

## Status of the *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 1985-1990

By: Diane L. Gill

Gill, D.L. (1992). Status of the *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 1985-1990. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *14*, 1-12.

Made available courtesy of Human Kinetics: <http://hk.humankinetics.com/JSEP/journalAbout.cfm>

**\*\*\*Note: Figures may be missing from this format of the document**

### **Abstract:**

Information on submitted manuscripts and editorial decisions suggested that the journal has maintained its status as a respected sport and exercise psychology research publication from 1985 to 1990. Most submitted manuscripts described research on sport and exercise participants with research topics, samples, and methodologies that follow traditional patterns. Surveys and factorial or regression designs dominated, although some research using alternative approaches, particularly interpretive methodologies, has been submitted and published. Future research might expand to include more diverse participants, settings, and methodologies.

### **Article:**

Approximately 1 year ago I completed my 5-year term as Editor of the *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology* (JSEP). My predecessor, Dan Landers, was the journal's first editor and the only editor during its first 7 years. Jack Rejeski has now taken over editorial responsibilities and will guide the journal through its next phase.

At the previous editorial change in 1985, Dan (Landers, Boutcher, & Wang, 1986) wrote an article presenting information on the editorial process and journal submissions and status over the first 7 years. At the same time, I (Gill, 1986) presented my views and plans as I began my editorial term. Now, as Dan did 5 years ago, I present information<sup>1</sup> that may provide readers with further insight into journal editorial policies and practices and also provide an indication of the state of sport and exercise psychology as reflected by submissions to the journal over the past 5 years.

As those 1986 editorial articles indicated, when I began my editorial term the journal was well established and respected as the premier publication for research in sport and exercise psychology. We were receiving high quality submissions, and our review process and publication rates compared favorably with respected research journals in psychology and exercise science. As the new editor, my major goal was to maintain the standards that Dan Landers had established and to maintain the journal's position as the premier research publication in the field. Second, I hoped to encourage diversity in our research by accommodating varied research topics and methodologies within sport and exercise psychology. I believe the journal has maintained its quality and research status, but submissions and the research that the submissions reflect are not as diverse as I had hoped. In the remainder of this article, I present data on submissions and the review process that may allow readers to draw their own conclusions about the status and progress of the journal and the field.

### ***Journal Operations and Manuscript Processing***

Before presenting detailed information on submissions, I want to provide an overview of the operation and structure of the journal. The most visible change in the journal since 1985 is the change of title. When I began my term, we were the *Journal of Sport Psychology*. I immediately began soliciting opinions about the name change; then, starting with volume 10 in 1988, we became the *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*.

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Ted Miller, Christina M. Caruso, and Jeffrey J. Martin helped in collecting and analyzing the data presented in the article. All three, as well as David Dziewaltowski, served as editorial assistants between 1985 and 1990.

Actually, the name change did not alter journal policies. The journal had always interpreted sport broadly, to include varied physical activities, and the name change was an attempt to make this implicit interpretation explicit. Also, we hoped to encourage more authors to submit research in the growing area of exercise psychology. Other than the name change, the basic policies and structure of the journal have not changed much over the past 5 years. We emphasize original research articles but also publish review articles, book reviews, opinion and commentary, and a digest of sport and exercise psychology articles from other sources. We now publish slightly more pages than we did in 1985. In 1988, when we began to backlog accepted manuscripts, we increased the number of pages slightly to accommodate more articles, and we have maintained that size (see Figure 1).

Other than the editor, the people who do most of the review work are the editorial board. The structure and responsibilities of the board have changed little over the past 5 years. We had 22 board members (not counting the editor) in 1985, and we had 22 in 1990 when I ended my editorial term. Nearly all submitted articles are reviewed by at least one board member, and evaluating submissions is the main responsibility of the board, although they also offer advice on the editorial process and journal operations. Editorial board members are appointed by the editor, and they are selected because they are experienced, competent reviewers with expertise in at least some areas of sport and exercise psychology.

