

Leisure Research by Canadians and Americans: One Community or Two Solitudes?

Edgar L. Jackson

Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Alberta

Recent empirical reviews of published research in North American leisure studies have argued that the field is intellectually and geographically isolated. The present article examines this contention by identifying similarities and differences in patterns of research dissemination between Canadian and American leisure researchers, with a view to investigating whether the two communities are distinct entities or part of an integrated and international community. The data were derived from a comprehensive record of refereed publication activity in leisure research journals and conference proceedings. From the standpoint of overall activities and productivity, Canadians and Americans were essentially the same, a conclusion substantiated in patterns of data related to general indicators of the level, timing, and longevity of research and publication activity. However, with respect to preferences for publishing articles in specific journals or presenting papers at specific conferences, Canadians and Americans diverged sharply: the majority tended to favor research dissemination in their own country's outlets. The results suggest that there are indeed "two solitudes" in North American leisure studies, at least among the majority of the community and in particular among Americans, less so among Canadians.

KEYWORDS: *Leisure research, leisure studies.*

Introduction and Background

Over the last three decades, many reviews of leisure studies, both quantitative and qualitative in nature, have appeared in the literature (e.g., Austin & Kennedy, 1983; Beckers, 1995; Bedini & Wu, 1994; Burdige, 1983, 1989; Coalter, 1999; Crandall & Lewko, 1976; Driver, 1999; Godbey, 1989; HENDERSON, Sessoms, Chen, & Hsiao, 1993; Iso-Ahola, 1986; Jackson & Burton, 1989; Jordan & Roland, 1999; Lewko & Crandall, 1980; McLellan, 1980; Riddick, DeSchriver, Weissinger, 1984; Samdahl & Kelly, 1999; Szymanski, 1980; Valentine, Alison, & Schneider, 1999; Van Doren and Heit, 1973; Van Doren, Holland, & Crompton, 1984). A theme that has emerged in some of the more recent commentaries is the perceived separation of leisure research in North America from comparable work being conducted elsewhere in the world, especially the UK and Europe. Not only have critiques of this kind expressed concern about different dominating paradigms, theories, and disciplinary underpinnings that have shaped the course of leisure studies in the

Address correspondence to Edgar L. Jackson, Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2E3, Canada; Phone: (780) 492-0342; Fax: (780) 492-7598; E-mail: Ed.Jackson@UAlberta.ca

various world regions, but several authors have also argued that North American leisure research is parochial and isolated, both geographically and intellectually (see, for example, Samdahl & Kelly, 1999). This parochialism is manifested in several ways: differences in disciplinary origins and intellectual traditions, most notably relative emphases on structure versus agency (Rojek, 1989); the types of objectives and questions addressed in research; assumptions about the nature of leisure; and, ultimately, the diverging pictures of the nature of leisure that have emerged in different countries and world regions (see, for example, Coalter, 1999).

One recent case in point is an article by Valentine *et al.* (1999), in which—with the objective of examining the extent of globalization in leisure research—the authors used content analysis to review the substance and international orientation of 1352 articles published in the *Journal of Leisure Research*, *Leisure Sciences*, and *Leisure Studies*. They concluded that only a tiny proportion of articles were cross-national. More importantly for the present study, they detected what they described as a high level of ethnocentrism, particularly among North American scholars. This, they contended, limits academic and professional growth.

A feature of Valentine *et al.*'s article was the striking omission of any explicit mention of Canadian leisure research, researchers, or academic departments, either because the authors overlooked Canadian contributions to the field, or inadvertently equated the borders of the United States with those of the continent. In a sense, then, the authors were guilty of committing exactly the same error for which they were castigating their colleagues in the North American leisure studies community, albeit in this case on a continental rather than a global scale. This criticism was forcefully made by Walker (2000), who directed Americans' attention to institutions, researchers, and journals in Canada, noting also the sizable contributions of Canadians to publication activity in the USA.

As part of the ongoing process of evaluating leisure studies referred to above, I have been conducting a research project since 1999 with a view to identifying and understanding variations in patterns of research activity and dissemination, as well as other aspects of participation in the North American leisure studies community. In a published paper based solely on data about participation in leisure research conferences (Jackson, 2001), I have established that there is a very high degree of concentration of research activity among a small proportion of individuals within the larger research community. The present article focuses in detail on another aspect of the patterns represented by a large data base summarizing research activity and its dissemination by North American leisure researchers: similarities and differences between Canadians and Americans,¹ and the extent to which research—and researchers—in the two countries can be considered as a single, integrated community, or, alternatively, two solitudes existing side-by-side but in intellectual isolation from each other. Thus, this study is a quantitative analysis which should help to address the concerns expressed by Walker

(2000), by identifying (1) the ways in which nationals of the two countries are part of an integrated research community, and (2) the ways in which they diverge.

Method

Data Collection

The data were collected by compiling a spreadsheet with almost 250,000 cells, in which the units of analysis initially consisted of 1785 people associated in several ways with leisure research in North America. However, 425 people were excluded from the analysis for one or both of the following reasons: (1) their country of employment could not be determined or was not recorded: in most instances the latter were non-academics; thus, the article essentially concentrates on Canada/US patterns in research by *academics*; (2) although included in the data base because of other indicators, they neither presented a conference paper nor published a journal article in any of the six journals included in this study in the 1990s. Among the remaining 1360 cases, 23.7% were Canadian and 76.3% were American.

The variables used for the identification of patterns in research dissemination were derived from recording each person's name and the number of their authorships (i.e., the number of journal articles or conference papers on which their name appeared either as a single author or as a co-author) in each year from 1990 to 1999 in:

- Four American leisure research journals (*Journal of Leisure Research*, *Leisure Sciences*, *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, and *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*);
- Two Canadian leisure research journals (*Journal of Applied Recreation Research* and *Loisir et Société*);
- Abstracts of the ten annual Leisure Research Symposia;²
- Abstracts of the four triennial Canadian Congresses on Leisure Research (1990, 1993, 1996, and 1999).³

Institutional affiliation (re-coded to country = Canada or USA) was noted for academically-affiliated people when available.

Data Manipulation

To identify patterns of research activity and dissemination, the spreadsheet was converted to SPSS and the raw data were manipulated to produce the following six basic variables, which summarize the *amount*, *timing*, and *longevity* of research activity:

- Total number of article authorships in all six journals combined (cases-wide mean = 1.35; range = 0 to 39).
- Total number of paper authorships at all thirteen conferences combined (mean = 1.49; range = 0 to 27).

- Number of refereed journals in which articles appeared (mean = 0.88; range = 0 to 6).
- Date of earliest published research product in the 1990s (journal article or conference paper) (mean = 1993.7; range = 1990 to 1999).
- Date of most recent published research product (mean = 1995.3; range = 1990 to 1999).
- Longevity of published research activity (number of years between the earliest and most recent research product in the 1990s) (mean = 2.6 years; range = 1 to 10 years).

