2 2 6 2 3 1</td>
<td>4.94 1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Research focused on current issues and diverse issues.</td>
<td>2 5 7 1</td>
<td>5.56 0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Scholars recognized and respected.</td>
<td>C 2 6 8</td>
<td>6.38 0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Dedicated, focused research programs.</td>
<td>C 1 6 9 1</td>
<td>6.5 0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Research rigorous in design, methodology, analysis, and interpretation.</td>
<td>C 1 5 10 1</td>
<td>6.5 0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Professional associations, research agencies, and universities foster and fund research.</td>
<td>1 1 8 5 2</td>
<td>5.93 1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Research published in first tier journals.</td>
<td>1 1 3 6 4 2</td>
<td>5.73 1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No Importance; 2 = Slight Importance; 3 = Limited Importance; 4 = Moderate Importance; 5 = Moderately High Importance; 6 = High Importance; 7 = Critical Importance; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17
C Consensus achieved

Table 4.7

**Delphi Panel's perceptions of the importance of realistic qualities. (R II)**
universities foster research in the field (#8); (c) that research is published in first tier journals (#9) and (d) that research focuses on current and diverse issues (#4).

**Probability Scale**

Delphi Panel members believed that there was approximately 60% chance that the realistic quality research focuses on current and diverse issues (#4) would occur in the next five to seven years (see Table 4.8). Also, they noted over a 55% chance that research would be application driven, consumer oriented, and field based (#3) in five to seven years. The two realistic qualities that Panel Members rated as having less chance (less than 40%) of occurrence were professional associations, research agencies and universities fostering research (#8) and research being published in first tier journals (#9).

**Items that Reached Consensus**

During Round II, 3 items reached consensus in question 4.

*Sport management scholars recognized and respected by scholars in other fields. (6)*

The Delphi Panel agreed that the level of importance for this to be a realistic quality for sport management research was between high (6) and critical (7). The mean value was 6.38 with a standard deviation of .72. One panel member reported that “some scholars are already recognized and respected” while other panel members believe that there is a “need to continue to work towards this end.”
Question 4: In your view, REALISTICALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research in 5 to 7 years from now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - No significant changes.</td>
<td>1 2 2 1 1 2 3 2</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Research theoretically driven.</td>
<td>1 2 4 2 4 2 1 1</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Research application drive, consumer oriented, and field based.</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 2 1 3 4</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Research focused on current issues and diverse issues.</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 5 2 3</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Scholars recognized and respected.</td>
<td>2 3 3 2 3 1 3</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Dedicated, focused research programs.</td>
<td>2 2 1 3 3 2 2 1 1</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Research rigorous in design, methodology, analysis, and interpretation.</td>
<td>4 2 1 4 4 2</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Professional associations, research agencies, and universities foster and fund research.</td>
<td>4 2 3 4 1 2 2</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Research published in first tier journals.</td>
<td>1 3 3 3 1 2 3</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = 0 - 10%; 2 = 11 - 20%; 3 = 21 - 30%; 4 = 31 - 40%; 5 = 41 - 50%; 6 = 51 - 60%; 7 = 61 - 70%; 8 = 71 - 80%; 9 = 81 - 90%; 10 = 91 - 100%; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17

Table 4.8

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the probability of realistic qualities. (R II)
Focused, sustained research programs. (7)

The Delphi Panel rated the importance of this item for sport management research between high (6) and critical (7). The mean value was 6.5 with a standard deviation of .63.

There were no comments regarding the importance of the item.

Research rigorous in design, methodology, and interpretation. (8)

The Delphi Panel agreed that the level of importance was between high (6) and critical (7). The specific mean value was 6.5 with a standard deviation of .82.

A comment by a panel member indicated that the field is still "heavily scripted in the descriptive method."

Q 5: General directions sport management field should emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future.

Importance Scale

As shown in Table 4.9, Delphi Panel members believed that it was highly important that overall the field emphasizes increased research preparation for doctoral students (#5), that it increased interdisciplinary and collaborative research (#7) as well as recognized sport as a context for theory testing and theory building (#3). The lowest rated direction (only moderately important) was expanding publication outlets (#11).

Probability Scale

On the other hand, the general direction that Delphi Panel members identified as the most probable for the field to emphasize was expanding
Question 5: In your opinion, what general directions should sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Shifting the prevailing paradigm</td>
<td>1 1 2 4 1 2 5</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Become more specialized in research focus and diverse in research topics.</td>
<td>2 3 8 2 2</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Recognize sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.</td>
<td>C 1 1 8 7</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries.</td>
<td>1 2 1 7 2 4</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Increase research preparation for doctoral students.</td>
<td>C 2 4 10</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty.</td>
<td>1 1 2 6 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Increase interdisciplinary and collaborative research.</td>
<td>1 3 4 9</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.</td>
<td>C 1 2 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Increase quality and innovation in research design.</td>
<td>2 1 7 6 1</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Increase standards for research publication.</td>
<td>3 1 7 6</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Expand publication outlets.</td>
<td>3 1 3 4 3 3</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration.</td>
<td>1 1 3 5 7</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No Importance; 2 = Slight Importance; 3 = Limited Importance; 4 = Moderate Importance; 5 = Moderately High Importance; 6 = High Importance; 7 = Critical Importance; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17
C Consensus achieved

Table 4.9

Delphi Panel’s perceptions of the importance of directions. (R II)
publication outlets (#11) with approximately 60% chance (see Table 4.10).

Meanwhile, a general direction with one of the lowest probability to be emphasized by the field (less than 40%) was application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries (#4).

**Items that Reached Consensus**

During Round II, 3 items reached consensus in question 5.

1. **Recognize sport as a context for theory testing and theory building. (3)**
   Consensus of the Delphi Panel was that this direction was highly important (6) or critically important (7) to the future of sport management research. The specific mean value was 6.24 with a standard deviation of .83. One Panel member emphasized the fact that “unless we have a change in the US, we will continue to do ‘applied’ research at the expense of theory work.” Another Panel member questioned: “if we don’t [recognize sport as a context for theory testing and theory building], then how could we claim to have a field of study?”

2. **Increased research preparation for doctoral students. (5)**
   Consensus of the Delphi Panel was that this direction was highly important (6) and critical (7) for the future of sport management research. The mean value was 6.38 with a standard deviation of 1.03. Comments reflect some of the experts’ concerns regarding this general direction. They noted that doctoral students research preparation “depends on the school and the country” and further specify that while in “some schools there is good research preparation” in “other schools … there is atrocious research preparation.” Another concern refers to the fact that “too many smaller programs pop up to meet demand but lack quality.”
Question 5: In your opinion, what general directions should sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Shifting the prevailing paradigm</td>
<td>1 5 2 1 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Become more specialized in research focus and diverse in research topics.</td>
<td>1 1 3 4 3 3 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Recognize sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.</td>
<td>3 1 4 3 1 3 1 1 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries.</td>
<td>3 1 4 3 1 4 4 1</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Increase research preparation for doctoral students.</td>
<td>1 1 3 3 4 3 1 1 1</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty.</td>
<td>1 4 1 4 4 2 1</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Increase interdisciplinary and collaborative research.</td>
<td>3 2 5 1 2 3 1</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.</td>
<td>5 3 3 2 4</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Increase quality and innovation in research design.</td>
<td>5 3 2 2 4 1</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Increase standards for research publication.</td>
<td>1 2 1 5 3 1 5 1 1</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 (continued)
Delphi Panel's perceptions of the *probability* level of the field emphasizing directions. (R II)

Table 4.10 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5: In your opinion, what general directions should sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?</th>
<th>Probability level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Expand publication outlets.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = 0 -10%; 2 = 11 - 20%; 3 = 21 - 30%; 4 = 31 - 40%; 5 = 41 - 50%; 6 = 51 - 60%; 7 = 61 - 70%; 8 = 71 - 80%; 9 = 81 - 90%; 10 = 91 - 100%; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17
Increased industry links and funding opportunities for research. (8)

Consensus of the Delphi Panel was that this direction had high importance (6) for the future of sport management research. The mean value was 6 with a standard deviation of 1.22. One of the panel members noted that this direction is “very important and heightens credibility within the academy/institutions of higher learning.”

Q 6: Specific actions and/or strategies that will move sport management research towards an ideal future.

Importance Scale

Delphi Panel members believed that it was critical that doctoral candidates’ knowledge or theories in parent disciplines increased (#10) and that research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs also increased (#9) in order for the field to move its research towards an ideal future (see Table 4.11). Also important were researchers doing collaborative research across disciplines (#3), research being presented and published inside and outside the field (#4). On the other hand Delphi Panel members indicated that to determine the viability of using curriculum accreditation (#12) is only moderately important.

Probability Scale

Delphi Panel members indicated that conducting professional research seminars and workshops (#8) had approximately a 60% chance to occur (see Table 4.12). Other strategies and or actions that have more than 55% chances of occurrence were: increasing publication outlets (#6) and increasing doctoral
**Question 6:** In your opinion and drawing on question # 5, what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Encourage research specialization.</td>
<td>2 5 7 3</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Celebrate research successes.</td>
<td>1 1 1 3 2 3 4 2</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Do collaborative research across disciplines.</td>
<td>4 6 7</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Present and publish outside sport management field.</td>
<td>1 5 4 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management.</td>
<td>3 2 5 7</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Increase publishing outlets.</td>
<td>3 1 3 6 2 2</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Increase research funding resources.</td>
<td>1 1 3 3 8</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Conduct professional research seminars and workshops.</td>
<td>1 1 3 5 6</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.</td>
<td>C 1 6 9 1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Increase doctoral candidates’ knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.</td>
<td>C 1 4 12</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Facilitate sport management doctoral programs’ collaboration across universities.</td>
<td>1 3 2 3 2 6</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Determine viability of using curriculum accreditation standards.</td>
<td>4 3 2 3 2 3</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- Establish &quot;center(s) of excellence.&quot;</td>
<td>2 6 4 1 4</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Promote institutional support for sport management programs.</td>
<td>6 5 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No importance; 2 = Slight importance; 3 = Limited importance; 4 = Moderate importance; 5 = Moderately High importance; 6 = High importance; 7 = Critical importance; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17
Consensus achieved

Table 4.11

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the importance of actions/strategies (R II)
Question 6: In your opinion and drawing on question # 5, what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions? Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 MD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Encourage research specialization.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 2 4 3 3 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Celebrate research successes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 1 1 3 4 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Do collaborative research across disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 1 3 4 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Present and publish outside sport management field.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4 1 5 1 2 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 4 2 1 1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Increase publishing outlets.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 2 2 1 6 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Increase research funding resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 4 3 3 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Conduct professional research seminars and workshops.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 2 3 2 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 2 2 1 6 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 3 2 1 3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Facilitate sport management doctoral programs' collaboration across universities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4 2 5 3 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the probability of occurrence of actions and/or strategies. (R II)
Table 4.12 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 - Determine viability of using curriculum accreditation standards.</td>
<td>1 5 1 4 2 2 2</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - Establish &quot;center(s) of excellence.&quot;</td>
<td>2 2 2 5 1 2 1 2</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - Promote institutional support for sport management programs.</td>
<td>1 1 2 4 3 1 3 1 1</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = 0 - 10%; 2 = 11 - 20%; 3 = 21 - 30%; 4 = 31 - 40%; 5 = 41 - 50%; 6 = 51 - 60%; 7 = 61 - 70%; 8 = 71 - 80%; 9 = 81 - 90%; 10 = 91 - 100%; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17
candidates’ knowledge of theories in parent disciplines (#10). The Panel perceived the increase of research funding resources (#7) as the action/strategy with the lowest chance to occur (less than 40%).

Items that Reached Consensus

During Round II, 2 items reached consensus in question 6.

**Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.** (9)

Consensus of the Delphi Panel was that this action/strategy was highly important (6) or critical (7) to the future of sport management research. The mean value was 6.5 with a standard deviation of .63. A panel member noted the need for “critical mass of active faculty” in order to increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.

**Increase doctoral candidates’ knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.**

(10) Consensus of the Delphi Panel was that this action/strategy was high (6) or critically important (7) to the future of sport management research. The mean value was 6.65 with a standard deviation of .61. This item shares the comment with the previous item: need for “critical mass of active faculty” in order to increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.

Q 7: **Challenges that can be managed now to move sport management research towards general ideal directions.**

**Importance Scale**

Delphi Panel members perceived that the quality of doctoral students (#5) was the most critical challenge to be managed now in order to move the field’s
research towards an ideal future (see Table 4.13). Other highly important challenges that needed to be managed were: (a) rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals (#4), (b) interaction with academic community (#3), and (c) critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (#2).

Probability Scale

The Delphi Panel noted that the challenges with more chances of being managed now in order to move the field’s research towards an ideal future were (a) interaction with academic community (#3), (b) quality of doctoral programs (#5), and (c) critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (#2), with more than 55% chances of occurrence (see Table 4.14). On the other hand the ones with the least chance of being managed were re-conceptualizing breath and scope of sport management (#7) and generalizability of research in the field (#6).

Items that Reached Consensus

During Round II, one item reached consensus in question 7. Quality of doctoral programs. (6)

The Delphi Panel agreed that it was almost of critical importance that this challenge be managed now in order to move sport management research towards an ideal future. The mean value was 6.71 with a standard deviation of .59. Comments revealed a concern with “creation of weaker programs to meet demand.” Also a panel member noted that it "takes substantial time to change doctoral programs."
Table 4.13

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the importance of challenges to be managed now. (R II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Engage in interdisciplinary research.</td>
<td>1 1 4 2 8</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (e.g., during conference presentations).</td>
<td>1 1 3 2 10</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Interaction with academic community.</td>
<td>3 4 9 1</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals.</td>
<td>2 5 10</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Quality of doctoral programs.</td>
<td>C 1 3 13</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Generalizability of sport management research results.</td>
<td>2 5 4 5 1</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Re-conceptualize breath and scope of sport management.</td>
<td>1 5 3 1 6 1</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Faculty time and resources for research.</td>
<td>2 4 3 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Formal recognition of scholarship.</td>
<td>1 1 1 4 4 6</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Change.</td>
<td>1 5 2 6</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No Importance; 2 = Slight Importance; 3 = Limited Importance; 4 = Moderate Importance; 5 = Moderately High Importance; 6 = High Importance; 7 = Critical Importance; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17
Consensus achieved
### Question 7: In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards the general directions mentioned in Q #5?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Engage in interdisciplinary research.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (e.g., during conference presentations).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Interaction with academic community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Quality of doctoral programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Generalizability of sport management research results.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Re-conceptualize breath and scope of sport management.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Faculty time and resources for research.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Formal recognition of scholarship.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Change.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = 0 - 10%; 2 = 11 - 20%; 3 = 21 - 30%; 4 = 31 - 40%; 5 = 41 - 50%; 6 = 51 - 60%; 7 = 61 - 70%; 8 = 71 - 80%; 9 = 81 - 90%; 10 = 91 - 100%; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17

#### Table 4.14

*Delphi Panel's perceptions of the probability of the field to manage the challenges in 5 to 7 years. (R II)*
Results of Content Analysis

After receiving all questionnaires, the researcher compiled all the comments by the Delphi Panel members into one document and submitted it to the Content Analysis Panel. Appendix I contains the comments, for each question and item, that the Content Analysis Panel considered significant to be included as feedback in Round III’s questionnaire. Further, the result of the content analysis indicated that: (a) there were items to be dropped (2 items); (b) new suggested items to be added (3 new items); (c) items that need to be split into two new items (6 items into 12); and finally (d) there were items that need to be reworded (15 items). Table 4.16 illustrates these changes.

The result was a Round III questionnaire composed of 88 items. Please refer also to Appendix G for Round III of the Delphi questionnaire which integrates all these changes as well as the feedback, both statistical and the summary of the Delphi Panel members’ comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1 (Successes):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Use of theory from parent disciplines.</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 (Ideal Qualities):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines' theories.</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - High quality doctoral candidates.</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians within the academe.</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4 (Realistic Qualities):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Sport management scholars recognized and respected by scholars in other fields.</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Focused, sustained research programs.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Research rigorous in design, methodology, and interpretation.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5 (General Directions):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Recognize sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Increase research preparation for doctoral students.</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15 (continued)

Level of importance of all items that reached consensus in Round II.

137
Table 4.15 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 6 (Actions/Strategies):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7 (Challenges)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Quality of doctoral programs.</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No Importance; 2 = Slight Importance; 3 = Limited Importance; 4 = Moderate Importance; 5 = Moderately High Importance; 6 = High Importance; 7 = Critical Importance.

Note: Round II: N = 17

Note 2: Consensus on an item was reached when 80% of the Panel Members' ratings (14) fell within two categories on a 7-point scale (i.e., importance, success, and impacts scales) or within three categories on a 10-point scale (i.e., probability scale)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Question 4</th>
<th>Question 5</th>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Question 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R II</td>
<td>R II</td>
<td>R II</td>
<td>R II</td>
<td>R II</td>
<td>R II</td>
<td>R II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R III</td>
<td>R III</td>
<td>R III</td>
<td>R III</td>
<td>R III</td>
<td>R III</td>
<td>R III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 R</td>
<td>1 R</td>
<td>1 R Drop</td>
<td>1 Drop</td>
<td>1 R</td>
<td>1 R</td>
<td>1 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 R</td>
<td>2 R</td>
<td>2 R</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>2 Spl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 R Rw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 R</td>
<td>3 R Rw</td>
<td>3 R</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 R</td>
<td>3 R Rw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 R</td>
<td>4 R</td>
<td>4 R</td>
<td>3 N</td>
<td>3 R</td>
<td>4 R</td>
<td>4 Spl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 R</td>
<td>5 R</td>
<td>5 R</td>
<td>4 Spl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 R</td>
<td>5 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 R Rw</td>
<td>6 R</td>
<td>6 R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 R</td>
<td>6 R</td>
<td>5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 R Rw</td>
<td>7 R</td>
<td>7 R</td>
<td>5 6 Rw</td>
<td>6 R</td>
<td>7 R</td>
<td>6 7 Rw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 R</td>
<td>8 R</td>
<td>8 R</td>
<td>6 7 Rw</td>
<td>7 R</td>
<td>8 R</td>
<td>7 8 Rw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 R</td>
<td>9 R</td>
<td>9 R</td>
<td>7 8</td>
<td>8 R</td>
<td>9 R</td>
<td>8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 R</td>
<td>10 R</td>
<td>10 Spl</td>
<td>10 8 Spl</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 R Rw</td>
<td>10 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 R Rw</td>
<td>11 R</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 Rw</td>
<td>11 R</td>
<td>10 11 Rw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 R</td>
<td>11 12 Rw</td>
<td>9 Spl</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11 R</td>
<td>12 R</td>
<td>14 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 R Rw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drop: Item dropped after Round II based on suggestions from the Delphi Panel.
R: Item retained.
Spl: Item was split into two items for Round III based on suggestions from the Delphi Panel to Round II.
Rw: Item was reworded for Round III based on suggestions from the Delphi Panel.

Table 4.16

Changes in items from Round II to Round III
RESULTS: ROUND III

Fifteen Panel members participated in Round III. Two Panel members were unable to participate either because of professional or personal reasons. However, since they participated in both previous rounds they could still be considered part of the panel of experts. The instrument for Round III contained a total of 88 items (Question 1 - 16 items, Question 2 - 11 items, Question 3 - 12 items, Question 4 - 12 items, Question 5 - 12 items, Question 6 - 14 items and, finally Question 7 - 11 items). Please refer to Appendix G for Round III instrument. Several changes were made based on comments from the Delphi Panel in Round II. Please refer to Table 4.16 in the previous section which illustrates all changes in items from Round II to Round III. Most of the original items were retained. Two items were dropped mainly because the Delphi Panel reported the items were not clear, too broad and/or created confusion. Three new items were added. A total of fifteen items were reworded for clarification purposes. And finally six items were split into two items each because the original statement referred to two different aspects, ideas or concepts.

Delphi Panel members were requested to review all the items in the questionnaire. For each item they were asked to review 3 forms of feedback before reconsidering their original ratings. One was to read the group's comments from Round II to that item, a second type of feedback was the frequency tables with the mode highlighted and, finally, Delphi Panel members
were also asked to note their individual rating of that item, from the previous round (see Round III questionnaire in Appendix G)

Also, Panel members were asked to clarify their position if their final rating varied more than two points (for the 7-point scales) or three points (for the 10-point scale) from the mode. Additional space was provided under each item as well as at the end of each section for the experts to note their comments if any. Again for the 13 panel members using email attachments space was never a problem. For the 2 panel members that preferred to use fax, extra space was allocated under each item for comments as well as at the end of each section.

The remainder of this chapter will be divided in two sections: Analysis of Round III and Results of Content Analysis.

Analysis of Round III

This section is organized by question and scale and contains (a) a brief description of Round III's results, (b) items that attained consensus, (c) items that reached 76.5% level of agreement, and (d) items that reached 70.5% level of agreement by the Delphi Panel.

Following Ludwig's (1994) practice, the researcher favored a conservative approach regarding consensus measurement. For the purpose of this study, consensus was calculated against the original number of researchers (n=17) constituting the Delphi Panel without reference to number of participants in the next two rounds. Also, consensus was deemed to have been reached if 80% of the Delphi Panel's (14 members) ratings fell within two categories on a
7-point scale (i.e., importance, success and, impact scales) or within three categories on a 10-point scale (i.e., probability scale).

Since only 15 Panel Members participated in Round III for reasons unrelated to this study, it is relevant to report the items where ratings of 13 and 12 Panel Members fell within two categories on a 7-point scale (i.e., importance, success and, impact scales) or within three categories on a 10-point scale (i.e., probability scale). Thirteen members represent 86.6% and twelve members represent 80% of Round III's participating Delphi Panel. Table 4.30 in the end of the Round III section includes means and standard deviations for items attaining consensus, 76.5 and 70.6% levels of agreement by this third round.

**Q 1: Successes in sport management research that should be sustained.**

**Success Scale**

From the 16 successes suggested in Round I, Delphi Panel members failed to identify any critical successes in sport management research (see Table 4.17). Establishing infrastructures for the new research field (#10) went from being perceived as being a moderately high success in Round II to being a high success in Round III. Otherwise ratings followed the patterns as in Round II. The two new items: developing knowledge about sport liability (#15) and developing knowledge about sport ethics (#16) were rated as moderately successful in sport management research. Similar to Round II, developing sport management theory (#1) was perceived to be the least successful in sport management research, (i.e., it was considered a slight success).
**Question 1:** What are the successes in sport management that should be sustained?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Success</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Developing sport management theory.</td>
<td>1 3 7 2 2</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Use of theory from parent disciplines.</td>
<td>1 1 8 4 1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Linking theory to practice.</td>
<td>4 5 5 1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Broadening of sport management research include both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.</td>
<td>2 0 3 6 1 3</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Diversifying sport management research settings.</td>
<td>1 3 4 5 1 1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Increasing quality of sport management research designs. (Rw)</td>
<td>2 5 7 1</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Increasing quality of sport management methods of analysis. (Rw)</td>
<td>1 6 4 4</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Increasing the number of research outlets in the sport management field.</td>
<td>1 2 7 3 2</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Increasing the quality of research outlets in the field.</td>
<td>1 5 5 4</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Establishing an infrastructure for the new research field of sport management (i.e., NASSM, JSM).</td>
<td>1 1 2 11</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Recognizing sport management as a field of study in academe. (Rw)</td>
<td>2 7 3 3</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Developing overall sport management knowledge.</td>
<td>2 9 3 1</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- Developing specific sport marketing knowledge.</td>
<td>1 2 6 5 1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Developing knowledge about leadership in sport. (Rw)</td>
<td>6 2 4 2 1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- Developing knowledge about sport liability. (NI)</td>
<td>1 2 5 5 1</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- Developing knowledge about sport ethics. (NI)</td>
<td>4 3 5 3</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = Not a Success; 2 = Slight Success; 3 = Limited Success; 4 = Moderate Success; 5 = Moderately High Success; 6 = High Success; 7 = Critical Success; and MD = Missing Data

Round III: N = 15

(Rw) Item printed as revised based on Panel Members suggestions following Round II
(NI) New item added in Round III

Table 4.17

Delphi Panel’s perceptions of successes in sport management research. (R III)
Importance Scale

Panel members noted that it was moderately high important or high important that all the successes considered for this study be sustained or become a success in sport management in the future (see Table 4.18). Similar to Round II, the use of theory from parent disciplines (#2), developing sport management theory (#1) and developing overall sport management knowledge (#12) are the highest in the list. Interestingly, increasing the number of research outlets in the sport management field (#8) is the lowest rated success regarding its importance to be sustained or become a success in the future.

Items that Reached 76.5% Level of Agreement

During Round III, 2 items reached 76.5% level of agreement in question 1.

Increasing the quality of research outlets in the field. (9)

Thirteen Panel members (76.5%) agreed that the level of importance for this item to be sustained or become a success in the future of sport management research was between high (6) and critical (7). The mean value was 6.33 with a standard deviation of .72. One Panel member stressed the how important it is to “continually strive to increase the quality of sport management research outlets, no matter how good they become in the future.” Some other Panel members noted that “over time most journals become more rigorous”, and also that “the quality of the articles in JSM has increased markedly.”

Establishing an infrastructure for the new research field of sport management (i.e., NASSM, JSM). (10)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developing sport management theory.</td>
<td>3 3 9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of theory from parent disciplines.</td>
<td>Consensus reached in RII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Linking theory to practice.</td>
<td>1 1 1 6 6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Broadening of sport management research include both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.</td>
<td>1 2 2 4 6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Diversifying sport management research settings.</td>
<td>2 4 2 2 5</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increasing quality of sport management research designs. (Rw)</td>
<td>1 2 4 4 4</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Increasing quality of sport management methods of analysis. (Rw)</td>
<td>1 2 8 4</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Increasing the number of research outlets in the sport management field.</td>
<td>1 2 2 6 1 3</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Increasing the quality of research outlets in the field.</td>
<td>2 6 7</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Establishing an infrastructure for the new research field of sport management (i.e., NASSM, JSM).</td>
<td>1 4 3 7</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Recognizing sport management as a field of study in academe. (Rw)</td>
<td>3 5 7</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Developing overall sport management knowledge.</td>
<td>1 2 3 9</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Developing specific sport marketing knowledge.</td>
<td>1 1 3 4 6</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Developing knowledge about leadership in sport. (Rw)</td>
<td>1 2 5 4 3</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Developing knowledge about sport liability. (NI)</td>
<td>1 3 4 3 3</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Developing knowledge about sport ethics. (NI)</td>
<td>2 2 3 8</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No Importance; 2 = Slight Importance; 3 = Limited Importance; 4 = Moderate Importance; 5 = Moderately High Importance; 6 = High Importance; 7 = Critical Importance; and MD = Missing Data

Round III: N = 15

C Consensus achieved
(Rw) Item printed as revised based on Panel Members suggestions following Round II
(NI) New item added in Round III

Table 4.18

Delphi Panel's perceptions of importance of sustaining the successes. (R III)
Thirteen Panel members (76.5%) agreed that the degree to which this item has been a success in sport management research is between moderate high (5) and high (6). The mean value was 5.53 with a standard deviation of .92. One of the Panel members expressed some doubts whether “NASSM is playing the major role” as an infrastructure for the field.