1986—24 articles (3 Sport Psychology Today, 15 Research Reports, 6 Comments) and 5 book reviews
1987—27 articles (22 Research Reports, 5 Comments), 7 book reviews, and 1 editorial note
1988—36 articles (31 Research Reports, 5 Comments) and 2 book reviews
1989—32 articles (28 Research Reports, 4 Comments) and 4 book reviews
1990—34 articles (27 Research Reports, 7 Comments) and 7 book reviews

**Figure 1 — Number of articles published from 1986 to 1990.**

Board members are critical to the editorial process, and many of the current board members served through all 5 years of my term. Other than Dan and I changing places as editor and board member, we had three changes on the board in 1986, three in 1987, one in 1988, and one in 1989.

For those interested in gender balancing (as I am), we had 4 female and 18 male board members in 1985 before I began my term. Over the 5 years, the ratio of women to men on the board increased as follows: in 1985-4:18 (18.2%; 17.4% including the editor), in 1986-5:17 (22.7%; 26.1% including the editor), from 1987 to 1989-6:16 (27.3%; 30.4% including the editor), and in 1990-7:15 (31.8%; 34.8% including the editor). Over the 5 years, then, the percentage of women increased from 18.2% to 31.8% (not counting the editor).

As noted, board members' main responsibility is reviewing manuscripts, and that review process, along with the related data on review decisions, is probably of most interest to the readers. Our review process is similar to that of most research journals. Manuscripts are submitted to the editor (in perfect format, following all guidelines to authors, for efficient processing). The editor immediately sends an acknowledgment card to the author, logs in the manuscript, and sends copies with review forms to two reviewers (usually one board member and one guest reviewer).

Reviewers are asked to return their reviews and recommendations within 5 weeks. The editor then uses the two reviews to make an editorial decision to accept, reject, or request revisions and then communicates that decision to the author. Although we aim to get feedback to the author within 2 months, the process often takes longer, usually because of delayed reviews. From 1987 to 1989, we calculated the time from submission until feedback was sent to the author. The mean time was slightly over 2 months (M=70 days, range=22-209 in 1987; M=74

days, range=26-229 in 1988; M=81 days, range=21-182 in 1989). Most manuscripts are reviewed within 2 months, but some excessive delays extend the average time.

As Table 1 indicates, most manuscripts are rejected at this point. Almost no manuscripts are accepted for publication without requesting revisions. So, for those manuscripts that eventually are published, the time continues as the author receives the decision and reviews, revises, and resubmits the manuscript. Typically, the editor then makes the final decision on the revision, although a few revisions are sent back to board members for a second review before a decision is made. As Table 1 suggests, most authors make adequate revisions, and most revisions are then accepted for publication.

After the editor makes the final decision on the revision (usually within 2 weeks), accepted manuscripts are sent to the publisher in the order of acceptance. Accepted manuscripts usually go to the publisher within 6 months, and the overall time from initial submission to actual publication is about 1 year. Although that may seem like a long time for those just beginning their careers, the time lag compares favorably with other research publications.

Information on submissions and decisions, which many readers will find useful for tenure and promotion files, is presented in Table 1. The number of submissions remained relatively constant over my 5-year term. Most submissions were rejected, and virtually none were accepted without revisions (the only two classified as accepted without revisions were editorial reports and commentary rather than research reports). Revised manuscripts were reviewed much more

**Table 1**  
**Editorial Decisions**

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990*	Total
<i>n</i> submitted	119	99	117	114	119	110	678
Returned to author	3	6	8	2	3	3	25
First review decision							
Accept	—	2	—	—	—	—	2 (.3%)
Reject	89	67	77	70	79	90	407 (67.5%)
Revise	30	30	40	44	40	20	194 (32.3%)
Decision on revision							
Accept	23	25	30	32	36	—	146 (78.1%)
Reject	1	1	1	3	1	—	7 (3.7%)
Revise	2	3	7	1	—	—	13 (7.0%)
Not returned	5	1	2	10	3	—	21 (11.2%)
Final decision							
Publish	25	30	37	32	36	18	178 (26.3%)
Not publish	94	69	80	82	83	92	500 (73.7%)

\*Final *n* submitted and final decisions were obtained from current editor, Jack Rejeski. Other information in all tables for 1990 is based on the 69 manuscripts submitted before the editorial change in August 1990.

favorably, and most were accepted at that point. Those that were rejected or not returned were the ones that required more extensive revisions that the author might have been unable, or unwilling, to make.