The data for publications were also coded into whether the journal or conference was American or Canadian. This procedure permitted the creation of a variable with 3 categories: (1) *Canada only*: the individual presented a paper only at the Canadian Congress on Leisure Research and/or published an article only in one of the two Canadian leisure research journals; (2) *USA only*: presented a paper only at the Leisure Research Symposium and/or published an article only in one of the four American leisure research journals; and (3) *Both countries*: presented at least one paper and/or published at least one journal article in each country.

Analytical Strategy

The analysis of the data proceeded as follows. To begin with, I compared Canadian and American scholars with respect to the six variables enumerated above. Then, in a sequence of more detailed analyses, I distinguished between Canadians and Americans in terms of their publications in specific journals in each country, and their participation in Canadian and American conferences. In each instance the data for all relevant cases were examined first, and then the analysis was repeated for the more productive sub-groups of scholars. Finally, at a much more aggregate level, I elaborated on interrelationships among three variables: country; preference for Canadian versus US outlets for research; and level of productivity (denoted by the total number of journal articles published and conference papers presented).

Findings

Basic Similarities Between Canadians and Americans

A pattern of striking similarity emerged when data for the six basic variables used in the cluster analysis were compared between Canadians and Americans (Table 1). While it should be recognized that these highly general data may mask some potentially important internal variations, Americans and Canadians were virtually identical with respect to the mean numbers of journal article authorships, conference paper authorships, and total authorships, as well as the timing and longevity of their participation in the North American leisure studies community. Moreover, Americans and Canadians were also identical in terms of their relative contributions to published knowledge

TABLE 1
Data for the Six Basic Variables for Americans and Canadians

| | USA | Canada |
|---|-------|--------|
| N of cases | 1038 | 322 |
| % of cases with identifiable country of origin (A) | 76.3% | 23.7% |
| Mean number of journal article authorships | 1.50 | 1.37 |
| Mean number of conference paper authorships | 1.69 | 1.66 |
| Mean number of journals published in | 0.93 | 0.85 |
| First activity* | 1994 | 1994 |
| Last activity* | 1995 | 1995 |
| Longevity (years) | 2.88 | 2.72 |
| Mean number of journal article & conference paper authorships | 3.19 | 3.03 |
| % of all article & paper authorships (B) | 77.2% | 22.8% |
| Ratio of (B) to (A) | 1.01 | 0.96 |

No differences were statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

*Rounded to the nearest full year.

about leisure, in that the percentages of authors and authorships (76.3% and 77.2% respectively for Americans, and 23.7% and 22.8% respectively for Canadians) were the same, producing no difference in the ratio between these two measures.

Journal Publication Activity

Analysis of the entire data base. To explore further comparative patterns of research activity among Americans and Canadians, the foregoing aggregate and relatively general data were broken down for more detailed examination. This stage of the analysis consisted of participation in conferences (see the next sub-section) and publication of journal articles. As far as journal articles are concerned, the data were analyzed at two levels of detail: first, for American journals combined versus Canadian journals combined (Table 2), and then for each of the six specific journals (Table 3). In both instances, a markedly different pattern emerged from the one outlined above, suggesting an "intra-country orientation" in journal article publication activity.

For example, when the analysis was conducted by aggregating the data for the four American journals and the two Canadian journals (Table 2), the mean number of articles published by Americans in US journals was 1.36, compared with 0.51 by Canadians. Conversely, the mean number of articles published by Canadians in Canadian journals was 0.86, compared with 0.14 among Americans. Similarly, 61.3% of Americans published in US journals, compared with 20.2% of Canadians, while 54.3% of Canadians published in Canadian journals, compared with only 10.3% of Americans. Finally, Americans were over-represented (in comparison with their numbers as a proportion of the overall data base) as authors of articles in US journals, while Canadians were over-represented in Canadian journals.

TABLE 2
Data for American and Canadian Journals by Country (All Cases)*

| | USA | Canada |
|--|-------|--------|
| N of cases | 1038 | 322 |
| % of cases with identifiable country of origin | 76.3% | 23.7% |
| Mean number of article authorships in American and Canadian journals | | |
| American journals ^a | 1.36 | 0.51 |
| Canadian journals ^b | 0.14 | 0.86 |
| Percentages of Americans and Canadians authoring an article in American and Canadian journals | | |
| American journals ^c | 61.3% | 20.2% |
| Canadian journals ^d | 10.3% | 54.3% |
| Percentages of authors in American and Canadian journals accounted for by Americans and Canadians | | |
| American journals ^c | 90.7% | 9.3% |
| Canadian journals ^d | 37.9% | 62.1% |

*i.e., People whose country of origin could be identified and who published at least one journal article or presented at least one conference paper in the 1990s.

^aF (1, 1358) = 31.77; p < 0.0001

^bF (1, 1358) = 215.94; p < 0.0001

^c χ^2 = 166.10; d.f. = 1; p < 0.0001

^d χ^2 = 290.01; d.f. = 1; p < 0.0001

At the more detailed level of the specific journals (Table 3), the mean number of authorships in the four American journals (*Journal of Leisure Research*, *Leisure Sciences*, *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, and *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*) was significantly and consistently higher among Americans than among Canadians, while the reverse was the case for the two Canadian journals (*Journal of Applied Recreation Research* and *Loisir et Société*).

This pattern of differences was repeated—and in some instances strikingly so—for the other measures of publication activity in the specific journals shown in Table 3. Key examples include:

- 22.3% of Americans published at least one article in the *Journal of Leisure Research* and 23.6% in the *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, compared with 7.8% and 5.9% respectively of Canadians. Conversely, 29.5% of Canadians published at least one article in the *Journal of Applied Recreation Research* and 28.9% in *Loisir et Société*, compared with 6.0% and 5.1% respectively of Americans.
- 89.0% or more of people who published an article in one of the four American journals were Americans, all of these proportions being higher than the 76.3% of the data base who were Americans. Canadians accounted for 11.0% or less of the authors in the four American journals, these proportions being lower than the 23.7% of the data base who were Canadians. Conversely, the majority of authors with articles in the *Journal of Applied Recreation Research* (60.5%) and *Loisir et Société* (63.7%) were Ca-