**Items that Reached 70.6% Level of Agreement**

During Round III, 8 items reached 70.6% level of agreement in question 1.

**Developing sport management theory. (1)**

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that the level of importance for this item to be sustained or become a success in the future of sport management research was between high (6) and critical (7). The mean value was 6.4 with a standard deviation of .83. One Panel member noted that sport management researchers “have done a good job of beginning the process of developing theory in specific areas, but not generally.”

**Use of theory from parent disciplines. (2)**

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that the degree to which this item has been a success in sport management research is moderate high (4). The mean value was 4.2 with a standard deviation of .94. One Panel member noted that there is “evidence of improvement, but considerable room for growth/improvement.”

**Linking theory to practice. (3)**

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that the level of importance for this item to be sustained or become a success in the future of sport management research
was close to critical (6). The mean value was 5.8 with a standard deviation of 1.7. Comments from Rounds II and III reveals that “too much emphasis is put on practice at the expense of theory, more specifically, too much focus on practice could take the field away from what should be its core: theory development and testing, which will ultimately have practical value.” One Panel member noted that the field needs to be able to “convince practitioners and students of the importance of theory and the place it has in their ongoing development.” While another Panel member stated that “often when we say linking theory to practice we mean forget the theory and focus on the practice.”

**Increasing quality of sport management research designs. (6)**

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that the degree to which this item has been a success in sport management research is close to (4) moderate. The mean value was 3.53 with a standard deviation of .99. Rounds II and III comments revealed a perception that there is still much room for improvement, as one Panel member noted in sport management “[we] need heightened refinement.” Also, “[we] get too hung up on using ‘sophisticated research designs’ simply to prove that we are more ‘sophisticated’ rather than because that is what is appropriate to answer the question(s).”

**Increasing quality of sport management methods of analysis. (7)**

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that the level of importance for this item to be sustained or become a success in the future of sport management research was close to high (6). The mean value was 5.93 with a standard deviation of
Mainly Panel members referred that in sport management researchers need to "use statistics and other forms of analysis correctly." As an expert noted "the quality has increased greatly in 10 years!" However, as another expert mentioned, some times "we are not using them correctly." Final comments stress a "need to increase the quality of our methods of analysis" and the need for continuity over time, "Should be an on-going objective."

Recognizing sport management as a field of study in academe. (11)

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that the level of importance for this item to be sustained or become a success in the future of sport management research was between high (6) and critical (7). The mean value was 6.27 with a standard deviation of .8. A Panel member emphasized, "The mainstream academic community regards us with some skepticism. We have a way to go before we have adequate academic (or industry) status." Others noted, "We need to heighten respect on our respective campus" and more specifically to "raise our level of visibility on campuses to gain respect of colleagues in other disciplines."

Some questioning occurred during Round II around who is/should be recognizing sport management as a field of study. A final comment, made during Round III, was to suggest the "need to be recognized as serious scholars by our colleagues and administrators ... is critically important, and we haven't yet accomplished that goal."
Developing overall sport management knowledge. (12)

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed on both the success and importance scales. First, they agreed that the degree to which this item has been a success in sport management research is between (4) moderate and (5) moderate high. The mean value was 4.27 with a standard deviation of .96. Also, twelve Panel members agreed that the level of importance for this item to be sustained or become a success in the future of sport management research was between high (6) and critical (7). The mean value was 6.33 with a standard deviation of .98. A Panel member during Round II suggested that the field needs to develop its own theory base.

Q 2: Current events/trends impacting sport management research.

Impact Scale

Panel members noted that funding resources for the field’s research (#11), information technology (#2), and commercialization of amateur and intercollegiate sports (#5) were highly impacting the field’s research (see Table 4.19). Also, they perceived movement of sport management to business schools as the trend least impacting the field’s research (#10). All the other events/trends were perceived as having a moderately high impact on sport management research.

Items that Reached 70.6% Level of Agreement

During Round III, one item reached 70.6% level of agreement in question 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Globalization.</td>
<td>2  3  3  4  3</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Information technology.</td>
<td>1  1  5  4  4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Increased diversity of sport consumer audience.</td>
<td>2  2  4  6  1</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Increase in legal issues and regulations.</td>
<td>1  5  5  2  2</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Commercialization of amateur and intercollegiate sports.</td>
<td>3  3  6  3  1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Increase in opportunities for participation in sport (both spectatorship and participation).</td>
<td>1  1  5  2  5  1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Increase in professional sport finance related issues (e.g., stadium/arenas, ticket prices, fiscal responsibility).</td>
<td>2  5  2  6  6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Demand for sport marketing research.</td>
<td>1  1  1  3  5  4</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Horizontal and vertical integration of the sport industry with other enterprises.</td>
<td>3  6  6  6  6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Movement of sport management to business schools.</td>
<td>1  1  5  1  4  1 2</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Limited funding resources for sport management research.</td>
<td>1  5  1  8  8</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No Impact; 2 = Slight Impact; 3 = Limited Impact; 4 = Moderate Impact; 5 = Moderately High Impact; 6 = High Impact; 7 = Critical Impact; and MD = Missing Data

Round III: N = 15

Table 4.19

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the impact of current events and trends on sport management research. (R III)
Horizontal and vertical integration of the sport industry with other enterprises. (9)

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that this event/trend will continue to have a (5) moderately high impact on sport management research. The mean value was 5 with a standard deviation of 1.13. A comment during Round II indicated this is a "vital area as it is radically changing the nature of relations between sport industries and the rest of the economy." However, as another Panel member emphasized there is "no serious work in the area at all." As seen by one of the experts, "clearly the area is vitally important." Another expert added, however, "to develop a serious research discourse on the topic, two things would have to be addressed: First, we would need to have a deeper and stronger discourse on strategy in sport management that considers strategy in sport management (i.e., strategic management that considers strategy in terms of the unique elements of the sport industry as a whole). ... Second, we would need to remove sport management research from its sport ghetto."

Q 3: Qualities that would ideally best describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now.

Importance Scale

Panel members only had to re-rate eight ideal qualities, since consensus had been attained on four during Round II (see Table 4.20). Out of the eight, they perceived adequate research resources (#6) to be a critical one for the
**Table 4.20**

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the level of Importance of ideal qualities. (R III)
field’s research. Followed by highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data (#5), and high quality doctoral students (#8).

**Probability Scale**

There were some changes in Delphi Panel members’ perceptions compared to Round II. For example in this round the Panel considered that theory developed /tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (#1) only had approximately 30% chances of occurrence compared to over 35% chances in Round II (see Table 4.21). On the other hand, they considered that high quality doctoral candidates (#8) and research grounded in parent disciplines' theories (#1) had a better chance of occurrence in this round, between 60 and 65% chances compare to less than 60% in Round II.

**Items that Reached 76.5% Level of Agreement**

During Round III, 2 items reached 76.5% level of agreement in question 3.

**Adequate research resources. (6)**

Thirteen Panel members (76.5%) agreed that the level of importance for this to be an ideal quality for sport management research in 5 to 7 years was between high (6) and critical (7), however closer to high importance. The mean value was 6.47 with a standard deviation of .74. Rounds II and III comments indicate that funding “depends on national and disciplinary context” and also that “being in a business school helps.” On the other hand some experts believe that “we do not generally need extensive external funding for our research programs.” One Panel member noted that “some work in sport contexts that does not call itself sport
Question 3: In your view, IDEALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research in 5 to 7 years from now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Theory developed/tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (e.g., management, marketing, sociology, psychology, etc.)</td>
<td>6 5 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines' theories.</td>
<td>4 5 1 3 2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Sport management research is cross-disciplinary. (Rw)</td>
<td>1 0 1 4 3 3 1 1</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Unique body of knowledge created in sport management.</td>
<td>2 4 1 3 2 1 2</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.</td>
<td>1 1 2 3 1 5 2</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Adequate research resources.</td>
<td>1 3 3 5 2 1</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Sport management research applied as a useful management tool and one that identifies best practices.</td>
<td>1 1 4 1 2 2 3 1</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - High quality doctoral candidates.</td>
<td>1 6 4 3 1</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Sport management research disseminated to the general public.</td>
<td>2 3 2 3 1 1 3</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - High quality sport management research published in first tier sport management journals. (NI)</td>
<td>1 1 3 1 3 2 2 1</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21 (continued)
Table 4.21 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - High quality sport management research published in first tier management journals. (Nl)</td>
<td>3 4 3 1 2 1 1</td>
<td>4.2 2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians within academe. (Rw)</td>
<td>1 1 1 3 7 1 1</td>
<td>5.33 1.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = 0 - 10%; 2 = 11 - 20%; 3 = 21 - 30%; 4 = 31 - 40%; 5 = 41 - 50%; 6 = 51 - 60%; 7 = 61 - 70%; 8 = 71 - 80%; 9 = 81 - 90%; 10 = 91 - 100%; and MD = Missing Data.

Round III: N = 15

(Rw) Item printed as revised based on Panel Members suggestions following Round II
(Nl) New item added in Round III
management (but that is) may be well funded" and another yet added that getting adequate research resources “may require creative thinking on our part.” Finally another Panel member stressed that there is “better support for some elements of sport management research in Australia than there is in the USA.”

High quality doctoral candidates. (8)

Thirteen Panel members (76.5%) agreed that the probability level for this to be an ideal quality for sport management research in five to seven years was approximately 60% (mean = 6.87) with a standard deviation of 1.25. Some experts believe that “we are attracting some very good students”, however, “only 2-3 programs” are producing them. Another Panel member highlights that the quality of doctoral candidates is “dependent upon quality of doctoral programs and we have a definite disparity in quality now.”

Items that Reached 70.6% Level of Agreement

During Round III, 3 items reached 70.6% level of agreement in question 3.

Theory developed/tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (e.g., management, marketing, sociology, psychology, etc). (1)

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed the probability level for this to be an ideal quality for sport management research in five to seven years was approximately 27% (mean = 3.6) with a standard deviation of 2.26. Several experts expressed their belief regarding sport management theory impacting parent disciplines: “Not convinced this will begin to happen”, “Think it will not happen.” One panel member noted “probability is not high and is not crucial in
the overall scheme of things." Another Panel member added that ultimately "it depends, in part, upon the rigor of our doctoral programs."

**Sport management research is cross-disciplinary.** (3)

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed the level of importance for this to be an ideal quality for sport management research in five to seven years was close to high (6). The mean value was 6.13 with a standard deviation of 1.13. Several thoughts emerged from Round II and III comments. First, one Panel member noted this was “important purely from a funding perspective.” This comment raised questions by other Panel members during Round III. In response to the comment a Panel member emphasized the fact that “interdisciplinary work has the potential for very creative, informed meaningful ways of studying issues in sport management.” In response to the same comment from Round II, another Panel member also emphasized that “we do not exist in a vacuum, and we are obligated to recognize and study across disciplines.”

Second, one expert stressed that this “will happen necessarily at large/research oriented institutions since granting agencies are demanding or expecting cross-disciplinary work.” Finally, one Panel member accentuated that “research in history of the social sciences has found that the fundamental breakthroughs have occurred in multi-disciplinary contexts that are vigorously concerned with real-world concerns.”

**High quality sport management research published in first tier sport management journals.** (10)
Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed the level of importance for this to be an ideal quality for sport management research in five to seven years was close to high (6). The mean value was 6.2 with a standard deviation of .95. During Round II a Panel member remarked, "JSM is considered a first tier journal" and another Panel member during Round III noted "JSM has a very low impact." Also during Round III an expert questioned how is 'first tier' journal defined, should it be "Acceptance rate? Citations?" The same person also questioned whether JSM should be considered a first tier journal despite being a high quality journal.

Q 4: Qualities that would realistically describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now.

Importance Scale

Consensus had been already reached in three items in the previous round, however, there were six new items resulting from the split of three items from Round II (see Table 4.22). Panel members believed that it was critically important that research published in first tier sport management journals (#11) realistically characterizes the future of research. All the other qualities were rated highly important, with the exception of research application drive, consumer oriented, and field based (#2) which was considered moderately high important.

Probability Scale

The most interesting alteration in Panel members' ratings compared to Round II resulted from the split of one of Round II's items. Consequently, Panel members perceived that the probability of research published in first tier sport
**Table 4.22**

**Delphi Panel's perceptions of the importance of realistic qualities. (R III)**
management journals was approximately 65% while the probability of research published in first tier management journals was only around 40% (see Table 4.23). The quality perceived by Panel members as having the lowest chance of occurrence, less than 40%, was professional associations, research agencies, and universities funding sport management research (#10).

Items that Reached Consensus

During Round III, one item reached consensus in question 4.

Research published in first tier sport management journals. (11)
The Delphi Panel agreed that it was highly important (6) or critically important (7) for this to be a realistic quality for sport management research in five to seven years. The mean value was 6.47 with a standard deviation of .64. One panel member noted that it "would advance perception of the field" and the "quality of sport management research."

Items that Reached 76.5% Level of Agreement

During Round III, 1 item reached 76.5% level of agreement in question 4.

Research theoretically driven. (1)
Thirteen Panel members (76.5%) agreed that it was highly important (6) for this to be a realistic quality for sport management research in five to seven years. The mean value was 6.07 with a standard deviation of .8. One panel member reported that "the journals will demand it."
Question 4: In your view, REALISTICALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research in 5 to 7 years from now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Research theoretically driven.</td>
<td>1 3 2 6 1 2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Research application driven, consumer oriented, and field based.</td>
<td>3 2 4 1 5</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Research both theoretical and application driven. (NI)</td>
<td>2 1 5 1 5 1 1</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Research focused on current issues. (NI)</td>
<td>1 3 1 2 4 2 2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Research focused on diverse issues. (NI)</td>
<td>1 1 3 2 3 3 2</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Sport management scholars recognized and respected scholars in other fields. (Rw)</td>
<td>1 3 3 3 2 3 3</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Focused, sustained research programs. (Rw)</td>
<td>2 2 3 3 3 1 1 1</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Research rigorous in design, methodology, analysis, and interpretation.</td>
<td>2 1 3 3 4 2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Professional associations, research agencies, and universities foster sport management research. (NI)</td>
<td>1 1 1 7 2 2 1</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Professional associations, research agencies, and universities fund sport management research. (NI)</td>
<td>1 5 1 5 2 1</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Research published in first tier sport management journals. (NI)</td>
<td>2 2 1 4 3 1 2 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the probability of realistic qualities. (R III)
### Table 4.23 (continued)

**Question 4: In your view, REALISTICALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research in 5 to 7 years from now?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 MD</td>
<td>12345678910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - Research published in first tier management journals. (Ni)</td>
<td>3 2 3 1 3 1 1</td>
<td>4.5 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale:**
- 1 = 0 -10%;
- 2 = 11 - 20%;
- 3 = 21 - 30%;
- 4 = 31 - 40%;
- 5 = 41 - 50%;
- 6 = 51 - 60%;
- 7 = 61 - 70%;
- 8 = 71 - 80%;
- 9 = 81 - 90%;
- 10 = 91 - 100%;
- and MD = Missing Data

**Round III:** N = 15

(Rw) Item printed as revised based on Panel Members suggestions following Round II
(Ni) New item added in Round III
Q 5: General directions sport management field should emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future.

Importance Scale

As reported in Table 4.24, Delphi Panel members believed that it was critical that the field emphasized the improvement of professional development opportunities in research for faculty (#6). Also, they perceived it was highly important that the field emphasized interdisciplinary and collaborative research (#7), quality in research design (#9), and global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration (#12).

Probability Scale

Delphi Panel members identified that expansion of publication outlets (#11) was the direction with the most probability of occurrence, approximately 55% (see Table 4.25). Followed by becoming more specialized in research focus (#1) and increasing interdisciplinary and collaborative research (#7), with over 50% chances of occurrence. On the other hand, Panel members perceived application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries (#4) the direction with the least probability of occurrence, less than 35%.

Items that Reached Consensus

During Round III, 3 items reached consensus in question 5.

Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty. (6)

Consensus of the Delphi Panel was that the importance of this direction was high (6) and critical (7) for the future of sport management research. The mean value was 6.53 with a standard deviation of .83.
Question 5: In your opinion, what general directions should sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Become more specialized in research focus. (NI)</td>
<td>1 5 4 5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Become more diverse in research topics. (NI)</td>
<td>1 6 3 4</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Recognize sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.</td>
<td>Consensus reached in RII</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries.</td>
<td>2 5 3 3 2</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Increase research preparation for doctoral students.</td>
<td>Consensus reached in RII</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty.</td>
<td>1 4 10</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Increase interdisciplinary and collaborative research.</td>
<td>1 3 1 10</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.</td>
<td>Consensus reached in RII</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Increase quality in research design. (Rw)</td>
<td>C 1 9 5</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Increase standards for research publication.</td>
<td>2 1 6 6</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Expand publication outlets.</td>
<td>2 1 2 1 5 1 3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration.</td>
<td>C 1 5 9</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No Importance; 2 = Slight Importance; 3 = Limited Importance; 4 = Moderate Importance; 5 = Moderately High Importance; 6 = High Importance; 7 = Critical Importance; and MD = Missing Data

Round II: N = 17
(Rw) Item printed as revised based on Panel Members suggestions following Round II
(NI) New item added in Round III

Table 4.24

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the importance of directions. (R III)
Question 5: In your opinion, what general directions should sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Become more specialized in research focus. (NI)</td>
<td>2 1 4 2 2 3 1</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Become more diverse in research topics. (NI)</td>
<td>2 1 5 1 3 1 1</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recognize sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.</td>
<td>1 1 5 4 3 1</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries.</td>
<td>2 1 7 2 1 2</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increase research preparation for doctoral students.</td>
<td>1 2 4 4 4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty.</td>
<td>1 2 1 4 4 3</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Increase interdisciplinary and collaborative research.</td>
<td>1 1 6 3 2 2</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.</td>
<td>1 2 4 4 1 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Increase quality in research design. (Rw)</td>
<td>6 1 3 2 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Increase standards for research publication.</td>
<td>1 1 6 3 1 3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Expand publication outlets.</td>
<td>4 3 1 3 2 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.25

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the probability level of the field emphasizing directions. (R III)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>Probability level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 - Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = 0 - 10%; 2 = 11 - 20%; 3 = 21 - 30%; 4 = 31 - 40%; 5 = 41 - 50%; 6 = 51 - 60%; 7 = 61 - 70%; 8 = 71 - 80%; 9 = 81 - 90%; 10 = 91 - 100%; and MD = Missing Data

Round III: N = 15

(Rw) Item printed as revised based on Panel Members suggestions following Round II

(NI) New Item added in Round III
Comments to Round III revealed that "opportunities vary by institution and by country." Also, a panel member noted, "professional groups like NASSM could do this in conference workshops."

**Increase quality in research design. (9)**

Consensus of the Delphi Panel was that the importance of this direction was high (6) and critical (7) for the future of sport management research. The mean value was 6.27 with a standard deviation of .59. As a panel member noted sport management is still "scripted in the descriptive method."

**Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration. (12)**

Consensus of the Delphi Panel was that the importance of this direction was high (6) and critical (7) for the future of sport management research. The mean value was 6.33 with a standard deviation of .129. Comments on both Rounds II and III were diverse. Some panel members felt that it "is happening in Europe to some degree," on the other hand, another member felt that "North America is not learning much from overseas." Another member noticed that there are "local agendas, which is a particularly serious problem in North America." Sport management should "open to other research agendas, and to new kinds of research." Two of the comments referred to the International Sport Management Alliance, and how it "is symbolic of the degree to which [global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration] will be fostered." On a different perspective one of the panel members felt that "the 'ideal future' research is based on the rigor of the research we do ... and the related theory development and testing, not on context, global or otherwise." In another comment, a panel
member pointed out that "many issues are more important than addressing globalization so that sport management can 'move its research towards an ideal future.'"

Items that Reached 70.6% Level of Agreement

During Round III, 2 items reached 70.6% level of agreement in question 5.

Increase research preparation for doctoral students. (5)

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that there is a probability of approximately 45% (mean = 5.4 with a standard deviation of 1.59) for the field to emphasize this general direction. One Panel member in Round II noted he or she does not see "things changing much" and another reminded "it depends on the school and the country." During Round III an expert stated, "it seems unlikely that institutions will move to greater demands on students over the near term. The pressures are in the other direction – to get students through to completion with minimal stumbling blocks (which added research preparation often constitutes)."

Increase standards for research publication. (10)

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that this direction had between high (6) and critical (7) importance to the future of sport management research. The mean value was 6.07 with a standard deviation of 1.03. There were mixed comments during both Rounds. A Panel member anticipated "we are moving in the other direction" while some others believe the field is "slowly moving in that direction" and therefore "it will happen." Also, another concern relates to the fact that there are "varying degrees of standards" and as one Panel member put it, "with the new journals in the field, some real drivel can still find an outlet."
Q 6: **Specific actions and/or strategies that will move sport management research towards an ideal future.**

**Importance Scale**

Delphi Panel members perceived that it was highly important to conduct professional research seminar and workshops (#8), to do collaborative research across disciplines (#3), to present and publish outside sport management field (#4) and, to increase research funding resources (#7) in order for the field to move its research towards an ideal future (see Table 4.26). At the lower end, Delphi Panel members perceived that the establishment of “center(s) of excellence” (#13), determination of the viability of using curriculum accreditation standards (#12) and increasing publication outlets (#6) were only moderately important for the field to move its research towards an ideal future.

**Probability Scale**

Delphi Panel members perceived that actions to increase publishing outlets (#6), conduct professional research seminar and workshops (#8), and increase doctoral candidates’ knowledge of theories in parent disciplines (#10) had approximately, or over 60% chances of occurrence (see Table 4.27). Strategies and or actions with the least chances to occur (less than 40%) were increase research funding resources (#7) and establishment of “center(s) of excellence” (#13).

**Item that Reached 70.6% Level of Agreement**

During Round III, 5 items reached 70.6% level of agreement in question 6.
**Question 6:** In your opinion and drawing on question # 5, what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Encourage research specialization.</td>
<td>5 7 3</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Acknowledge research successes. (Rw)</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 4 6</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Do collaborative research across disciplines.</td>
<td>3 6 6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Present and publish outside sport management field.</td>
<td>5 4 6</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management.</td>
<td>1 2 5 7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Increase publishing outlets.</td>
<td>2 1 1 8 1 2</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Increase research funding resources.</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 10</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Conduct professional research seminars and workshops.</td>
<td>3 5 7</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.</td>
<td>Consensus reached in RII</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.</td>
<td>Consensus reached in RII</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Facilitate sport management doctoral programs' collaboration across universities.</td>
<td>3 2 5 5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Determine viability of using curriculum accreditation standards.</td>
<td>5 4 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- Establish &quot;center(s) of excellence.&quot;</td>
<td>1 1 7 3 1 2</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Promote institutional support for sport management programs.</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No Importance; 2 = Slight Importance; 3 = Limited Importance; 4 = Moderate Importance; 5 = Moderately High Importance; 6 = High Importance; 7 = Critical Importance; and MD = Missing Data

Round III: N = 15

(Rw) Item printed as revised based on Panel Members suggestions following Round II

Table 4.26

**Delphi Panel's perceptions of the importance of actions/strategies. (R III)**
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**Question 6:** In your opinion and drawing on question # 5, what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Encourage research specialization.</td>
<td>1    2  2  4  4  1  1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acknowledge research successes. (Rw)</td>
<td>1    3  1  2  1  7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do collaborative research across disciplines.</td>
<td>3    4  1  5  1  1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Present and publish outside sport management field.</td>
<td>2    7  2  2  2</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management.</td>
<td>3    2  3  1  6</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increase publishing outlets.</td>
<td>1    1  2  3  6  1  1</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Increase research funding resources.</td>
<td>2    5  3  2  3</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Conduct professional research seminars and workshops.</td>
<td>1    5  1  5  1  2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.</td>
<td>1    1  3  8  1  1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.</td>
<td>2    2  2  3  3  3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.27 (continued)

*Delphi Panel's perceptions of the probability of occurrence of actions and/or strategies. (R III)*
Table 4.27 (continued)

**Question 6:** In your opinion and drawing on question # 5, what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Facilitate sport management doctoral programs' collaboration across universities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Determine viability of using curriculum accreditation standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Establish &quot;center(s) of excellence.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Promote institutional support for sport management programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = 0 - 10%; 2 = 11 - 20%; 3 = 21 - 30%; 4 = 31 - 40%; 5 = 41 - 50%; 6 = 51 - 60%; 7 = 61 - 70%; 8 = 71 - 80%; 9 = 81 - 90%; 10 = 91 - 100%; and MD = Missing Data

Round III: N = 15

(Rw) Item printed as revised based on Panel Members suggestions following Round II
Encourage research specialization. (1)

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that this action/strategy had close to high importance (6) to the future of sport management research. The mean value was 5.87 with a standard deviation of .74. A Panel member noted the “tenure review processes tend to reward specialization” and another reinforced that “focus is a good thing.” However, as one expert mentioned, some sport management programs require faculty to teach several courses, which does not “encourage specialization in research or teaching.” To conclude, a Round III comment emphasized that “our depth of knowledge will come from” specialization.

Do collaborative research across disciplines. (3)

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that this action/strategy had (6) high importance to the future of sport management research. The mean value was 6.2 with a standard deviation of .77. Panel members seem to have mixed opinions regarding this item. One Panel member believes that collaborative research across disciplines “is the way of the future,” while another Panel member does not agree that it “is as critical.” Yet another expert noted that “we are too parochial and not well versed enough in parent disciplines.”

Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management. (5)

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that this action/strategy had (6) high importance to the future of sport management research. The mean value was 6.2 with a standard deviation of .94. Experts have diverse opinions regarding this
Panel members noted there is some "resistance to it in some quarters" and that it seems that researchers in sport management are "unwilling to invite other academics." Also during Round II another Panel member emphasized that involving researchers from outside disciplines would be a "credibility test." On the other hand, during Round III a Panel member stressed that the involvement of outside researchers is "not critical to the development of our field. If we produce good research ourselves, ...not sure why we need 'outsiders' to publish research in our area."