The overall publication rate remained relatively constant at around 30% during my term. Although the rate has not changed much (and, in fact, the rejection rate was higher in 1985), I believe publication standards have become tougher over the 5 years. Readers can judge the quality of the published manuscripts for themselves. My experiential knowledge, based on reviewers' comments and on my own reviews of submissions, indicates that the overall quality of submitted manuscripts is high. We receive very few manuscripts that do not have some merit. Most authors understand research methodology, pose reasonable questions, and prepare

manuscripts professionally. I suspect that many of the manuscripts we reject are published elsewhere and eventually contribute to the literature. Thus, I hope that authors, especially those beginning research careers, are not discouraged by rejection rates and rejection letters but use reviewers' comments constructively to pursue their research and publication efforts.

Authors often ask about reviewer agreement. That is, do both reviewers say the same things? Both reviewers seldom say (or write) exactly the same things, but I have observed more consistency than I expected in decisions. Most of the time, both reviewers agree on the final decision and tend to pick out the same major points to make their recommendations. From 1987 to 1989, we recorded reviewer agreement by noting whether both reviewers voted to reject (the most common vote), whether both voted to request revisions (either major or minor revisions), or whether one voted to reject and the other to request revisions. Reviewers voted as follows: in 1987 both reject = 40%, both revise = 26%, split = 34%; in 1988—both reject = 35%, both revise = 25%, split = 40%; and in 1989—both reject = 40%, both revise = 26%, split = 34%.

When reviewers disagreed, the comments usually were closer than the votes might suggest. Typically, the revision request would call for major revisions, and often both reviewers would indicate that the decision was a close one. Generally, then, I found reviewers tending to make similar judgments, and my editorial decisions followed those judgments. In all cases when both reviewers voted to reject, the manuscript was rejected. Similarly, revision was requested for all cases in which both reviewers voted to request revision. With split votes, most were rejected (71.4% in 1987, 68.2% in 1988, 67.6% in 1989).

### *Characteristics of Manuscripts*

As just discussed, submission and acceptance rates indicate that the journal has maintained its status, and that information along with my editorial observations suggests that the quality of submitted manuscripts has been at least maintained, and probably enhanced, over the past 5 years. I now present more specific information on the submitted manuscripts to give readers an idea of their content and of research content in sport and exercise psychology.

### **Author Characteristics**

Table 2 presents information on the authors who submitted manuscripts. The number of authors and the sex, departmental affiliation, and country of the lead author for each manuscript are reported here. Generally, author characteristics have changed little, and the overall profile holds across the 5 years. About one third of the manuscripts have one author, the majority (42.6%) have two authors, and a relatively small percentage (7.7%) have four or more authors. These proportions are relatively stable, but the most recent numbers in 1989 and 1990 suggest a slight move away from single authors to more multiple-author submissions.

In their 1986 report, Landers et al. noted a trend toward a greater number of female authors over the journal's first 7 years, and about one third of the principal authors were female in the last year of their report. The current information in Table 2 indicates that the percentage of female principal authors has remained stable over the past 5 years, although the gender gap has not diminished any further.

Landers et al. (1986) also noted a change in authors' departmental affiliations over the journal's first 7 years. At first, about three fourths of the authors were from physical education (including related departments of kinesiology, exercise science, etc.), but by 1984 only about half were from physical education, with an increasing number from psychology, in particular, as well as other departments. Recent data suggest that pattern continues. Over the past 5 years, about 50% of the authors were from physical education and related departments, about 30% were from psychology, and 20% were from other departments. The 112 authors in other departments were from education (21), sociology (6), counseling (9), business (11), medicine (17), athletics (11), and others (37), with no particular trends across years in the distribution of these classifications.

**Table 2**  
**Author Characteristics**

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	Total	
							<i>n</i>	%
<i>n</i> of authors								
1	37	43	38	38	32	15	203	32.4
2	62	33	49	44	54	25	267	42.6
3	12	18	25	25	20	9	109	17.4
4+	8	5	5	7	11	12	48	7.7
Gender								
Female	37	32	32	42	44	17	207	33.0
Male	79	67	82	72	68	44	412	65.7
Unknown	3		3		2		8	1.3
Departmental affiliation								
P.E.	62	49	55	64	69	37	336	53.6
Psych.	29	30	37	33	33	17	179	28.5
Other	28	20	25	17	15	7	112	17.9
Country								
U.S.	85	69	85	80	78	41	438	69.9
Canada	16	14	15	12	20	10	87	13.9
Europe	5	7	6	6	6	5	35	5.6
Aust./NZ	9	7	2	13	7	5	43	6.9
Other	4	2	9	3	6	–	24	3.8

