

Editor's Note

John J. Miller, Troy University

As members who study and research the application of legal aspects to sport and recreation, we are fortunate to have a seemingly endless supply of topics from which to draw. A cursory review of legal issues reveals collective bargaining issues, concussion litigation, contract issues, discrimination, drugs/doping, First Amendment, intellectual property, NCAA violations, negligence, salary arbitration, and Title IX as areas that have recently exploded onto the sports scene. This issue of the *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport* (JLAS) reveals the diversity of topics that may be investigated: from legal issues in obstacle racing events (such as Tough Mudder), to sport trademark dilution examination, to an analysis of sport regulation in collegiate athletics.

As this issue is my last one as editor-in-chief of *JLAS*, I am excited that it represents different, yet relevant, legal topics in sports and recreation. Smith (1990) stated

One of the most negative aspects of the pressure to publish is that it discourages any bold or original work. When so much rests on not simply doing the research but, more important, getting it published, the risks of doing something unorthodox, something that might offend strongly held prejudices in a particular field, are great. (p. 191)

As such, researchers may become cautious of conducting studies that may not be rapidly considered for publication. Outlets that could include interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, or longitudinal approaches or those with a distinct philosophical orientation may be moderated at the expense of 'publication speed.' If it is the former, the emphasis on productivity may come as a sacrifice of innovative thinking. Miller (1995) suggested that a Machiavellian attitude of 'whatever it takes' to get published instead of adopting the goals of research, promotes non-substantive research. In other words, such an attitude tends to discourage any bold or original work. As a result, publication efficiency takes precedence over innovation or originality thereby halting the research progress in the field. To this extent, JLAS has maintained a sense of rigor without compromising the legal application to the sport and recreation industry. Over the past three years, the acceptance rate for the JLAS has hovered around 25 percent. As such, 75 percent of all submissions are not accepted for publication in *JLAS*. While this last figure may be perceived as somewhat severe, it does not take into account the number of revisions the authors are asked to conduct.

The fear of rejection may be common in the research community and may result in scholars adhering to research projects which are less detrimental for their career. A lack of academic boldness to the practical application of research may be

due, in part, to the journal review process (De Rond & Miller, 2005). In some cases, only one revision is required. However, in many other cases, multiple revisions are needed. This is a credit to those on the *JLAS* Editorial Review Board, who possess an understanding that the submitted manuscripts may offer different representations of a subject matter. By doing so, those who choose to submit to *JLAS* find that

there is a need for a variety of ways of seeing and interpreting in the pursuit of knowledge; the more one applies, the more dimensions and consequences of the field can be illuminated. It is in this sense that we embrace an expansion of knowledge, of ways of seeing and interpreting through engagement with alternative ontological, epistemological, ideological, political, and methodological approaches (Amis & Silk, 2005, p. 361)

Submissions to *JLAS* have increased and the ability to receive the *Journal* in hard copy as well as online form speaks well to the future of *the Journal*. I encourage future authors, as well as their doctoral students, to submit new ways of viewing different topics which are applicable to the study of legal aspects of sport and recreation. I am proud of the achievements that *JLAS* has had in the past three years. While some of the “heavy lifting” has been accomplished, much more is in store for the flagship journal of the Sport and Recreation Law Association. I am thankful for the efforts of Associate Editor, J.O. Spengler, who will be assuming the mantle of editor after this issue. Also, the Editorial Review Board members have provided a great deal of time and effort, which cannot be overlooked, to maintain the rigor of the *Journal*. It is this effort that provides the cornerstone for attracting bold new ideas or concepts in the study of legal aspects of sport and recreation. Finally, much credit goes to those individuals who submitted research after a period of time in which *JLAS* was on hiatus. The faith they had in submitting to *JLAS* under such circumstances is appreciated. Thank you.

References

- Amis, J., & Silk, M. (2005). Rupture: Promoting critical and innovative approaches to the study of sport management. *Journal of Sport Management, 19*, 355–366.
- De Rond, M., & Miller, A. N. (2005). Publish or perish: Bane or boon of academic life? *Journal of Management Inquiry, 14*, 321–329.
- Miller, H. (1995). *The management of change in universities: Universities, state and economy in Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom*. Buckingham: Open University Press.