2005, Vol.11, No. 1, pp. 15 - 26

Early Efforts to Professionalize Leisure Services in Canada

Susan Markham-Starr
Acadia University

The earliest recorded efforts to create a group representing recreation and parks practitioners in Canada occurred in 1913 at the annual meeting of the National Council of Women of Canada (NCW). The convenor of the NCW's Committee on Vacation Schools and Supervised Playgrounds reported that there was very high support for the "advisability of forming a National Canadian Playground Association" (NCW, 1913, p. 44) and that petitions had been sent to "several Provincial Legislatures requesting the establishment of departments in Normal Schools for the training of playground teachers and supervisors to meet distinctive Canadian needs" (NCW, 1913, p. 45). Thus began the professionalization of leisure services in Canada.

Using models of professionalization by Sessoms (1991) and Burton (1982), this paper explores the efforts of various groups in Canada between 1913 and 1950 to build a profession in which there would be both education of the members and advocacy to promote the importance of the field. The groups included the National Council of Women of Canada, Canadian Council on Child Welfare, the Canadian Physical Education Association, and the Parks and Recreation Association of Canada. Moving forward to today, the paper then asks a number of questions about the ongoing contemporary discussion about professionalization of leisure services.

Les plus anciens efforts structurés pour établir un groupe représentant les travailleurs canadiens des parcs et loisirs remontent à 1913, lors de la réunion annuelle du Conseil national des femmes du Canada (CFC). L'organisateur du comité du CFC sur les écoles récréatives et terrains de jeux supervisés faisait état d'un appui important en faveur de la création de la National Canadian Playground Association (CFC, 1913, p. 44), précisant que des pétitions avaient été envoyées à plusieurs législatures provinciales réclamant la création de départements, au sein des écoles normales, pour former des enseignants et des superviseurs de terrain de jeu, de façon à répondre aux besoins particuliers de la population canadienne (CFC, 1913, p. 45). C'est ainsi que s'engageait le processus de professionnalisation des services de loisirs au Canada.

Misant sur les modèles de professionnalisation définis par Sessoms (1991) et Burton (1982), ce document examine les efforts déployés par divers groupes canadiens entre 1913 et 1950 pour mettre sur pied une profession vouée à la formation de ses membres et à la promotion du domaine. Divers groupes étaient engagés dans ce projet, y compris le Conseil national des femmes du Canada, le Conseil canadien pour la sauvegarde de l'enfance, l'Association canadienne pour l'éducation physique et l'Association des parcs

et de la récréation du Canada. Les auteurs en viennent à parler du temps présent, des enjeux contemporains et des discussions actuelles entourant la professionnalisation des services de loisirs.

Background and Models

The earliest recorded efforts to professionalize leisure services in Canada occurred in 1912 and 1913 at the annual meetings of the National Council of Women when proposals for both the training of playground teachers and supervisors, and the development of a national association were discussed. But what resulted from these bold ideas? Burton's (1982) and Sessoms' (1991) models of professionalization provide a foundation to enable us to review the efforts of several groups in Canada in the first half of the 20th century to build a profession wherein there would be both education of the members and advocacy to promote the importance of the field. There is a substantial body of literature regarding professionalization, most of which focuses on the United States. The Canadian focussed body of literature is substantially smaller, but addresses the Canadian reality wherein we discuss professionalization but have made few moves toward that state (Burton, 1982, 1991; McGill & Hutchison, 1991; Nogradi, 1994; Searle, 1986).

There are various lists of criteria or indicators for professionalization, but it is useful to step back and look the larger picture of professions. Burton (1982) provided that larger picture through his useful typology of three types of professions wherein he identified and defined:

- *de jure* professions which are legally recognized through legislation (e.g., medicine and engineering);
- *de facto* professions which, while not entrenched through legislation, do have a process which regulates entry into the field, (e.g., planning through the Canadian Institute of Planners); and lastly,
- *conventionally labelled* professions wherein the member (the professional) "exhibits the character, spirit and methods of a person engaged in a profession, even though, formally, he or she may not belong to an organized and established profession" (p. 2).

