

A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF SPORT MANAGEMENT FACULTY COLLABORATION: SINGLE VERSUS MULTIPLE AUTHORSHIP

MICHAEL SMUCKER, PHD, UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA

HEIDI GRAPPENDORF, PHD, NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important aspects of a faculty member's reward and recognition system is securing tenure and promotion. Among the major criteria used to evaluate candidates for tenure and promotion, especially at research intensive universities, is the number of publications in refereed journals. For sport management faculty, an increased emphasis is often placed on the number of published manuscripts due to difficulty securing external funding. Acquiring external funds equivalent to other areas of specialization within the department (e.g., exercise science) and the university is often a struggle for sport management faculty. Thus, more publishing expectations are placed on some sport management faculty at more research-centered universities to compensate for a likely lacking of external funding. As this "publish or perish" mentality continues to be upheld in higher education, faculty members have pursued various strategies to increase their success rate of publishing in refereed journals. One strategy that has caught the attention of academicians is the growing number working in collaborative groups or teams (Creamer, 2005). After initial examination, this move toward collaborative endeavors appears to go against the traditional solitary nature in higher education. The solitary process is seen throughout graduate school, reinforced in the dissertation process, and continues into tenure track positions with classroom teaching and developing independent research lines (Bohen & Stiles, 1998). Also, the reward structure has primarily been based on individual effort. However, this trend is changing as the need to publish has contributed to the increase in collaboration as a prevalent phenomenon (Sever, 2005). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine single versus multiple authorship differences in sport management faculty research. Specifically, professional presentations and refereed journals from 2000-2005 were examined with the hope this study would serve as a foundation for future research.

COLLABORATION AND NEGOTIATED ORDER THEORY

Faculty collaboration is a joint endeavor which involves like goals, cooperative efforts, and outcomes in which collaborators can share the responsibilities, as well as the benefits (Austin & Baldwin, 1992). According to Creamer (2005), collaboration can take two forms. The first is known as a functionalist perspective where maximum efficiency is achieved by dividing labor. Essentially this form serves as a management directed approach where the "team" is actually serving more as a group. One clear leader is appointed who makes most of the decisions, jobs are distinct, and individual members complete their part of the work (Gomez, Kirkman, & Shapiro, 2000). The second form of collaboration is referred to as a collaborative approach which places more emphasis on theoretical insight and scholarship. This second form takes a true "team" approach where the collaborators are self directed. Leadership is shared, jobs are fluid and overlap, and members perform interdependent tasks. According to Daprano, Bruening, Pastore, Greenwell, Dixon, Jae Ko, Jordan, Lilienthal, & Turner (2005) "collaborative processes within a team context consist of dynamic, interwoven, and disciplined exchanges of knowledge and information, participative decision making, and co-created solutions to emerging problems" (p. 302). Both of these perspectives fit within the framework of negotiated order theory (Strauss, 1978). According to negotiated order theory, all group/team interactions and decisions are worked out and negotiated. Strauss defines negotiation as a method of working out issues by dealing with each other to get

those things done efficiently and effectively. Negotiation therefore becomes the framework of collaborating amongst members of a group/team. Austin and Baldwin (1992) utilized this theory in their description of collaborators working out the details of executing a shared project or activity.

Two major elements to negotiated order theory are the structural context and the negotiation context (Strauss, 1978). The structural context refers to the organizational and societal components that could shape and be shaped by negotiations. In terms of faculty collaboration, organizational components might be an institution's resources, emphasis on publishing, incentives and rewards, or time provided to publish. The negotiation context refers to the interactions that are constantly at work to (re)create social order. Some of the specific characteristics of these interactions are the number of negotiators, the experience of the negotiators, the balance of power exhibited by the negotiators, how often the negotiations are repeated, the number and complexity of the issues negotiated, and the clarity of the boundaries negotiated (Strauss, 1978). In his research, Strauss welcomes researchers to select from this list of characteristics that impact their context of study. Therefore, this study aims to investigate faculty collaboration from a "number of negotiators/collaborators" standpoint. An understanding of this initial characteristic will allow the researchers to grasp the context of collaboration in sport management and thus propel an investigation into other contextual negotiated aspects of faculty collaboration.