As for the home country of the principal authors, Table 2 indicates a stable pattern across the 5 years. As expected, most authors (about 70%) were from the U.S., and a consistent, notable number (about 14%) were from Canada. We also received a consistent number (about 7%) from Australia and New Zealand, probably reflecting their growing sport psychology field, and a small, consistent percentage from Europe. We received some manuscripts from other countries in Africa (9), Asia (7), the Middle East (6), and South America (1), with no particular trends in the numbers from these countries over the 5 years.

Generally, then most principal authors were male, although we had a consistent, notable representation of female authors. Most manuscripts had coauthors, but we had more single-author manuscripts than manuscripts with more than two authors. About half the authors were from physical education or related departments; the other half, from psychology and other departments, reflecting the extension of sport and exercise psychology research into other disciplines and programs. Most authors were from North America, where most sport and exercise psychology programs are located, and many of the authors from other countries did sport and exercise psychology work in North America. Only a few manuscripts were submitted from countries with fewer universities, fewer research facilities, and less access to sport and exercise psychology literature. These few submissions suggest interest and work around the world, and perhaps the journal and the field can find ways to support sport and exercise psychology research by authors in these locations.

### **Subject Characteristics**

To give the reader an overview of the content of the submitted articles, I now present information on the characteristics of the subjects, the methodology, and the topic areas of the submitted manuscripts. First, as Table 3 suggests, nearly all the submitted manuscripts included human subjects. The N/A category in Table 3 indicates that only for a small number (13%) was information on subject characteristics not applicable; most of these were methodological, review, or issue-discussion manuscripts.

**Table 3**  
**Subject Characteristics**

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	Total	
							<i>n</i>	%
<i>n</i> of subjects								
1-9	7	2	1	2	4	1	17	2.8
10-29	17	7	18	16	13	12	83	13.5
30-99	38	41	43	40	41	16	219	35.6
100-999	37	26	37	46	39	22	207	33.6
1000+	2	1	3	-	-	4	10	1.6
N/A	18	22	15	10	15	-	80	13.0
Gender of subjects								
Female	20	13	14	14	13	6	80	12.9
Male	24	14	18	20	27	10	113	18.2
Both	54	49	69	71	61	40	344	55.4
N/A	21	23	16	9	15	-	84	13.5
Age of subjects								
1-17	19	16	14	18	15	5	87	14.0
18-25	36	31	37	44	61	28	237	38.2
26+	6	7	4	5	6	4	32	5.2
Combined	36	23	46	34	11	18	168	27.1
N/A	22	22	16	13	23	-	96	15.5
Type of setting								
Elite	36/2	20/4	29/4	22/-	12/-	6/-	125/10	20.2/21.8
Nonelite	10/13	11/8	15/12	33/6	33/3	23/-	125/43	20.2/27.1
Exercise	3/3	4/2	11/5	8/1	6/1	4/-	36/17	5.8/8.5
Youth	9/-	5/1	3/-	6/4	8/1	1/-	32/6	5.2/6.1
Coach	4/5	6/-	5/2	1/5	2/-	-/-	18/12	2.9/4.8
Disabled	3/-	-/-	-/1	2/-	1/-	-/-	6/1	1.0/1.1
College	24/7	20/8	21/7	27/8	33/9	14/-	139/41	22.4/29.0
Public	9/5	12/8	18/3	7/8	7/3	7/-	60/29	9.7/14.4
N/A	21	21	15	8	14	-	79	12.7

*Note.* The number to the left of the slash indicates the primary type of setting; the number to the right of the slash indicates the number of additional manuscripts using that type of setting. For the Total %, the number to the left of the slash is the percentage with that type as the primary type of setting; the number to the right of the slash is the total percentage (primary plus additional) using that type of setting.

The first part of Table 3 groups studies by the number of subjects. Most fell into the 30-99 and 100-999 categories, suggesting the typical sizes for surveys or factorial and regression designs. Very few (2.8%) were small *n* or case studies, and very few (1.6%) used samples of over 1,000.