The basis of Burton's (1982) typology is that legally recognized professions have the following identifiable characteristics: "a common higher education requirement, a mandatory period of specialized training, restrictions on entry, a written code of ethics, and self administered, formal disciplinary procedures" (p. 2). Based on these characteristics, Burton asserted over two decades ago that "leisure services is clearly *not* a profession" (p. 2) - or at least, not a de jure profession.

Sessoms' (1991) discussion of the certification of parks/recreation/leisure service professionals noted the essential ingredients involved in creating a profession.[i] He asserted that:

> For an occupation to become a profession, several things must happen.
>
> There must be recognition by the public of its importance to the welfare of the public: a social mandate.
>
> There must be acceptance by both those who practice and those who receive the service that the practitioner needs specialized knowledge and training in order to perform the service correctly.
>
> There must be the formulation of professional organizations which assume responsibility for the control and destiny of the profession.
>
> There must be a body of knowledge and programs of formal preparation to impart that knowledge to those who wish to practice. (p. 21)

Thus, irrespective of a profession's status as de jure, de facto, or conventionally labelled, the common factors are that:

- it should be recognized as socially relevant, both formally through legislation, and informally through a social mandate;

- its members should have formal training in a specialized field, with defined education and experience requirements; and,
- it should be controlled by a formal organization with responsibilities both to its members and to the recipients of the service.

So, if we accept these common factors, what were the early efforts of those involved in leisure services to build a base of social relevance, to train, to control, and to move toward a legislated structure? This paper will review the contributions of four national organizations - the National Council of Women, the Canadian Council on Child Welfare, the Canadian Physical Education Association, and the Parks and Recreation Association of Canada - up to 1950 and assess their role in professionalizing leisure services in Canada.

The Early Efforts

Leisure services in Canada have a lengthy history. The Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) opened its doors in Montreal in 1851 (Ross, 1951). The first public municipal parks were established several decades before Confederation in 1867 (McFarland, 1970). The first supervised public playgrounds were established as early as 1898 (McFarland, 1970). But, it was a resolution at the 1901 meeting National Council of Women of Canada that sparked the first national efforts to deliver leisure services - in the language of that era, "vacation schools and supervised playgrounds."

National Council of Women of Canada

In 1901, The National Council of Women (NCW) responded to the following resolution from the Saint John Council of Women:

> whereas the agitation for Vacation Schools and Playgrounds where children may find organized recreation having become so wide-spread that it is now known as the Playground Movement, and whereas the establishment of such Vacation Schools and Playgrounds is acknowledged by educators and philanthropists to be desired in every community, and whereas the necessity for such schools and playgrounds to improve the condition of children in the cities of Canada is obvious, therefore be it resolved that this National Council of Women of Canada declare themselves in favour of the establishment of Vacation Schools and Playgrounds, and pledge themselves to do all in their power to promote their organization. (NCW, 1901, p. 152)

The phrase "to do all in their power to promote their organization" (NCW, 1901, p. 152) is one key to understanding the Council of Women's approach. They promoted playgrounds - they did not want to run them. They promoted training - they did not do it themselves. They preferred to be an advocate for playgrounds, a catalyst for their establishment, and an arms-length supporter of playgrounds.

In many towns and cities across Canada, the local Council of Women formed a playgrounds committee that would raise funds for and awareness of supervised playgrounds. The women did not work on the playgrounds themselves, rather they hired staff - often local female school teachers. Veronica Strong-Boag's 1976 dissertation about the National Council of Women, *The Parliament of Women*, put this into a feminist perspective when she noted that:

> The National Council was instrumental in establishing influential social institutions in the vacation school and the public playground. Both entailed further feminine supervision of the nation's development and represented new forums for the propagandizing of middle class values. They also provided new opportunities for paid feminine employment. (1976, p. 270)

But, paid employment often requires training, and it was to this end that, in 1912, the National Council advocated that the provincial Normal School (teacher training) departments develop courses to train playground teachers and supervisors. That year,