ADVANTAGES OF COLLABORATION

All groups/teams must work through various steps in the collaborative process, some of which are negotiated as mentioned previously. These include: choosing colleagues or team members, dividing the labor, establishing work guidelines, and terminating the collaboration (Austin & Baldwin, 1992). How these decisions are made impacts the possible advantages of the collaborative effort.

The advantages of collaboration in assisting with scholarly production have been frequently noted in the research. Some of the individual benefits are enhanced motivation, development of enhanced research skills by working with others, enhanced understanding of philosophical and cultural perspectives of fellow collaborators, and the total number of publications are increased by achieving more efficient research techniques (e.g., Crase & Rosato, 1992; Creamer, 2005; Daprano et al., 2005; Gelman & Gibelman, 1999; Sever, 2005). Another advantageous element to faculty collaboration is the process of expanding, strengthening, and reinforcing professional relationships. This can occur with fellow co-workers at the same institution or colleagues at other schools. Of note, Knoppers (1989) indicated that an individual's relationship with colleagues at his/her institution can impact the ability to produce scholarly research. Welsh and Bremser (2005) in studying accounting faculty, noted the likelihood of an article having multiple authors to occur where researchers were at the same institution, as they found 70% of authors at the same institution when they began a project. Conversely, collaborating with colleagues at different institutions can also expand possible networking opportunities.

Pursuing collaborative relationships early in ones career can have the advantage of developing into a mentoring relationship. Although there is a danger of conflict occurring between the mentor and mentee over power and order of authorship (especially in the dissertation process), the practice develops the negotiating skills vital to future collaboration. In fact, mentoring has been found in the literature to have a positive impact on career development in academia (Hodge, 1997; Kartje, 1996; Kram, 1985; Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, Kearney, 1997; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). The benefits of mentoring can enhance career progression in the areas of salaries, success, and power within an organization (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999).

Some of the team benefits to faculty collaboration include (1) creating an accepting forum where new ideas are formed, shared and questioned; (2) overall increased quality that produces more highly cited research; (3)

support and resources; and (4) increased accountability to complete the project (Bohen & Stiles, 1998; Daprano et al., 2005; Gelman & Gibelman, 1999; Sever, 2005; Wuchty, Jones, & Uzzi, 2007). These aspects enrich the overall research process as a whole as opposed to individually. However, both individual and team benefits are related. For instance, a typical collaborator experiences team benefits such as new ideas being shared, and additional support and resources from fellow collaborators. This promotes and instigates individual benefits of enhanced motivation and research skills and understanding of philosophical and cultural perspectives of fellow collaborators. All of this can then lead to the potential benefit of an increase in number of publications.

ETHICAL ISSUES

The questionable practices related to collaboration in assisting with scholarly production have also been frequently noted in the research. Based upon trends being seen in collaboration, these disadvantages often result in some ethical issues arising. Numerous articles have addressed some of these issues. The questions of credit, order of listing on a publication, amount of contribution, single versus multiple authored publications, establishment of guidelines, institutional reward and tenure systems, and power are being examined more closely as collaboration increases in higher education (Austin & Baldwin, 1992; Bohem & Stiles, 1998; Crase & Rosato 1992; Gelman & Gibelman, 1999). Some of these issues such as questions of credit, order of listing on a publication, and institutional reward systems have not been adequately addressed and lack needed guidelines. However, the field of economics has addressed the problems associated with order of listing. Over 80% of all manuscripts in this field follow a pattern of credit utilizing alphabetical order (Endersby, 1996). On a similar note, Crase and Rosato (1992) addressed the trend of multi-authored papers by suggesting more emphasis should be put on the quality of work instead of the quantity. Occasionally research results have been sliced up into their least publishable units to provide multiple publications when one would suffice. This term has been called "salami science" and is widely used in higher education (Gelman & Gibelman, 1999). Also, some papers have been slightly altered (different title and some different content) and sent for publication to different journals. Although some of these practices related to faculty collaboration are yet to be worked out, the overwhelming consensus is that the benefits are worthwhile and collaboration is here to stay.