In terms of subject gender, studies were classified as all females, all males, or both female and male participants. As Table 3 shows, most studies (55.4%) included both females and males, and slightly more studies included only males (18.2%) than included only females (12.9%).

Subject age was more difficult to classify because many studies used combined, overlapping, or poorly specified age categories. The largest proportion used the 18-25 age range, the typical college age. A consistent number (14%) included younger subjects, with about equal numbers focusing on younger children (age 1-12) and adolescents (age 13-17) and some combining both of these groups in a sample. A smaller, consistent number (5.2%) included adults older than 25, and only three studies specifically identified subjects over age 50. About 25% of the studies used combined-age categories that overlapped with the typical college age but also included younger or older participants.

To further identify the participants, subjects were categorized by their sport or exercise setting. Specifically, subjects were classified as elite athletes, nonelite athletes, exercise participants, youth participants, coaches, disabled participants, college students (not participants in specific sport or exercise activities), and general public (noncollege adult nonparticipants). Some studies specifically identified more than one setting, such as

studies comparing elite and nonelite athletes, exercisers and nonexercisers, or coaches and athletes. In those studies, the primary or first-identified type was recorded, and any other identified types were also recorded, so that we could calculate the total number of studies including each type of participant.

Most studies included sport or exercise participants, which suggests an emphasis on field settings and applied research. Only about one third of the studies were categorized as using either the general public or college students as their first type, and several of these studies also included sport or exercise participants. Elite and nonelite athletes were most often included, with about half the studies using one of these groups. Smaller but consistent percentages of the studies included exercisers and youth sport participants. Only seven studies included disabled participants, such as participants in Special Olympics, wheelchair athletes, or participants in certain health-related exercise programs. Most studies with elite and nonelite athletes (note that this distinction was somewhat arbitrary, both in this data coding and in the studies) or youth participants involved competitive athletics. The small number of studies with exercisers, other noncompetitive activity participants, or older participants is disappointing, and no noticeable increase in studies with these participants is evident.

### **Methodological Characteristics**

To describe methodology, studies were classified as lab experiment, held experiment, field study, survey, interpretive, methodological or review, archival, or issue discussion. Some manuscripts included more than one methodology, such as with multiple experiments or with different observations on the same sample (e.g., interviews and questionnaires). For those, the primary or first-identified methodology and then any additional methodological approaches used in that manuscript were recorded.

Similarly, the primary or first-identified statistical analysis for each manuscript was recorded as descriptive, correlation/regression (including multiple regression), ANOVA (including MANOVA, discriminant analysis), meta-analysis,  $z$  or  $t$  comparisons, chi-square (including other nonparametric statistics), factor analysis, or path analysis. Many studies included more than one statistical analysis, and all statistical approaches used in each manuscript were coded by recording additional statistics after identifying the first analysis.

As Table 4 indicates, surveys were the most common methodology; over 50% of the studies used surveys. About 25% were lab experiments, and another 20% used a field study or field experiment. About 10% of the manuscripts were primarily review or discussion articles, and a small number used archival data. Less than 5% used interpretive or qualitative methodologies, and that number has not increased over the past 5 years despite more discussion of such approaches at conferences and in the literature.

Most studies included descriptive statistics (67.3%), and univariate or multivariate regression (39.5%) and factorial analyses (54.8%) are popular techniques. Only three studies used meta-analysis, and despite the popularity of structural equation modeling and path analyses in related psychology research,