Mabel Peters, the convenor of the NCW's Committee on Vacation Schools and Supervised Playgrounds noted that:

> It is the earnest hope of your Convenor that the members of this National Council will sanction petitions to the several Provincial Legislatures for the establishment of departments in the Normal Schools for the training of playground teachers and supervisors to meet Canadian needs in the world-wide playground movement. (NCW, 1912, p. 48)

The National Council carried out Miss Peters' recommendation, petitioned the provinces and received several responses indicating varying degrees of support for the concept of training. A typical response was the one from the Province of Nova Scotia's Superintendent of Education wherein he agreed that such training should be provided, but gave no real commitment to it, and noted that:

> As the demand should increase in the future I have very much pleasure in bringing your communication together with my own views, to the attention of the Principal of the Normal College; in order to discover what we may be reasonably able to do under present conditions. (Letter from the Superintendent of Education to Mrs. Cummings, December 23, 1912 in NCW records at National Archives of Canada (NAC) MG28 .I25 Vol 68 File 2)

Manitoba, British Columbia, Ontario, and New Brunswick also responded with similar platitudes of support, but no evidence of action (see NCW records at NAC MG28 .I25 Vol 68 File 2). After many months of delay and, in their words, "careful consideration of the Resolution," Saskatchewan educators came to a conclusion which is familiar to many Canadian policy makers sorting out issues of federal-provincial jurisdictions - they

> were of the opinion that the question is a national rather than a provincial one and that present conditions in our new Province would hardly justify an expenditure such as would have to be incurred in case provision were made for a complete course of training in our Normal Schools. (Letter from the Superintendent of Education to Mrs. Cummings, August 17, 1914 in NCW records at NAC MG28 .I25 Vol 68 File 2,)

So, 13 years after the playground advocacy began in Canada, there were no firm commitments to engage in training.

Undaunted by the lack of training commitments from governments, one year later, that same Council of Women Convenor, Mabel Peters, reported that there was strong support for the "advisability of forming a National Canadian Playground Association" (NCW, 1913, p. 44). However, even though there may have been strong support for the idea, when Mabel Peters died in 1914, the idea of a National Canadian Playgrounds Association died with her - at least for a decade. Thus began the slow process of professionalizing leisure services in Canada with discussions about two of the essential ingredients, training and a formal organization. But, planting the idea of training and an organization certainly did not lead to immediate implementation of the idea.

Canadian Council on Child Welfare and its successors[ii]

Over a decade later, in 1925, the Recreation Division of the Canadian Council on Child Welfare (CCCW) recommended that "an organization be established . . to function in Canada in a manner similar to the Playground and Recreation Association of America in the United States" (Gettys, 1925, p. 50). The Playground and Recreation Association of America (PRAA) was the model of the time for education and advocacy[iii]. This was the beginning of what would become a ten year quest by the Council to position itself as the leader in professionalizing leisure services in Canada. The recommendation suggested that this organization have rather wide ranging duties and partnerships as follows:

> Such an organization should have power to raise funds, employ a staff, maintain headquarters, publish and distribute reports and other literature, provide field service, serve as a clearing centre, and assist in the promotion of recreation programs in all provinces and communities where called upon to do so. Such an organization should co-operate with all national and provincial

> organizations now in existence, such as the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada, physical education groups and so on. (Gettys, 1925, p. 50)

The early years of the Council's quest to position itself included much glorious rhetoric such as that noted above, some discussion, but little action as the leadership work in the 1920s was limited to presentations at the Council's national conferences, augmented by the preparation of a suggested national program for recreation by Dr. W. E. Gettys of McGill University[iv] and its 1928 publication in a pamphlet for national distribution (noted in letter from C. Whitton to W. E. Gettys, June 29, 1928 in CCCW records in NAC, MG28 I10, Vol 8, File 42). Little is known about the distribution strategy of that pamphlet, but one avenue of distribution was to (and through) student teachers in the Nova Scotia Rural Education program in hopes that they would "help to spread the gospel of 'a wise use of leisure'" (letter from D. Baker to C. Whitton, March 16, 1929 in CCCW records at NAC, MG28 I10, Vol 8, File 42). The Nova Scotia Department of Education apparently ordered 200 copies for distribution (letter from C. Whitton to W. E. Gettys, April 10, 1929 in CCCW records at NAC, MG28 I10, Vol 8, File 42). Thus, we finally have evidence that the role that the National Council of Women had wanted the Normal Schools to take on 15 years earlier was possibly moving forward.[v]