COLLABORATION TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Because the advantages of collaboration have been apparent, researchers have conducted studies on various collaborative efforts in their respective fields. The consensus is that multiple authorships are growing in almost all academic fields (e.g., Austin, 2001; Austin & Baldwin, 1992; Baldwin & Austin, 1995; Endersby, 1996; Gelman & Gibelman, 1999; Knoppers, 1989; Mendenhall & Higbee, 1992). This trend does not appear to be slowing especially with the omnipresent "publish or perish" mentality and resource crunch (Crise & Rosato, 1992; Sever, 2005). Gelman and Gibelman (1999) suggested the trend in collaboration may result from the increased pressure to publish. In fact, they studied the field of social work and determined there was a 50% increase in multiple authorships over a ten year span. They attributed this increase to a more complex and sophisticated research environment in the field of social work. Also, Crase and Rosato (1992) noted the importance of singular research productivity, but also indicated that as the body of knowledge in the field of physical education expanded, more collaboration would naturally occur. The researchers conducted a content analysis of several journals in the Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance field. They determined that the *Journal of Sport History* had the highest percentage (94%) of single-authored articles while the *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness* had the lowest at 11%. Their study revealed the more scientifically oriented journals in the field (*Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *Journal of Sport Sciences*, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*) had a higher percentage of multi-authored manuscripts. Although there has been research published in the greater field of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, there has been a lack of investigation into the sub discipline of sport management. Though Quarterman, Jackson, and Chen (2006) examined individual contributors and their institutions, and Daprano et al. (2005) examined

collaboration in terms of benefits and challenges to the research process; nothing has examined the topic of single or multiple authorship within sport management.

To add depth to understanding the research environment for faculty members in sport management higher education, the following research questions were asked:

RQ1: What was the total number of multiple-authored and single-authored manuscripts and presentations?

RQ2: Were there yearly differences in the total number of multiple-authored and single-authored manuscripts and presentations?

RQ3: What was the total number of multiple-authored and single-authored manuscripts for each journal?

RQ4: Were there yearly differences in the total number of multiple-authored and single-authored manuscripts for each journal?

METHODOLOGY

This study used a content analysis to investigate accepted presentations from the North American Society of Sport Management (NASSM) conference and all research articles from five refereed sport journals from 2000-2005. The type of content analysis utilized was analysis of communication, which is commonly used to examine written documents in an unobtrusive manner (Babbie, 2005). According to Riffe, Lacy, and Fico (2005), content analysis is the objective, systematic, quantifiable, and replicable analysis of symbols (e.g., written documents) to describe and draw inferences about the communication. The conference presentation list was ascertained from the official programs of NASSM's annual conference. The journals included the *Journal of Sport Management*, *International Journal of Sport Management*, *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, and *the Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*. The conference and journals selected represent a cluster sample which is common and appropriate to content analysis of communication (Babbie, 2005). Additionally, the journals selected represent the broad array of diverse disciplines in the field. Lastly, other journals in the field of sport management that one might expect to be included in this study did not exist in the year 2000.

The study required two trained investigators working independently of each other to code every presentation and journal article. It is common for content analysis to use one, two, and more than two coders (Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 2005). For the journal articles, the coders only analyzed the research sections of each volume. For the *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, focus articles, commentary essays, and trend articles were included in the analysis. Each article and presentation was coded according to five measures. These included the year of the article and presentation, the number of single authored articles and presentations, the number of two authored articles and presentations, the number of three authored articles and presentations, and the number of four or more authored articles and presentations. Descriptive statistics, including frequency counts and percentages were tabulated.

To address intercoder reliability, a simple analysis was conducted that measured agreement between the two coders. The two coders independently examined the same 20% of the journal articles and presentations. The agreement between the coders in each of the measures was 91% for articles and 98.4% for presentations, well within acceptable standards for content analysis (Riffe et al., 2005).

RESULTS

Results indicated in journal articles (N = 573) and the North American Society for Sport Management conference presentations (N = 887) that multiple authored manuscripts and presentations outnumbered individual efforts.