**Table 4**  
**Methodological Characteristics**

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	Total	Total %
<b>Methodology</b>								
Lab exper.	26/-	26/-	38/-	22/4	20/-	15/2	147/6	23.4/24.4
Field exper.	18/-	7/-	5/-	10/1	15/1	6/-	61/2	9.7/10.0
Field study	8/3	10/-	3/-	4/6	22/-	5/-	52/9	8.3/9.7
Survey	38/31	35/17	52/27	66/21	41/21	19/2	251/119	40.0/59.0
Interpretive	4/7	-/3	2/3	2/2	1/2	2/1	11/18	1.6/4.6
Meth./review	11/2	8/2	4/3	7/-	10/-	9/1	49/8	7.8/9.1
Archival	3/-	3/-	3/3	1/-	7/1	4/2	21/6	3.3/4.3
Issue	1/-	5/-	7/-	-/-	-/-	-/-	14/-	2.2
<b>Statistics</b>								
Descriptive	16/71	6/69	8/89	62/-	55/-	44/1	191/230	30.5/67.3
Correl./reg.	10/34	5/31	5/46	21/28	17/34	-/16	58/189	9.3/39.5
ANOVA/MANOVA	29/28	29/24	29/37	21/44	26/36	7/30	141/202	22.5/54.8
Meta	-	1/-	-	-	1/-	1/-	3/-	.5
z/t	19/6	19/6	21/9	-/31	2/18	3/5	64/75	10.2/22.2
Chi-square	11/4	14/1	27/3	-/16	1/5	1/5	54/34	8.6/14.1
Factor	9/-	6/-	10/1	2/5	4/4	1/9	32/19	5.1/8.1
Path analysis	3/-	1/-	3/-	-/6	1/1	-/-	8/7	1.3/2.4
N/A	22	18	14	8	10	3	75	12.0

*Note.* The numbers to the left and right of the slash represent primary and additional numbers and primary and total percentages, respectively.

only 2.4% of the submitted manuscripts used such analyses. Overall, the studies emphasized descriptive, correlational, and factorial analyses of survey data as well as group comparisons in lab and field investigations.

### Topic Areas

To present an overview of the topics covered in the research, manuscripts were classified using the categories described by Landers et al. (1986) in their summary, with some modifications to better fit the recent data and to group manuscripts into more equivalent categories. Manuscript topics were classified under the broad headings of cognitive motivation (including attributions, self-efficacy, perceived abilities, flow, goal orientation, intrinsic motivation); intervention/preparations (including cognitive and behavioral interventions, superstitions, adherence, rehabilitation); personality (including self-esteem, body image, attitudes); social aspects (including group dynamics, social influence, social development, coach-player relationships); stress/anxiety (including competitive trait and state anxiety, mood, anxiety-performance, exercise and stress, psychophysiology); and professional/methodological issues. Generally, adding finer distinctions did not provide any more information or show differing trends, so the broad categories are used to classify the topics in Table 5. Because some manuscripts covered topics in addition to the primary or first-identified topic, any other topics are recorded as secondary topics in Table 5.

The distribution of manuscripts among the topic areas did not change much over the 5 years. Cognitive motivation topics were most popular, and intervention issues were covered in about one third of the manuscripts. Both stress/anxiety and social aspects were included in about one fourth of the manuscripts. Personality issues were covered in only 15.2% of the manuscripts, and that number has dropped some over the 5 years. Also, the relatively small number of manuscripts dealing with professional issues has decreased.

The drop in articles on professional issues is not surprising given that two new journals began publication during my editorial term, and both include such articles. *The Spoil Psychologist* (TSP), which began publication in 1987, focuses on applied sport psychology and includes a section for professional issues as well as applied research articles. Both TSP and JSEP are published by Human Kinetics, and they serve as complementary publication outlets for sport and exercise psychologists. TSP emphasizes applied sport psychology research and practice; JSEP emphasizes theoretically based basic and applied sport and exercise psychology research. Many



researchers publish in both journals, and many articles cover applied research that could be published in either journal.

Also, the Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology began publishing its journal, the *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, in 1989. Again, many applied sport psychology research articles could be submitted here as well as to *JSEP*. Generally, these two new journals do not seem to have had any negative effect on the quantity or quality of submissions to *JSEP*. They do seem to have drawn some of the professional issues articles that might previously have been submitted to *JSEP*, but *JSEP* continues to receive high quality research submissions on applied sport and exercise topics.

### Summary

The Landers et al. (1986) review of the journal's first 7 years suggested several trends and changes as the journal evolved into a respected sport and