As Charlotte Whitton took on the position of Executive Director of the Council on Child Welfare, the quest for professionalization became more proactive. In 1929, she began to implement plans for a national organization through contact with the New York based Playgrounds and Recreation Association of America (PRAA). Her contact with the PRAA started with her attempts to organize a meeting between herself, William Bowie who was the head of the Council's Recreation Division, and the PRAA's field worker for the northeastern United States, Mr. A. R. Wellington. Her goal was not only to develop a national organization, but also to hire staff. The correspondence over next three years between 1929 and 1932 included several references to hiring "an excellent young chap," "a good young chap, with energy and promise," and "some young chap who knows something of the work" - not a young woman, like herself, but a young man (letters from C. Whitton to A. R. Wellington and W. Bowie, May 11, 1929, March 27, 1931, December 8, 1932 in CCCW and CCCFW records at NAC, MG28 I10, Vol 8, File 42). Regrettably, the meeting to get assistance in forming a national organization did not take place due to the inability of all parties to coordinate their schedules. As well the hiring of a staff person did not occur until 1933 when a young man, Eric Muncaster, was hired (memo from C. Whitton to members of the Governing Board, October 12, 1933 in CCCW reocrds at NAC, MG28, I10, Vol. 8, File 42).

Miss Whitton's bid to communicate with the PRAA (soon renamed the National Recreation Association [NRA] and now part of the National Recreation and Parks Association [NRPA]) was carried out in isolation from many of the recreation workers in Canada. While she was trying to arrange a meeting with Association staff, many Canadians were already actively involved with the Association. They were members of the Association, were honorary members and honorary directors, and were working successfully to organize the first and only National Recreation Association or National Recreation and Parks Association congress held outside the United States (NRA files at NRPA and the Social Welfare History Archives [SWHA]).

That 1931 conference was viewed by some of the Canadian organizers as part of the effort to professionalize recreation services. Credit for this effort was taken several years later by one of its organisers, J. J. Syme of Hamilton, as he recounted, somewhat bitterly, in the *Bulletin* of the Canadian Physical Education Association, that

> the...Annual Congress of the National Recreation Association was held in Toronto in 1931, after no small effort on my part to bring it to Canada. One of the purposes of this move was to arouse interest in the recreation movement and in the formation of a Canadian Association. Why was it not developed? (Syme, 1938, p. 5)

The National Recreation Association continued to act, although at an arms-length relationship, as the organization that provided services such as publications and field work staff, to Canadian communities. One example of the NRA providing consulting work to Canadian communities occurred in 1929 when the City of Hamilton, Ontario used the Association's Mr. Wellington to do an "analysis" and provide "constructive criticism" of the City's parks and recreation system (letter from A.R. Wellington to C. Peebles, August 26, 1929, in NRA records at SWHA, NRA Series 16, Box 121). This situation of having an external organization providing services to Canadian cities was viewed by the (now renamed) Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare (CCCFW) as being irritating and frustrating, as noted by Miss Whitton when she wanted to find ways and means of financing a national organization and not, in her words, "be left to exist on the incidental services of United States organizations. We must find some ways and means to finance National Canadian services for them" (letter from C. Whitton to W. Bowie, March 28, 1932 in CCCFW records at NAC, MG28, I10, Vol 8, File 42). Such a way of financing an organization and national services did not come for another decade, after the end of World War II.