RQ1: MULTIPLE AND SINGLE AUTHORED MANUSCRIPTS AND PRESENTATIONS

The first research question investigated the total number of multiple and single authored manuscripts and presentations. There were 216 (37.7%) single-authored manuscripts compared to 357 (62.3%) multiple-authored manuscripts. Similar results were found for NASSM conference presentations. It was determined that 278 (31.3%) were solo presentations while 609 (68.7%) were collaborative efforts.

RQ2: YEARLY DIFFERENCES IN MULTIPLE AND SINGLE AUTHORED MANUSCRIPTS AND PRESENTATIONS

The second research question examined the yearly differences in the number of multiple and single authored manuscripts and presentations. According to Table 1, the number of single-authored manuscripts dropped from 46 in the year 2000 to 28 in the 2005. Another result of the analysis indicated that the number of multiple-authored manuscripts increased from 47 in the year 2000 to 66 in the 2005. One other major difference was determined when analyzing the category having three authored manuscripts. These increased from 10 in the year 2000 to 27 in 2005. Table 1 indicates a slight trend of decreasing numbers of single-authored manuscripts, and an increase in multiple-authored manuscripts.

Regarding NASSM presentations, Table 2 shows the number of solo presentations decreased from 52 in the year 2000 to 31 in 2005. Multiple presentation efforts remained relatively stagnate decreasing from 104 in the year 2000 to 93 in 2005. However a difference was noticed when analyzing four or more presenters. These increased from 12 in the year 2000 to 21 in 2005.

RQ3: NUMBER OF MULTIPLE AND SINGLE AUTHORED MANUSCRIPTS FOR EACH JOURNAL

The third research question investigated the number of multiple and single authored manuscripts for each journal. According to Table 3, there were differences based on journal. Specifically, the journals with the most collaborative efforts were *Sport Marketing Quarterly* at 85.6%, followed by *International Journal of Sport Management* at 74.7%, then *Journal of Sport Management* at 71.6%, and *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport* at 63.9%. The journal with the least amount of collaborative efforts was *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* at 27.7%.

RQ4: NUMBER OF MULTIPLE AND SINGLE AUTHORED MANUSCRIPTS FOR EACH JOURNAL BY YEAR

The fourth research question examined the yearly differences in the number of multiple and single authored manuscripts for each journal. According to Table 4, the *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* was the only journal to maintain a relatively high and consistent number of single-authored manuscripts published throughout the six years. Also, *IJSM* was the only journal to have a consistent decline in the number of single-authored manuscripts throughout the six years. There were no evident patterns of single versus multiple efforts by year for *Sport Marketing Quarterly* and *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*. However, for *IJSM* the number of collaborative manuscripts increased throughout the six years, especially in the three-four or more authored categories. For the *Journal of Sport Management* the number of multiple-authored manuscripts remained constant but the numbers have dispersed from two authors more toward three-four or more throughout the six years.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This purpose of this study was to examine single versus multiple authorship differences in sport management faculty research. Key findings included: 1) Collaborative efforts were more common than solo efforts for both

published manuscripts and NASSM presentations; 2) Presentations were more likely to be collaborative efforts than published manuscripts; 3) A slight trend of decreasing numbers of single authored manuscripts, and an increase in multiple-authored manuscripts; 4) A slight trend of decreasing numbers of single-authored presentations; and 5) *The Journal of Sport and Social Issues* contained a much higher percentage of single-authored manuscripts than the other four journals, 6) A trend of more collaborative efforts for *IJSM* and a trend of increasing 3-4 authored manuscripts for the *Journal of Sport Management*.

Based on the results of this study, it is evident that collaboration is growing in sport management research. This trend appears to be on the rise especially in presentations. Perhaps collaborators have been successful in developing and creating many of the social order elements required as part of negotiated order theory early in the research process. This most likely begins with boundaries being set and negotiated from the beginning stages of the research process (ideas generation). This success is evident in that the results indicated that presentations were more likely to be collaborative efforts than manuscripts. Because publishing a manuscript requires more effort and work into the final stages of the research process, it is possible that elements of both the structural context and negotiated order context are hindering the collaborative method necessary later in the research process to produce completed and published manuscripts. For instance, researchers typically submit their work to be presented at a professional conference. Most likely this results in a chance to interact with other researchers and to gather feedback on the potential manuscript. This process would no doubt be enhanced with a collaborative research process due to the presence of multiple perspectives and an increased chance to engage in scholarly activity. However, if aspects of negotiated order theory were not evident such as emphasis on publishing, resources, and time, it might impact the researcher from continuing the research project into the publication phase.