TABLE 3
Data for Specific Journals by Country (All Cases)*

| | USA | Canada |
|---|-------|--------|
| N of cases | 1038 | 322 |
| % of cases with identifiable country of origin | 76.3% | 23.7% |
| Mean number of article authorships in each journal | | |
| Journal of Leisure Research ^a | 0.36 | 0.15 |
| Leisure Sciences ^b | 0.30 | 0.16 |
| Journal of Park & Recreation Administration ^c | 0.39 | 0.12 |
| Therapeutic Recreation Journal ^d | 0.30 | 0.08 |
| Journal of Applied Recreation Research ^e | 0.07 | 0.46 |
| Loisir et Société ^f | 0.07 | 0.40 |
| Percentages of Americans and Canadians authoring an article in each journal | | |
| Journal of Leisure Research ^g | 22.3% | 7.8% |
| Leisure Sciences ^h | 20.2% | 8.1% |
| Journal of Park & Recreation Administration ⁱ | 23.6% | 5.9% |
| Therapeutic Recreation Journal ^j | 15.7% | 4.7% |
| Journal of Applied Recreation Research ^k | 6.0% | 29.5% |
| Loisir et Société ^l | 5.1% | 28.9% |
| Percentage of authors in each journal accounted for by Americans and Canadians | | |
| Journal of Leisure Research ^g | 90.2% | 9.8% |
| Leisure Sciences ^h | 89.0% | 11.0% |
| Journal of Park & Recreation Administration ⁱ | 92.8% | 7.2% |
| Therapeutic Recreation Journal ^j | 91.6% | 8.4% |
| Journal of Applied Recreation Research ^k | 39.5% | 60.5% |
| Loisir et Société ^l | 36.3% | 63.7% |

*i.e., People whose country of origin could be identified and who published at least one journal article or presented at least one conference paper in the 1990s.

^aF (1, 1358) = 13.92; p < 0.0001

^bF (1, 1358) = 8.73; p < 0.01

^cF (1, 1358) = 15.86; p < 0.0001

^dF (1, 1358) = 12.81; p < 0.0001

^eF (1, 1358) = 129.63; p < 0.0001

^fF (1, 1358) = 105.40; p < 0.0001

^g $\chi^2 = 33.77$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.0001

^h $\chi^2 = 25.33$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.0001

ⁱ $\chi^2 = 49.23$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.0001

^j $\chi^2 = 26.36$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.0001

^k $\chi^2 = 133.25$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.0001

^l $\chi^2 = 144.98$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.0001

nadians, while 39.5% and 36.3% respectively were Americans; these numbers represent a similar discrepancy with the proportions of Canadians and Americans in the data base.

Clearly, the conclusion that emerges from the data summarized in Tables 2 and 3 is that—while there is a degree of “cross-border” publication

activity—Americans appear to have a stronger preference for publishing in American journals and Canadians in Canadian journals. However, this general conclusion must be qualified with the fact that the “intra-country” preference was notably less marked among Canadians than among Americans.

Re-analysis of journal publication patterns among more productive scholars. The conclusions reached in the preceding paragraphs must be qualified by the fact that the analyses were conducted using all cases for whom it was possible to identify the country of origin. In other words, the data included people whose name was on only one journal article in the entire 1990s, who in fact accounted for a substantial proportion of people included in the data base: 755 people, or 42.3% of the entire data base of 1785, and 69.4% of people who had published at least one article.

Two distinct but interrelated implications follow from the aforementioned numbers:

- First, it would not be surprising to find that those people who published only one article would be more likely to have done so in their own country than abroad. (Indeed, the data bear this out, in that 89.2% of the 434 Americans who published only one article did so in US journals, with only 10.8% in Canadian journals. Correspondingly, 82.0% of the 150 Canadians who published only one article did so in Canadian journals, with only 18.0% in US journals: $\chi^2 = 273.6$; d.f. = 1; $p < 0.0001$.)
- Second, it could be argued that the level of “parochialism” evident on both sides of the border in the aggregate data would be less pronounced, if not entirely absent, among more productive researchers. This hypothesis is based on two lines of reasoning: (1) people who write more articles require more outlets in which to publish them; and (2) more productive scholars are more likely than others to adopt an international orientation, thus seeking to publish at least some of their work outside their own national borders.

Based on this reasoning, the patterns of publication in American and Canadian journals summarized for the data base as a whole in Tables 2 and 3 were re-analysed, but this time only among sub-sets of the data base which could be defined as the “most productive.” The first criterion chosen for the re-analysis was people who published 3 or more articles in the 1990s; then, this initial analysis was further restricted to people with 5 or more articles, and then to people who published 10 or more articles. However, because the same general patterns of similarity and difference between Americans and Canadians emerged at each level of analysis, only the results for the subgroup publishing 5 or more articles are reported and interpreted here (Table 4). This choice represents an acceptable compromise between a “conservative” analysis (i.e., one that restricts the comparisons to demonstrably more productive scholars) and having a sufficient number of cases to produce meaningful data for between-group comparisons and measures of statistical significance.

Despite the reasoning advanced above, the same general pattern of similarities and differences between Americans and Canadians was repeated in

TABLE 4
Data for American and Canadian Journals by Country (Most Productive Scholars)*

| | USA | Canada |
|--|--------|--------|
| N of cases | 72 | 19 |
| % of cases with identifiable country of origin | 79.1% | 20.9% |
| Mean number of article authorships in American and Canadian journals | | |
| American journals ^a | 8.53 | 4.89 |
| Canadian journals ^b | 0.71 | 4.53 |
| Percentages of Americans and Canadians authoring an article in American and Canadian journals | | |
| American journals ^c | 100.0% | 84.2% |
| Canadian journals ^d | 34.7% | 100.0% |
| Percentages of authors in American and Canadian journals accounted for by Americans and Canadians | | |
| American journals ^c | 81.8% | 18.2% |
| Canadian journals ^d | 56.8% | 43.2% |
| Percentages of authorships in American and Canadian journals accounted for by Americans and Canadians^e | | |
| American journals | 86.8% | 13.2% |
| Canadian journals | 37.2% | 62.8% |

*i.e., People whose country of origin could be identified and who published 5 or more journal articles in the 1990s.

^aF (1, 89) = 7.80; p < 0.01

^bF (1, 89) = 98.85; p < 0.0001

^c χ^2 = 11.76; d.f. = 1; p < 0.01

^d χ^2 = 25.65; d.f. = 1; p < 0.0001

^eData are derived from calculations based on tests a and b; therefore the same inferences about the statistical significance of the differences apply

the more restricted analysis of the 91 people (72 Americans and 19 Canadians) who published 5 or more papers in the 1990s. First, with respect to the mean number of journal article authorships, Canadians' output was fairly evenly split between US journals (mean = 4.89) and Canadian journals (mean = 4.53), whereas the mean number of articles published by Americans in US journals (8.53) was twelve times greater than the mean number of articles they published in Canadian journals (0.71). Second, the mean number of articles published by Americans in US journals (8.53) was almost twice as high as the corresponding figure among Canadians (4.89). Third, the mean number of articles published by Canadians in Canadian journals (4.53) was six times greater than the corresponding figure among Americans (0.71).