The Council, through its Leisure Time Activities Division (formerly the Recreation Division), continued to toil through the early years of the Depression as an advocate for recreation and leisure services. Its highest priorities were advocating for recreation services for the unemployed and for men in the Relief Camps (Markham, 1994). However, the idea of some form of national coordination did not die - the Council under its new name, the Canadian Welfare Council (CWC) sponsored a Round Table Conference on Leisure Time Activities in Toronto on September 27, 1935 with 32 national organizations invited (see the unconfirmed minutes in CWC records at NAC, MG28, I10, Vol 164, File 10-5-2/2 Vol I). Twenty-two of the organizations were present at the round table as the delegates attempted to come to grips with the interrelated problems of rising unemployment, increasing free time, and reduced funds for services. The Council offered to fund a secretary, but eight months later had to report that they were unable "to locate exactly the person whom we would like to appoint" (letter from W. Bowie to the members of the round table conference, May 1936, in CWC records at NAC, MG28, I10, Vol 164, File 10-5-2/2 Vol I). In the intervening eight months, one of the Division volunteers prepared a lengthy report on the state of *Recreation and Leisure Time Services in Canada* which ended with yet another call for professional staff to work on education programs, give "leadership in national joint planning by voluntary recreation agencies," and "making social surveys" (Canadian Welfare Council, 1936, p. 47) Using rhetoric that continues to be familiar to recreation and leisure professionals who attempt to co-ordinate services and form partnerships, the report expected that the Council would now be able to "hammer home in one town after another the contribution made to human welfare by proper leisure-time activities, utilizing existing agencies and services." Ever the optimist, the report's author ended by saying "one feels like closing with the pious hope that not only these prospects but also other much needed improvements may materialize in the years immediately ahead" (Canadian Welfare Council, 1936, p. 47). Improvements came, but not led by the Canadian Welfare Council.

In the meantime, as Canada struggled through the depths of the Great Depression, two new organizations emerged to champion the cause of leisure services. In 1933 the Canadian Physical Education Association (CPEA) was formed under the leadership of Dr. Arthur S. Lamb of McGill University (Gurney, 1983). Three years later, in 1936, the Ontario Parks Association (OPA) was formed to represent the interests of the parks men of Ontario, under the leadership of A.T. Whitaker of Brantford Ontario, a commissioner of the Niagara Parks Commission (Drysdale, 1970).[vi]

Canadian Physical Education Association

While both the title and the early membership of the Canadian Physical Education Association suggest a narrow focus on physical education and physical activity, the actual operation of the Association embraced a much broader clientele. Examples of this

can be seen in the conference programs from 1937 and 1939. In 1937 J. J. Syme, Superintendent of the Playgrounds Commission of Hamilton, Ontario chaired a session of the Playground and Parks Section titled "The Why? The What? and The How? of Public Recreation" with agenda item 5 being "Professional organization" with discussion of

a. Should there be a Provincial or Dominion organization of recreation workers?
b. Should such an organization be affiliated with another organization? Or should it be entirely separate?
c. Annual dues and the amount? (1937 conference program in CPEA records at NAC, MG28 I153, Vol 3, File X-25-3-1937)

Syme later reported that "the opinion expressed at that time was unanimously in favour of forming such an organization" (1938, p. 5). Flushed with the illusion that his idea was a success, Syme had written an article in the CPEA's *Bulletin* headed "Playground Leaders Consider National Organization" (1937). In that article he reported on the meeting at the conference and asked CPEA members to "give the matter of playground organization [their] earnest attention" (p. 5). Alas, a year later, he had to report that

> the response was anything but encouraging, giving such reasons as geographical distance; lack of organization; lack of interest locally; work being carried out by volunteer staff and contributions, etc., and in some cases, no response. In view of this, the matter was shelved for the time being. (Syme, 1938, p. 5).

He neglected to realize and mention that the effects of the Depression, including unemployment, were probably much higher priorities than creating a national organization. Various federal government programs of the time such as the Unemployment and Agricultural Assistance Act were attempting to alleviate the impacts of the Depression through leisure, but were not working on a national organization per se (McFarland, 1970).