**Table 5**  
**Primary and Additional Topic Areas**

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	Total	%
Cognitive motivation								
Primary	15	25	30	32	45	25	172	28.2
Additional	16	22	25	18	9	4	94	15.4
Total	31	47	55	50	54	29	266	43.5
Intervention								
Primary	41	20	26	33	32	11	163	26.7
Additional	9	12	11	6	9	2	49	8.0
Total	50	32	37	39	41	13	212	34.7
Personality								
Primary	17	9	9	15	8	3	61	10.0
Additional	9	15	7	5	5	1	32	5.2
Total	26	24	16	20	13	4	93	15.2
Social								
Primary	16	16	23	14	12	8	89	14.6
Additional	20	9	22	15	5	2	73	11.9
Total	36	25	45	29	17	10	162	26.5
Stress/anxiety								
Primary	19	11	16	15	15	9	85	13.9
Additional	9	14	18	11	16	5	73	11.9
Total	28	25	34	26	31	14	158	25.9
Professional/methodological issues								
Primary	10	13	6	5	5	2	41	6.7
Additional	4	6	7	7	4	1	29	4.7
Total	14	19	13	12	9	3	70	11.5

exercise psychology research publication. Generally, the data presented here from the past 5 years suggest more stability than change. When we changed editors in the fall of 1990, the journal's status, policies, and procedures were much the same as when we changed editors in 1985. Moreover, the characteristics of authors and the characteristics of submitted articles (participants, methodologies, topic areas) are similar to the profiles in Landers et al. (1986). As Editor, I did initiate some changes in editorial operations, but these were more a fine tuning and personal preference than a major restructuring.

I had hoped that we would expand the content of our research during my editorial term, particularly to include more research on health-oriented exercise, more diverse participants, and alternative research methodologies. The data presented here do not point to any particular trends in research topics, settings, participants, or methodologies over the 5 years.

Despite the lack of noticeable changes in the information presented in Tables 1 to 5, published and unpublished research does seem to be changing in more subtle ways. Although the major topics have changed little, conceptual models and methodologies seem to be more sophisticated and of consistently higher quality. For example, stress and anxiety continues to be an important research topic, but the research has changed. When I began my term, this research emphasized self-report measures of state and trait anxiety and simple correlations of anxiety and performance. Current anxiety research usually takes a multidimensional approach, follows more sophisticated conceptual models, and often incorporates varied physiological as well as psychological measures.

Although the data did not indicate more research within exercise psychology, one of my goals, I believe we have more exercise psychology research than we did in 1985. Some studies specifically used exercise samples, whereas almost none did in the journal's early years. Moreover, many of the lab experiments, as well as some of the field research and intervention studies, focused on exercise. Many current studies within the topic of stress/anxiety focused on the relationship between exercise and stress, and several cognitive motivation studies considered exercise motivation. In the past, nearly all studies within these areas focused on competitive athletic settings. Although I believe we have increased our exercise psychology research, we certainly have not come as far as I had hoped. In particular, we have not begun to study older adults as we could, and few studies take place in health-related exercise settings.

Just as we have not changed our topics or settings very much, we have not changed our research methods much over the past 5 years. Factorial and regression designs still clearly dominate, although we now see mainly multivariate rather than univariate approaches. I had anticipated an increase in submitted research using qualitative or interpretive methodologies and analyses, and I particularly thought that Tara Scanlan's (e.g., Scanlan, Ravizza, & Stein, 1989; Scanlan, Stein, & Ravizza, 1989) model work using qualitative approaches to study stress and enjoyment in youth sport might elicit research and submissions from others.

Although we have not had an increase in submissions of qualitative work, we have received a consistent number. Moreover, we have published that work. and I hope authors recognize that the journal is receptive to such approaches. I have noticed more qualitative research at recent conferences, and some established researchers are incorporating varied qualitative methodologies, so I expect the journal will receive more of this research in the future. I hope researchers will also pursue other less traditional methodologies and will submit that work. I am surprised that we have not received more research using time series analyses or other approaches that seem appropriate for interventions in sport or exercise settings with small or limited samples. Perhaps over the next few years sport and exercise psychology researchers will find other methodologies for some of the issues that are not easily investigated with factorial and regression designs.

### *References*

- Gill, D.L. (1986). A prospective view of the *Journal of Sport (and Exercise) Psychology*. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 8, 164-173.
- Landers, D.M., Boutcher, S.H., & Wang, M.Q. (1986). The history and status of the *Journal of Sport Psychology*: 1979-1985. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 8, 149-163.
- Scanlan, T.K., Ravizza, K., & Stein, G.L. (1989). An in-depth study of former elite figure skaters: I. Introduction to the project. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 11, 54-64.
- Scanlan, T.K., Stein, G.L., & Ravizza, K. (1989). An in-depth study of former elite figure skaters: II. Sources of enjoyment. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 11, 65-83.