**Conduct professional research seminars and workshops. (8)**

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that this action/strategy had (6) high importance to the future of sport management research. The mean value was 6.27 with a standard deviation of .8. As one Panel member expressed it, this action/strategy would "help inform practice" and would contribute to "more effective practice." Another Panel member noted that this "would be great if done well" while another one showed his or her concern regarding whether the field is "at the point we need to be in order to consistently do these types of seminars in a quality manner."

**Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs. (9)**

Twelve Panel members (70.6%) agreed that this action/strategy had a probability of occurrence in sport management of approximately 47% (mean = 5.6 with a standard deviation of 1.68) in the next five to seven years. A Panel member noted that "the institutional trend seems to be status quo oriented" and another one stated that he or she did "not have great confidence in doctoral programs in
the US." Another one further added that "programs seem to be producing a few
great prospects but many weak PhDs as well."

Q 7: Challenges that can be managed now to move sport management research
towards general ideal directions.

Importance Scale:

During Round III Delphi Panel members perceived interaction with the
academic community outside sport management (# 3) and faculty time and
resources for research (#9) were the most critical challenges to be managed now
in order to move the field’s research towards an ideal future (see Table 4.28).
Overall, the other challenges were perceived as highly important.

Probability Scale:

The Delphi Panel perceived that the challenges with more chances of
being managed now in order to move the field’s research towards an ideal future
were critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers
(#2), interaction with academic community (# 3) and, quality of doctoral programs
(#6), with more than 60% chances of occurrence (see Table 4.29). On the other
hand, the challenge with the least chance of being managed now was rigor and
competitiveness of conferences (# 4).

Items that Reached Consensus

During Round III, 1 item reached consensus in question 7.

Interaction with academic community outside sport management. (3)
**Question 7**: In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards the general directions mentioned in Q #5?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Engage in interdisciplinary research.</td>
<td>1 4 3 7</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (e.g., during conference presentations).</td>
<td>1 1 3 10</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Interaction with academic community outside sport management. (Rw)</td>
<td>C 1 5 9</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Rigor and competitiveness of conferences. (Ni)</td>
<td>2 3 4 6</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Rigor and competitiveness of journals. (Ni)</td>
<td>1 2 3 9</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Quality of doctoral programs.</td>
<td>Consensus reached in RII</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Generalizability of research results in various sport management settings. (Rw)</td>
<td>2 6 3 4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Specifically in the US, broaden research scope to include other settings than college and professional sport (e.g., youth sport, sports media). (Rw)</td>
<td>2 1 4 7 1</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Faculty time and resources for research.</td>
<td>2 9 4</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Formal recognition of scholarship within the field. (Rw)</td>
<td>2 1 1 6 5</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Peoples’ and/or institutions’ resistance to change. (Rw)</td>
<td>1 5 4 5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = No Importance; 2 = Slight Importance; 3 = Limited Importance; 4 = Moderate Importance; 5 = Moderately High Importance; 6 = High Importance; 7 = Critical Importance; and MD = Missing Data

Round III: N = 15

C Consensus achieved

(Rw) Item printed as revised based on Panel Members suggestions following Round II

(Ni) New item added in Round III

Table 4.28

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the importance of challenges to be managed now. (R III)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7: In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards the general directions mentioned in Q #5?</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Engage in interdisciplinary research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (e.g., during conference presentations).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Interaction with academic community outside sport management. (Rw)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Rigor and competitiveness of conferences. (NI)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Rigor and competitiveness of journals. (NI)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Quality of doctoral programs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Generalizability of research results in various sport management settings. (Rw)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Specifically in the US, broaden research scope to include other settings than college and professional sport (e.g., youth sport, sports media). (Rw)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Faculty time and resources for research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Formal recognition of scholarship within the field. (Rw)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.29 (Continued)

Delphi Panel's perceptions of the probability of the field to manage the challenges in 5 to 7 years. (R III)
Table 4.29 (continued)

**Question 7:** In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards the general directions mentioned in Q #5?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Probability Level</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - Peoples' and/or institutions' resistance to change. (Rw)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = 0 -10%; 2 = 11 - 20%; 3 = 21 - 30%; 4 = 31 - 40%; 5 = 41 - 50%; 6 = 51 - 60%; 7 = 61 - 70%; 8 = 71 - 80%; 9 = 81 - 90%; 10 = 91 - 100%; and MD = Missing Data

Round III: N = 15

(Rw) Item printed as revised based on Panel Members suggestions following Round II

(NI) New Item added in Round III
The Delphi Panel agreed that the level of importance that this challenge be managed now in order to move sport management research towards an ideal future is between (6) high and (7) critical. The mean value was 6.53 with a standard deviation of .64. Rounds II and III comments revealed that some panel members felt that sport management scholars “are already doing this.” On the other hand one panel member noted that sport management researchers “talk with [their] own types only.”

**Items that Reached 76.5% Level of Agreement**

During Round III, four items reached 76.5% level of agreement in question 7.

1. **Critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers**
   
   Thirteen Panel members agreed that it was of high importance that this challenge be managed now in order to move sport management research towards an ideal future. The mean value was 6.33 with a standard deviation of 1.23. Some of the Panel members note that even though “the best setting for this is our conferences...there is little constructive critical dialog.” Also “As a discipline we are not comfortable with ‘critiques’ of our work, at least in the US.” Further “a public form is not always the best place to engage in these types of discussions.” Finally, “Research discussions are important.”

2. **Interaction with academic community outside sport management.**

   Thirteen Panel members (76.5%) agreed that the probability level for this challenge to be managed now in order to move sport management research
towards an ideal future is approximately 57% (mean = 6.6) with a standard deviation of 1.12. Some experts believe "we are already doing this."

**Quality of doctoral programs. (6)**

Thirteen Panel members (76.5%) agreed that the probability level for this challenge to be managed now in order to move sport management research towards an ideal future is approximately 56% (mean = 6.53) with a standard deviation of 1.19. While some Panel members believe that “improvement is already evident” others remind the group that it “takes substantial time to change doctoral programs.”

**Faculty time and resources for research. (9)**

Thirteen Panel members agreed the level of importance for this challenge to be managed now in order to move sport management research towards an ideal future was between (6) high and (7) critical. The mean value was 6.47 with a standard deviation of .74. Panel members remind that faculty time and resources “must be earned” and it “depends on institution and country.” However one expert noted that “Research I and Doctoral institutions need to give time for research.”

**Items that Reached 70.6% Level of Agreement**

During Round III, one item reached 70.6% level of agreement in question 7.

**Rigor and competitiveness of journals. (5)**

Thirteen Panel members agreed that it was of high importance that this challenge be managed now in order to move sport management research towards an ideal
future. The mean value was 6.33 with a standard deviation of .98. There were no comments during Round II and III relating to the importance scale.

Results of Content Analysis

After receiving all questionnaires from Round III, the researcher compiled all the comments by the Delphi Panel members into one document and submitted it to the Content Analysis Panel. Appendix J contains the representative comments by Delphi Panel members for each question and item that the content analysis panel considered significant. For the most part, Delphi Panel members did not advance any comments regarding vague or confusing comments which explained the almost nonexistence of missing data in Round III. The only exception is item #11 in Question 7 “Peoples’ and/or institutions’ resistance to change” which had 5 responses missing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question 1 (Successes):</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question 2 (Events/Trends):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 -</td>
<td>Developing sport management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 -</td>
<td>theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 -</td>
<td>Use of theory from parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 -</td>
<td>disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 -</td>
<td>Linking theory to practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 -</td>
<td>Increasing quality of sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 -</td>
<td>management research designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 -</td>
<td>Increasing quality of sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 -</td>
<td>management methods of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 -</td>
<td>Increasing the quality of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 -</td>
<td>research outlets in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 -</td>
<td>field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 -</td>
<td>Establishing an infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 -</td>
<td>Recognizing sport management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 -</td>
<td>Developing overall sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 -</td>
<td>management knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 -</td>
<td>Developing overall sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 -</td>
<td>management knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 -</td>
<td>Horizontal and vertical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 -</td>
<td>integration of the sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 -</td>
<td>industry with other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 -</td>
<td>enterprises.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Importance of all the Items that reached consensus, 76.5% and 71.6% levels of agreement by Round III.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 4.30 (continued)
Table 4.30 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Impt</th>
<th>Succ</th>
<th>Impc</th>
<th>Fob</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 (Ideal Characteristics):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Theory developed/tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (e.g., management, marketing, sociology, psychology, etc).</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines’ theories.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Sport management research is cross-disciplinary.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Adequate research resources.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - High quality doctoral candidates.</td>
<td>xC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - High quality sport management research published in first tier sport management journals.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians within the academe.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4 (Realistic Characteristics):

1 - Research theoretically driven. | x | 6 | 1.16 |

6 - Sport management scholars recognized and respected by scholars in other fields. | x | 6.38 | 0.72 |
Table 4.30 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Impt Scales</th>
<th>Consensus at 80 %</th>
<th>Consensus at 76.5 %</th>
<th>Consensus at 70.6 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Focused, sustained research programs.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Research rigorous in design, methodology, and interpretation.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11*- Research published in first tier sport management journals.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5 (General Directions):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Recognize sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Increase research preparation for doctoral students.</td>
<td>xC</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*- Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9*- Increase quality in research design.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Increase standards for research publication.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*- Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6 (Actions/Strategies):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Encourage research specialization.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Do collaborative research across disciplines.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.30 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Consensus at</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impt</td>
<td>Succ</td>
<td>Impc</td>
<td>Pob</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publish in sport management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Conduct professional research seminars and workshops.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.27 0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.</td>
<td>xC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5 0.63</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.65 0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7 (Challenges to be Managed Now):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Critical and constructive dialogue among sport management</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.33 1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researchers (e.g., during conference presentations).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3* - Interaction with academic community outside sport management</td>
<td>xC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.53 0.64</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Rigor and competitiveness of journals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.33 0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Quality of doctoral programs.</td>
<td>xC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.71 0.59</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Faculty time and resources for research.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.47 0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items that reached consensus only in Round III.
Note: Round II: N = 17; Round III: N = 15
CHAPTER 5

CRITICAL COMMENTS BY THE DELPHI PANEL

While the previous chapter presented the degree of consensus arrived through three stages of the Delphi Method, this chapter presents the significant comments made by Panel members independent of their responses to the structured questionnaire.

The significant comments were related to the following 15 areas:

- Status of Sport Management field and research
- Sport management theory
- Linking theory to practice
- Inclusion of both qualitative and quantitative methodologies
- Infrastructure for the new research field of Sport Management
- Globalization
- Sport finance related issues
- Diversity topics
- Rigor and competitiveness of conferences
- Recognition of scholarship within the field
- Interdisciplinary and collaborative research
- Increase quality of sport management research designs and methods of analysis
- Research outlets
- Funding resources
- Doctoral students/programs

Status of Sport Management field and research

Several comments from Rounds I to Round III referred to the field of Sport Management per se and its status. While Panel members noted that Sport Management was a young field of study they also voiced their concerns regarding the field's basic assumptions, beliefs and/or concerns.

For example, one Panel member noted in response to the item – Developing specific sport marketing knowledge (Q 1) - “One of the research issues in sport management (in fact one reason to have a field we call 'sport management') is to determine the degree to which this thing we call 'sport' requires any special procedures, approaches, emphases, or understandings in its...management. If not, then we don’t need the discipline at all, since we can rely on the 'parent' disciplines of ... management.” Two other comments made during Round III in response to the item – Theory development/testing in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (Q 3) – echoed this perspective: “If we believe that there are some things special enough about the object we call ‘sport’ to warrant a special field called 'sport management,' then we have to believe that there will be vital areas of research in which our findings and theories
are distinctive." On the same line "If contributing to 'other' disciplines is the sine qua non of our achievement, then we really don't have a field that can be called 'sport management'; all we would have is management research with sport examples." These three comments reflect the ongoing discussion in the field regarding the uniqueness of the field.

Relating to this definition/identity question is the issue of where should sport management programs be housed within universities. One Panel member expressed her/his concerns as: "Since our tertiary institutions have chosen to house the vast majority of sport management researchers within departments of sport studies (variously called: kinesiology, physical education, human kinetics, etc.), we have institutionalized the separateness of sport (and, more vitally, the study of sport) from the rest of social and economic life (and the study of the rest of social and economic life)." Another comment was, "The overwhelming majority of our research publications concentrate on sport in isolation, are presented at conferences dedicated solely to sport, and are published in journals devoted uniquely to sport." As a result "There is little opportunity (and even less kudos) for researchers to develop, present, and publish papers that examine sport within its broader social and economic context."

Yet another comment on this issue was: "By the very way we have structured and institutionalized the field, we have made sport the focal center of what we study, and we have done so by separating it from other (and sometimes more general) fields of economic and social research. Consequently, it will take
a paradigm shift of Galilean proportions to remove sport from the center of our field’s solar system, and relegate it to the status of a mere planetary body.”

Finally, another Panel member commented on the housing of sport management programs and how it affected the field’s development. The Panel member started by noting, “We have been very hung-up on matters of academic prestige.” Then added the following comment: “In many places (especially North America), sport studies departments sit at the bottom of the academic prestige hierarchy. Consequently, there has been some degree of inferiority complex, and a felt need to draw strongly on other (more prestigious) disciplines.”

Sport management theory

Some sport management researchers have argued in the past whether the sport management field has a distinctive theory to earn its right to be called a field of study. Some of the comments in this Delphi study related to this. For example, as one Panel member stated, “There is no theory that is sport management per se. We borrow theories from other areas!” Another Panel member questioned, “What sport management theory is specifically sport management theory?” and another one noted, “Theory of parent disciplines is the critical knowledge—what is 'overall' sport management knowledge?” Yet, another Panel member wondered, “when/if we will ever get there.” As the comments show this issue needs to be addressed.
**Linking theory to practice**

Several Panel members reacted to the item “Linking theory to practice” Q 1) and “Research both theoretical and application driven” (Q 4). One Panel member noted that some of the field’s research is just “Research for research’s sake!” Another Panel member stated that “often when we say linking theory to practice we mean forget the theory and focus on the practice.” Some experts stressed how too much focus on practice can be negative to the field’s development as an academic field of study: “Too much emphasis put on practice at the expense of theory,” and also “too much focus on practice could take the field away from what should be its core: theory development and testing—which will ultimately have practical value.”

Another group of comments focused on the existing lack of integration between theory and practice in the field. As one Panel member put it: “Our dialog maintains the distinction between theory and practice, and thereby militates against an appropriate (read: real and meaningful) integration.” Further, “Since we still talk within the field as if theoretical work and practical work (disciplinary work and applied work) were different, there is little prospect that work that deems itself to be ‘applied’ will also seek theoretical / conceptual relevance.” Still in the same line, a Panel member recommended, “We have to believe that application and theory can be jointly obtained if we are going to seek to obtain them jointly.”
One Panel member referred to the need of "convincing practitioners and students of the importance of theory and the place it has in their ongoing development." Also another expert reported, "We are still having difficulty getting our work applied within the sport industry." Finally a Panel member asked if "this [integration is] always necessary and desirable?" The above statements highlight the concerns of this study's Delphi Panel members regarding the integration of theory and practice in the field.

Inclusion of both qualitative and quantitative methodologies

The comments relating to the methodological issue (Q 1) can be divided into (a) clarifying the issue, (b) how the field views qualitative research, and (c) a recommendation.

The first one questions what is really the underlying issue every time this discussion takes place among the field's researchers. Comments seem to point in the direction that the problem has more to do with rigor than really with type of methodology. As one Panel member stated the "Problem here is not with pluralism but with rigor." And another added, "The issue, of course, is not method, but is the insightfulness and creativity of our research questions, and the rigor we bring to research pursuant to those questions — both conceptually and methodologically." A third reinforcing comment was that "It is much more critical that people are involved in sound, rigorous research regardless of the methodological approach used." Thus, these comments focused on the rigor of research rather than on the method used.
The second group of comments focused on how qualitative research was perceived by sport management researchers. One Panel member affirmed that the "Qualitative method [is] underutilized and [under]appreciated in sport management." Another Panel member noted that "Many still look at qualitative as ‘fluffy’ research." Another expert noted that "Some reviewers reject qualitative studies based on their own positivist biases rather than on knowledgeable assessments of the research."

Finally, one Panel member recommended, "An examination of what is taught and how research design is integrated into the Masters and PhD courses of study may help us see some gaps" regarding the appropriate use of qualitative and quantitative methodologies in the sport management field.

Infrastructure for the new research field of sport management

Regarding support for research (Q 1) Panel members’ comments were varied and at times contradictory. Some Panel members focused on who ‘sets the tone’. As one expert stated, "Organization is unlike any other academic body in that people from small schools dominate it and that in many ways that has set the tone for research" while another Panel member noted his/her disagreement with the statement in the subsequent round. Yet another expert added that "Members set the tone, so it’s up to all of us to continue." Another Panel member stressed that "Until we have more research quality, the infrastructure is irrelevant—or, worse yet, an institutionalization of incompetence." As these comments illustrate, there is a divergence of opinions among Panel members.
regarding the need, timing, and orientation for the infrastructure of the new research field of sport management.

Globalization

Overall, analysis of Panel members' comments revealed that there is a divergence of opinions among Panel members in this regard. Some researchers believe that the topic is very important and is not being embraced by other researchers:

- "Globalization is a very important phenomenon, and one that we should be paying attention to."
- "We are not tackling globalization."
- "There is no research that looks at globalization from a sport management perspective."
- "For MOST sport management programs, globalization is not a strong influence in the research line chosen by faculty."
- "The claim by one of the panelists (above) that there is 'no research that looks at globalization from a sport management perspective' is wrong."
- "Those of us in North America need to pay more attention to the international scene."
- "Not much likelihood that such work is on the horizon among the sport management research fraternity."
- "Some of our gatekeepers are poorly prepared."
- "Many people 'fight' this."

Sport finance related issues.

Based on the comments to all three rounds, Panel members seem to agree that finance related issues (Q 2) are very important for the field. However, there is a substantial lack of training and preparation of sport management academics for sport financing. As one member stated: "Few people in sport management have financial training at an advanced level of research/theory
competency.” From another member, “We simply lack people trained in this area in sport management, and our sport management programs are not training them.”

To make the issue even more pertinent some Panel members seem to agree that this is “clearly important and growing in significance to the industry – which may say something about matters we need to address in the training of some sport management PhDs.” Another Panel member referred to this same preparation issue: “Sport management programs should require more coursework in finance.” Finally, another noted, “Students in business schools are better prepared in this area.”

**Diversity in topics**

Regarding diversity in sport management topics the main concern seemed to be with the existence of barriers. Some Panel members agreed with the perspective that “The field (particularly in north America) still defines itself and its objects of study too narrowly. Consequently it is hard to increase diversity of topics (and contexts) and get the research past the field’s gatekeepers.”

Another comment noted the same “barrier”: “NASSM tried to do [diversity in topics] and some members were against it.” Finally another comment just reinforced that “we are creatures of habit” and therefore have an inherent tendency to resist change.
Rigor and competitiveness of conferences.

Overall, analysis of Panel members' comments revealed a concern regarding whether an increase in rigor and competitiveness of conferences will happen or not. One Panel member highlighted the two steps necessary to increase conferences' rigor and competitiveness. First, candidates need to submit a paper instead of just an abstract. As another comment reasoned, "It is virtually impossible to give a meaningful and rigorous review to an abstract." Second, "it would be necessary to lift the standard of the reviewers who review conference submissions" meaning the field should "use reviewers who are established scholars." Along these lines, another comment stressed, "First-year assistant professors and people who don't publish aren't appropriate [reviewers]." One of the most stringent comments was that "Researchers who are doing cutting edge stuff are getting rejected for NASSM presentations."

Another member noted NASSM's conference rigor and competitiveness was not the only one the field should be concerned about since "other associations (e.g., EASM and SMAANZ) have been similarly reticent to demand more from presenters and reviewers."

Recognition of scholarship within the field.

Analysis of comments from Delphi Panel members revealed that they are concerned with potential consequences formal recognition of scholarship may have in the field. One Panel member noted, "Formal recognition will have much
influence on moving research in the desired direction." Another member was
"concerned that "we may recognize mediocre research as well." Yet another
member stated that the field of sport management is "already an organization
that champions mediocrity."

On the other hand some Panel members seemed to imply that maybe
there is no need for more formal recognition since there are "Not enough good
people to win the Ziegler award every year." Moreover, "The last few winners of
the Zeigler award (our scholarship award) have won it primarily for service." And
as yet another Panel member put it, "The standards for the Research Fellows
presented at NASSM this year allow for researchers to be recognized as a
Research Fellow way too early in their careers" which may not contribute to the
development of the field's research since, as one expert mentioned, "recognition
takes time."

Interdisciplinary and collaborative research.

Some Panel members were concerned that interdisciplinary and
collaborative research was not happening and that "acceptability is low."
However, another member noted that it "must happen to some extent." Another
Panel member even stated, "If we do not do this, we will soon be marginalized."
This did not seem to be the only reason to increase interdisciplinary and
collaborative research involving sport management researchers. Another reason
would be because, as highlighted by one of the experts, "Cutting edge
developments [happen] in multidisciplinary and interstitial environments."
Increase quality of sport management research designs and methods of analysis.

Several Panel members were mainly concerned about the misuses of both sophisticated designs and methods of analysis. As noted by one Panel member "We get too hung up on using 'sophisticated research designs' simply to prove that we are more 'sophisticated' rather than because that is what is appropriate to answer the question(s)." As another Panel member wrote, "Much academia has become obsessed with using the most complicated statistics possible and this is not necessary to answer most research questions." Also there is the concern that some sport management researchers "do not spend enough time prior to collection of data thinking through the design." As experts pointed out concerns like the previous ones seem to be related to the fact that "there is still too much methodologically flawed work being submitted to journals and presented at our conferences." Further, a Panel member believed that "allowing conference presentations to be reviewed and presented on the basis of abstracts (as at NASSM) rather than developed work has exacerbated the problem."

Regarding the choice of designs by sport management researchers, Panel members highlighted that "the best designs are elegant—simple enough to interpret" and therefore "some of the best researchers use very simple designs." On the other hand, "Complicated designs are usually difficult to interpret in a way that is meaningful to the reader." One Panel member cautioned that researchers should only use "more sophisticated designs" if "they are called for" because "increasing quality doesn't mean we have to increase complexity."
Another significant concern had to do with the time it takes to enhance quality in research. One expert stated that an increase in quality of sport management research designs and methods of analysis “must happen over time” and another Panel member noted: “How can the quality [of research designs] fail to increase? If it doesn’t, we won’t be around in five to seven years because the assistant professors won’t get tenure.” Yet another expert revealed her/his “pessimism on this matter … it does not seem that we - in aggregated term – are likely to reach the kinds of rigor to which this panel would aspire within the foreseeable future.”

Research outlets

The comments on research outlets related to three issues. The first issue was the number of research outlets in the field. The second was the quality of the research being published in the field. Finally, the third issue addressed the reasons why research outlets have and may continue to increase in the field of sport management. Overall, the main emergent concern among Panel members regarding research outlets specifically related to the quality of the research being published.

Many comments addressed the high number of publications serving the field. Some examples of these comments were: “Oversupplied with journals,” “Too many journals and not enough quality work to go in them,” “New journals in the field that are begging for material” and “We can’t fill our current outlets with
quality material. The last issue of JSM contained only four articles. Why expand?"

Second, Panel members discussed how the number of research outlets seems to affect the quality of research being published. Some of the comments made by Panel members in this regard are presented below:

- "Too easy to publish drivel or, worse yet, simply wrong assertions."
- "Lot of junk is being published."
- "Bad research representing the field."
- "We have diluted the field through the establishment of journals that will publish rubbish."
- "If research is weak, reviewers have to accept some blame."
- "This is not important if the new publications serve as outlets for substandard work."
- "Time to step back and assess the increased number of outlets – at a quality cost?"
- "Oversupply may lead to quality decline."
- "Need more rigorous journals."
- "Quality is more important than quantity."

Third, a group of comments addressed justification for the increase in number of research outlets in the field of sport management. Some of the examples are quoted below:

- "Much of the need for increased research outlets is the editorial policy in terms of the type of material (not speaking of quality here) that will be considered for publication."
- "We will see more outlets, not because of demand but because of personal interest under the guise of meeting a new market niche."
- "Another issue related to increased outlets is the fact that some journals take an inordinate amount of time returning reviews – those on a tenure track can often not afford that kind of time."
- "Review Boards do make mistakes" and "sometimes a manuscript will be held up by the views of one reviewer. Smacks of academic snobbery."

Finally, in spite of all the concerns presented above relating to the high number of research outlets in the field and how that can affect negatively the
quality of research representing the field, there are some Panel members that believe more outlets are still needed. Their comments follow:

- “Missing a few journals that we could use, but we are making great strides in this area.”
- “Need different kinds of outlets ... outlets for practical research and one that focuses on sport management education.”

**Funding resources**

Panel members’ comments to this item revealed several areas of concern. First, the increasing pressure by research universities for faculty to conduct externally funded research. Panel members’ comments were:

- “Universities are beginning to grant tenure and promotion only to assistant professors who have brought in grant money.”
- “Huge problem with Universities focusing on external funding much more.”
- “Huge issue on campuses before very long.”
- “There is increasing demand that we get funded.”

Then there is another concern regarding the status of funding resources in the US where researchers “are not supported well in the US and that will not change.” On the other hand, professional associations, research agencies, and universities funding sport management research is “happening to some degree in Europe and Australia (although often in situations were the research does not call itself ‘sport management’”) instead “‘city marketing’ or ‘event leveraging’ or ‘economic development.’”

Third, some Panel members were concerned about the consequences funding may have on the field’s research.

- “Emphasis on grants could also begin to dictate our research interests, as faculty conduct only fundable research.”
- “The topics that are fundable may come to dominate our research agendas.”
“Is not without its problems.”

“There is no question that our opportunities to do quality work will be enhanced to the degree that we can find strong and renewable funding resources.”

“The escalating demands that we do so are likely to have a significant impact on the ways we do research and on the kinds of questions we ask – whether for better or worse.”

“There is no question that our opportunities to do quality work will be enhanced to the degree that we can find strong and renewable funding resources.”

“See external funding being the source of attracting quality graduate students who are necessary for an active research agenda.”

“The status and sustainability of the field may depend on our ability to attract and renew funding for the research that we do.”

“It is a critical issue.”

The field has yet to establish the necessary credibility to attract substantial funding in its own right.”

“We can do research without extensive funding.”

**Doctoral students/programs**

Panel members’ comments to this item revealed several areas of concern.

