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Synopsis:
This paper offers inventory of knowledge, vocabulary, scientific findings and methodology based on content analysis of abstracts presented at EASM 2014 in Coventry. The inventory is elaborated in tune with the strong appeal posed by Zeigler (2007) using the qualitative approach based on the coding techniques (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Thus heading towards the EASM 2015 the paper contributes to the understanding and awareness of the state of art in sport management discipline. Whereas previous studies dealt with the inventories of scientific journals and books in sport management, this paper presents the disciplinary overview of the EASM conference abstracts, which have not been analysed in the systematic manner yet.

Abstract:

Introduction
This paper offers inventory of knowledge, vocabulary, scientific findings and methodology based on content analysis of abstracts presented at EASM 2014 in Coventry. The inventory is elaborated in tune with the strong appeal posed by Zeigler (2007) using the qualitative approach based on the coding techniques (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Thus heading towards the EASM 2015 the paper contributes to the understanding and awareness of the state of art in sport management discipline. Whereas previous studies dealt with the inventories of scientific journals and books in sport management, this paper presents the disciplinary overview of the EASM conference abstracts, which have not been analysed in the systematic manner yet.

Literature review
There is an ongoing discussion led by scholars in quest to clarify the sport management as a discipline with its own body of knowledge, vocabulary and methodology (Zeigler, 1987; Paton, 1987; Olafson, 1990, 1995; Slack, 1991, 1996; Soucie & Doherty, 1996; Boucher, 1998; Pitts, 2001; Balduck, Parmentier & Buelens, 2004; Skinner & Edwards, 2005; Frisby, 2005; Chalip, 2006; Chadwick, 2009, 2011, 2013; Rudd, Johnson & Burke, 2010; Doherty, 2012,
2013; Chelladurai, 2013). There has been also a remarkable progress in the number and diversity of scholarly opinions regarding the research topics and methodologies in the field of sport management (Zeigler, 1987; Paton, 1987; Olafson, 1990, 1995; Slack, 1991, 1996; Soucie & Doherty, 1996; Boucher, 1998; Pitts, 2001; Balduck, Parmentier & Buelens, 2004; Skinner & Edwards, 2005; Frisby, 2005; Chalip, 2006; Chadwick, 2009, 2011, 2013; Rudd, Johnson & Burke, 2010; Doherty, 2012, 2013; Naumovski, Sojkov, Naumovski & Naumovski, 2013; Chelladurai, 2013). This academic discussion regarding the core of the sport management disciplines is also supplemented by studies which are assessing the body of knowledge generate so far in sport management. (Parkhouse, Ulrich & Soucie, 1982; Soucie & Doherty, 1996; Pitts & Pedersen, 2005; Pitts & Danylchuk, 2007; Kim, 2012; Ciomaga, 2013).

Theoretical design

To perform the inventory of the scientific results presented at EASM 2014 the disciplinary approach described by Renson (1989) i.e. that the discipline is characterized by a particular focus or object of study, a specialized method of inquiry and unique body of knowledge, was applied. The content analysis of EASM abstracts using coding method (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) was conducted so to provide the overview of the development of thoughts and developments in these three areas. To consolidate the findings the approach suggested by Morgan (1979) in terms of paradigms’ level (philosophical, social and technical) was utilized. Particular attention was paid to the identification of the proportion between the borrowed theories and new, original theories in sport management (Doherty, 2013).

Results and discussion

The final results will be available at the conference, but the finding so far revealed that there is a variety of research designs used when conducting research in sport management. But they are described by different vocabulary although they are often the same in the nature. Therefore on the base of Morgan’s (1979) technical level of paradigms (specifying the methods and techniques which ideally should be adopted when conducting research) and using the coding technique the vocabulary consolidation in this disciplinary area is suggested. With regard to the body of knowledge the 16 core areas of investigation have been identified which are very much in tune with the areas of research in sport management suggested by Chadwick in 2011. In terms of the proportion between the borrowed and new theory the results strongly support Chalip’s (2006) concept of two complementary streams of research reflected in derivative model and sport – focused model and as inventory of EASM 2014 abstracts showed, these two streams are developing equally.

Please note: Full results are not available at the time of abstract submission, but will be presented at the conference.
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