A second aspect of the data suggests that Canadians were more likely to publish abroad than Americans, in that 84.2% of Canadians published at least one article in US journals, whereas only 34.7% of Americans published

at least one article in Canadian journals. This finding was echoed in the remaining data in Table 4, in that Canadians were far less under-represented both in terms of authors and authorships in US journals (18.2% and 13.2% respectively compared with the proportion of 20.5% in the data base) than the extent to which Americans were under-represented in Canadian journals: Americans amounted to 79.1% of the restricted data base, but accounted for only 56.8% of authors and 37.2% of authorships in Canadian journals. Also, the discrepancy between the percentage of Americans as authors in Canadian journals (56.8%) and the corresponding percentage of authorships (37.2%) suggests that Americans may choose to publish in Canadian journals but only sporadically. In contrast, the reverse discrepancy for Canadians' publications in Canadian journals (43.2% of authors but 62.8% of authorships) suggests that Canadians channel a disproportionate portion of their articles to Canadian journals.

All in all, the results summarized in Table 4 are somewhat equivocal in that there are indications of a rather more developed international outlook among Canadian researchers than among their American counterparts with respect to journal article publication activity. On the other hand, the overriding pattern in the data is generally the same among the most productive North American leisure scholars as it is within the community as a whole, namely a tendency to look within one's own borders for the main publication outlets.

This conclusion is generally supported by the data derived from the most detailed level of analysis, i.e., differences between the most productive sub-groups of Americans and Canadians with respect to their patterns of publication in specific journals (Table 5). Thus, for example, the mean number of authorships in the four American journals (*Journal of Leisure Research*, *Leisure Sciences*, *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, and *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*) was consistently higher among Americans than among Canadians, although significantly so only in the case of the *Journal of Leisure Research*. The reverse was the case for the two Canadian journals (*Journal of Applied Recreation Research* and *Loisir et Société*), for which both differences were statistically significant.

This pattern of differences was repeated—and in some instances strikingly so—for the other measures of publication activity in the specific journals shown in Table 5:

- 75.0% of Americans published at least one article in the *Journal of Leisure Research* and 76.4% in *Leisure Sciences*, compared with 42.1% and 52.6% respectively of Canadians. The same pattern was repeated for the other two US journals. Conversely, 84.2% of Canadians published at least one article in the *Journal of Applied Recreation Research* and 68.4% in *Loisir et Société*, compared with 22.2% and 18.1% respectively of Americans.
- 84.6% or more of people who published an article in one of the four American journals were Americans, while Canadians accounted for 15.4% or less. Conversely, there was an even split between Americans and Ca-

TABLE 5
Data for Specific Journals by Country (Most Productive Scholars*)

| | USA | Canada |
|---|-------|--------|
| N of cases | 72 | 19 |
| % of cases with identifiable country of origin | 79.1% | 20.9% |
| Mean number of article authorships in each journal | | |
| Journal of Leisure Research ^a | 2.54 | 1.37 |
| Leisure Sciences ^b | 1.93 | 1.63 |
| Journal of Park & Recreation Administration ^c | 2.13 | 1.32 |
| Therapeutic Recreation Journal ^d | 1.93 | 0.58 |
| Journal of Applied Recreation Research ^e | 0.33 | 2.74 |
| Loisir et Société ^f | 0.38 | 1.79 |
| Percentages of Americans and Canadians authoring an article in each journal | | |
| Journal of Leisure Research ^g | 75.0% | 42.1% |
| Leisure Sciences ^h | 76.4% | 52.6% |
| Journal of Park & Recreation Administration ⁱ | 68.1% | 36.8% |
| Therapeutic Recreation Journal ^j | 44.4% | 21.1% |
| Journal of Applied Recreation Research ^k | 22.2% | 84.2% |
| Loisir et Société ^l | 18.1% | 68.4% |
| Percentage of authors in each journal accounted for by Americans and Canadians | | |
| Journal of Leisure Research ^g | 87.1% | 12.9% |
| Leisure Sciences ^h | 84.6% | 15.4% |
| Journal of Park & Recreation Administration ⁱ | 87.5% | 12.5% |
| Therapeutic Recreation Journal ^j | 88.9% | 11.1% |
| Journal of Applied Recreation Research ^k | 50.0% | 50.0% |
| Loisir et Société ^l | 50.0% | 50.0% |

*i.e., People whose country of origin could be identified and who published 5 or more journal articles in the 1990s.

^aF (1, 89) = 3.80; p < 0.05

^bF (1, 89) = 0.37; n.s.

^cF (1, 89) = 1.04; n.s.

^dF (1, 89) = 2.91; n.s.

^eF (1, 89) = 74.54; p < 0.0001

^fF (1, 89) = 19.68; p < 0.0001

^g $\chi^2 = 7.49$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.01

^h $\chi^2 = 4.16$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.05

ⁱ $\chi^2 = 6.19$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.01

^j $\chi^2 = 3.44$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.05

^k $\chi^2 = 25.37$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.0001

^l $\chi^2 = 18.69$; d.f. = 1; p < 0.0001

nadians with respect to the percentages of authors publishing in the *Journal of Applied Recreation Research* and *Loisir et Société*—50.0% for both journals.

- The percentages of American authors in each of the four American journals were all greater than would be expected on the basis of the percent-

age of Americans in the data base. Conversely, the percentages of Canadian authors in both of the Canadian journals were greater than would be expected on the basis of the percentage of Canadians in the data base.

Clearly, the conclusion that emerges from the data summarized in Table 5 is that—while there is a degree of “cross-border” publication activity—Americans appear to have a stronger preference for publishing in American journals and Canadians in Canadian journals, even among the small group of the most productive scholars in the field of leisure studies.

Conference Participation Activity

Analysis of the entire data base. The most striking feature of the data for the presentation of papers at conferences among people in the data base as a whole was the difference between the results for the two conferences combined and the data for the two conferences analyzed separately (Table 6). When viewed from the perspective of overall conference participation (i.e., both conferences combined), the results for Americans and Canadians were almost uncannily identical, particularly given the differences in the rest of

TABLE 6
Data for Conference Papers by Country (All Cases)*

| | USA | Canada |
|--|-------|--------|
| N of cases | 1038 | 322 |
| % of cases with identifiable country of origin | 76.3% | 23.7% |
| Both conferences (LRS & CCLR) combined | | |
| Mean number of conference paper authorships ^a | 1.69 | 1.66 |
| % presenting a conference paper ^b | 63.3% | 64.0% |
| % of conference paper authors accounted for by American & Canadians ^b | 76.1% | 23.9% |
| Leisure Research Symposium (LRS) | | |
| Mean number of LRS paper authorships ^c | 1.48 | 0.70 |
| % presenting a paper at LRS ^d | 58.2% | 28.6% |
| % of LRS paper authors accounted for by American & Canadians ^d | 86.8% | 13.2% |
| Canadian Congress on Leisure Research (CCLR) | | |
| Mean number of CCLR paper authorships ^e | 0.20 | 0.97 |
| % presenting a paper at CCLR ^f | 13.5% | 50.0% |
| % of CCLR paper authors accounted for by American & Canadians ^f | 46.5% | 53.5% |

*i.e., People whose country of origin could be identified and who published at least one journal article or presented at least one conference paper in the 1990s.