First, some of the researchers referred to issues of concern pertaining specifically to doctoral students and their training as future scholars. The following comments illustrate the nature of the discussion:

- “Some of the doctoral programs are not developing individuals with the necessary tools to become good researchers.”
- “We need to do a better job training [good PhD students].”
- “Particularly need to do more to train [PhD students] in matters of intellectual curiosity and intellectual ambition — in the substance of research, rather than just the form of research.”
- “It seems unlikely that institutions will move to greater demands on students over the near term.”
- The pressures are in the other direction – to get students through to completion with a minimal stumbling blocks (which added research preparation often constitutes.)”

Second, researchers noted some challenges in the field that may be contributing to the status of quality in doctoral work:
“Produced only by 2-3 programs.”
“Dependent upon quality of doctoral programs and we have a definite
disparity in quality now.”
In some “schools and some countries there is atrocious research
preparation.”
“Too many smaller programs popping up to meet demand – but lack quality.”

Finally, there were some comments addressing researchers’ perceptions
of existing doctoral programs:

• “The institutional trend seems to be status quo oriented.”
• “Programs seem to be producing a few great prospects but many weak PhDs
  as well.”
• “Do not have great confidence in doctoral programs in US.”
• Increase doctoral candidates’ knowledge of theories in parent disciplines -
  “Do not see this happening in doctoral programs in the future.”
• “Creation of weaker programs to meet demand.”
• “Takes substantial time to change doctoral programs.”
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to assess the opinions of selected experts, and the extent of congruence of these opinions regarding the future of sport management research. The underlying rationale behind the varying opinions was also a focus of the present study. The discussion of the findings is organized into the following four sections: (a) evaluation of the Delphi Method, (b) most significant findings based on the consensus by the Delphi Panel, (c) summary of the findings, and (d) recommendations for future research.

Evaluation of the Delphi Method

Providing enlightenment was a guiding principle throughout this study. The researcher followed this principle in this section by answering the following two questions suggested by Krueger (1994):

1) What was known and then confirmed or challenged by this study?

Regarding the method, it was known, based on the literature, and then confirmed in this study that:
• The classical Delphi is a very robust research method and that many of its
  criticisms stem from poor implementation by researchers. In designing and
  conducting the present study the researcher focused on:
  
  • Overcoming conceptual and methodological limitations of many of the
    adapted Delphis used in the literature.
  • Following the implementation guidelines for the Classical Delphi.
  • Designing robust questionnaires.
  • Designing and implementing a strong protocol for Delphi Panel selection.
  • Carrying out a reliable analysis of the results.

• It was known, that three iterations would potentially be enough. In this study,
  the researcher felt that after the third round Delphi Panel members had
  already contributed the most and were ready to end the process. The Delphi
  method implies a long process and demands an extended length of time (in
  this case, approximately 50 minutes for rounds II and III). Thus, the
  researcher felt that a fourth round would not add many more insights and that
  keeping high participation rate could very potentially be a challenge.

• Establishing a good communication system with each Delphi Panel member
  (in this study the researcher persistently used telephone and email to engage
  each Panel member with the study). The researcher felt that initial contact,
  and personalized and timely emails established a degree of commitment from
  the Panel. It was also very important to communicate the Delphi time plan
  (i.e., when each round would be sent out) early on in the process so
  adjustments could be made, either alternative email addresses, use of fax or
  some flexibility with dates.
Delphi Method is very demanding in terms of data analysis and questionnaire development (i.e., second and subsequent rounds). Since the schedule was predetermined and particularly in this study, there was not much time between iterations. Therefore, it became essential to pre-allocate plenty of time for the researcher and Content Analysis Panel during analysis time.

- It is also important to highlight the significance of feedback, to provide experts the opportunity for learning and understanding other experts' rationales regarding a specific topic. Additionally, reminding experts' of their own rating to the previous round was very fruitful because it gave them a chance to provide a rationale confirming their rating or explaining the change, after re-analyzing it in light of the comments of others.

2) What was suspected and then confirmed or challenged by this study?

Regarding the method, it was suspected and then confirmed in this study that:

- The email (attachment) is a very effective means of communication to decrease the time between iterations.
- Flexibility with Delphi Panel members is needed with the Delphi Method.
- The use of email attachments could potentially limit the researchers formatting choices of Rounds II and subsequent rounds. This concern was confirmed, particularly when organizing the feedback information. For example, frequency tables were included instead of stem-leaf graphics, which would have been more informative for the Panel from a visual standpoint. The main limitation is that documents supporting graphics become unmanageable to send through email attachments.
- The fact that different researchers used different operating systems and word processor software resulted in some Panel members finding it difficult to open the document.

- Because by Round II and thereafter the questionnaire increases substantially in size, it becomes very important that participants are still comfortable with the chosen means of communication. Therefore, it is important to assess the computer literacy level of Delphi Panel members a priori. This specific challenge surfaced in two or three instances where Panel members had difficulty assessing the questionnaire or where they experienced technical difficulties when attempting to send it back. For example, in the present study, there was a Panel member that received the questionnaires in an email attachment and preferred to send it back by mail. None of the challenges became a problem since the researcher was able to promptly clarify the situations.

Most Significant Findings Based on Consensus
by the Delphi Panel

The present study was undertaken from the perspective of strategic planning and management. Strategic planning literature suggests that the overall strategic intent is to (a) build on and repeat successes, (b) monitor events and trends, (c) actualize the ideal qualities, (d) benchmark the realistic qualities, (e) move in the general direction of the ideal future, (f) implement strategies and actions, and (g) manage promptly challenges and issues. These principles of
strategic planning would enable the field to sustain the successes, monitor present and future trends and events, identify the ideal and realistic qualities, and set the directions and strategies to achieve those qualities. The researcher could discern from the three-stage Delphi study several themes that were consistent with strategic planning. These recurring themes or topical threads were related to:

1. Doctoral education
2. Research outlets
3. Research funding resources
4. Quality of research designs and methods
5. Recognition of sport management scholars
6. Development and use of theory in the field
7. Professional development opportunities in research for faculty
8. Research specialization
9. Research collaboration
10. Constructive interaction with other scholars

**Doctoral education**

As for doctoral education, the Panel did not consider it to be a success nor did they feel it would be a realistic expectation in the near future of the field. However they felt high quality doctoral candidates an ideal that ought to be an integral part of the field in five to seven years from now. The Panel proposed an increase in research preparation for doctoral students as a general direction if the
field is to move its research towards an ideal future. Further, the Panel agreed on the importance of two of the proposed strategies. One is to increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs and the second is to increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines. Finally, Panel members felt that the quality of doctoral programs is a challenge that the field can and absolutely must manage at the present time. Of all the findings, doctoral education was the one where Delphi Panel members had a higher level of agreement regarding the probability of occurrence. They believed that there was over 55% chance that high quality doctoral candidates would characterize the field in five to seven years from now.

Findings regarding doctoral education were not unexpected considering the literature in sport management. Almost a decade ago, Slack (1991, p. 97) noted that "In the future [sport management] has to specialize more at the graduate level" (Slack, 1991, p. 96). The author argued that this would allow for a deeper understanding of research topics and areas and a concentration of focused graduate students around those topics, thus contributing to a faster development of the field.

A few years earlier, Ziegler (1987) commented on the quality of the sport management programs: "One can only speculate about the intellectual level of these programs when the professors and instructors have typically been such reluctant, unproductive scholars themselves" (p. 10). Further, Slack (1992) affirmed that the way graduate students are trained in sport management relates to many of the challenges encountered in the discipline. The author noted that
the graduate students take fewer courses than at the undergraduate level and are usually supervised by faculty who are “too diverse and consequently too superficial in their understanding of the various aspects of sport management” (Slack, 1992, p. 96). These are some of the challenges faced by the field.

It is indeed not surprising that research experts in the sport management field believe that the future of the field’s research is greatly dependent on the quality of its doctoral education because doctoral candidates will be the next generation of researchers. There could be a couple of explanations for these findings. First, it could be that they are a function of only few universities offering doctoral programs. Second, it may be that some of the doctoral programs are not providing doctoral candidates with the necessary tools to become good researchers as one Panel member had mentioned. Third, it could also be that doctoral programs are focusing too much on the form of research instead of in the substance of research. As noted by a Panel member, there is a lack of intellectual curiosity and intellectual ambition. Fourth, as noted by a Panel member, doctoral programs are under the university institutional pressure to guide students through to completion without many stumbling blocks, and in a limited timeframe. This results in a lower quality of doctoral preparation.

**Research outlets**

The Panel considered research outlets a success in sport management research and agreed that it was extremely important to continue to increase their quality. Also, the Panel considered it almost critical that research published in
first tier sport management journals realistically describe sport management research five to seven years from now. They also stressed that it was highly important that high quality sport management research published in first tier sport management journals ideally characterize the field’s research five to seven years from now. In order to move research towards this ideal, the Panel agreed that it was very important that the field increase standards for research publication and promptly manage aspects related to rigor and competitiveness of journals.

Not surprisingly, the main concern among Panel members regarding research outlets was specifically related to the quality of the research being published. The experts expressed their concerns for not only the quality of the publications but also the quality of the reviewers. According to the literature, faculty in sport management field are still “spreading themselves too thin” (Chelladurai, 1992, p. 216) and there is a need for the field’s faculty to grow to be more specialized in both their roles: researchers and reviewers (Mahony & Pitts, 1998).

Mahony and Pitts (1998) recently addressed the reviewers’ aspect. These authors made a pertinent point regarding research publications in sport management. They highlighted that at a time where individuals in sport management are more specialized (mainly because of the increasing number of faculty in the field), it becomes more difficult to gather editorial review board member specifically skilled to review articles in the different content areas (e.g., sport marketing, sport ethics, sport law, sport finance, and management in sport). Thus, “one must question the adequacy of the review process in this case”
Further, referring to JSM, they also noted that “expecting reviewers to be able to review articles across all content areas is unrealistic and unfair to both the reviewer and the reviewee” (Mahony & Pitts, 1998). These authors recommend the introduction of specialized journals to alleviate this problem. Contrary to this perspective, several members cautioned against rapid growth of number of publications. They feared that the increase in quantity may result in a decrease in quality.

**Research funding resources**

Panel members felt that availability of research resources could not be considered a success in sport management at the present time. At the same time, they felt that it was critical that adequate research resources characterize sport management research in five to seven years. In addition, Panel members agreed it was highly important for the field to make strong efforts towards increasing industry links and funding opportunities in research for faculty. Further, they felt that it was almost crucial that faculty time and resources for research be addressed at this point in time.

There could be a couple of explanations behind the critical need for adequate research resources to characterize sport management research in five to seven years. On one hand, it may be that sport management researchers are feeling the escalating pressure by research institutions to conduct externally funded research, as mentioned by one Panel member, and therefore they know that the field’s survival and research development is dependent on it. Another
explanation may have to do with the researchers own professional survival, since more and more universities are considering external funding resources as a significant criterion for tenure and promotion. Also, it may be that, as a Panel member suggested, researchers in sport management are becoming aware that finding rich and renewable funding resources will greatly increase the opportunity to carry out quality research and attract quality graduate students who are essential for active research agendas.

Quality of research designs and methods

Panel members agreed that the quality of sport management research designs represented a limited success in sport management research. They also agreed that it was highly important to increase the quality of sport management methods of analysis. Moreover, they believed that it was very important for highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data to ideally characterize sport management research in the next five to seven years. At a more realistic level, the Panel felt that it was extremely important that the field be at least characterized by research rigorous in design, methodology, and interpretation. Finally, increasing quality in research design was felt to be highly important strategy for the field to emphasize in order to move to an ideal future.

This high need for heightening the quality of research designs and methods in the field may be a function of the large body of methodologically flawed work submitted to journals and presented at conferences in the sport management field. Consequently this awareness may create a concern in the
field since researchers know that this is having a negative impact on the field's reputation and respectability. Another potential explanation for this felt need to improve quality of research designs and methods in the field may have to do, comparatively, to external funding resources, with the researchers' own professional survival, since more and more universities consider publishing in first tier journals the main criterion for tenure and promotion.

**Recognition of sport management scholars**

The Panel did not refer to recognition of sport management scholars as a success in the field. However, they felt that it is highly important that sport management researchers be professionally accepted as credible, and respected as scholars and academicians within the academe. Moreover, they did not agree on general characteristics of an ideal future, nor did they agree on any specific strategy or challenges in this regard.

Not surprisingly, researchers as individuals and as a collective wish to be respected within academe perhaps because they perceive the field's survival and development to be dependent on it. Just recently, Mahony and Pitts (1998) noted that one of the possible explanations for sport marketing research not being published in mainstream marketing journals could relate to business school faculty's perception of sport management researchers. More specifically, one reason may be that they lack respect for sport focused research while another reason may be that they "believe that sport management faculties are made up of former 'jocks' who lack the intelligence and skills to produce quality research"
As these authors implied, many doors can be opened if and when sport management researchers are respected by other fields.

**Development and use of theory in the field**

Regarding the development and use of theory in the field, Panel members noted that researchers had moderately succeeded in developing overall sport management knowledge and in using theory from parent disciplines. Also they agreed that it was extremely important to continue doing so and also to continue developing sport management theory as well as linking theory to practice.

The literature on the topic supports the perspective of the Panel members. Five years ago, Ziegler and Bowie (1995, p.2) noted that “despite the fact that growth of programs in sport and exercise science has been matched by programs in sport management, there has only been nominal movement toward improving the theoretical aspect of management training.” Perhaps an explanation for the extreme need to continue to develop, apply and integrate theory both in the field and from parent disciplines relates to researchers belief that without it the field’s body of knowledge will not be able to develop in a strong and systematic way, which ultimately will threaten the field’s survival within academia.

Further, the Panel believed that there was over a 30% chance that theory developed/tested in sport management would impact parent disciplines in five to seven years. Also, they felt it was very important that in five to seven years research in the field be theoretically driven and grounded in parent disciplines’
theories. Moreover, the Panel agreed that it was highly important that the field emphasizes the recognition of sport as a context for theory testing and theory building as a general direction.

This finding paralleled a proposition made recently by Slack (1998). The author proposed two ways in which to contribute to theory development: a) test existing theory on sport organizations therefore validating them in a new setting while attempting to solve a problem, and b) extend existing theory using sport organizations, meaning that the primary focus is to test or develop a specific theory and the sport organization is the site of choice.

Finally, there was no agreement regarding the level of importance of the challenges the field could potentially face at the moment. However, the Panel did suggest that doctoral candidates’ knowledge of theories in parent disciplines should be highly emphasized as a strategy to move sport management research towards an ideal future.

Professional development opportunities in research for faculty

The Panel felt that professional development opportunities in research for faculty were critical to move sport management research towards an ideal future and therefore to be emphasized as a general direction. Further, the Panel agreed on the importance of conducting professional research seminars and workshops. The fact that professional development opportunities in research for faculty was not perceived by Panel members as a success in the field is not surprising. Also not surprising is the felt need to do so. Ten years ago, Olafson (1990) urged that
sport management researchers “must become more attuned to the advances and expectations in [research] design, methodology, and analysis.” Further, the author suggested a way to accomplish this would be to encourage faculty to retool in these areas (p. 116).

More recently, Parks et al. (1999) noted that researchers who live in a “publish or perish” environment might believe that they lack the time to invest in becoming acquainted and learning about other research design, methodological, and statistical approaches. A potential explanation for the expressed need may be that researchers are recognizing that retooling is essential both for conducting their own rigorous research agendas and also challenging and supporting their doctoral students to acquire the knowledge and dexterity necessary for them to become good researchers.

### Research specialization

As for specialization, the Panel did not mention it as being a success in the field. However they felt focused and sustained research programs ought to be an integral part of the field in five to seven years from now. Further, the Panel agreed that it was highly important that research specialization be emphasized in order to move its research towards an ideal future.

Panel members perceived research specialization as being so important for the development of the field’s research because ultimately as one Panel member noted, that was where the field’s depth of knowledge would come from. Mainly, researchers should begin to develop lines of sequential studies, instead
of engaging in what is commonly called a "shot gun" approach where a researcher has several areas of interest and conducts singular studies in each of them.

Research collaboration

The Panel did not perceive research collaboration as a success in the field. However, they felt that it was extremely important that global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration be emphasized as a general direction in the field. Also they felt that doing collaborative research across disciplines was a highly important strategy that the field should pursue.

Perhaps researchers, as one Panel member suggested, are starting to perceive that if they do not engage in research collaboration they will be somewhat marginalized in institutions of higher education which emphasize it. Another potential explanation, suggested by another Panel member, could be that researchers realize that cutting edge developments happen more often in multidisciplinary settings.

Through the years, authors (e.g., Slack, 1991) have suggested more collaboration among researchers as a way to create and strengthen research links with other disciplines. Slack's (1991) specific suggestion was to elaborate joint projects, attend and present at their conferences or publish in their journals. Also Zakrajsek (1993) called for more collaborative research among faculty in sport management, professionals and organizations in the field, and other
disciplines as a way to contribute to the field's development. The author proposed that this measure would definitely intensify research in the field.

Constructive interaction with other scholars

Constructive interaction with other scholars was not considered a success in the field. However, Panel members felt the extreme importance of involving researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management in order to move the field's research towards an ideal future. Also the Panel agreed on the great importance of the field promptly managing two of its challenges: promote critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (e.g., during conference and presentations) and promote interaction with academic community outside sport management.

It was interesting to notice that Panel members believed constructive interaction with other scholars was of great importance. This, as many Panel members noted, was not central to field's main conference (NASSM). There could be several explanations for this reaction. Perhaps, researchers perceive engaging in constructive research interactions with other scholars both in and outside the field of sport management as opportunities to establish credibility for the field. Or, maybe researchers realize that being too polite to each other and resisting interaction is not really the best for the field's research on the long run. Also, it could be that researchers realized that the standard of research in the field could be enhanced through give and take constructive criticisms on an ongoing basis rather than just in public forums like annual conferences. Finally, it
could be that the extreme importance placed on constructive interaction with other scholars might be from the realization that research discussions are extremely important for the development of a field's body of knowledge. The most significant set of directions, strategies/actions, and challenges to be managed now suggested by the experts are summarized in Table 6.1.

There was less consensus regarding events and trends that shaped the research in the field. Without such agreed-upon assessment of events and trends, future directions cannot be developed and implemented. Strategic planning and management for the future cannot be effective if the events and trends are not effectively monitored. A potential next step could be to invite the same group of experts or sport management researchers with similar expertise to join a Nominal Group Technique to further address this issue during the next NASSM Conference.

While the 80% rule to indicate the presence of consensus is meaningful in many contexts, it also leads one to ignore the significance of the patterns of distributions of responses. For example, if the response distribution was bimodal, the 80% rule would set aside the question as lacking consensus. However, such a distribution would clearly show two sharply contrasting perspectives on the issue under consideration. Therefore, caution must be exercised when applying the consensus decision rule adopted a priori (in the case of the present study the 80% decision rule adopted) since a bimodal distribution could also yield valuable insights on specific issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directions</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Challenges to manage now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase quality of doctoral education.</td>
<td>1A. Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs. 1B. Increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.</td>
<td>Quality of doctoral programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase standards for research publication.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rigor and competitiveness of journals in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development and use of theory.</td>
<td>3A. Recognize sport as a context for theory testing and theory building. 3B. Ground sport management research in parent discipline's theories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging sport management researchers in critical and constructive dialogues. Interactions with academic community outside sport management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1

General conclusions.
Recommendations and Implications for Future Research.

Future research may address the following questions that could provide additional insight for the field's research:

1. How is the field of sport management building and repeating its research successes?

2. How is sport management monitoring events and trends that impact the field's research?

3. How is the field of sport management actualizing the proposed research ideal scenario?

4. How is the field of sport management benchmarking the proposed research realistic scenario?

5. How is the field of sport management moving towards the proposed general directions?

6. How and to what extent is the field of sport management implementing the proposed strategies and actions to move its research towards an ideal future?

7. How is the field of sport management managing the proposed challenges?
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APPENDIX D

Invitation Letter
Dear Dr.

I am Carla Costa, a doctoral student in sport management at The Ohio State University. I request your help with my doctoral research—a Delphi study of the future of research in sport management.

I am approaching you because of your deep involvement in sport management research, and a sound publishing record. Your perspectives on the future directions for sport management research would be valuable to the proposed research.

As you are well aware, the Delphi method involving several scholars like you would help identify the convergence and/or divergence of ideas on the topic. I am planning on three waves of data collection (every other week you will receive one round and will have a full week to respond). In the first wave, you will be requested to respond to an open-ended questionnaire eliciting your vision for sport management research in the future, and the strategies to be undertaken to achieve that vision. This phase will take about 20 minutes of your time.

In the second phase, I will send a list of characteristics of the visions identified by all participants with a request that you rate those characteristics.

Once again opinions and suggestions from the second phase will be summarized and a third questionnaire will be sent to you. The second and third questionnaires will each take a maximum of thirty minutes to complete. As soon as the results are available I will share them with you.

As I am pressed for time as well as to reduce time between iterations, I would like to use the email for sending out the questionnaires. I would also like to receive your responses through email. If this process is not convenient to you, I will use the regular mail.

I hope that you will agree to participate in this study and either way, please reply to this email no later than next Friday, the 23rd, with your decision. Your answers to each questionnaire will be kept confidential. I will be calling you shortly to give you an opportunity to question me further about the study (please confirm your contact information below).

We eagerly look forward to your response.

Thank you in advance,

Carla A. Costa (Doctoral Candidate)  P. Chelladurai (Adviser)
(614) 421-0882 (Phone and Fax)  (614) 292-0816
costa.27@osu.edu  chelladurai.1@osu.edu
Dear Dr.

Thank you for continuing to participate in the Future of Research in Sport Management Delphi study. Round II summarizes the responses of fifteen members to the seven questions in Round I.

As I mentioned in the previous communication, the Delphi method involving several scholars like you will help the convergence and/or divergence of ideas on the topic. This phase will take approximately 35 minutes of your time.

My request in this round is that you refine your responses using scales with regard to such topics as success, impact, importance, and probability. Please continue to draw on your understanding and perspectives on the future directions for sport management research. In addition to rating each item, add any insights you may have regarding each of the specific items or questions in general (i.e., state disagreement, state agreement, make clarifications, ask questions, etc).

Please complete the questionnaire and email it back to me by July 14th (Friday). I will be emailing you Round III questionnaire July 24th, which will be a summary of responses to this round.

Just a reminder, your reply to the questionnaire will be kept confidential and your participation is voluntary. Please email me if you have any questions, regarding this round or the study in general.

We look forward to the insights you have to share,

Carla A. Costa (Doctoral Candidate)  
(614) 421-0882 (Phone and Fax)  
costa.27@osu.edu

P. Chelladurai (Adviser)  
(614) 292-0816  
chelladurai.1@osu.edu
Future of Research in Sport Management – Delphi Study

Background Information
1. Age:

2. Gender:

3. Race:

4. Academic Rank:

5. Under what College and School is your Department?
   College:
   School:

6. Year you earned your Doctorate Degree:

7. Your Doctoral University:

8. Most people are interested in the future to some degree. Their main interest in the future usually extends beyond tomorrow, but not usually as far as hundreds of years from now. Using the time scale below (a, b, c, d, e, f, and g), please indicate the period(s) in the future in which you are mainly interested (include all that apply):
   a) Next week
   b) Next month
   c) Next year
   d) 2002
   e) 2003-2007
   f) 2008-2013
   g) 2014-2024

9. Using the scale below (a, b, c, and d) indicate the amount of time you spend thinking about the future, compared with other people.
   a) None
   b) A very small amount
   c) A moderate amount
   d) A large amount

Your Answer:
Your answer:
Delphi Questionnaire – ROUND I

1. What are the successes in sport management research that should be sustained?

2. What are the current events and trends impacting research in sport management?

3. What qualities and characteristics would you use to describe a best-case scenario for sport management research in five to seven years?

4. What qualities and characteristics would you use to realistically describe sport management research in five to seven years?

5. In your opinion, what directions should sport management research take to move it towards the best-case scenario?

6. In your opinion, what actions and/or strategies will contribute to the movement of sport management research in these directions?

7. In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research in these directions?

Thank you for your participation.
APPENDIX F

Round II
Dear Dr.

Thank you for continuing to participate in this study. Round II summarizes the responses of sixteen Panel Members to the seven questions in Round I.

As I mentioned in the previous communication, the Delphi method involving several scholars like you will help the convergence and/or divergence of ideas on the topic. This phase will take approximately 30 of your time.

My request in this round is that you refine your responses using scales with regard to such topics as success, impact, importance, and probability. Please continue to draw on your understanding and perspectives on the future directions for sport management research. In addition to rating each item, add any insights you may have regarding each of the specific items or questions in general (i.e., state disagreement, state agreement, make clarifications, ask questions, etc).

Please complete the attached questionnaire and email it back to me by July 14th (Friday). Please do not forget to attach your response. I am attaching a second file (Scale reference RII) that I would advise you print (it is only two pages) and use for scale and specific questions reference while filling out the questionnaire directly on your computer.

I will be emailing you Round III questionnaire July 24th, which will be a summary of responses to this round.

Just a reminder, your reply to the questionnaire will be kept confidential and your participation is voluntary. Please email me if you have any questions regarding this round, the study in general, or if you have any challenges opening the attachment.

I look forward to the insights you have to share.

Carla Costa  
(614) 421-0882 (Phone and Fax)  
costa.27@osu.edu
Future of Research in Sport Management
Delphi Study – ROUND II

Included in this Round are the summaries of the responses of all the Panel Members to the seven Round I questions. In this second Round, I will be asking you to refine your answers using Likert-type scales.

Please:
• Review all Round I responses on the questionnaire. Feel free to comment (i.e., ask questions, make clarifications, argue in favor or against items) on any items you wish. Please do so under "Comments" following each item.
• If there are any other items that you believe should be included, please list them under "ADDITIONAL ITEMS" at the end of each main question.
• Also if you feel the content analysis Panel did not give some of your suggestions full weight, please note this under "ADDITIONAL ITEMS" at the end of each main question.
• Rate each item using the given scales as exemplified in the following example.
• Note: In the event a question was reworded, the original question is reported between [ ] for reference.

Please read the example carefully:

Question 3: In your view, IDEALLY what qualities would best describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now?
[Original question: What qualities and characteristics would you use to describe a best-case scenario for sport management research in five to seven years?]

Please rate each quality on the following two scales.

Importance scale:
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance of the following ideal qualities.
Scale: "1"- No importance, "2"- Slight importance, "3"- Limited importance,"4"- Moderate importance,"5"- Moderately high importance,"6"-High importance, and "7"-Critical importance.