The only sure way to determine why there was a difference in collaborative efforts between presentations and published manuscripts and why there was an overall increasing trend in collaboration is to conduct future research. This research should utilize a more in depth questionnaire or perhaps utilize the interview methodology. Questions could be based on the structural and negotiated order context elements not addressed in this exploratory study. Questions relating to institutional resources, time allotment, institution's emphasis/requirements on publishing, experience with collaborative efforts, gender of collaborators, balance of power, and how often negotiations take place could all be incorporated into a more complete understanding of these results. Essentially, the next step is to understand the how and why, as opposed to the situation, of which this study has investigated.

One aspect of the results focused on each specific journal. Perhaps the most interesting element of the results was the fact that the *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* has the least amount of collaborative efforts of any of the journals analyzed in the content analysis. One thought for why this journal encompasses mostly solo efforts is due to the research usually found in the journal. Several manuscripts published in this journal use a qualitative approach to research as opposed to a more data driven quantitative type of research typically found in the other journals analyzed. Perhaps researchers feel the need to collaborate more when undertaking more quantitative research efforts due to the amount of data sometimes collected. The collection, analysis, and interpretation of this data can be overwhelming. There are also several opinion/issue based manuscripts published in the *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* as opposed to the other journals which may have impacted the results.

This study did have limitations in that it was limited to five journals over a six year period, in the field of sport management. A more extensive sample of journals, particularly now that sport management and the number of journals have increased significantly, could be utilized in the future. Additionally, the analyses of the conference presentations included only one professional organization, NASSM. A larger, more extensive analysis is warranted for future studies. It would not be appropriate to generalize the findings of this study to the other journals or conferences in the field of sport management.

REFERENCES

- Austin, A. (2001). Reviewing the literature on scholarly collaboration: How we can understand collaboration among academic couples. In E.G. Creamer and Associates (Eds.), *Working Equal: Academic couples as collaborators* (pp. 130-145). New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.
- Austin, A.E. & Baldwin, R.G. (1992). *Faculty collaboration: Enhancing the quality of scholarship and teaching*. ERIC Digest.
- Babbie, E. (1998). *The practice of social research* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Baldwin, R.G., & Austin, A.R. (1995). Toward a greater understanding of faculty research collaboration. *Review of Higher Education*, 19(1), 45-70.
- Bohen, S.J., & Stiles, J. (1998). Experimenting with models of faculty collaboration: Factors that promote their success. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 100, 39-55.
- Cruse, D., & Rosato, F. (1992). Single versus multiple authorship in professional journals. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 63(7), 28-31.
- Creamer, E.G. (2005). Promoting the effective evaluation of collaboratively produced scholarship: A call to action. *New Directions For Teaching and Learning*, 102(6), 85-98.
- Daprano, C.M., Bruening, J.E., Pastore, D.L., Greenwell, T.C., Dixon, M.A., Jae Ko, Y., Jordan, J.S., Lilienthal, S.K., & Turner, B.A. (2005). Collaboration in sport research: A case from the field. *Quest*, 57, 300-314.
- Dreher, G.F., & Ash, R.A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(5), 539-546.
- Endersby, J.W. (1996). Collaborative research in the social sciences: Multiple authorship and publication credit. *Social Science Quarterly*, 77(2), 375-392.
- Gelman, S.R., & Gibelman, M. (1999). A quest for citations? An analysis of and commentary on the trend toward multiple authorship. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 35(2), 203-215.
- Gomez, C., Kirkman, B.L., & Shapiro, D.L. (2000). The impact of collectivism and in-group/out-group membership on the evaluation generosity of team members. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 38-41.
- Hodge, S.R. (1997). Mentoring: Perspectives of physical education graduate students from diverse cultural backgrounds. *The Physical Educator*, 54, 181-195.
- Kartje, J. (1996). O mentor! My mentor! *Peabody Journal of Education*, 71(1), 114-125.
- Kram, K.E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Knoppers, A. (1989). Productivity and collaborative patterns of physical educators. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 60(2), 159-165.
- Mendenhall, M. & Higbee, K.L. (1992). Psychology of the scientist: XLVIII. Recent trends in multiple authorship in psychology. *Psychology Reports*, 51, 1019-1022.