^aF (1, 1358) = 0.013; n.s.

^b $\chi^2 = 0.05$; d.f. = 1; n.s.

^cF (1, 1358) = 26.22; $p < 0.0001$

^d $\chi^2 = 86.20$; d.f. = 1; $p < 0.0001$

^eF (1, 1358) = 168.73; $p < 0.0001$

^f $\chi^2 = 190.11$; d.f. = 1; $p < 0.0001$

the table: the mean number of conference papers presented by Americans was 1.69, while the corresponding figure among Canadians was 1.66; 63.3% of Americans and 64.0% of Canadians in the data base presented at least one paper at a conference in the 1990s; and the percentages of conference paper authors and authorships accounted for by Americans and Canadians were exactly the same as the percentages of Americans and Canadians among the 1360 cases included in the analysis.

A markedly different pattern of statistically significant differences emerged, however, when data for papers presented at each conference were analyzed separately (Table 6). There was clearly an American bias for papers presented at the Leisure Research Symposium (LRS), where US residents presented an average of 1.48 papers, compared with 0.70 by Canadians. Similarly, a significantly higher proportion of Americans (58.2%) presented a paper at LRS than Canadians (28.6%), while Americans were over-represented and Canadians under-represented in terms of the percentages of LRS authors they accounted for in relation to the percentages of Americans and Canadians among the number of cases included in the analysis.

An almost exactly opposite pattern is evident in the data for papers presented at the Canadian Congress on Leisure Research (CCLR), for which the mean number of papers presented by Americans (0.20) was substantially and significantly lower than the corresponding figure among Canadians (0.97). Similarly, 50.0% of Canadians compared with only 13.5% of Americans presented at least one paper at CCLR, while Canadians were over-represented and Americans under-represented in terms of the percentages of CCLR authors they accounted for in relation to the percentages of Canadians and Americans among the number of cases included in the analysis.

Clearly, the conclusion that emerges from the data summarized in Table 6 is that—while there is a degree of “cross-border” conference participation—Americans appear to have a stronger preference for attending and presenting at LRS and Canadians for attending and presenting at CCLR. However, this conclusion must be tempered by the finding that the average number of papers presented by Canadians at LRS (0.70) was over three times greater than the average number of papers presented by Americans at CCLR (0.20). This difference leads to the conclusion that, notwithstanding the “within-country” orientation evident on both sides of the border, Canadians were more likely than Americans to adopt an international orientation as far as attendance and presentation of papers at conferences is concerned.

Re-analysis of conference paper presentation patterns among more productive scholars. As in the analysis of journal article data, above, the data for conference presentations included people whose name was on only one conference paper in the entire 1990s, who in fact accounted for a substantial proportion of people included in the data base: 570, or 31.9% of the entire data base of 1785, and 58.8% of people who presented at least one conference paper.

The same implications as for journal articles follow from the aforementioned numbers:

- First, it would not be surprising to find that those people who presented only one conference paper would be more likely to have done so in their own country than abroad. (Indeed, the data bear this out, in that 85.8% of the 358 Americans who presented only one paper did so at LRS, with only 14.2% at CCLR. Correspondingly, 68.3% of the 126 Canadians who presented only one conference paper did so at CCLR, with only 31.7% at LRS: $\chi^2 = 139.96$; d.f. = 1; $p < 0.0001$.)
- Second, it could be argued that the level of "parochialism" evident on both sides of the border in the aggregate data would be less pronounced, if not entirely absent, among more productive researchers. This hypothesis is based on the same reasoning as for journal articles, above.

Following this reasoning, patterns of presentation of conference papers were re-analyzed, but this time only among the sub-set of the data base that could be defined as the "most productive." For consistency with the previous analysis of journal articles, the criterion used to define this group was people who presented 5 or more conference papers in the 1990s (Table 7). Despite this reasoning, however, the same general pattern of similarities and differences between Americans and Canadians was repeated in the more restricted

TABLE 7
Data for Conference Papers by Country (Most Productive Scholars)*

| | USA | Canada |
|--|--------|--------|
| N of cases | 102 | 33 |
| % of cases with identifiable country of origin | 75.6% | 24.4% |
| Both conferences (LRS & CCLR) combined | | |
| Mean number of conference paper authorships ^a | 8.65 | 8.97 |
| % presenting a conference paper ^b | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| % of conference paper authors accounted for by American & Canadians ^b | 75.6% | 24.4% |
| Leisure Research Symposium (LRS) | | |
| Mean number of LRS paper authorships ^c | 7.55 | 4.58 |
| % presenting a paper at LRS ^d | 100.0% | 84.8% |
| % of LRS paper authors accounted for by American & Canadians ^d | 78.5% | 21.5% |
| Canadian Congress on Leisure Research (CCLR) | | |
| Mean number of CCLR paper authorships ^e | 1.10 | 4.39 |
| % presenting a paper at CCLR ^f | 51.0% | 100.0% |
| % of CCLR paper authors accounted for by American & Canadians ^f | 61.2% | 38.8% |

*i.e., People whose country of origin could be identified and who presented 5 or more conference papers in the 1990s.

^aF (1, 133) = 0.13; n.s.

^bNo measure of association computed.

^cF (1, 133) = 13.82; $p < 0.0001$

^d $\chi^2 = 16.05$; d.f. = 1; $p < 0.0001$

^eF (1, 133) = 106.29; $p < 0.0001$

^f $\chi^2 = 25.69$; d.f. = 1; $p < 0.0001$

analysis of the 135 people (102 Americans and 33 Canadians) who presented 5 or more conference papers in the 1990s.

- First, when the data for both conferences combined were analyzed, there were no differences between Americans and Canadians: an exact replication of the analysis of the data for all cases.
- Second, with respect to data for each conference analyzed separately, Canadians' output was fairly evenly split between LRS (mean number of papers presented = 4.58) and CCLR (mean = 4.39), whereas the mean number of papers presented by Americans at LRS (7.55) was about seven times greater than the mean number of papers they presented at CCLR (1.10).
- Third, the mean number of papers presented by Americans at LRS (7.55) was almost twice as high as the corresponding figure among Canadians (4.58).
- Fourth, the mean number of papers presented by Canadians at CCLR (4.39) was four times greater than the corresponding figure among Americans (1.10).