Probability scale:
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of each of the following ideal qualities.
Scale: "1"- 0-10%, "2"- 11-20%, "3"- 21-30%, "4"- 31-40%, "5"- 41-50%, "6"- 51-60%, "7"- 61-70%, "8"- 71-80%, "9"- 81-90%, "10"- 91-100%.

Ideal Qualities:

4. Creating groups with common interests.
Importance (1-7): 6
Probability (1-10): 3
Comments:

NOTE:
A rating of "6" (high importance) is the rating the respondent indicates for item #4 question #3 on the importance scale.

A rating of "3" (21 to 30%) is the rating the respondent indicates for item #4 question #3 on the probability scale.

The example ends here.
Question 1: What are the successes in sport management research that should be sustained?

Please rate ALL successes on the following two scales.

**Success scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the extent to which each of the following items has been a success in sport management research.

**Importance scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance for each of the following items to be sustained or become a success in the future.

**Successes:**
1. Developing sport management theory.
   - Success (1-7):
   - Importance (1-7):
   - Comments:

2. Use of theory from parent disciplines.
   - Success (1-7):
   - Importance (1-7):
   - Comments:

3. Linking theory to practice
   - Success (1-7):
   - Importance (1-7):
   - Comments:

4. Broadening of sport management research to include both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.
   - Success (1-7):
   - Importance (1-7):
   - Comments:

5. Diversifying sport management research settings.
   - Success (1-7):
   - Importance (1-7):
   - Comments:

6. Adding sophistication to its research designs.
   - Success (1-7):
   - Importance (1-7):
   - Comments:

7. Adding rigor to sport management methods of analysis.
   - Success (1-7):
   - Importance (1-7):
   - Comments:

8. Increasing the number of research outlets in the sport management field.
   - Success (1-7):
   - Importance (1-7):
   - Comments:
9. Increasing the quality of research outlets in the field.
   Success (1-7):
   Importance (1-7):
   Comments:

10. Establishing an infrastructure for the new research field of sport management (i.e., NASSM, JSM).
    Success (1-7):
    Importance (1-7):
    Comments:

11. Recognizing sport management as a field of study.
    Success (1-7):
    Importance (1-7):
    Comments:

12. Developing overall sport management knowledge.
    Success (1-7):
    Importance (1-7):
    Comments:

13. Developing specific sport marketing knowledge.
    Success (1-7):
    Importance (1-7):
    Comments:

14. Developing specific sport leadership knowledge.
    Success (1-7):
    Importance (1-7):
    Comments:

ADDITIONAL ITEMS:
Question 2: What are the current events and trends impacting research in sport management?

Please rate ALL events/trends on the following scale.

Impact scale:
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of impact each of the following events/trends will continue to have on sport management research.
Scale: "1"- No impact, "2"- Slight impact, "3"- Limited impact, "4"- Moderate impact, "5"- Moderately high impact, "6"- High impact, and "7"- Critical impact.

Events/trends:
   Impact (1-7):
   Comments:

2. Information technology.
   Impact (1-7):
   Comments:

3. Increased diversity of sport consumer audience.
   Impact (1-7):
   Comments:

4. Increase in legal issues and regulations.
   Impact (1-7):
   Comments:

5. Commercialization of amateur and intercollegiate sports.
   Impact (1-7):
   Comments:

6. Increase in opportunities for participation in sport (both spectatorship and participation).
   Impact (1-7):
   Comments:

7. Increase in professional sport finance related issues (e.g., stadium/arenas, ticket prices, fiscal responsibility)
   Impact (1-7):
   Comments:

8. Demand for sport marketing research.
   Impact (1-7):
   Comments:

9. Horizontal and vertical integration of the sport industry with other enterprises.
   Impact (1-7):
   Comments:

10. Movement of sport management to business schools.
    Impact (1-7):
    Comments:

11. Limited funding resources for sport management research.
    Impact (1-7):
Question 3: In your view, IDEALLY what qualities would best describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now?

[Original question: What qualities and characteristics would you use to describe a best-case scenario for sport management research in five to seven years?]

Please rate ALL ideal qualities on the following two scales.

**Importance scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance of the following ideal qualities.
Scale: "1" - No importance, "2" - Slight importance, "3" - Limited importance, "4" - Moderate importance, "5" - Moderately high importance, "6" - High importance, and "7" - Critical importance.

**Probability scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of each of the following ideal qualities.
Scale: "1" - 0-10%, "2" - 11-20%, "3" - 21-30%, "4" - 31-40%, "5" - 41-50%, "6" - 51-60%, "7" - 61-70%, "8" - 71-80%, "9" - 81-90%, "10" - 91-100%.

**Ideal Qualities:**
1. Theory developed/tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (e.g., management, marketing, sociology, psychology, etc).
   
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

2. Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines’ theories.
   
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

3. Sport management research integrated across disciplines.
   
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

4. Unique body of knowledge created in sport management.
   
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

5. Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.
   
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

6. Adequate research resources.
   
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

7. Sport management research applied as a useful management tool and one that identifies best practices.
   
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:
8. High quality doctoral candidates.
Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

9. Sport management research disseminated to the general public.
Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

10. High quality sport management research published in first tier journals.
Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

11. Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians.
Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

ADDITIONAL ITEMS:
Question 4: In your view, REALISTICALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now?

[Original question: What qualities and characteristics would you use to realistically describe sport management research in five to seven years?]

Please rate ALL realistic qualities on the following two scales.

**Importance scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance of the following realistic qualities.
Scale: "1" - No importance, "2" - Slight importance, "3" - Limited importance, "4" - Moderate importance, "5" - Moderately high importance, "6" - High importance, and "7" - Critical importance.

**Probability scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of each of the following realistic qualities.
Scale: "1" - 0-10%, "2" - 11-20%, "3" - 21-30%, "4" - 31-40%, "5" - 41-50%, "6" - 51-60%, "7" - 61-70%, "8" - 71-80%, "9" - 81-90%, "10" - 91-100%.

**Realistic Qualities:**
1. No significant changes.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

2. Research theoretically driven.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

3. Research application driven, consumer oriented, and field based.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

4. Research focused on current and diverse issues.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

5. Scholars recognized and respected.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

6. Dedicated, focused research programs.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

7. Research rigorous in design, methodology, analysis, and interpretation.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

8. Professional associations, research agencies, and universities foster and fund research.
   Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

ADDITIONAL ITEMS:
Question 5: In your opinion, what general directions should sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?

[Original question: In your opinion, what directions should sport management research take to move it towards the best-case scenario?]

Please rate ALL directions on the following two scales.

**Importance scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate how important are each of the following directions.
Scale: "1" - No importance, "2" - Slight importance, "3" - Limited importance, "4" - Moderate importance, "5" - Moderately high importance, "6" - High importance, and "7" - Critical importance.

**Probability scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of the field emphasizing each of the following directions.
Scale: "1" - 0-10%, "2" - 11-20%, "3" - 21-30%, "4" - 31-40%, "5" - 41-50%, "6" - 51-60%, "7" - 61-70%, "8" - 71-80%, "9" - 81-90%, "10" - 91-100%.

**Directions:**
1. Shifting the prevailing paradigm.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

2. Becoming more specialized in research focus and diverse in research topics.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

3. Recognizing sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

4. Application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

5. Increase research preparation for doctoral students.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

6. Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

7. Increase interdisciplinary and collaborative research.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

8. Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.
9. Increase quality and innovation in research design.
Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

10. Increase standards for research publication.
Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

11. Expand publication outlets.
Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

12. Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration.
Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

ADDITIONAL ITEMS:
Question 6: In your opinion and drawing on question number 5, what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions?

[Original question: In your opinion, what actions and/or strategies will contribute to the movement of sport management research in these directions?]  

Please rate ALL actions and/or strategies on the following two scales.

**Importance scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate how important are each of the following actions and/or strategies.
Scale: "1"- No importance, "2"- Slight importance, "3"- Limited importance,"4"- Moderate importance,"5"- Moderately high importance,"6"-High importance, and "7"-Critical importance.

**Probability scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of occurrence of each of the following actions and/or strategies in the next 5 to 7 years.
Scale: "1"- 0-10%, "2"- 11-20%, "3"- 21-30%, "4"- 31-40%, "5"- 41-50%, "6"- 51-60%, "7"- 61-70%, "8"- 71-80%, "9"- 81-90%, "10"- 91-100%.

**Actions and/or strategies:**
1. Encourage research specialization.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

2. Celebrate research successes.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

3. Do collaborative research across disciplines.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

4. Present and publish outside sport management field.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

5. Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

6. Increase publishing outlets.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

7. Increase research funding resources.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

8. Conduct professional research seminars and workshops.
9. Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

10. Increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.
    Importance (1-7):
    Probability (1-10):
    Comments:

11. Facilitate sport management doctoral programs' collaboration across universities.
    Importance (1-7):
    Probability (1-10):
    Comments:

    Importance (1-7):
    Probability (1-10):
    Comments:

13. Establish "center(s) of excellence."
    Importance (1-7):
    Probability (1-10):
    Comments:

14. Promote institutional support for sport management programs.
    Importance (1-7):
    Probability (1-10):
    Comments:

ADDITIONAL ITEMS:
Question 7: In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards general directions?

Please rate ALL challenges on the following two scales.

**Importance scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance for each of the following challenges to be managed now.
Scale: "1"- No importance, "2"- Slight importance, "3"- Limited importance,"4"- Moderate importance,"5"- Moderately high importance,"6"-High importance, and "7"-Critical importance.

**Probability scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of the field managing each of the following challenges in the next 5 to 7 years.
Scale: "1"- 0-10%, "2"- 11-20%, "3"- 21-30%, "4"- 31-40%, "5"- 41-50%, "6"- 51-60%, "7"- 61-70%, "8"- 71-80%, "9"- 81-90%, "10"- 91-100%.

**Challenges:**
1. Engage in interdisciplinary research.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

2. Critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (e.g., during conference presentations).
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

3. Interaction with academic community.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

4. Rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

5. Quality of doctoral programs.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

6. Generalizability of sport management research results.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

7. Re-conceptualize breath and scope of sport management.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

8. Faculty time and resources for research.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

    Importance (1-7):
    Probability (1-10):
    Comments:

ADDITIONAL ITEMS:
APPENDIX G

Round III
Dear Dr.,

Thank you for your continued participation in this study. As I mentioned in my previous email, 17 Panel Members responded to Round II, which is highly encouraging!

Comments by Panel Members from Round II were sorted, summarized, and grouped. They are presented under each item in a bulleted form. Also, under each item you will find statistical feedback in the form of a frequency table detailing the group responses (where the Mode - i.e., the most frequently occurring value - is underlined and bolded) and your own individual response.

This questionnaire contains approximately the same number of items as Round II. The difference in size is due to inclusion of the Panel’s suggestions and comments.

Based on the Panel’s suggestions some items were added and/or extensively modified. Modified items may not have any or only part of the feedback information underneath them. Also, based on several comments 2 items were dropped because they were too general to provide useful information.

In Round III, your task is threefold:

1. Review all the items in the questionnaire. Consider the comments made by other Panel Members. Reconsider your original rating on all items. The rating you assigned on each item on Round II is given under each Frequency table. Space for any comments you wish to make is provided under “Comments” following each item and/or “Additional Comments” in the end of each section.

2. Rate or Re-rate items using the given Likert-type scales. The goal of this round is to determine if convergence of opinion on several topics regarding the future of research in sport management can be reached. Therefore, on those items where your final ranking varies more than two points (for the 7-point scales) or three points (for the 10-point scales) from the Mode, please clarify why your opinion differs from other expert Panel Members.

3. Please complete the attached questionnaire and email it back to me by August 2nd (Wednesday). Please do not forget to attach your response.

Just a reminder, your reply to the questionnaire will be kept confidential and your participation is voluntary. Please email me if you have any questions regarding this round, the study in general, or if you have any challenges opening the attachment.

I look forward to the insights you have to share.

Carla A. Costa  
(614) 421-0882 (Phone and Fax)  
costa.27@osu.edu
Round III summarizes Panel Members' responses to Round II. Consensus was reached on fourteen items for the "importance" scale. Since one of the purposes is to approach consensus, there will be no further scoring required on these items in the importance scale.

In this third Round, I will be asking you to re-rate each of the items in the given scales following review and reflection on the comments made by other panel members as well as the statistical information provided under each item. Throughout the questionnaire focus your attention on the request made under each of the scales (in bold) for Questions 1, 2, 3, and so on instead of the questions themselves (Questions 1. 2. 3. ... are from Round I and are given for reference).

Feel free to comment (i.e., ask questions, make clarifications, argue in favor or against items) on any items you wish. Please do so under "Comments" following each item.

Under each item you will find:
1. Comments made by members of the expert panel (bulleted).
2. "Frequency table" for each given scale with the Mode underlined and bolded.
3. Your rating for the item on Round II.

IMPORTANT:
- For 7-point scales: If your rating varies two points or more from the Mode, please clarify your rationale. Use the "Comments" space under each item.
- For 10-point scales: If your rating varies three points or more from the Mode, please clarify your rationale. Use the "Comments" space under each item.

Note: some items are multi-modal and dispersed; in those cases please justify your rationale.

Please read the example on the next page carefully.
Question 3: In your view, IDEALLY what qualities would best describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now?

Please rate each quality on the following two scales.

**Importance scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance of the following ideal qualities.
Scale: "1"- No importance, "2"- Slight importance, "3"- Limited importance, "4"- Moderate importance, "5"- Moderately high importance, "6"- High importance, and "7"- Critical importance.

**Probability scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of each of the following ideal qualities.
Scale: "1"- 0-10%, "2"- 11-20%, "3"- 21-30%, "4"- 31-40%, "5"- 41-50%, "6"- 51-60%, "7"- 61-70%, "8"- 71-80%, "9"- 81-90%, "10"- 91-100%.

Ideal Qualities:

4. Creating groups with common interests.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- Not doing.
- Important.

| Ideal Qualities: 4. Creating groups with common interests. |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Frequency       | 1              | 1              | 3              | 4              | 5              | 6              | 7              | Missing        |

[Your rating on Round II was 6]

**Importance (1-7): 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was 2]

**Probability (1-10): 4**

Comments: Prob. 4, because I really believe this will take more than 5 to 7 years to happen.

**NOTE:**
Importance scale: a rating of "6", high importance was the rating you indicated on Round II and you have not modified your position. Since your rating is within 2 points of the Mode (which is 7 - # underlined and bolded) there is no need for clarifying your rationale.

Probability scale: a rating of "2", 11-20%, was the rating you indicated on Round II. You have modified your position and now indicate your rating as "4", 31-40%. Since your new rating is more than 3 points from the Mode (which is 8) you indicated your rationale under "comments."

The example ends here.
Question 1: What are the successes in sport management research that should be sustained?

Please rate ALL successes on the following two scales.

**Success scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the extent to which each of the following items has been a success in sport management research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Your rating on Round II was*
**Success (1-7):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Your rating on Round II was*
**Importance (1-7):**

**Comments:**

2. Use of theory from parent disciplines.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- There is no theory that is sport management per se. We borrow theory from other areas!
- What sport management theory is specifically sport management theory?
- Sport management theory field is so broad with many different sub-disciplines and even more parent disciplines and literature.
- We have done a good job of beginning the process of developing theory in specific areas, but not generally.
- Can be successful developing a body of knowledge specific to sport management context.
- Moving in this direction – but have a long way to go.
- Moderately successful in developing theory directly related to sport but grounded in the "parents."
- Developing theory in general is important, i.e., theory that is of value in other fields.
Since we have no firmly established theories of our own, we had to "borrow" and we continue to do so. Evidence of improvement - but considerable room for growth/improvement. I think we have done very well in this regard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was Success (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance (1-7): CONSENSUS REACHED — no further scoring required Comments:

3. Linking theory to practice
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Research for research's sake!
- Difficult time convincing even our own "practical" faculty that there is value in formulating and testing theory.
- Too much emphasis is put on practice at the expense of theory.
- Is this always necessary or desirable?
- Our dialog maintains the distinction between theory and practice, and thereby militates against an appropriate (read: real and meaningful) integration.
- See Weese's not serving article in JSM as well as the recent Pitts and Mahoney article
- There are practical aspects of all theoretical research.
- Integration of what we know from theory to practice.
- Theory and practice are symbiotic and synergetic.
- Theory and practice are dialectically related.
- Theory and practice are, in the ideal instance, co-determinative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was Success (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance (1-7): CONSENSUS REACHED — no further scoring required Comments:

4. Broadening of sport management research to include both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Problem here is not with pluralism but with rigor
- Majority of questions that we have to answer are best served by the descriptive design.
- We are "quantoids" and "descriptive" researchers.
- Qualitative method underutilized and appreciated in sport management research.
5. Diversifying sport management research settings.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Who is included under the rubric of "sport management research"?
- What countries are we referring to?
- What communities of academic discourse do we want to include in the response.
- North American sport management research has been far too focused on professional and (especially) college sport. However, that is far less true in European or Australian sport management research.
- Very important sport management research taking place in Europe under the rubric of "sport and city marketing".
- In the North American context, what constitutes an appropriate setting is very narrowly defined by a key group of gatekeepers.
- Provincialism – both geographic and academic – of mainstream sport management work.
- Becomes an issue if we are interested in external validity
- We make use of populations that are easily accessible
- From an internal validity perspective of theory, setting is generally not an issue.
- Need to move to the volunteer sector - especially service volunteers in sport
- Need for this is somewhat overblown

6. Increasing quality of sport management research designs.
[Original item: Adding sophistication to its research designs.]
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Get too hung up on using "sophisticated research designs" simply to prove that we are more "sophisticated" rather than because that is what appropriate to answer the question(s)
- The best designs are elegant—simple enough to interpret.
Complicated designs are usually difficult to interpret in a way that is meaningful to the reader.

The majority of questions that we have to answer are best served by the descriptive design.

The descriptive method is best used to answer some of our prevailing questions.

When a new way to investigate something is used traditionalists in sport management say the new design is not "well tested" and therefore not acceptable.

Do not spend enough time prior to collection of data thinking through the design.

Have not explored the option of more powerful designs such as experiments.

Need heightened refinement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Success (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):
Comments:

[Original item: Adding rigor to sport management methods of analysis.]

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Too focused on using more complicated analysis when it is not really called for.
- Use statistics and other forms of analysis correctly.
- See Parks et al - statistical power paper in JSM
- While we have a ways to go, we have also come a long way in relatively short time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Success (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):
Comments:

8. Increasing the number of research outlets in the sport management field.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Oversupplied with journals.
- Happening without the direction and involvement of NASSM.
- Too easy to publish drivel or, worse yet, simply wrong assertions.
- There is no use adding more outlets if what gets published is weak scholarship.
- Too many journals and not enough quality work to go in them.
- This is not important if the new publications serve as outlets for substandard work.
  Quality, not quantity, should be paramount.

266
When is enough-enough

Missing a few journals that we could use, but we are making great strides in this area.

Need different kinds of outlets ... outlet for practical research and one that focuses on sport management education.

Outlets = conferences, journals, workshops, seminars?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Your rating on Round II was  
Success (1-7): |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Your rating on Round II was  
Importance (1-7): |

9. Increasing the quality of research outlets in the field.

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Articles in the Sport Management Review appear to be solid.
- Over time most journals become more rigorous
- Need for a range of quality is starting to develop
- The quality of the articles in JSM has increased markedly
- SMQ quality has increased and still trying to be an academic journal and practical journal at the same time.
- JSM quality has increased in the last 5 years.
- Oversupplied with journals
- It is too easy to publish drivel or, worse yet, simply wrong assertions.
- Outlets = conferences, journals, workshops, seminars?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Your rating on Round II was  
Success (1-7): |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Your rating on Round II was  
Importance (1-7): |

10. Establishing an infrastructure for the new research field of sport management (i.e., NASSM, JSM).

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Organization is unlike any other academic body in that people from small schools dominate it and that in many ways has set the tone for research.
11. Recognizing sport management as a field of study in academe.
[Original statement: Recognizing sport management as a field of study.]
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
\[\begin{align*}
\text{Amount} & \quad 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & \text{Remaining} \\
\text{Frequency} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 6 & 7 & 0 \\
\end{align*}\]
(Your rating on Round II was
Success (1-7):
Comments:

Who is recognizing sport management as a field of study?
Recognized by whom?
The mainstream academic community regards us with some skepticism. We have a way
to go before we have adequate academic (or industry) status.
Need to heighten respect on our respective campus

12. Developing overall sport management knowledge.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
\[\begin{align*}
\text{Amount} & \quad 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & \text{Remaining} \\
\text{Frequency} & 0 & 1 & 1 & 5 & 4 & 5 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{align*}\]
(Your rating on Round II was
Success (1-7):
Comments:

Need to develop our own theory base

13. Developing specific sport marketing knowledge.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Amount} & \quad 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & \text{Remaining} \\
\text{Frequency} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 9 & 0 \\
\end{align*}\]
(Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):
Comments:
I don’t think managing or marketing sport organizations is any different from other industrial areas hence the lower score on importance

Need to develop our own theory base

Sport marketing and sport law are the two realms of study that seem to have moved ahead the most

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Success (1-7):]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):
Comments:

14. Developing knowledge about leadership in sport.
[Original statement: Developing specific sport leadership knowledge.]
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Limited research on leadership considering many parameters that comprise management
- Risk in leadership work of simply making the fundamental attribution error in a big way
- Much of the current work is speculative and biased
- Need to develop our own theory base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Success (1-7):
Comments:

15. Developing knowledge about sport liability. [New item]

Success (1-7):
Importance (1-7):
Comments:

16. Developing knowledge about sport ethics. [New item]

Success (1-7):
Importance (1-7):
Comments:
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
Question 2: What are the current events and trends impacting research in sport management?

Please rate ALL events/trends on the following scale.

Impact scale:
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of impact each of the following events/trends will continue to have on sport management research.
Scale: "1"- No impact, "2"- Slight impact, "3"- Limited impact, "4"- Moderate impact, "5"- Moderately high impact, "6"- High impact, and "7"-Critical impact.

Events/trends:

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

▲ Many people “fight” this.
▲ We are not tackling globalization.
▲ There is no research that looks at globalization from a sport management perspective.
▲ Those of us in North America need to pay more attention to the international scene.
▲ We are broadening - need to do more comparative work.
▲ Clearly globalization is important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was
Impact (1-7):
Comments:

2. Information technology.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

▲ Most of what is written from a sport management point of view is actually fairly low level.
▲ It is becoming easier to access and find related information, to communicate with colleagues worldwide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was
Impact (1-7):
Comments:

3. Increased diversity of sport consumer audience.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

▲ Only a few doing this and it is critical
▲ Need to broaden our focus - able/disabled, rec./elite, volunteer and paid settings
▲ Continue to conduct research that includes diverse groups
▲ Sport consumers will become more and more diverse as time goes by.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was
Impact (1-7):
Comments:
4. Increase in legal issues and regulations.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- This is one of the areas our people seem to take seriously.
- A number of people look at Title IX issues.
- There are other issues to address (e.g., governing body regulations, tax laws, anti-trust issues, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was Impact (1-7): ]
Comments:

5. Commercialization of amateur and intercollegiate sports.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- Go beyond the professionals and the colleges
- Commercialization has crept into primary and secondary schools as well as community sport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was Impact (1-7): ]
Comments:

6. Increase in opportunities for participation in sport (both spectatorship and participation).
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- Need to provide greater attention to this area
- I think participation more than spectatorship - recreational sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was Impact (1-7): ]
Comments:

7. Increase in professional sport finance related issues (e.g., stadium/arenas, ticket prices, fiscal responsibility)
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- We do too much of this already
- Few people in sport management have financial training at an advanced level of research/theory competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was Impact (1-7): ]
Comments:
8. Demand for sport marketing research.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- Flavor of the month for sport management scholars.
- Demand for other types of research.
- Growing area of study and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Impact (1-7):
Comments:

9. Horizontal and vertical integration of the sport industry with other enterprises.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- We don't research sport in context.
- No serious work in the area at all.
- A vital area as it is radically changing the nature of relations between sport industries and the rest of the economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Impact (1-7):
Comments:

10. Movement of sport management to business schools.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- Non-issue in Canada
- More cooperation, but very little movement
- In rare cases sport management does exist in top business schools
- Exists in small private schools
- Happening in business schools with little or no research tradition.
- Will change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Impact (1-7):
Comments:

11. Limited funding resources for sport management research.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- Researchers becoming creative - looking at their problems of interest with populations that are fundable
- We can do research without extensive external funding
- Universities are beginning to grant tenure and promotion only to assistant professors who have brought in grant money
- Emphasis on grants could also begin to dictate our research interests, as faculty conduct only fundable research.
- Huge problem with Universities focusing on external funding much more.
- Huge issue on campuses before very long

273
Your rating on Round II was
impact (1-7):
Comments:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
Question 3: In your view, IDEALLY what qualities would best describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now? 

(Original question: What qualities and characteristics would you use to describe a best-case scenario for sport management research in five to seven years?)

Please rate ALL ideal qualities on the following two scales.

Importance scale:
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance of the following ideal qualities.
Scale: "1" - No importance, "2" - Slight importance, "3" - Limited importance, "4" - Moderate importance, "5" - Moderately high importance, "6" - High importance, and "7" - Critical importance.

Probability scale:
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of each of the following ideal qualities occurring.
Scale: "1" - 0-10%, "2" - 11-20%, "3" - 21-30%, "4" - 31-40%, "5" - 41-50%, "6" - 51-60%, "7" - 61-70%, "8" - 71-80%, "9" - 81-90%, "10" - 91-100%.

Ideal Qualities:
1. Theory developed/tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (e.g., management, marketing, sociology, psychology, etc).
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   - This will start to emerge in the next ten years or so.
   - Also be in other fields of endeavor.
   - This would demonstrate impact - lead to greater respect for research conducted by sport management types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was)

Importance (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was)

Probability (1-10):

Comments:

2. Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines' theories.
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   - Need to continue to refine this
   - Demonstrates knowledge of other work
   - Be informed by the best other disciplines have to offer as well as make our own contributions to their theoretical bases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance (1-7): CONSENSUS REACHED – no further scoring required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Sport management research is cross-disciplinary.**

[Original statement: Sport management research integrated across disciplines.]

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

► Important purely from a funding perspective
► Shows growth/respect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Unique body of knowledge created in sport management.**

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

► Still extremely reliant on other disciplines
► Add sport and stir approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.**

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

► Must continue to get better
► Ensure that young academics have the rigor/will demand the same of their work and of their Ph.D. students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Adequate research resources.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- We don't generally need extensive external funding for our research programs.
- Depends on national and disciplinary context.
- Better support for some elements of sport management research in Australia than there is in the USA.
- Being in a business school also helps.
- Some work in sport contexts that does not call itself sport management (but that is) may be well funded.
- This may require some creative thinking on our part.

