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Background

1984 is the title of George Orwell’s famous novel. It was also the year APAQ was born. Impact is competitive! So in this paper I will share my recollections of how APAQ was formulated during the months preceding the publication of its volume 1, issue 1. I am grateful for the invitation, and I hope readers will understand that little of this information is documented.

Remember, in the U.S. Congress a representative or senator might request a moment of “personal privilege.” That is my request.

Although I shall focus on events prior to the publication of APAQ’s first issue, there are places where I have added a little extra information to help those readers who may not be familiar with events that took place so long ago.

APAQ is 33 years old, but over a period of at least 45 years there have been many substantial changes in the development of our field of study into what I will for convenience call our “subdiscipline.” Of particular importance for the development of this paper are changes involving the adapted physical activity (APA) graduate research training of future faculty, as well as the competence and performance of extant faculty, as I will explain.

Although the first issue of APAQ was published in January 1984, an APA journal, possibly having a different name, was nearly published some years earlier. In April 1980, as a professor at Louisiana State University (LSU), I attended the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, in Philadelphia, PA. It was there that I met the acquisitions editor for Aspen Systems Corporation (ASC), a large Dutch publishing company, which was strong in the health-related fields, and expanding its special education portfolio. Having expressed the desire for APA to have a specialist journal, which it did not at the time, I was invited to submit a proposal. That proposal entered the evaluation process applicable to their journals and was favorably reviewed. After only a couple of months, I was informed that it had entered the final round of evaluation.

Although I did not know it at the time, the acquisitions editor had been diagnosed with a terminal condition. He quickly became very ill and died. Later I received a phone call from ASC, indicating that in-process material would not be
continued. Thus, there would be no APA journal, and I filed and forgot about my proposal, for I had plenty to do at LSU!

Then, at the conclusion of the Annual Conference of the North American Society for the Psychology of Sport and Physical Activity, held at the University of Maryland, College Park, MD, in May 1982, I stood on the hotel sidewalk, awaiting airport transportation, talking to Rainer Martens, founder and, at the time, owner of Human Kinetics (HK). He asked me whether I had thought about developing a journal. I hope he didn’t think I was rude, for I remember laughing, probably feeling shocked that my filed proposal might see the light of day again. I recounted the existence of the proposal and its history. “Do you still have it? And would you be interested in sending it to me?” Rainer asked me. I sent it less than a week later. In retrospect, I wish I had kept that document so that I could see how or whether my ideas have evolved.

It is appropriate and timely for me, on behalf of our APAQ family, to thank Rainer Martens and his HK colleagues for their strong and enduring support. In particular, Peg Goyette was so much fun to work with. Over the years Rainer has directed HK from initially publishing conference proceedings to becoming the world’s largest producer of physical activity and health-related books and materials. Rainer clearly had great confidence in our field of study, believing that APA persons would support the journal, help develop our knowledge base, and contribute to APAQ’s success. He set for APAQ the same rigorous standards as for other journals in the HKP fold. So we are eternally grateful for that. Rainer and HK, please continue your support!

I do not remember all the stages HK used in its evaluation process, but there was a continuing interest. Eventually, after I had clarified certain parts of the proposal, such as providing more detail about the intended audience and naming and evaluating the most likely competing journals, it was sent out for professional and academic review.

Experts in the field were asked two questions. First they were asked for their reactions to the proposal for a specialist journal. Specifically, HK wanted to know whether the field of study was thought to be sufficiently developed to warrant a scholarly journal. Second, they were asked who should be considered for the editor position.

Actually, when I learned about the second question, I was shocked and dismayed. Looking back, I must have taken it for granted that my proposal, if accepted, would result in my appointment. But that was naïveté writ large.

After a while I was indeed appointed editor. The time from proposal submission to my appointment as editor was very short. The target publication date for volume 1, issue 1, January 1984, was about a year away. Phew!

**The Preparation Year**

**Support From Universities**

As I try to recollect exactly all that had to be accomplished during that year, my mind blurs. I recall finding it nearly impossible to fit my new responsibilities into my existing full-time faculty position at LSU. I had neither an allotment of time for this new position nor personnel nor financial help. However, tasks that had to be done had to be done! (But there was no buyer’s remorse.)