A second aspect of the data suggests that Canadians were more likely to present a conference paper abroad than Americans, in that 84.8% of Canadians presented at least one paper at LRS, whereas only 51.0% of Americans presented at least one paper at CCLR. This finding was echoed in the remaining data in Table 7, in that Canadians were far less under-represented in terms of authors at LRS (21.5% compared with the proportion of 24.4% in the restricted data base) than the extent to which Americans were under-represented at CCLR: Americans amounted to 75.6% of the restricted data base, but accounted for 61.2% of authors at CCLR.

All in all, the results summarized in Table 7 are, like the data for journal articles, somewhat equivocal. On the one hand, there was a smaller magnitude of differences between the most productive Americans and their Canadian counterparts than was evident in the comparable data for the entire set of cases. This finding suggests that relatively more productive people are more inclined than those who are somewhat less productive to look outside their national borders in order to present papers at conferences—a trend that was more marked among Canadians than among Americans. On the other hand, even among this relatively select group of the most productive scholars, there was still evidence—particularly among the Americans if somewhat less so among the Canadians—of a “within-country” orientation in the selection of conferences at which to present papers.

Aggregate Analysis: Refining the Patterns and Trends in the Data

A final component of the analysis—and one that neatly summarizes and clarifies the trends apparent in much of the data reported above—was an assessment of interactions among three variables: country; preference for Canadian versus US outlets for research; and level of productivity. More spe-

cifically, preferences for US versus Canadian outlets for research were first analysed separately for each of two independent variables (country; level of productivity), and then the analysis was repeated for each independent variable controlling for the effect of the other on the dependent variable of "outlet preference."

The distribution of research dissemination among the 1360 cases was 20.7% in Canada only, 64.6% in the USA only, and 14.8% in both countries. When this distribution was broken down according to researchers' country of residence, a statistically significant difference emerged ($\chi^2 = 539.09$; d.f. = 2; $p < 0.0001$): (1) 63.7% of Canadians published only in Canada, compared with 7.3% of Americans; (2) conversely, 79.6% of Americans published only in the USA, compared with 16.1% of Canadians; and (3) proportionally more Canadians (20.2%) than Americans (13.1%) presented a conference paper or published a journal article in both countries. These data show that the majority of nationals of both countries confine the dissemination of their research to outlets in their own country. However, the pattern was less extreme for Canadians than Americans in that: (1) proportionally more than twice as many Canadians (16.1%) as Americans (7.3%) published only in the other country; (2) proportionally, a total of almost twice as many Canadians (36.3%) published in the USA, as Americans publishing in Canada (20.4%); and (3), as noted above, proportionally more Canadians than Americans presented a conference paper or published a journal article in both countries.

Publication patterns were also significantly associated with level of productivity. Leaving aside the people who published only one article, there was a steady decline with increasing productivity level in the percentages of people who published only in Canada: 14.3% among the "2-5 papers" sub-group, 4.4% among the "6-9 papers" sub-group, and 1.0% among the "10 or more papers" sub-group. Comparable figures for publishing only in the USA were 64.7%, 48.9%, and 26.3%. Conversely, the percentages publishing in both countries increased from 21.0% among the "2-5 papers" sub-group, to 46.7% of the "6-9 papers" sub-group, and to 72.7% of the "10 or more papers" sub-group ($\chi^2 = 108.80$; d.f. = 4; $p < 0.0001$).

When the two preceding analyses were combined (i.e., differences by country controlling for productivity level, and vice versa), the ensuing relationships both supported and amplified the findings summarized above (Table 8). First, among all but the most productive sub-group, the majority of Americans published only in American outlets; similarly, the majority of Canadians who published 1 through 5 papers did so only in Canada. Second, Canadians in all sub-groups more frequently published outside Canada or in both countries than the proportion of Americans who published outside the USA or in both countries. Third, there was a consistent decline from the least to the most productive sub-groups in the tendency to publish only in one's own country: among Canadians, 78.0% of the "1 paper" sub-group published only in Canada, declining to 56.7% of the "2-5 papers" sub-group, and then to 19.0% and 5.0% of the "6-9 papers" and "10 or more papers"

TABLE 8
Research Dissemination by Americans and Canadians, Controlling for the Number of Papers Published in Journal Articles or Presented at Conferences in the 1990s

| | Published 1 paper | | Published 2-5 papers | | Published 6-9 papers | | Published 10 or more papers | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| | Americans % | Canadians % | Americans % | Canadians % | Americans % | Canadians % | Americans % | Canadians % |
| Published only in Canada | 12.0 | 78.0 | 2.5 | 56.7 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
| Published only in USA | 88.0 | 22.0 | 79.6 | 11.1 | 63.8 | 0.0 | 32.9 | 0.0 |
| Published in both countries (N) | 0.0 (566) | 0.0 (191) | 17.9 (324) | 32.2 (90) | 36.2 (69) | 81.0 (21) | 67.1 (79) | 95.0 (20) |

Statistical results for differences between Americans and Canadians, controlling for number of papers:

1 paper: $\chi^2 = 304.18$; d.f. = 1; $p < 0.0001$

2-5 papers: $\chi^2 = 203.13$; d.f. = 2; $p < 0.0001$

6-9 papers: $\chi^2 = 33.43$; d.f. = 2; $p < 0.0001$

10 or more papers: $\chi^2 = 12.24$; d.f. = 2; $p < 0.01$

Statistical results for differences based on number of papers, controlling for country:

Americans: $\chi^2 = 350.86$; d.f. = 6; $p < 0.0001$

Canadians: $\chi^2 = 175.20$; d.f. = 6; $p < 0.0001$

sub-groups respectively. Comparable figures for Americans were 88.0%, 79.6%, 63.8%, and 32.9%.

Consistent with these trends, the proportions of both Americans and Canadians publishing their work in both countries increased with increasing level of productivity: among Canadians, 32.5% of the "2-5 papers" sub-group published in both countries, increasing to 81.0% and 95.0% of the "6-9 papers" and "10 or more papers" sub-groups respectively. Comparable figures for Americans were 17.9%, 36.2%, and 67.1%. Overall, the data indicate a degree of "convergence" with increasing levels of productivity: an increasingly international outlook as productivity increases among both Canadians and Americans, coupled with smaller differences between nationals of the two countries. Having said this, it should also be noted that the data indicate a consistently higher proportion of people publishing or presenting in the other country among Canadians than among Americans.