7. Sport management research applied as a useful management tool and one that identifies best practices.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Little impact on shaping the practice of sport management.
- Need to more effectively outline the implications of our research to better inform/shape practice.

8. High quality doctoral candidates.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Need high quality programs - programs that have a critical mass of active researchers producing sport management Ph.D.'s.
Function of the candidate and the environment in which they are being trained, and by whom.

Some of the doctoral programs are not developing individuals with the necessary tools to become good researchers.

We have these now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance (1-7): CONSENSUS REACHED — no further scoring required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was]
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

9. Sport management research disseminated to the general public.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Our audience are those in the field
- We generally only talk with one another

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was]
Importance (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was]
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

10. High quality sport management research published in first tier sport management journals. [Changed item]
(Original statement: High quality sport management research published in first tier journals.)
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- We tend to think “within the box”.
- JSM is considered a first tier journal

Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

11. High quality sport management research published in first tier management journals. [Changed item]
(Original statement: High quality sport management research published in first tier journals.)
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- We tend to think “within the box”.

Importance (1-7):
12. Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians within academe.

[Original statement: Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians.]

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- The above needs to happen prior to this happening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance (1-7): CONSENSUS REACHED — no further scoring required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was]

Probability (1-10):

Comments:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
Question 4: In your view, REALISTICALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now? 

[Original question: What qualities and characteristics would you use to realistically describe sport management research in five to seven years?] 

Please rate ALL realistic qualities on the following two scales. 

**Importance scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance of the following realistic qualities.
Scale: "1"- No importance, "2"- Slight importance, "3"- Limited importance,"4"- Moderate importance,"5"- Moderately high importance,"6"-High importance, and "7"-Critical importance.

**Probability scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of each of the following realistic qualities.
Scale: "1"- 0-10%, "2"- 11-20%, "3"- 21-30%, "4"- 31-40%, "5"- 41-50%, "6"- 51-60%, "7"- 61-70%, "8"- 71-80%, "9"- 81-90%, "10"- 91-100%.

Realistic Qualities:

1. Research theoretically driven.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Probability (1-10): Comments:

2. Research application driven, consumer oriented, and field based.

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Need to highlight implications.
- Need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Probability (1-10): Comments:
3. Research both theoretical and application driven. [New item]
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

4. Research focused on current issues. [Changed item]
   [Original statement: Research focused on current and diverse issues.]
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   ▲ This is important if we want to attract funding.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

5. Research focused on diverse issues. [Changed item]
   [Original statement: Research focused on current and diverse issues.]
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   ▲ This is important if we want to attract funding.
   Importance (1-7):
   Probability (1-10):
   Comments:

6. Sport management scholars recognized and respected by scholars in other fields.
   [Original item: scholars recognized and respected.]
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   ▲ Need to continue to work towards this end
   ▲ We need more.
   ▲ Some scholars are already recognized and respected.
   Scale level 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Missing
   Frequencies 0 0 0 0 2 6 8 1
   Importance (1-7): CONSENSUS REACHED — no further scoring required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was)
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

7. Focused, sustained research programs.
   [Original statement: Dedicated, focused research programs.]
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   ▲ Future outcome
   ▲ This is beginning to happen
   ▲ We have these now.
   Scale level 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Missing
   Frequencies 0 0 0 0 1 6 9 1
   Importance (1-7): CONSENSUS REACHED — no further scoring required
8. Research rigorous in design, methodology, analysis, and interpretation.
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   ▲ Heavily scripted in the descriptive method

9. Professional associations, research agencies, and universities foster and fund research.
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   ▲ May not be as necessary
   ▲ Would help heighten our credibility within the academic institutions/academy

10. Professional associations, research agencies, and universities fund sport management research.
    (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
    ▲ May not be as necessary
    ▲ Would help heighten our credibility within the academic institutions/academy

    (Comments made by members of the expert panel)

Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:
**Question 5:** In your opinion, what general directions should sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?

[Original question: In your opinion, what directions should sport management research take to move it towards the best-case scenario?]

Please rate ALL directions on the following two scales.

**Importance scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate how important are each of the following directions.
Scale: "1" - No importance, "2" - Slight importance, "3" - Limited importance, "4" - Moderate importance, "5" - Moderately high importance, "6" - High importance, and "7" - Critical importance.

**Probability scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of the field emphasizing each of the following directions.
Scale: "1" - 0-10%, "2" - 11-20%, "3" - 21-30%, "4" - 31-40%, "5" - 41-50%, "6" - 51-60%, "7" - 61-70%, "8" - 71-80%, "9" - 81-90%, "10" - 91-100%.

**Directions:**

1. **Become more specialized in research focus.** [Changed item]
   [Original statement: Becoming more specialized in research focus and diverse in research topics.]
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   - Important
   - Moving in that direction

2. **Become more diverse in research topics.** [Changed item]
   [Original statement: Becoming more specialized in research focus and diverse in research topics.]
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   - Important
   - Moving in that direction

3. **Recognize sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.** [Changed item]
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   - This is already happening – at least among ourselves.
   - Great metaphor (testing area for life/business)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance (1-7):</td>
<td>CONSENSUS REACHED – no further scoring required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was]

**Probability (1-10):**

**Comments:**
4. Application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
importance (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Probability (1-10):

Comments:

5. Increase research preparation for doctoral students.

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- Status quo
- Don't see things changing much
- Depends on the school and the country
- In some schools there is good research preparation.
- Other schools and in some countries there is atrocious research preparation.
- Too many smaller programs popping up to meet demand - but lack quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7): CONSENSUS REACHED – no further scoring required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Probability (1-10):

Comments:

6. Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty.

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- Little change
- Opportunities vary by institution and by country
- Our professional groups like the NASSM could do this in conference workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Probability (1-10):

Comments:
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7. **Increase interdisciplinary and collaborative research.**

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- From within academe
- Acceptability (in sport management and in other disciplines) is low.
- A few scholars are endeavoring to do this with sport management.
- Universities encourage this - we must get on board
- Cutting edge developments are in multidisciplinary and interstitial environments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was)

**Importance (1-7):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was)

**Probability (1-10):**

Comments:

8. **Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.**

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- Very important and heightens credibility with in the academy/institutions of higher learning
- Learn to astonish them and be useful at the same time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was)

**Importance (1-7):** CONSENSUS REACHED – no further scoring required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was)

**Probability (1-10):**

Comments:

9. **Increase quality in research design.**

(Original statement: Increase quality and innovation in research design.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- Scripted in the descriptive method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was)

**Importance (1-7):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was)
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10. Increase standards for research publication.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- We are moving in the other direction.
- With the new journals in the field, some real drivel can still find an outlet.
- Varying degrees of standards.
- A few more journals popping up can we maintain quality?
- Slowly moving in that direction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

11. Expand publication outlets.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- New journals in the field that are begging for material.
- Lot of junk is being published
- Bad research representing the field.
- Time to step back and assess the increased numbers of outlets - at a quality cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

12. Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
- North America is not learning much from overseas
- Local agendas - which is a particularly serious problem in North America.
- International Sport Management Alliance plays a role here - could be more.
- Happening in Europe to some degree.
- Open to other research agendas, and to new kinds of research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
-
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**Question 6:** In your opinion and drawing on question number 5, what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions?

[Original question: In your opinion, what actions and/or strategies will contribute to the movement of sport management research in these directions?]

Please rate ALL actions and/or strategies on the following two scales.

**Importance scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate how important are each of the following actions and/or strategies.

Scale: "1" - No importance, "2" - Slight importance, "3" - Limited importance, "4" - Moderate importance, "5" - Moderately high importance, "6" - High importance, and "7" - Critical importance.

**Probability scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of occurrence of each of the following actions and/or strategies in the next 5 to 7 years.

Scale: "1" - 0-10%, "2" - 11-20%, "3" - 21-30%, "4" - 31-40%, "5" - 41-50%, "6" - 51-60%, "7" - 61-70%, "8" - 71-80%, "9" - 81-90%, "10" - 91-100%.

**Actions and/or strategies:**

1. **Encourage research specialization.**
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   - Tenure review processes tend to reward specialization.
   - Focus is a good thing

   **Importance (1-7):**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Probability (1-10):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Acknowledge research successes.**
   (Original statement: Celebrate research successes.)
   (Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   - Let's celebrate the achievements of sport management scholarship

   **Importance (1-7):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Probability (1-10):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Do collaborative research across disciplines  
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)  
- More motivated to reach across disciplines  
- Way of the future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Present and publish outside sport management field.  
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)  
- Key to increasing credibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management.  
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)  
- Resistance to it in some quarters.  
- Unwilling to invite other academics.  
- Some of this has occurred.  
- Credibility test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. Increase publishing outlets.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
  ▲ Too many now?
  ▲ Outlets we have are short of quality material
  ▲ Material rejected by rigorous review is then published elsewhere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was]

Probability (1-10):

Comments:

7. Increase research funding resources.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
  ▲ Need?
  ▲ Broaden our agendas
  ▲ Establish the kinds of cutting edge usefulness that creates funding resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was]

Importance (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was]

Probability (1-10):

Comments:

8. Conduct professional research seminars and workshops.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
  ▲ We already do this.
  ▲ Help inform practice/more effective practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was]

Importance (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   - Need critical mass of active faculty
   - Don't see much changing

10. Increase doctoral candidates’ knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   - Theory can be learned more easily 'on the job' than can research related design and analysis
   - Need critical mass of active faculty
   - Is happening now

11. Facilitate sport management doctoral programs’ collaboration across universities.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   - Video conferencing and/or internet hold the key
   - Location makes a difference
   - Happening very little in North America
   - Happening to low extent in Australia
   - Happening to some degree in Europe
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   ▲ Should be avoided at all cost.
   ▲ We already did this.
   ▲ Especially in USA

13. Establish “center(s) of excellence.”
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   ▲ This smacks of dangerous and unproductive elitism.
   ▲ University theme/current practice
   ▲ We need a broad, rigorous, and disputatious community of scholars.
   ▲ I interpret this as research institutes with funding.

14. Promote institutional support for sport management programs.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
   ▲ Some compete too much
   ▲ Need to support each other
   ▲ Endeavoring to do this
   ▲ Success has been limited
See Weese's not serving article in JSM as well as the recent Pitts and Mahoney article

Has been forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Your rating on Round II was
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
Question 7: In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards the general directions mentioned in Question #5?
[Original question: In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards general directions?]

Please rate ALL challenges on the following two scales.

**Importance scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 7 indicate the level of importance for each of the following challenges to be managed now.

**Probability scale:**
On a scale of 1 to 10 indicate the probability of the field managing each of the following challenges in the next 5 to 7 years.
Scale: “1”- 0-10%, “2”- 11-20%, “3”- 21-30%, “4”- 31-40%, “5”- 41-50%, “6”- 51-60%, “7”- 61-70%, “8”- 71-80%, “9”- 81-90%, “10”- 91-100%.

Challenges:
1. Engage in interdisciplinary research.
   Futuristic modus operandi
   - Work is not adequately engaging
   - Little time for dialogue or discussion
   - Happy with things the way that they are right now.
   - We’re very kind
   - Too polite to each other.
   - Researchers who are doing cutting edge stuff are getting rejected for NASSM presentations.
   - Attendance at sessions at NASSM is low
   - Learn to give and take criticism in a public forum.
   - Something needs to be done to lift the standard
   - Could be changed

Scale level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Missing |
------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------|
Frequencies | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 0 |         |

[Your rating on Round II was
Importance (1-7):

Scale level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Missing |
------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---------|
Frequencies | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 0       |
3. Interaction with academic community outside sport management.

[Original statement: Interaction with academic community.]

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Talk with own types only
- Doing this

4. Rigor and competitiveness of conferences. [Changed item]

[Original statement: Rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals.]

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Work is not adequately engaging
- Researchers who are doing cutting edge stuff are getting rejected for NASSM presentations.
- If people don’t feel attracted to attend sessions, then they won’t be there for the dialogue.
- NASSM session attendance speaks very poorly for the value attendees feel they get from the conference.
- Lift the standard

5. Rigor and competitiveness of journals. [Changed item]

[Original statement: Rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals.]

6. Quality of doctoral programs.

(Comments made by members of the expert panel)

- Creation of weaker programs to meet demand
- Takes substantial time to change doctoral programs
7. Generalizability of research results in various sport management settings. [Changed item]
[Original statement: Generalizability of sport management research results.]

8. Specifically in the US, broaden research scope to include other settings than college and professional sport (e.g.: youth sport, sports media).
[Original statement: Re-conceptualize breath and scope of sport management.]

9. Faculty time and resources for research.
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
Must be earned
Research I and Doc I institutions need to give time for research
Depends on institution and country
Some program have so few people that they teach too many courses
10. Formal recognition of scholarship within the field.
[Original statement: Formal recognition of scholarship.]
(Comments made by members of the expert panel)
* Already an organization that champions mediocrity.
* Not enough good people to win the Ziegler award every year
* Recognition takes time
* Should have a group of Research Fellows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was)

Importance (1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Your rating on Round II was)

Probability (1-10):

Comments:

11. Peoples' and/or institutions' resistance to change. [Changed item]
[Original statement: Change.]
Importance (1-7):
Probability (1-10):
Comments:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
Question 1: What are the successes in sport management research that should be sustained?

1. Developing sport management theory.
   - Developing theory
   - Use of theory

2. Use of theory from parent disciplines.
   - Ground theory in parent disciplines

3. Linking theory to practice
   - Linking theory and practice

4. Broadening of sport management research to include both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.
   - Use qualitative and quantitative

5. Diversifying sport management research settings.
   - Diversity of settings

6. Adding sophistication to its research designs.
   - Better research designs
   - In depth case studies

7. Adding rigor to sport management methods of analysis.
   - Better methods of analysis
   - Sophistication of analysis

8. Increasing the number of research outlets in the sport management field.
   - Places to publish
   - Research outlets
   - Existence of journals
   - Outside journals accepting articles

9. Increasing the quality of research outlets in the field.
   - Peer review articles

10. Establishing an infrastructure for the new research field of sport management (i.e., NASSM, JSM).
    - Growth of NASSM
    - NASSM, JSM, NASPE

11. Recognizing sport management as a field of study.
    - Recognition of SM as a “bone fide” field of study.

12. Developing overall sport management knowledge.
    - Knowledge about sport management education
    - Knowledge of the field
    - Noting phenomenon – descriptive
    - Knowledge development
    - Knowledge about SM
13. Developing specific sport marketing knowledge.
   • Develop of research in sub-fields (sport marketing)

14. Developing specific sport leadership knowledge.
   • Develop of research in sub-field (leadership)

Kind of lost
   • Young people doing research.

Question 2: What are the current events and trends impacting research in sport management?

Events/trends:
   • (Integration: - media, - business enterprise)

2. Information technology.
   • Information technology.

3. Increased diversity of sport consumer audience.
   • Market expansion

4. Increase in legal issues and regulations.
   • Legal + regulation
   • Ethics

5. Commercialization of amateur and intercollegiate sports.
   • Commercialization

6. Increase in opportunities for participation in sport (both spectatorship and participation).

7. Increase in professional sport finance related issues (e.g., stadium/arenas, ticket prices, fiscal responsibility)

8. Demand for sport marketing research.
   • Sport marketing research

9. Horizontal and vertical integration of the sport industry with other enterprises.
   • Horizontal and vertical integration of the sport industry with other enterprises

10. Movement of sport management to business schools.
    • Sport management to business schools

11. Limited funding resources for sport management research.
    • Funding resources for sport management research

Question 3: In your view, IDEALLY what qualities would best describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now?
[Original question: What qualities and characteristics would you use to describe a best-case scenario for sport management research in five to seven years?]

Ideal Qualities:
1. Theory developed/tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (e.g., management, marketing, sociology, psychology, etc).
   - New theory development
   - Impact parent disciplines

2. Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines' theories.
   - Ground in parent disciplines

3. Sport management research integrated across disciplines.
   - Use integration in other perspectives (psychological, sociological, historical)
   - Create groups with common interests
   - Multi-context, multicultural

4. Unique body of knowledge created in sport management.
   - Creates/develops body of knowledge
   - Emphasize unique facts of sport context

5. Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.
   - Multivariate statistics
   - Methodology (designs)
   - Understand assumptions of methods, theory, analysis
   - Design; variety, rigor
   - Method analysis

6. Adequate research resources.
   - Resource availability

7. Sport management research applied as a useful management tool and one that identifies best practices.
   - Applied as best practice
   - Useful management tool

8. High quality doctoral candidates.
   - High quality doctoral candidates

9. Sport management research disseminated to the general public.
   - Wide dissemination to general public

10. High quality sport management research published in first tier journals.
    - Publishing: JSM, other journals, more complete info
    - Professional

11. Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians.
    - Professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians

12. Advanced sport management theory ... (specific areas)
Question 4: In your view, REALISTICALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now?  
[Original question: What qualities and characteristics would you use to realistically describe sport management research in five to seven years?]

Realistic Qualities:
1. No significant changes.
   - No change/continue the same
2. Research theoretically driven.
   - Theoretically driven
   - More theoretical
3. Research application driven, consumer oriented, and field based.
   - Field based
   - Built on specific body of knowledge
   - Consumer oriented; lead toward best practice, local application
   - Internet based
4. Research focused on current and diverse issues.
   - More current and diverse issues
5. Scholars recognized and respected.
   - More scholarly; recognized, respected
6. Dedicated, focused research programs.
   - Dedicated, focused research programs
   - Less pedagogically based, good doctoral programs
7. Research rigorous in design, methodology, analysis, and interpretation.
   - More sophistication in design, methodology, analysis
8. Professional associations, research agencies, and universities foster and fund research.
   - NASSM fosters and funds research
   - Publication in rigorous journals
   - Use of other outlets

Question 5: In your opinion, what general directions should sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?  
[Original question: In your opinion, what directions should sport management research take to move it towards the best-case scenario?]

Directions:
1. Shifting the prevailing paradigm.
   - Paradigm shift "changing of old guard"
2. Becoming more specialized in research focus and diverse in research topics.
   - Become more specialized and diverse
3. Recognizing sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.
   - Sport as a place to build/test theory
4. Application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries.
   • Sport management/marketing findings with reference to other industries
   • Consider management implication of sport studies

5. Increase research preparation for doctoral students.
   • Increase quality of training of doctoral students to do research
   • Required research core for doctoral programs

6. Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty.
   • Increase professional development opportunities; NASSM workshops, NASSM mentor
     programs for young faculty

7. Increase interdisciplinary and collaborative research.
   • Collaborative research
   • More interdisciplinary research; field based, more qualitative, more reflective of
     Information Technology
   • Leverage theoretical plus methodology expertise with other scholars

8. Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.
   • Industry links for research funding
   • Resources for research/scholarships/research chairs

9. Increase quality and innovation in research design.
   • Strengthen research/theory
   • Bold, brave research designs

10. Increase standards for research publication.
    • Stricter standards for journals

11. Expand publication outlets.
    • More publishing opportunities

12. Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration.
    • Facilitate International Alliance

**Question 6:** In your opinion and drawing on question number 5, what specific actions
    and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions?
    [Original question: In your opinion, what actions and/or strategies will contribute to the movement
    of sport management research in these directions?]

**Actions and/or strategies:**
1. Encourage research specialization.
   • Encourage research specialization

2. Celebrate research successes.
   • Celebrate research successes

3. Do collaborative research across disciplines.
   • Move multidisciplinary research: join conferences, publishing

4. Present and publish outside sport management field.
   • Infuse scholarship from outside: go out, bring in
5. Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management.
   • Infuse scholarship from outside: go out, bring in

6. Increase publishing outlets.
   • Increase publishing opportunities: more outlets

7. Increase research funding resources.
   • Increase funding opportunities/endowments

8. Conduct professional research seminars and workshops.
   • Seminars/workshops on research: needs, publishing, methods, design, analysis

9. Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.
   • Increase quality of doctoral programs
   • Reduce faculty/student ratio

10. Increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.
    • Curriculum/reading learning theory
    • Reduce faculty/student ratio

11. Facilitate sport management doctoral programs' collaboration across universities.
    • Ph.D. program collaboration
    • Encourage startup Ph.D. programs

    • NASPE-NASSM program review evaluation standards

13. Establish "center(s) of excellence."
    • Establish "center(s) of excellence"

14. Promote institutional support for sport management programs.
    • Administrative support for sport management programs

**Question 7:** In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards general directions?

**Challenges:**

1. Engage in interdisciplinary research.
   • Lack of interdisciplinary research

2. Critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (e.g., during conference presentations).
   • Lack of critical/constructive dialogue (internal)

3. Interaction with academic community.
   • Lack of interaction with academic community (both internal and external)

4. Rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals.
   • Lack of rigor plus competitiveness of conferences/journals

5. Quality of doctoral programs.
   • Doctoral programs
6. Generalizability of sport management research results.
   - Evaluation of published research

7. Re-conceptualize breath and scope of sport management.
   - Re-conceptualization of "sport management"

8. Faculty time and resources for research.
   - Resource: availability, workload

   - Lack of recognition of top scholars and students
   - Formal recognition

    - Resistance to change
APPENDIX I

Panel Members' Comments from Round II
Comments from Round II (no spaces)

Question 1: What are the successes in sport management research that should be sustained?

Successes:
1. Developing sport management theory.
   - There is no theory that is sport management per se. We borrow theory from other areas!
   - What sport management theory is specifically sport management theory?
   - Sport management theory field is so broad with many different sub-disciplines and even more parent disciplines and literature.
   - We have done a good job of beginning the process of developing theory in specific areas, but not generally.
   - Can be successful developing a body of knowledge specific to sport management context.
   - Moving in this direction – but have a long way to go.
   - Moderately successful in developing theory directly related to sport but grounded in the "parents."
   - Developing theory in general is important, i.e., theory that is of value in other fields.

2. Use of theory from parent disciplines.
   - Outlets? = Conferences, Journals, workshops, seminars?
   - There is no theory that is sport management per se. We borrow theory from other areas!
   - Parent disciplines as well as other areas of study.
   - Until sport specific models/theories are developed (if they are even necessary), then the use of theory from parent disciplines or related fields is extremely important/critical.
   - Since we have no firmly established theories of our own, we had to "borrow" and we continue to do so.
   - Evidence of improvement - but considerable room for growth/improvement.
   - I think we have done very well in this regard.

3. Linking theory to practice
   - Research for research's sake!
   - Difficult time convincing even our own "practical" faculty that there is value in formulating and testing theory.
   - Too much emphasis is put on practice at the expense of theory.
   - Is this always necessary or desirable?
   - Our dialog maintains the distinction between theory and practice, and thereby militates against an appropriate (read: real and meaningful) integration.
   - See Weese's not serving article in JSM as well as the recent Pitts and Mahoney article
   - There are practical aspects of all theoretical research.
   - Integration of what we know from theory to practice.
   - Theory and practice are symbiotic and synergetic.
   - Theory and practice are dialectically related
   - Theory and practice are, in the ideal instance, co-determinative.
   - See Weese's not serving article in JSM as well as the recent Pitts and Mahoney article

4. Broadening of sport management research to include both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.
   - Problem here is not with pluralism but with rigor
   - Majority of questions that we have to answer are best served by the descriptive design.
   - We are "quantoids" and "descriptive" researchers.
   - Qualitative method underutilized and appreciated in sport management research
5. Diversifying sport management research settings.
   ▲ Who is included under the rubric of "sport management research"?
   ▲ What countries we are referring to
   ▲ What communities of academic discourse we want to include in the response.
   ▲ North American sport management research has been far too focused on professional and 
     (especially) college sport. However, that is far less true in European or Australian sport 
     management research.
   ▲ Very important sport management research taking place in Europe under the rubric of "sport 
     and city marketing".
   ▲ In the North American context, what constitutes an appropriate setting is very narrowly 
     defined by a key group of gatekeepers.
   ▲ Provincialism – both geographic and academic – of mainstream sport management work.
   ▲ Becomes an issue if we are interested in external validity
   ▲ We make use of populations that are easily accessible
   ▲ From an internal validity perspective of theory, setting is generally not an issue.
   ▲ Need to move to the volunteer sector - especially service volunteers in sport
   ▲ Need for this is somewhat overblown

6. Adding sophistication to its research designs.
   ▲ Get too hung up on using "sophisticated research designs" simply to prove that we are more 
     "sophisticated" rather than because that is what appropriate to answer the question(s)
   ▲ The best designs are elegant—simple enough to interpret.
   ▲ Complicated designs are usually difficult to interpret in a way that is meaningful to the reader.
   ▲ The majority of questions that we have to answer are best served by the descriptive 
     design.
   ▲ The descriptive method is best used to answer some of our prevailing questions.
   ▲ When a new way to investigate something is used traditionalists in sport management 
     say the new design is not "well tested" and therefore not acceptable.
   ▲ Do not spent enough time prior to collection of data thinking through the design.
   ▲ Have not explored the option of more powerful designs such as experiments
   ▲ Need heightened refinement

7. Adding rigor to sport management methods of analysis.
   ▲ Too focused on using more complicated analysis when it is not really called for.
   ▲ Use statistics and other forms of analysis correctly.
   ▲ See Parks et al - statistical power paper in JSM
   ▲ While we have a ways to go, we have also come a long way in relatively short time.

8. Increasing the number of research outlets in the sport management field.
   ▲ Oversupplied with journals.
   ▲ Happening without the direction and involvement of NASSM
   ▲ Too easy to publish drivel or, worse yet, simply wrong assertions.
   ▲ There is no use adding more outlets if what get published is weak scholarship
   ▲ Too many journals and not enough quality work to go in them.
   ▲ This is not important if the new publications serve as outlets for substandard work. Quality, 
     not quantity, should be paramount.
   ▲ When is enough-enough
   ▲ Missing a few journals that we could use, but we are making great strides in this area.
   ▲ Need different kinds of outlets ... outlet for practical research and one that focuses on sport 
     management education.
9. Increasing the quality of research outlets in the field.
- Articles in the Sport Management Review appear to be solid.
- Over time most journals become more rigorous.
- Need for a range of quality is starting to develop.
- The quality of the articles in JSM has increased markedly.
- SMQ quality has increased and still trying to be an academic journal and practical journal at the same time.
- JSM quality has increased in the last 5 years.
- Oversupplied with journals.
- It is too easy to publish drivel or, worse yet, simply wrong assertions.
- Outlets = conferences, journals, workshops, seminars?