Quarterman, J., Jackson, N. E., & Chen, Y. J. (2006). An analysis of leading contributors to the *Journal of Sport Management: 1987-2002*. *The Sport Management and Related Topics Journal*, 2, 22-35.

Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. G. (2005). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sever, B. (2005). Ranking multiple authors in criminal justice scholarship: An examination of underlying issues. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 16(1), 79-100.

Strauss, A. (1978). *Negotiations: Varieties, contexts, processes, and social order*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Waldeck, J.H., Orrego, V.O., Plax, T.G., & Kearney, P. (1997). Graduate student/faculty mentoring relationships: Who gets mentored, how it happens, and to what end. *Communication Quarterly*, 45(3), 93-120.

Weaver, M. & Chelladurai, P. (1999). A mentoring model for management in sport and physical education. *Quest*, 51(1), 24-38.

Welsh, M.J. & Bremser, W.G. (2005). Accounting faculty research collaboration: A study of relationship benefits and gender differences. *Global Perspectives on Accounting Education*, 2, 19-36.

Wuchty, S., Jones, B. F., & Uzzi, B. (2007). The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge. *Science Magazine*, 316(5827), 1036-1039.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF MULTIPLE AND SINGLE AUTHORED MANUSCRIPTS BY YEAR

<u>Number of Authors</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	46	37	36	31	38	28	216
2	34	39	40	33	36	32	214
3	10	14	18	19	17	27	105
4 or more	3	6	3	14	5	7	<u>38</u>
						Total	573

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF MULTIPLE AND SINGLE AUTHORED PRESENTATIONS BY YEAR

<u>Number of Authors</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	52	55	66	38	36	31	278
2	59	66	49	49	54	44	321
3	33	30	24	30	33	28	178
4 or more	12	14	20	23	20	21	110
						Total	887

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF MULTIPLE AND SINGLE AUTHORED MANUSCRIPTS FOR EACH JOURNAL

<u>Journal</u>	<u>SMQ</u>	<u>IJSM</u>	<u>LAS</u>	<u>JSSI</u>	<u>JSM</u>
Single Author	19	29	26	115	27
Multiple Authors	113	86	46	44	68

TABLE 4
MULTIPLE AND SINGLE AUTHORED MANUSCRIPTS FOR EACH JOURNAL

Sport Marketing Quarterly

<u>Number of Authors</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	4	6	4	2	0	3	19
2	11	8	11	8	14	10	62
3	4	4	8	7	5	8	36
4 or more	1	4	0	6	1	3	<u>15</u>
						Total	132

IJSM

<u>Number of Authors</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	7	6	6	5	5	0	29
2	5	6	9	5	10	7	42
3	4	4	6	2	4	10	30
4 or more	1	2	2	5	3	1	<u>14</u>
						Total	115

Legal Aspects of Sport

<u>Number of Authors</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	7	5	5	4	2	3	26
2	3	9	2	8	5	7	34
3	1	1	2	1	2	2	9
4 or more	1	0	0	1	0	1	<u>3</u>
						Total	72

TABLE 4 (CONT.)

MULTIPLE AND SINGLE AUTHORED MANUSCRIPTS FOR EACH JOURNAL

JSSI							
<u>Number of Authors</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	21	19	18	15	24	18	115
2	6	6	7	5	2	3	29
3	1	2	1	3	1	3	11
4 or more	0	0	1	2	0	1	<u>4</u>
						Total	159

JSM							
<u>Number of Authors</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	7	1	3	5	7	4	27
2	9	10	11	7	5	5	47
3	0	3	1	6	5	4	19
4 or more	0	0	0	0	1	1	<u>2</u>
						Total	95