Discussion and Conclusions

Recap

To return to the context within which this study was conducted, some recent empirical reviews of published research in North American leisure studies have contended that the field is intellectually and geographically isolated. In different ways and based on different data, both Valentine *et al.* (1999) and Samdahl and Kelly (1999) have pointed to the interrelated attributes of ethnocentrism and an apparent unwillingness to look outside our intellectual or geographical borders for new ideas about leisure. These problems were nicely summarized by Samdahl and Kelly (1999, p. 178), who suggested that, within the North American leisure research community, we are "becoming too inbred in our scholarship." Given these provocative conclusions, the purposes of the present article were: (1) to identify similarities and differences in patterns of research dissemination between Canadian and American members of the North American leisure studies community; (2) assess the degree of overlap in research dissemination across the border; and (3) investigate whether the Canadian and American leisure research communities are distinct entities or part of a broader, integrated, and international community.

Because of the overall objectives of the study from which the present article was taken, it was not possible to cover aspects of the isolation of North American leisure research at a *global*, or *intercontinental*, level, but the data collected permitted the examination of patterns of leisure research production and dissemination *within* North America. It was found that, on average, Canadians and Americans were equally productive: they did not differ with respect to the amount, timing, and longevity of their research and publication activity. However, based on data for publishing articles in *specific* journals or presenting papers at *specific* conferences (and therefore in aggregate in Canadian or American outlets), it was shown that Canadians and Americans diverged sharply: the majority tended to favor research dissemination in their

own country. This conclusion, however, was qualified in two ways: (1) increasingly higher levels of research productivity were associated with a greater tendency to publish journal articles and present conference papers internationally—although the same patterns of parochialism still existed even among the most productive researchers, if not to the same extent as within the research community as a whole; and (2) the level of parochialism was significantly lower among Canadians than among Americans, this finding being true at all levels of productivity.

Discussion

Identifying, describing, and analyzing the patterns and trends summarized above is a much easier task than interpreting and accounting for them, even more so than proposing what—if anything—should be done about them. There are several reasons why. First, a fairly large array of “explanations” can be offered, each of which is at best speculative because it cannot be empirically verified (at least within the confines of the present study). Thus, the interpretations offered below are better viewed as suggestions put forward to provoke discussion than as definitive explanations.⁴ Second, both individually and collectively, these suggestions can only be partly correct, and it is probably more the interplay among them than any single dominant factor alone that helps to explain the aggregate patterns of research dissemination activity that were identified in this study. Third, and perhaps most important, while the data unquestionably capture the *overall* patterns of research publication activity among members of the community, they are also the product of thousands of individual and collective decisions made over a ten-year period, all of which were likely taken for numerous reasons in any given instance by authors and co-authors. These include: what to publish; who is the desired audience; how the paper itself and the outlet for its publication will enhance one’s vita and therefore prospects for promotion; and probably a host of other reasons beyond these. In turn, each of these decisions will likely be affected, both implicitly and explicitly, by the social, political, and academic milieu within which they occur, some of which I suggest below. Having said this, and despite each publication decision being an individual one, it is striking that they should all add up to a set of data observations in which the patterns are discernible, regular, and consistent.

It seems to me that there are three main “levels” at which we might try to account for the apparent insularity of the Canadian and American leisure studies communities from each other, coupled with the somewhat less pronounced isolation of the Canadian community from the American one. At the most immediate level, there is simply the fact of differences in the sizes of the two communities, reflected both in the number of outlets for publication, and in the number of scholars and academic institutions. Next, there is the issue of perceptions of the relative quality of the research journals published in Canada and the United States. Last there are, for want of a better term, “cultural” issues expressed in Americans’ perceptions of Can-

ada, and vice versa, that may provide a covert but nonetheless influential context within which people make their publication decisions.

At the first "level," simply the number of publishing and presenting outlets available in each country may play a part in Americans' preference for US outlets and Canadians' greater likelihood of publishing south of the border. Only two leisure research journals are published in Canada, coupled with a single conference that takes place once every three years. In contrast, there are at least four such journals published in the United States, together with an annual conference. Given differences in the number of publication outlets, one might expect that people who publish relatively infrequently would look first to their own country's journals, whereas those who have more to say need more places in which to say it. These factors, at any rate, would account for differences in international orientation as a function of research productivity level, especially among the more productive Canadians, who are constrained by a limited number of outlets unless they publish outside their own country.

Turning now to the second "level," there may be a perception among some American leisure scholars that the quality of the Canadian journals is inferior to their American equivalents. Thus, it may be thought that there is less "weight" or "vita-value" attached to publishing in the *Journal of Applied Recreation Research* (now *Leisure/Loisir: The Journal of the Canadian Association for Leisure Studies*) or in *Loisir et Société* than in, say the *Journal of Leisure Research* or *Leisure Sciences*. I would venture to suggest that this perception is also echoed among many if not all Canadian scholars, which may stem in part from the kind of self-perception suggested below and which would also help to explain why Canadian scholars publish more in the United States than vice versa.

It is hard to escape the conclusion, however, that differences in patterns of publication are rooted, albeit deeply and covertly, in the diverging cultures of the two countries. At this third "level," we may argue that, for many Americans, the United States is the "center of the universe." Thus, to gain an academic reputation in the only community that is perceived to "count," Americans feel less pressure than foreigners to publish outside their own borders. This posture may be coupled with the perception that because the American journals are of such high quality and because they are distributed internationally, publishing in them will inevitably reach an audience of scholars outside the United States.

The notion among Americans that the United States is the center of the universe also frequently, if not universally, translates into a lack of knowledge about or indifference toward Canada, which may also help to explain why, proportionally, fewer Americans than Canadians look outside their borders for research dissemination opportunities. This perception has been satirized on "The Simpsons": for example, in answer to Marge Simpson's concern that "It took the children forty minutes to find Canada on the map," Homer replies, "Marge, anyone can miss Canada—all tucked away down there." Similarly, on hearing that a friend is moving to Toronto, Bart exclaims, "You're

going to Spain?" Homer, resisting the idea of a visit to Canada, remarks, "Why should we leave America to visit America Junior?" And Marge, on arriving in Canada, says, "It's so clean. And bland."

In contrast, Canadians secretly believe that their own country is the best in the world, but even this feeling is tempered by a kind of apologetic national persona. For example, following Canada's winning of gold medals in both women's and men's ice hockey at the 2002 Salt Lake City Olympic Games, someone remarked that the obvious Canadian way to respond would be: "Canada. We're the greatest. Sorry about that." This Canadian "apologetic confidence" tends to encourage the perception that success is equated only with achieving a reputation in the United States. There is no question that this perception pervades the arts and entertainment fields, which are rife with examples of actors and musicians who achieve acceptance in Canada only after they have "made it" south of the border. Something similar may account for the desire and behavior among many Canadian scholars (and not just those in the leisure studies field), especially the more productive ones, to more frequently publish in American journals and participate in American conferences than in their "own."