10. Establishing an infrastructure for the new research field of sport management (i.e., NASSM, JSM).
- Organization is unlike any other academic body in that people from small schools dominate it and in many ways has set the tone for research.

11. Recognizing sport management as a field of study in academe.
- Who is recognizing sport management as a field of study?
- Recognized by whom?
- The mainstream academic community regards us with some skepticism. We have a way to go before we have adequate academic (or industry) status.
- Need to heighten respect on our respective campus.

12. Developing overall sport management knowledge.
- Need to develop our own theory base.

13. Developing specific sport marketing knowledge.
- I don't think managing or marketing sport organizations is any different from other industrial areas hence the lower score on importance.
- Need to develop our own theory base.
- Sport marketing and sport law are the two realms of study that seem to have moved ahead the most.

14. Developing knowledge about leadership in sport.
- Limited research on leadership considering many parameters that comprise management.
- Risk in leadership work of simply making the fundamental attribution error in a big way.
- Much of the current work is speculative and biased.
- Should be developed further.
- Need to develop our own theory base.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS:
Should you consider the development of specific sport liability knowledge?
Should you consider the development of specific sport ethic knowledge?

**Question 2: What are the current events and trends impacting research in sport management?**

**Events/trends:**
1. **Globalization.**
   - Many people “fight” this.
   - We are not tackling globalization.
   - No research that looks at globalization from a sport management perspective.
   - Those of us in North America need to pay more attention to the international scene.
   - We are broadening - need to do more comparative work.
   - Clearly globalization is important.

2. **Information technology.**
   - Most of what is written from a sport management point of view is actually fairly low level.
   - It is becoming easier to access and find related information, to communicate with colleagues worldwide.

3. **Increased diversity of sport consumer audience.**
   - Only a few doing this and it is critical
   - Need to broaden our focus - able/disabled, rec/elite, volunteer and paid settings
   - Continue to conduct research that includes the diverse groups.
   - Sport consumers will become more and more diverse as time goes by.

4. **Increase in legal issues and regulations.**
   - This is one of the areas our people seem to take seriously.
   - A number of people look at Title IX issues.
   - There are other issues to address (e.g., governing body regulations, tax laws, anti-trust issues, etc.)

5. **Commercialization of amateur and intercollegiate sports.**
   - Go on the professionals and the colleges; commercialization has crept into primary and secondary schools as well as community sport.

6. **Increase in opportunities for participation in sport (both spectatorship and participation).**
   - Need to provide greater attention to this area
   - I think participation more than spectatorship - recreational sport

7. **Increase in professional sport finance related issues (e.g., stadium/arenas, ticket prices, fiscal responsibility).**
   - We do too much of this already
   - Few people in sport management who have financial training at an advanced level of research/theory competency.

8. **Demand for sport marketing research.**
   - Flavor of the month for sport management scholars.
Demand for other types of research.
Growing area of study and practice

9. Horizontal and vertical integration of the sport industry with other enterprises.
- We don't research sport in context.
- No serious work in the area at all.
- A vital area as it is radically changing the nature of relations between sport industries and the
  rest of the economy.

10. Movement of sport management to business schools.
- Non-issue in Canada
- More cooperation, but very little movement
- Rare cases does sport management exist in top business schools
- Exists in small private schools
- Happening in business schools with little or no research tradition.
- Will change

11. Limited funding resources for sport management research.
- Researchers becoming creative - looking at their problems of interest with populations that
  are fundable
- We can do research without extensive external funding
- Universities are beginning to grant tenure and promotion only to assistant professors who
  have brought in grant money
- Emphasis on grants could also begin to dictate our research interests, as faculty conduct only
  fundable research.
- Huge problem with Universities focusing on external funding much more.
- Huge issue on campuses before very long

Question 3: In your view, IDEALLY what qualities would best describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now?

Ideal Qualities:
1. Theory developed/tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (e.g.,
   management, marketing, sociology, psychology, etc).
   - This will start to emerge in the next ten years or so.
   - Also be in other fields of endeavor.
   - This would demonstrate impact - lead to greater respect for research conducted by sport
     management types

2. Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines' theories.
   - Need to continue to refine this
   - Demonstrates knowledge of other work
   - Be informed by the best other disciplines have to offer as well as make our own contributions
     to their theoretical bases

3. Sport management research is cross-disciplinary.
   [Old item: Sport management research integrated across disciplines.]
   - Important purely from a funding perspective
   - Shows growth/respect
4. Unique body of knowledge created in sport management.
   ▲ Still extremely reliant on other disciplines
   ▲ Add sport and stir approach

5. Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.
   ▲ Must continue to get better
   ▲ Ensure that young academics have the rigor/will demand the same of their work and of their Ph.D. students

6. Adequate research resources.
   ▲ We don’t generally need extensive external funding for our research programs
   ▲ Depends on national and disciplinary context.
   ▲ Better support for some elements of sport management research in Australia than there is in the USA.
   ▲ Being in a business school also helps.
   ▲ Some work in sport contexts that does not call itself sport management (but that is) may be well funded.
   ▲ This may require some creative thinking on our part.

7. Sport management research applied as a useful management tool and one that identifies best practices.
   ▲ Little impact on shaping the practice of sport management.
   ▲ Need to more effectively outline the implications of our research to better inform/shape practice

8. High quality doctoral candidates.
   ▲ Need high quality programs - programs that have a critical mass of active researchers producing sport management Ph.D.’s.
   ▲ Function of the candidate and the environment in which they are being trained, and by whom.
   ▲ Some of the doctoral programs are not developing individuals with the necessary tools to become good researchers.
   ▲ We have these now.

9. Sport management research disseminated to the general public.
   ▲ Our audience are those in the field
   ▲ We generally only talk with one another

10. High quality sport management research published in sport management first tier journals.
    [Old item: High quality sport management research published in first tier journals.]
    ▲ We tend to think "within the box".
    ▲ JSM is considered a first tier journal

11. High quality sport management research published in management first tier journals.
    [Old item: High quality sport management research published in first tier journals.]
    ▲ We tend to think "within the box".
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12. Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians within the field.
[Old item: Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians.]

13. Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians by other fields.
[Old item: Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians.]

Question 4: In your view, REALISTICALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now?

Realistic Qualities:

1. Research theoretically driven.

2. Research application driven, consumer oriented, and field based.
   ▲ Need to highlight implications.
   ▲ Need.

3. Research both theoretically and application driven. [New item]

4. Research focused on current issues.
   [Old item: Research focused on current and diverse issues.]
   ▲ This is important if we want to attract funding.

5. Research focused on diverse issues.
   [Old item: Research focused on current and diverse issues.]
   ▲ This is important if we want to attract funding.

6. Scholars recognized and respected.
   ▲ Need to continue to work towards this end
   ▲ We need more.
   ▲ Some scholars are already recognized and respected...

7. Focused, sustained research programs.
   [Old item: Dedicate, focused research programs.]
   ▲ Future outcome
   ▲ This is beginning to happen
   ▲ We have these now.

8. Research rigorous in design, methodology, analysis, and interpretation.
   ▲ Heavily scripted in the descriptive method

9. Professional associations, research agencies, and universities foster research.
10. Professional associations, research agencies, and universities fund research.  
May not be as necessary  
Would help heighten our credibility within the academic institutions/academy


12. Research published in management first tier journals.

Question 5: In your opinion, what general directions should sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?

Directions:
1. Becoming more specialized in research focus.  
Important  
Moving in that direction

2. Becoming more diverse in research topics.  
Important  
Moving in that direction

3. Recognizing sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.  
This is already happening – at least among ourselves.  
Great metaphor (testing area for life/business

4. Application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries.

5. Increase research preparation for doctoral students.  
Status quo  
Don't see things changing much  
Depends on the school and the country  
In some schools there is good research preparation.  
Other schools and in some countries there is atrocious research preparation.  
Too many smaller programs popping up to meet demand - but lack quality

6. Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty.  
Little change  
Opportunities vary by institution and by country
7. **Increase interdisciplinary and collaborative research.**
- From within academe
- Acceptability (in sport management and in other disciplines) is low.
- A few scholars are endeavoring to do this with sport management.
- Universities encourage this - we must get on board
- Cutting edge developments are in multidisciplinary and interstitial environments.

8. **Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.**
- Very important and heightens credibility with in the academy/institutions of higher learning
- Learn to astonish them and be useful at the same time

9. **Increase quality in research design.**
   [Old item: Increase quality and innovation in research design.
   - Scripted in the descriptive method

10. **Increase standards for research publication.**
- We are moving in the other direction.
- With the new journals in the field, some real drivel can still find an outlet.
- Varying degrees of standards.
- A few more journals popping up can we maintain quality?
- Slowly moving in that direction.

11. **Expand publication outlets.**
- New journals in the field that are begging for material.
- Lot of junk is being published
- Bad research representing the field.
- Time to step back and assess the increased numbers of outlets - at a quality cost?

12. **Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration.**
- North America is not learning much from overseas
- Local agendas – which is a particularly serious problem in North America.
- International Sport Management Alliance plays a role here – could be more.
- Happening in Europe to some degree.
- Open to other research agendas, and to new kinds of research questions.

**Question 6:** In your opinion and drawing on question number 5, what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions?

**Actions and/or strategies:**
1. **Encourage research specialization.**
   - Tenure review processes tend to reward specialization.
   - Focus is a good thing

2. **(Acknowledge research successes.**
   [Old item: Celebrate research successes.]
   - Let's celebrate the achievements of sport management scholarship
3. **Do collaborative research across disciplines**
   - More motivated to reach across disciplines
   - Way of the future

4. **Present and publish outside sport management field.**
   - Key to increasing credibility

5. **Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management.**
   - Resistance to it in some quarters.
   - Unwilling to invite other academics.
   - Some of this has occurred.
   - Credibility test

6. **Increase publishing outlets.**
   - Too many now?
   - Outlets we have are short of quality material
   - Material rejected by rigorous review is then published elsewhere

7. **Increase research funding resources.**
   - Need?
   - Broaden our agendas
   - Establish the kinds of cutting edge usefulness that creates funding resources.

8. **Conduct professional research seminars and workshops.**
   - We already do this.
   - Help inform practice/more effective practice

9. **Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.**
   - Need critical mass of active faculty
   - Don't see much changing

10. **Increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.**
    - Theory can be learned more easily 'on the job' than can research related design and analysis
    - Need critical mass of active faculty
    - Is happening now

11. **Facilitate sport management doctoral programs' collaboration across universities.**
    - Video conferencing and/or internet hold the key
    - Location makes a difference
    - Happening very little in North America
    - Happening to low extent in Australia
    - Happening to some degree in Europe

12. **Determine viability of using curriculum accreditation standards.**
    - Should be avoided at all cost.
We already did this.

Especially in USA

13. Establish “center(s) of excellence.”
- This smacks of dangerous and unproductive elitism.
- University theme/current practice
- We need a broad, rigorous, and disputatious community of scholars.
- I interpret this as research institutes with funding.

14. Promote institutional support for sport management programs.
- Some compete too much
- Need to support each other
- Endeavoring to do this
- Success has been limited
- Direction See Weese’s not serving article in JSM as well as the recent Pitts and Mahoney article
- Has been forward.

Question 7: In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards the above mentioned general directions?
[Old question: In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards general directions?]

Challenges:
1. Engage in interdisciplinary research.
   - Futuristic modus operandi

2. Critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (e.g., during conference presentations).
   - Work is not adequately engaging
   - Little time for dialogue or discussion
   - Happy with things the way that they are right now.
   - We’re very kind
   - Too polite to each other.
   - Researchers who are doing cutting edge stuff are getting rejected for NASSM presentations.
   - Attendance at sessions at NASSM is low
   - Learn to give and take criticism in a public forum.
   - Something needs to be done to lift the standard
   - Could be changed

3. Interaction with academic community outside sport management.
   [Old item: Interaction with academic community.]
   - Talk with own types only
   - Doing this

4. Rigor and competitiveness of conferences.
   [Old item: Rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals.]
   - Work is not adequately engaging
   - Researchers who are doing cutting edge stuff are getting rejected for NASSM presentations.
   - If people don’t feel attracted to attend sessions, then they won’t be there for the dialogue.
NASSM session attendance speaks very poorly for the value attendees feel they get from the conference.
Lift the standard

5. **Rigor and competitiveness in journals.**  
[Old item: Rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals.]

6. **Quality of doctoral programs.**  
   - Creation of weaker programs to meet demand  
   - Takes substantial time to change doctoral programs

7. **Generalizability of sport management research results.**  
   - Often external validity issues in research design

8. **(Broaden or Narrow?) (breath or scope?) of sport management.**  
   [Old item: Re-conceptualize breath and scope of sport management.]  
   - What would we be re-conceptualizing it from or to  
   - Need to consider the use of existing knowledge.  
   - Be more creative in our use of knowledge and in the questions we derive.  
   - Volunteers, mass recreation, fitness vs. to much emphasis on elite sport

9. **Faculty time and resources for research.**  
   - Must be earned  
   - Research I and Doc I institutions need to give time for research  
   - Depends on institution and country  
   - Some program have so few people that they teach too many courses

10. **Formal recognition of scholarship within the field.**  
    [Old item: Formal recognition of scholarship.]  
    - Already an organization that champions mediocrity.  
    - Not enough good people to win the Ziegler award every year  
    - Recognition takes time  
    - Should have a group of Research Fellows

11. **Peoples' and/or institutions' resistance to change.**  
    [Old item: Change.]
APPENDIX J

Panel Members’ Comments from Round III
Panel members' comments to Round III

Question 1: What are the successes in sport management research that should be sustained?

Successes:

1. Developing sport management theory.
   - I believe it is important - just wonder when/if we will ever get there.
   - We have yet to really examine the validity/applicability of important theory in the parent disciplines.
   - Some of the sport related theory will necessarily be modifications of or built upon theory in the parent disciplines.
   - A sign of success in sport management research is when we are recognized for strong use of theory and contributions to theory development
   - Disagree with comment: "There is no theory that is sport management per se"
   - We borrow theory from other areas and apply it to sport management.

2. Use of theory from parent disciplines.
   - Some use no theory or misuse theories from parent disciplines.
   - Disagree with comment: "There is no theory that is sport management per se"

3. Linking theory to practice
   - Often when we say linking theory to practice we mean forget the theory and focus on the practice.
   - There is nothing so practical as good theory
   - Too much focus on practice could take the field away from what should be its core: theory development and testing—which will ultimately have practical value.
   - We must move beyond talking to one another and begin to impact the practice of sport management. Key - clearing stated, cogent implications.
   - All theory ultimately stems from experience (practice) and nothing is as practical as a good theory.
   - Did not yet convince practitioners and students of the importance of theory and the place it has in their ongoing development.
   - There is room for both theory and practice.
   - Agree with comments:
     ▲ There are practical aspects of all theoretical research.
     ▲ Integration of what we know from theory to practice.
     ▲ Theory and practice are symbiotic and synergetic.
     ▲ Theory and practice are dialectically related
     ▲ Theory and practice are, in the ideal instance, co-determinative.

4. Broadening of sport management research to include both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.
   - The issue, of course, is not method, but is the insightfulness and creativity of our research questions, and the rigor we bring to research pursuant to those questions - both conceptually and methodologically.
   - Many still look at qualitative as "fluffy" research.
   - Agree with the above comment: "here is not with pluralism but with rigor"
   - We have incorporated significant qualitative work into the field, e.g.: work coming out of UBC and Alberta, most of it is qualitative in nature
   - It is important, but not a 7.
   - The nature of the questions being asked often determines the method of inquiry (or it should).
• It is much more critical that people are involved in sound, rigorous research regardless of the methodological approach used.
• A mixture of both is important.
• An examination of what is taught and how research design is integrated into the Masters and PhD course of study may help us see some gaps.
• Very few qualitative studies are published in our literature or presented at NASSM.
• If we are to prosper as a field of study, people are going to have to stop resisting change.
• Some reviewers reject qualitative studies based on their own positivist biases rather than on knowledgeable assessments of the research.
• Disagree with comment: "We are "quantoids" and "descriptive" researchers."

5. Diversifying sport management research settings.
• Disagree strongly with the claim that diversity of settings is "overblown.
• Internal validity of theory, though necessary, is insufficient.
• We need to know the boundary conditions on theory, and we only discover those through diversification of settings in research.
• Different settings can highlight new ideas, new needs, and new insights.
• More than valuable; it is essential.
• North America, in particular, focuses on easy access to subjects through intercollegiate sports.
• The issue is not the specific setting but the rigor with which a study is conducted, and thus, knowledge about its generalizability.
• Agree with comment that "diversification" is given too much attention.
• Not convinced that this is critical to the advancement of theory in the area.
• Depends on the theoretical propositions or the problems one is investigating.
• Rather see us do a good job in some more narrow areas than become more diverse and not be strong at anything.
• We need to do more with sport business and with sport management education (e.g., best practices, teaching methods, etc.).

6. Increasing quality of sport management research designs.
[Original item: Adding sophistication to its research designs.]
• There is still too much methodologically flawed work being submitted to journals and presented at our conferences.
• Allowing conference presentations to be reviewed and presented on the basis of abstracts rather than developed work (as at NASSM) has exacerbated the problem.
• Do not think we should use more sophisticated designs unless they are called for.
• Some of the best researchers use very simple research designs.
• Increasing quality doesn't mean we have to increase complexity.
• Agree with comment: "Get too hung up on using "sophisticated research designs" simply to prove that we are more "sophisticated" rather than because that is what appropriate to answer the question(s)."

[Original item: Adding rigor to sport management methods of analysis.]
• There is still too much methodologically flawed work being submitted to journals and presented at our conferences.
• Allowing conference presentations to be reviewed and presented on the basis of abstracts rather than developed work (as at NASSM) has exacerbated the problem.
• Moved by comments of others.
• We are not always using them correctly.
Much of academia has become obsessed with using the most complicated statistics possible and this is not necessary to answer most research questions.

Need to increase the quality of our methods of analysis. This should be an on-going objective.

We are using more complicated statistics than the other experts believe.

The quality has increased greatly in 10 Years! Greatly!

8. Increasing the number of research outlets in the sport management field.
   - Over-endowed with outlets.
   - Oversupply may lead to quality decline
   - Quality is more important than quantity.
   - As stated above:
     - No use adding more outlets if what gets published is weak scholarship
     - Too many journals and not enough quality work to go in them.
     - This is not important if the new publications serve as outlets for substandard work.
   - Quality, not quantity, should be paramount.

9. Increasing the quality of research outlets in the field.
   - Over-endowed with outlets.
   - Quality is more important than quantity.
   - Continually strive to increase the quality of our research outlets, no matter how good they might become in the future.

10. Establishing an infrastructure for the new research field of sport management (i.e., NASSM, JSM).
    - Until we have more research quality, the infrastructure is irrelevant — or, worse yet, an institutionalization of incompetence.
    - Find JSM to be mostly worthless for me.
    - Many feel that NASSM is dominating by Canadians — a small proportions of membership — weighted voting has been suggested.
    - Disagree with the statement that small schools dominate and set the tone.
    - Still not convinced that NASSM necessarily has to major role.
    - Members set the tone, so it's up to all of us to contribute.
    - Disagree with comment: "Organization is unlike any other academic body in that people from small schools dominate it and that in many ways has set the tone for research.

11. Recognizing sport management as a field of study in academe.
    [Original statement Recognizing sport management as a field of study.]
    - Need to be recognized as serious scholars by our colleagues and administrators.
    - It is critically important, and we haven't yet accomplished that goal.
    - Some programs have achieved great recognition in their institutions. Need to branch out.
    - Need for recognition, simply to facilitate and allow people to investigate complex research problems associated with sport, be they marketing related, law or social issues. Without program recognition, and by implication of the field these questions do not get addressed.
    - Need to raise our level of visibility on campuses to gain respect of colleagues in other disciplines.

12. Developing overall sport management knowledge.
• Theory of parent disciplines is the critical knowledge—what is “overall” sport management knowledge?

13. Developing specific sport marketing knowledge.
• Just one of many parameters.
• I disagree with the assertion that marketing sport organizations is like marketing other kinds of organizations.
• There are similarities and points of isomorphism and there are also differences that do make a difference.
• Marketing sport is very different than marketing other products.
• I don’t see why “marketing” should be considered any more important than any other function; I imagine that this has to do with the definition of “management”
• Do not believe “sport marketing” is unique.
• Critical because it will be examined closely by both academics and practitioners. If we can do both it will be a great help to our field.
• Good progress has been made in Sport marketing, with much of the research focused on what constitute unique features of sport, e.g. consumer behavior and attendances/loyalty, brand equity etc.

14. Developing knowledge about leadership in sport.
• Just one of many OB parameters.
• Key area in our field.
• Is sport business leadership different from other kinds of business leadership?
• Theories of management may be “industry generic” but I do believe sport industry differs from other industries at least in part so no reason why we cannot encourage development of leadership in sport.
• Leadership research (not just in sport, but more generally) has found that (a) many different approaches work, (b) the situation is a pivotal mediator, and (c) most of what is called leadership is simply post-hoc attribution to successful outcomes. All this suggests that the leadership research area has been built on a fundamental attribution error – attributing to persons or personality that which has had a vital situational element.
• Bennis and Nanus’s (1985) comment is still pertinent: “Never have so many labored so long to say so little” (p. 4).
• In the context of an increasing focus on management education in sport, the need for specific leadership in sport dissipates.
• Sport management is not any worse on researching “leadership” than business in general.
• Developed a narrow view of what leadership in sport consists of - namely front office leadership, can this be so different from industry or non-sport management arenas?
• Leadership in sport is one area in which we have evidence of some good scholarship - there are still many questions to be explored but we have had some success.

15. Developing knowledge about sport liability. [New item]
• Just one of many parameters.
• Too much focus on “risk management” as simply personal injury without addressing the broad range of liability concerns, e.g., employment law, civil rights issues, contracts, administrative law, etc.
• Law literature – add sort and stir.
• We have scholars who are raising important issues.

16. Developing knowledge about sport ethics. [New item]
• If sport ethics is to be more than the golden rule + a bit of Kohlberg with sport examples, then we need to link it to sport history and sport sociology. Chapter 2 of Sport Ethics.
Concepts and cases in sport and recreation (by D.C. Malloy, S. Ross, & D.H. Zakus) points in a direction which indicates how this may be achieved. So does the recent article by Allan Edwards ("Reflective Practice in Sport Management").

- Just one of many parameters.
- Very limited perspective.
- Our "ethics" texts focus on participant and coaching ethics and we need to use "business" models for sport managers.
- DeSensi and Rosenberg have contributed in this area, but there is much more to be done.
- Fundamental area – underlines ethical, principled decision making in sport management – see Boucher's Ziegler lecture.
- Important area that has been developed some by those outside of sport management programs.
- We have scholars who are raising important issues.

Question 2: What are the current events and trends impacting research in sport management?

Events/trends:
   - Globalization is a very important phenomenon.
   - Not much likelihood that such work is on the horizon among the sport management research fraternity.
   - The claim by one of the panelists (above) that there is “no research that looks at globalization from a sport management perspective” is wrong.
   - We can't develop a research discourse on the topic of globalization if our institutional gatekeepers are intolerant of global research contexts.
   - For MOST sport management programs, globalization is not a strong influence in the research line chosen by faculty.

2. Information technology.
   - The journalistic stuff we have seen in sport management and sport marketing journals does not qualify as "research".
   - Sport management PhD programs are not training people (or recruiting trained people) to do work on that topic at the necessary level.
   - It will revolutionize what being a fan means.

3. Increased diversity of sport consumer audience.
   - We still think of "sport" as big college, pro, male, able-bodied, etc.
   - There has been little other work on diversity from a sport management perspective.
   - The work on culture and sport management has largely been conceptual, rather than empirical.
   - Little work on other kinds of diversity (except, perhaps, gender) is tackled at a research level in sport management.
   - The British sociologists have done some very useful research on training for cultural tolerance in the context of British soccer. However, with the exception of Thomas and Dyall ("Culture, Ethnicity and Sport Management: A New Zealand Perspective"), no one publishing in sport management seems to have noticed.
   - Critical.
   - Research will not generally attend to this, unless "diversity" translates to more profit for sport business.
• Can have a greater impact because of the increasing diversity in North America and the growing world marketplace.

4. Increase in legal issues and regulations.
• Surprised that others tended to evaluate this as having less of an impact.
• There seems to be a lot of interest in this field by sport management people — even those without legal training and without training in policy analysis.
• Legal issues are such a big thing in the US that this will continue to have a great impact.
• Area permeates all of society — should not be given a secondary role within all and among other sport management functional areas (law, marketing, management, ethics, etc).

5. Commercialization of amateur and intercollegiate sports.
• Most work in sport management is, at its core, about how to commercialize. Thus, there is a research effort on this front. Even if it is not intended to address commercialization directly, it does so implicitly.

6. Increase in opportunities for participation in sport (both spectatorship and participation).
• We need to know more about WHY people want to participate/spectate—it gets into the social psychology realm.
• This is what sport marketing researchers (and leisure management researchers) are doing, so of course the research literature in this realm will grow.

7. Increase in professional sport finance related issues (e.g., stadium/arenas, ticket prices, fiscal responsibility)
• We simply lack people trained in this area in sport management, and our sport management programs are not training them.
• Who, other than Dennis Howard, is doing all of this research that has lead to "too much"???
• Shocked by the comment: "we do too much of this already."
• Sport management programs should require more coursework in finance.
• Students in business schools are better prepared in this area.
• Some people may dabble in the area at some points in time, but they are unlikely to address finance from a sophisticated conceptual or methodological base because they are untrained to do so.
• Clearly important, and growing in significance to the industry — which may say something about matters we need to address in the training of some sport management PhDs).
• Agree with the comment that "few people in sport management have financial training at an advanced level of research/theory competency."

8. Demand for sport marketing research.
• It is much more than the "flavor of the month". This is a critical part of our future and has potential for grant money that has largely eluded us.
• Other functions are, or should be, equally important.

9. Horizontal and vertical integration of the sport industry with other enterprises.
• Clearly the area is vitally important.
• The overwhelming majority of our research publications concentrate on sport in isolation, are presented at conferences dedicated solely to sport, and are published in journals devoted uniquely to sport.
• Since our tertiary institutions have chosen to house the vast majority of sport management researchers within departments of sport studies (variously called:
kinesiology, physical education, human kinetics, etc.), we have institutionally instantiated the separateness of sport (and, more vitally, the study of sport) from the rest of social and economic life (and the study of the rest of social and economic life).

- To develop a serious research discourse on the topic, two things would have to be addressed: First, we would need to have a deeper and stronger discourse on strategy in sport management (i.e., strategic management that considers strategy in terms of the unique elements of the sport industry as a whole. Second, we would need to remove sport management research from its sport ghetto.