Conclusions

The results of this study suggest that there are indeed "two solitudes" in North American leisure studies, at least among the majority of the community and in particular among Americans, slightly less so among Canadians. This pattern lends empirical support to the conclusion reached by Valentine *et al.* (1999) and others, namely that *American*—if not North American as a whole—leisure research is isolated geographically, perhaps helping to explain the intellectual isolation which has been suggested by Samdahl and Kelly (1999). On the other hand, there is also a trend towards "one community," at least within the sub-groups of the more productive scholars in Canada and the United States, who, by virtue of their greater tendency to look outside their own national borders, interact internationally more intensively and more frequently with their colleagues on the other side of the border.

This study has identified patterns of publication activity that should be of interest to (not to say concern among) leisure scholars. Moreover, the investigation of similarities and differences between Canadian and American leisure scholars should help to focus on one of the essential points raised by Walker (2000), namely that accusations of insularity in North America should be tempered by recognition that there appear to be two distinct national communities in North American leisure studies. Not incidentally, the findings should contribute to a more explicit recognition of the significant contributions that Canadians have made and are continuing to make toward the scholarly understanding of leisure.

In the final analysis, the data—for all their limitations—speak for themselves. The trends that emerged in the results were clear and consistent

across all components of the analysis. Explaining the patterns, though, is rather more difficult than identifying and describing them, and, as noted above, no single explanation is universally true. Rather, it is likely that a large range of influences affects each publication decision in subtle ways but ones which are sufficiently powerful to produce a discernible pattern. Thus, the findings described in this article and the reasons proposed to account for the results are better viewed as the starting point for discussion than as the last word.

Notes

1. Note that the terms "Canadian" and "American" are not intended to identify people's nationality or citizenship; rather, they should be read as "shorthand" terms to denote the country in which researchers are employed and from which their publications originate.

2. The 1998 Leisure Research Symposium scheduled to be held in Miami, FL, was included in the data base because, despite the conference being cancelled due to a natural disaster, papers had been reviewed and were published in the 1998 LRS abstracts booklet.

3. The procedure for data manipulation differed from that of Henderson *et al.* (1993), in that a "points system" based on allocating partial points among the authors of a paper was not used. Instead, a score of 1 was awarded to each author of a given paper regardless of the number of authors of that paper, based on the assumption that the reputation associated with publishing an article or presenting a paper accrues equally to all authors. The important point to remember is that decisions had to be made about how to measure participation and manipulate the data. No choice would have been perfect. Regardless of the system used, it can be argued that the same general patterns would emerge: even if the system were different, it is highly unlikely that it would have radically affected the general patterns identified within the data. Riddick *et al.* (1984) also recognize that the selection of criteria for assessment is subjective, including decisions that must be made about sources of data, the choice and measurement of indicators, and manipulation of the data, a point echoed by Burdge (1983) and Dunn (1999).

4. Several of the points that follow were suggested by *Journal of Leisure Research* editor David Scott in response to his reading of the originally-submitted manuscript of this article. I am indebted to Dr. Scott for these suggestions, but take responsibility both for their elaboration and for any errors of fact or judgment.

References

- Austin, D., & Kennedy, D. (1983). Sources of articles published in the *Therapeutic Recreation Journal* during the 1970s. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 16, 35-41.
- Beckers, T. (1995). Back to basics: International communication in leisure research. *Leisure Sciences*, 17, 327-336.

- Bedini, L. A., & Wu, Y. (1994). A methodological review of research in *Therapeutic Recreation Journal* from 1986 to 1990. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 28, 87-98.
- Burdge, R. J. (1983). Making leisure and recreation research a scholarly topic: Views of a journal editor, 1972-1982. *Leisure Sciences*, 6, 99-126.
- Burdge, R. J. (1989). The evolution of leisure and recreation research from multidisciplinary to interdisciplinary. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Understanding leisure and recreation: Mapping the past, charting the future* (pp. 29-46). State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Coalter, F. (1999). Leisure sciences and leisure studies: The challenge of meaning. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century* (pp. 507-519). State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Crandall, R., & Lewko, J. (1976). Leisure research, present and future: Who, what, where. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 8, 150-159.
- Driver, B. L. (1999). Recognizing and celebrating progress in leisure studies. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century* (pp. 523-534). State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Dunn, E. (1999). Enhancing the accessibility and visibility of leisure research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 31, 192-194.
- Godbey, G. (1989). Implications of recreation and leisure research for professionals. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Understanding leisure and recreation: Mapping the past, charting the future* (pp. 613-628). State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Henderson, K. A., Sessoms, H. D., Chen, Y., & Hsiao, C. C. (1993). Using faculty publication rates to measure the quality of PR&L curricula. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 64(7), 59-62.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1986). Concerns and thoughts about leisure research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 18, iv-x.
- Jackson, E. L. (2001). The North American leisure research community in the 1990s: An exploratory quantitative analysis of participation in the Leisure Research Symposium and the Canadian Congress on Leisure Research. *Leisure/Loisir*, 25(1-2), 79-107.
- Jackson, E. L., & Burton, T. L. (1989). Leisure research and the social sciences: An exploratory study of active researchers. *Leisure Studies*, 8, 263-280.
- Jordan, D. J., & Roland, M. (1999). An examination of differences between academics and practitioners in frequency of reading research and attitudes toward research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 31, 166-170.
- Lewko, J., & Crandall, R. (1980). Research trends in leisure and special populations. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 12, 69-79.
- McLellan, R. (1980). Research. *Parks and Recreation*, 15, 62-67.
- Riddick, C. C., DeSchriver, M., & Weissinger, E. (1984). A methodological review of research in *Journal of Leisure Research* from 1978 to 1982. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 16, 311-321.
- Rojek, C. (1989). Leisure and recreation theory. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Understanding leisure and recreation: Mapping the past, charting the future* (pp. 69-88). State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Samdahl, D. M., & Kelly, J. J. (1999). Speaking only to ourselves? Citation analysis of *Journal of Leisure Research* and *Leisure Sciences*. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 31, 171-180.
- Szymanski, D. (1980). An index for determining trends in selected leisure journals and publications. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 10, 42-51.
- Valentine, K., Allison, M. T., & Schneider, I. (1999). The one-way mirror of leisure research: A need for cross-national social scientific perspectives. *Leisure Sciences*, 21, 241-246.
- Van Doren, C. S., & Heit, M. J. (1973). Where it's at: A content analysis and appraisal of the *Journal of Leisure Research*. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 5, 67-73.

-
- Van Doren, C. S., Holland, S. M., & Crompton, J. L. (1984). Publishing in the primary leisure journals: Insight into the structure and boundaries of our research. *Leisure Sciences*, 6, 239-256.
- Walker, G. J. (2000). Response to "The one-way mirror." *Leisure Sciences*, 22, 37-38.