- There is little opportunity (and even less kudos) for researchers to develop, present, and publish papers that examine sport within its broader social and economic context.

- By the very way we have structured and institutionalized the field, we have made sport the focal center of what we study, and we have done so by separating it from other (and sometimes more general) fields of economic and social research. Consequently, it will take a paradigm shift of Galilean proportions to remove sport from the centre of our field's solar system, and relegate it to the status of a mere planetary body.

10. Movement of sport management to business schools.

- Clearly the area is vitally important.

- The overwhelming majority of our research publications concentrate on sport in isolation, are presented at conferences dedicated solely to sport, and are published in journals devoted uniquely to sport.

- Since our tertiary institutions have chosen to house the vast majority of sport management researchers within departments of sport studies (variously called: kinesiology, physical education, human kinetics, etc.), we have institutionally instantiated the separateness of sport (and, more vitally, the study of sport) from the rest of social and economic life (and the study of the rest of social and economic life).

- To develop a serious research discourse on the topic, two things would have to be addressed: First, we would need to have a deeper and stronger discourse on strategy in sport management (i.e., strategic management that considers strategy in terms of the unique elements of the sport industry as a whole. Second, we would need to remove sport management research from its sport ghetto.

- There is little opportunity (and even less kudos) for researchers to develop, present, and publish papers that examine sport within its broader social and economic context.

- By the very way we have structured and institutionalized the field, we have made sport the focal center of what we study, and we have done so by separating it from other (and sometimes more general) fields of economic and social research. Consequently, it will take a paradigm shift of Galilean proportions to remove sport from the centre of our field's solar system, and relegate it to the status of a mere planetary body.

- We need to keep it in HPERD with Business cooperation.

- The low rating reflects Nth American views, and that there is little likelihood of such movement. This is not the case in Australia where this is becoming the norm.

- A very real possibility at some institutions if we don't increase our credibility.

- In 10-20 years I think it will have a great impact.

- This will happen more and more as Business schools' enrollment fall. Unfortunately, if sport management moves into Business schools, it will probably lose the emphasis on the socio-cultural dimension of sport, per se.

11. Limited funding resources for sport management research.

- It is a critical issue.

- The escalating demands that we do so are likely to have a significant impact on the ways we do research and on the kinds of questions we ask – whether for better or for worse.

- The present situation (where I have secured research funding), has facilitated the development of a strong and innovative research stream, and it has enhanced the quality of graduate education experience I can provide to PhD students.
There is increasing demand that we get funded.
The topics that are fundable may come to dominate our research agendas.
Is not without its problems.
There is no question that our opportunities to do quality work will be enhanced to the
degree that we can find strong and renewable funding resources.
The status and sustainability of the field may depend on our ability to attract and renew
funding for the research that we do.
We "can do research without extensive funding"

Question 3: In your view, IDEALLY what qualities would best describe sport management
research 5 to 7 years from now?
[Original question: What qualities and characteristics would you use to describe a best-case scenario for sport
management research five to seven years?] 

Ideal Qualities:
1. **Theory developed/tested in sport management that impacts parent disciplines (e.g.,
management, marketing, sociology, psychology, etc).**
   - Contributing to the "other" disciplines is the sine qua non of our achievement, then we
     really don't have a field that can be called "sport management"; all we would have is
     management research with sport examples.
   - If we believe that there are some things special enough about the object we call "sport" to
     warrant a special field called "sport management", then we have to believe that there will
     be vital areas of research in which our findings and theories are distinctive.
   - Why are we so concerned about what other fields think?
   - It is not critical, the key is to understand sport better.
   - There is some likely flow back to parent disciplines, particularly as research quality
     increases, but the probability is not high and is not crucial in the overall scheme of things.
   - It is not necessary that our research impacts the parent disciplines, it would be nice if it
     did.
   - It isn't important that this occur in the next 5-7 years.
   - First things first-lets get our own theory established.
   - Seems highly probable since sport management research is symbiotic and synergetic, so
to speak, with parent discipline research. We inevitably use parent disciplines' theory in
our own sport management research – and we should!
   - Depends, in part, upon the rigor of our doctoral programs.
   - Not convinced this will begin to happen.

2. **Sport management research grounded in parent disciplines' theories.**
   - Not convinced this will happen.
   - Will happen more as the current doc students become assistant professors and begin to
     publish their research.
   - Seems inevitable and a fairly logical relationship.

3. **Sport management research is cross-disciplinary.**
   [Original statement: Sport management research integrated across disciplines.]
   - Do not believe our colleagues in other disciplines will seek to promote this.
   - Research in the history of the social sciences has found that the fundamental
     breakthroughs have occurred in multi-disciplinary contexts that are vigorously concerned
     with real-world concerns.
   - Will happen necessarily at large/research orientated institutions since granting agencies
     are demanding or expecting cross-disciplinary work.
I would like to know more why a reviewer thinks it is for funding purposes only
Important for reasons other than funding.
Interdisciplinary work has the potential for very creative, informed meaningful ways of
studying issues in sport management.
We do not exist in a vacuum, and we are obligated to recognize and study across
disciplines.
Seems inevitable – most all research is, in fact, cross disciplinary.
Most people can only do good research in a few disciplines.

4. Unique body of knowledge created in sport management.
   - We have been very hung-up on matters of academic prestige.
   - In many places (especially North America), sport studies departments sit at the bottom of
     the academic prestige hierarchy. Consequently, there has been some degree of
     inferiority complex, and a felt need to draw strongly on other (more prestigious)
     disciplines.
   - We have been far too reticent to push for a distinctive body of knowledge that is truly
     grounded in the phenomenon on which the field's name says we focus.
   - Any knowledge that provides insights into our understanding of sport management
     becomes unique. There evidence that there is this body of knowledge beginning to grow.
   - We are a growing field. It will happen over time.
   - This will/has happened.
   - The sport industry is different, at least in some or many ways, and will develop its own
     body of knowledge in time.

5. Highly rigorous research designs, methodologies, analysis, and interpretation of data.
   - Do not believe that we will get there within 5-7 years.
   - Pessimism on this matter because of the generally low standard of work I see submitted
     to journals and presented at sport management conferences.
   - There are certainly some bright sparks in the field, but it does not seem that we – in
     aggregate terms – are likely to reach the kinds of rigor to which this panel would aspire
     within the foreseeable future.
   - Little passion for improving methodology in sport management.

6. Adequate research resources.
   - We are not supported well in the US and that will not change.
   - Australian perspective traded off against North America.
   - We don't generally need extensive external funding for our research programs.
   - Changed on this as I see external funding being the source of attracting quality graduate
     students who are necessary for an active research agenda.

7. Sport management research applied as a useful management tool and one that
   identifies best practices.
   - Often we replicate the "worst practices" not the "best practices".
   - This will happen overtime.
   - I am already seeing practitioners coming to the academics for input and advise
   - This is very important and I am optimistic that we will be at least somewhat successful at
     doing this.
   - If our applied research doesn't accomplish this in 5-7 years, what's the point of doing it?
   - Adoption follows quality.

8. High quality doctoral candidates.
   - Produced by only 2-3 programs.
• We are attracting some very good students.
• We need to do a better job training them.
• Particularly need to do more to train them in matters of intellectual curiosity and intellectual ambition — in the substance of research, rather than just the form of research.
• Dependent upon quality of doctoral programs and we have a definite disparity in quality now.

9. Sport management research disseminated to the general public.
• We certainly aren't reaching the general public now. And, frankly, why should we?
• Research and theory typically have narrow audiences — those on whose work it impinges. That is certainly an important target (and one we often fail to hit).
• JSM has a very low impact factor.
• General public too broad, too our students who in turn transfer to work place.
• This will not happen if the tenure process remains the same.
• Why does the general public need to know and why would they be interested???
• Our public is the practitioners and future practitioners (students).
• Our research is already reaching the general public more than some people think, e.g.: I have seen Dennis Howard quoted in Sports Illustrated and my local paper in the last year,
• Optimistic that as Universities make more of an effort to publicize the research of their faculty, our research will receive more public attention.
• Might happen if the person in charge of external relations does a good job. This was a new service position recommended by J. Cuneen at the 1999 conference.

10. High quality sport management research published in first tier sport management journals. [Changed item]
[Original statement: High quality sport management research published in first tier journals.]
• This is essential.
• To some degree, it is already happening.
• JSM has a very low impact factor.
• How do we define “first tier”? Acceptance rate? Citations? JSM is high quality but is it “first tier”?

11. High quality sport management research published in first tier management journals. [Changed item]
[Original statement: High quality sport management research published in first tier journals.]
• If the doc programs graduate extremely well-qualified students, this could happen in a few cases.
• This will be sign of growth in sport management.

12. Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians within academe.
[Original statement: Sport management researchers professionally accepted, credible, and respected as scholars and academicians.]
• The degree of acceptance varies with sub-disciplines (sport law, sport marketing) and with the degree of research emphasis at a particular university.
• Respect follows quality.

Question 4: In your view, REALISTICALLY what qualities will actually describe sport management research 5 to 7 years from now?
What qualities and characteristics would you use to realistically describe sport management research in five to seven years?

Realistic Qualities:

1. Research theoretically driven.
   - The journals will demand it, so it is bound to happen.
   - Most everything is grounded in theory.

2. Research application driven, consumer oriented, and field based.
   - Our research should be theory driven.
   - Is this the opposite of theory?

3. Research both theoretical and application driven. [New item]
   - Since we still talk within the field as if theoretical work and practical work (disciplinary work and applied work) were different, there is little prospect that work that deems itself to be “applied” will also seek its theoretical / conceptual relevance.
   - We have to believe that application and theory can be jointly obtained if we are going to seek to obtain them jointly.

4. Research focused on current issues. [Changed item]
   - Not sure that it isn’t already driven by “current issues”.

5. Research focused on diverse issues. [Changed item]
   - We tend to think within the box.

6. Sport management scholars recognized and respected by scholars in other fields. [Original item: scholars recognized and respected.]
   - Some scholars recognized.
   - Don’t believe our scholars generally are recognized.
   - Quality work will be recognized by our peers.
   - Our success in this area is dependent, in large measure, on the capabilities of current doc students.
   - Mostly the field is a small club.

7. Focused, sustained research programs. [Original statement: Dedicated, focused research programs.]
   - Again: We have these now.
   - Probability: This will happen only if more people begin to develop lines of sequential studies rather than having “areas” of research in which a shotgun approach is taken.

8. Research rigorous in design, methodology, analysis, and interpretation.
   - Although not all will be, there will be a lot of rigorous research.
   - The new docs are becoming more sophisticated in this area.
   - The road to rigor is long.

9. Professional associations, research agencies, and universities foster sport management research. [Changed item]
   - To a large degree, this is happening already.
10. Professional associations, research agencies, and universities fund sport management research. [Changed item]
   [Original statement: Professional associations, research agencies, and universities foster and fund research.]
   - In general, the field has yet to establish the necessary credibility to attract substantial funding in its own right. (Indeed, that is why so much of the funded research is happening under other names – such as “city marketing” or “event leveraging” or “economic development”.)
   - Happening to some degree in Europe and Australia (although often in situations where the research does not call itself “sport management”).

11. Research published in first tier sport management journals. [Changed item]
   [Original statement: Research published in first tier journals.]
   - Already happening.
   - Would advance perception of field/quality of sport management research.

12. Research published in first tier management journals. [Changed item]
   [Original statement: Research published in first tier journals.]
   - As our own journals grow in standard and reputation, this will become less important.

Question 5: In your opinion, what general directions should sport management field emphasize to move its research towards an ideal future?
[Original question: In your opinion, what directions should sport management research take to move it towards the best-case scenario?]

Directions:
1. Become more specialized in research focus. [Changed item]
   [Original statement: Becoming more specialized in research focus and diverse in research topics.]
   - Doc students are learning to do this.

2. Become more diverse in research topics. [Changed item]
   [Original statement: Becoming more specialized in research focus and diverse in research topics.]
   - The field (particularly in North America) still defines itself and its objects of study too narrowly. Consequently, it is hard to increase diversity of topics (and contexts) and get the research past the field’s gatekeepers. NASSM tried to do this but some members were against it.
   - We are creatures of habit.

3. Recognize sport as a context for theory testing and theory building.
   - If we don’t recognize this, then how could we claim to have a field of study?
   - We already recognized this.
   - Is happening, so probability is that it will continue/increase
   - Unless we have a change in the US, we will continue to do “applied” research at the expense of theory work.
   - We are doing this.

4. Application of sport management research to other disciplines and industries.
   - We are still having difficulty getting our work applied within the sport industry.
   - How can we expect it to be applied outside the industry?
   - Even if it is, I am not sure it will be recognized in this way.
• I don't see the point of striving for this goal. If we develop a unique body of knowledge, how can it apply to other disciplines/industries?
• We do want sport management research to reflect and build upon other disciplinary theories.

5. Increase research preparation for doctoral students.
• It seems unlikely that institutions will move to greater demands on students over the near term.
• The pressures are in the other direction – to get students through to completion with minimal stumbling blocks (which added research preparation often constitutes).

6. Improve professional development opportunities in research for faculty.
• Given funding systems and institutional priorities, there is not a strong enough agenda to shift the status quo.
• Australian perspective.
• Some NASSM members are resistant to professional development sessions at the conference.

7. Increase interdisciplinary and collaborative research.
• Must happen to some extent.
• If we do not do this, we will soon be marginalized.
• Collaboration is necessary, however, interdisciplinary research is not that important.
• Universities often talk about this being important.
• Do not see Universities doing much to reward this.
• People need to reach out.

8. Increase industry links and funding opportunities for research.
• There seems to be a greater opportunity for this in Canada, Australia, and Europe than there is in the United States.
• Some opportunities are occurring under other names (e.g., place marketing, economic development, sport tourism).
• It seems to depend on context.
• Australian perspective on opportunities.
• Should be quite feasible since "increase(ing) industry links" is not very difficult.
• Sport industry does not value academe generally.
• I see this happening.
• Just a matter of getting the foot in the door and showing them what we can do for them.
• It is probable.

9. Increase quality in research design.
[Original statement: Increase quality and innovation in research design.]
• Programs seem to be producing a few great prospects but many weak Ph Ds as well.
• Must happen over time.
• It will happen.
• How can the quality fail to increase? If it doesn't, we won't be around in 5-7 years because the assistant professors won't get tenure.

10. Increase standards for research publication.
• We have diluted the field through the establishment of journals that will publish rubbish.
• If research is week, reviewers have to accept some blame.
• It will happen.

11. Expand publication outlets.
We don’t need more outlets; we need more quality. We are getting more outlets and consequently we are seeing more publication of low quality material. Recognize and accept too many can lower quality. I don’t change the score here, agreeing with the comments made above: Lot of junk is being published Bad research representing the field. Much of the need for increased research outlets is the editorial policy in terms of the type of material (not speaking of quality here) that will be considered for publication. We will continue to see an increase in the number of research journals, which may not be necessarily good if they are not the journals we need. We do not need them We will see more outlets, not because of demand but because of personal interest under the guise of meeting a new market niche. We can’t fill our current outlets with quality material. The last issue of JSM contained only 4 articles. Why expand? Don’t see this happening with any great quality or quantity. We have had a few new journals come about in the last 5 years – this is such an expensive and labor intensive endeavor – don’t see or project it will happen with great speed.

12. Encourage global sharing of knowledge and inter-country collaboration.
   - The Alliance is symbolic of the degree to which this will be fostered.
   - The “ideal future” research is based on the rigor of the research we do (qualitative and quantitative) and the related theory development and testing—not on context—global or otherwise.
   - Many issues are more important than addressing globalization so that SM can “move its research towards an ideal future.”

Question 6: In your opinion and drawing on question number 5, what specific actions and/or strategies will move sport management research in these general directions?
[Original question: In your opinion, what actions and/or strategies will contribute to the movement of sport management research in these directions?]

Actions and/or strategies:
1. Encourage research specialization.
   - That’s where our depth of knowledge will come from.
   - Unless we hire more faculty for sport management programs so that we have fewer preparations, we will not encourage specialization in research or teaching.
   - More doctoral students are learning about this.
   - Eventually, it should become the norm.

2. Acknowledge research successes.
[Original statement: Celebrate research successes.]
   - NASSM tried to do this but some members were against it.
   - “Celebrating research success” will have much influence on moving research in the desired direction.
   - Other types of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations might have that affect.
   - Who is acknowledging the successes? Are we acknowledging successes in our own little enclave?
   - This will happen even though I consider it unimportant.
• Hope NASSM will begin to recognize Research Fellows.
• We have built on "success" via tenure and promotions process, getting articles published, acceptance at professional conferences for presentations.
• We (human nature) tend to do what is rewarded.
• Difficulty/issues in getting NASSM "awards" passed (which most did not) – don't see this happening and if so reward how? More money? Research Fellow Award?

3. **Do collaborative research across disciplines**
   • We are too parochial and not well versed enough in parent disciplines.
   • This is not as critical.

4. **Present and publish outside sport management field.**
   • Partly an exercise in self-justification.
   • What is important is increasing our understanding of sport management, this will force us to draw from outside the sport literature.
   • Few of our sport management folks can do so with credibility.
   • If we do quality work in the sport management journals that will be sufficient.
   • It is important, but we should publish good work in our own journals too.

5. **Involve researchers from outside disciplines to present and publish in sport management.**
   • We are too parochial to encourage this.
   • Not critical to the development of our field.
   • If we produce good research ourselves, not sure why we need "outsiders" to publish research in our area.
   • It seems to me that all our NASSM guest speakers have been practitioners, not scholars.

6. **Increase publishing outlets.**
   • Agree with Round II comments:
     - Too many now?
     - Outlets we have are short of quality material
     - Material rejected by rigorous review is then published elsewhere
   • Relative lack of importance of this issue.
   • Just because a manuscript is rejected by one set of reviewers does not mean it is not worthy of publication.
   • Review boards do make mistakes.
   • Sometimes a manuscript will be held up by the views of one reviewer.
   • Smacks of academic snobbery.
   • Another issue related to increased outlets is the fact that some journals take and inordinate amount of time returning reviews - those on a tenure track can often not afford that kind of time.
   • We don't need more outlets. We need better outlets.

7. **Increase research funding resources.**
   • Australian perspective.
   • One can do excellent organizational/managerial research on a very small budget.
   • As our research programs develop so will the ability to secure funding.
   • So tough to acquire.

8. **Conduct professional research seminars and workshops.**
   • This would be great if it is done well.
   • Concerned that we are not at the point we need to be in order to consistently do these types of seminars in a quality manner.
9. Increase research rigor and requirements of doctoral programs.
   - The institutional trend seems to be status quo oriented.
   - Programs seem to be producing a few great prospects but many weak PhDs as well.
   - Do not have great confidence in doctoral programs in US.
   - Limited faculty at institutions of higher education.
   - Faculty have heavy workloads stretched very thin.
   - Would require more faculty time.

10. Increase doctoral candidates' knowledge of theories in parent disciplines.
    - This is already occurring.
    - Do not see this happening in doctoral programs in the future.
    - Some doctoral students are already beyond many people on this one.

11. Facilitate sport management doctoral programs' collaboration across universities.
    - Do not perceive it as being particularly difficult to accomplish.
    - Does not happen in US.

    - Don't consider it important because the standards are minimalist in their orientation.
    - We will advance the field through programs that are seeking to be optimal in their orientation—well beyond the minimalist accreditation standards.
    - NASSM/NASPE needs to spend some money and get some PR on this.
    - Some benchmarks are useful.
    - It is happening now in the US.
    - We are already moving in this direction.
    - The SMPRC standards are a good start.
    - Lost as to why someone would say this "should be avoided at all cost".
    - If we can not identify a relatively standard curriculum (body of knowledge) that we are trying to teach, I am not sure we are truly a unique academic discipline.
    - Is it time for a review of the standards?
    - See the standards as offering 'benchmarks'
    - What else could be done?
    - While we need standards, some programs, particularly those that don't meet the current standards, can ignore them.
    - The sport industry should have standards—then we'd see programs improve or disappear.
    - Important when operating in the "system" of higher education.
    - Accreditation will lock in the lowest common denominators of training.

13. Establish "center(s) of excellence."
    - This is not the way we are headed, nor should it be.
    - Countries that have sought to do this (e.g., state socialist countries and countries under fascist dictatorships) have damaged rather than enhanced the quality of scholarship obtained.
    - Academic rigor and advance come through a multi-faceted, multi-vocal, geographically diverse community of scholarship—not through centralization.
    - The quality of work that we turn out is established in the context of academic debate, replication, and extension. So, we determine excellence post-hoc, not ex-ante.
    - It makes little sense to "create centers of excellence", because we would then have to be able to know ex-ante who and what is excellent.
    - The centralization would reduce the requisite level of disputation and the degree of diversity (and innovation) required to engender excellence.
• Nothing wrong with promoting excellence.
• What's the problem with 'excellence'?
• If it happens, it won’t be on a very large scale.

14. Promote institutional support for sport management programs.
• We are still struggling on this front, but I detect real progress.
• The probabilities are good.
• It’s a cash cow – of course universities will support it.
• Critical for ongoing sustainability, and esteem.
• Unlikely to occur.
• Many universities already provide a lot of support to programs because we generate large numbers of students

Question 7: In your opinion, what challenges can be managed now to move sport management research towards the general directions mentioned in Question #5?

Challenges:
1. Engage in interdisciplinary research.
   ▲  Futuristic modus operandi
   • Interdisciplinary research is not that important.
   • If we work together as a group to produce good research, I do not know why we have to do research with those in other fields.
   • Universities often talk about this being important, but I do not see Universities doing much to reward this.

2. Critical and constructive dialogue among sport management researchers (e.g., during conference presentations)
• The best setting for this is our conferences.
• There is little constructive critical dialog at our conferences.
• Our conferences seem to be treated primarily as opportunities to socialize with friends, rather than as occasions to engage in intense and extended exchanges of ideas.
• We, as a discipline, are not comfortable with “critiques” of our work, at least in the US.
• Public form is not always the best place to engage in these types of discussions.
• Have seen it in psychology and it was a way to show off and argue over who was smarter.
• However research discussions are important.
• No evidence to suggest we are willing to challenge each others’ thinking in a public forum.
• Some people take it personally and have temper outbursts. which discourages further discussion.

3. Interaction with academic community outside sport management.
   [Original statement: Interaction with academic community.]
• We are already doing this.
4. Rigor and competitiveness of conferences. [Changed item]
[Original statement: Rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals.]
- For this to happen, two things would need to occur. First, to give a paper, it is virtually impossible to give a meaningful and rigorous review to an abstract. Second, it would be necessary to lift the standard of the reviewers who review conference submissions. Both issues have been raised with the NASSM Executive Council, but the Council has refused even to consider changes of this kind.
- Other associations (e.g., EASM and SMAANZ) have been similarly reticent to demand more from presenters and reviewers.
- There is not likely to be any shift upward in conference quality.
- Would rather see more people be able to present and discuss their research at the conferences than to make it more too selective.
- The conference should be the place to discuss a wide variety of research, both high quality and average.
- Tone of some of the comments too 'competitive' for my liking
- This will happen only if we use reviewers who are established scholars.
- First-year assistant professors and people who don't publish aren't appropriate.
- NASSM conference reviewers' comments should be shared with the submitters so they can learn from their mistakes.

5. Rigor and competitiveness of journals. [Changed item]
[Original statement: Rigor and competitiveness of conferences and journals.]
- Of course, the likelihood depends on which journal we are talking about.
- Depends on what journals we are discussing.

6. Quality of doctoral programs.
- Improvement is already evident.

7. Generalizability of research results in various sport management settings. [Changed item]
[Original statement: Generalizability of sport management research results.]
- In order to test for generalizability, we need to have robust theory as well as findings that are replicated in particular contexts. Since we do not yet have much of either, we don't yet have the necessary foundation to move forward on this front in the near term.
- Optimistic that the foundation can be established during the next decade.
- Critical outcome of scientific enquiry!
- Why must our results generalize or be extrapolated to other settings?

8. Specifically in the US, broaden research scope to include other settings than college and professional sport (e.g.: youth sport, sports media).
[Original statement: Re-conceptualize breadth and scope of sport management.]
- This will depend on the academic risk entailed for the researcher. If the gatekeepers (journal and conference reviewers) rule this work to be irrelevant or peripheral, then researchers won't take the risk — and even if they do, it won't be accepted for the preferred outlets.
- The probability depends on the nature of reviewers we choose for conferences and journals, and also on the instructions those reviewers are given by editors and program chairs.
- Not certain this will happen as the editorial policy of some journals does not consider youth sport or recreational sport what sport management is.
- This is important.
- Would rather have someone who is an expert on professional sports than know very little about a lot of different areas.
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• Why have we gone to a US focus?

9. **Faculty time and resources for research.**
   • It will happen
   • Higher education continues to stretch faculty workloads.
   • Limited resources in higher education.
   • Don't see this happening.

10. **Formal recognition of scholarship within the field.**
    [Original statement: Formal recognition of scholarship.]
    • NASSM attempted this but there was some resistance by those who don't do research. That NASSM Zeigler Award has been given to several non-scholars.
    • Formal recognition will not have much influence on moving research in the desired direction.
    • Other types of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations might influence on moving research in desired direction.
    • The last few winners of the Zeigler award (our scholarship award) have won it primarily for service.
    • We should recognize scholarship, however, concerned that we may recognize mediocre research as well.
    • The standards for the Research Fellows presented at NASSM this year, allow for researchers to be recognized as a Research Fellow way to early.
    • (hope) the Research Fellows idea will be implemented.

11. **Peoples' and/or institutions' resistance to change.** [Changed item]
    [Original statement: Change.]
    • It would be self-defeating to be resistant to change, particularly at this phase of the field's early existence.
    • The reality is that we are already suffering from the (rather normal) fact of resistance to change.
    • Probability of "resistance" very high
    • If we are to prosper as a field of study, people are going to have to stop resisting change.
    • Very important to be able to change – adapt to change – be supportive of change.
APPENDIX K

Other Correspondence
Script for the telephone call to the Panel Selection

Dr. _______, my name is Carla Costa and I sent you an email recently. I am one of Dr. Chella’s advisees and as I mentioned in the email I am initiating a study on the status and future direction for sport management research. We decided to use the Delphi Technique, which for this study requires the identification of 15 to 20 panel members.

We would like to ask for your help in identifying these experts.

Could you please name other academicians that in your opinion are prominent researchers in the field of sport management?

Specifically we are interested in including academicians-researchers who are Associate level Professors as well as Assistant level Professors.

Associate level          Assistant Level