In 1939 at the CPEA conference, the playground directors met to discuss "Recreation on Supervised Playgrounds" with no apparent discussion of a professional organization (1939 conference program in CPEA records at NAC, MG28 I153, Vol 4, File X-25-4-1939). The CPEA played a substantial role in early efforts to professionalize leisure services, however, its role in that regard took a lower priority than its work related to physical education and physical fitness of men going into the military - that latter topic being a personal issue of Dr. A. S. Lamb, the CPEA's first president. Dr. Lamb waged a tenacious four year campaign at the beginning of World War II to try to convince the Department of Defence that physical education and physical fitness should be a top priority of the military, and that he could be of use to the military (summary of Ottawa correspondence in Arthur Lamb's records at McGill University Archives (MUA), RG 30, File 185). The results of his work may be seen in the 1943 passing of the National Physical Fitness act, which had the title "National War Fitness Act" in a 1942 draft (memo to the Minister of Pensions and National Health, April 30, 1942 in the departmental files at NAC, RG 29, Vol. 822, File 210-8-1, Pt. 1). The national priority at the time was physical fitness and training its leaders in wartime, rather than community oriented training.

Parks and Recreation Association of Canada

The first significant post World War II activity in professionalizing leisure services was the creation of the Parks and Recreation Association of Canada (PRAC), the forerunner of today's Canadian Parks and Recreation Association (CPRA).[vii] The Ontario Parks Association (OPA) had been formed in 1936 to represent the interests of the parks men of Ontario - but it was time for a change. The rationale for the change in name and mandate was to reflect the reality of both the OPA's membership (broader than just Ontario) and its concerns (more than just parks), as noted in a notice of motion at the 1944 meeting:

> That the Ontario Parks Association extend its objectives and change its name . . . enlarging its objectives to take in all forms of recreation utilizing public parks and playgrounds and buildings and inviting all recreational bodies, including Boards of Education in Canada, to become members on the same basis and at the same fee as already in effect, on a proportional population basis as is in effect for park bodies. ("Notice of Motion," 1944, p.24)

The resulting organization became one of the leaders in attempting to professionalize leisure services in Canada. PRAC's 1947 Charter stated that it was charged with the "dominion-wide stimulation of recreation, the dominion-wide extension of parks including municipal, provincial and national parks and recreation activities" (Letters Patent of the Parks and Recreation Association of Canada, February 8, 1947). Presumably, the stimulation of recreation included the professionalization of recreation and leisure services. In its early years from 1945 to 1951, PRAC suffered the growing pains associated with many organizations as it tried to establish a national membership base, smooth internal differences, and jockey for the national leadership role in matters related to recreation. The 50th anniversary history of the Association concludes:

> What did parks and recreation leaders have after seven years of discussion? They had an association that promised to serve Canada. They had a membership that was still central Canadian based, but which was attempting to become broader. They had an association that was part of national level discussions, but was not the representative of recreation and parks interests in Canada. They had an association whose executive included practitioners and lay people working in recreation and parks. They had the beginning. (Markham, 1995, p. 14)

But.....Was There Professionalization?

If professionalization requires that a field be recognized as socially relevant, with members having formal training in a specialized field, and being controlled by a formal organization with legislated responsibilities both to its members and to the recipients of the service, it can be concluded that leisure services were partly professionalized in the early years. The four organizations whose early efforts are described above all contributed to the process of professionalization. By applying Sessoms' (1991) and Burton's (1982) criteria it can be seen that the social relevance criterion was present as leisure had been accepted as a key to the quality of life. Formal training was in its embryonic state. Control by an organization was minimal. Legislation was nonexistent. These are the roots upon which the current field is based. There are, of course, discussions about the degree to which present day practitioners have achieved professional status (Burton, 1982); applications of the ideas of professionalization to the creation of curricula (Burton, 1991); and contributions to the debates regarding the relevance of professionalization (McGill & Hutchison, 1991; Nogradi, 1994; Searle, 1986; Sessoms, 1991). However, an understanding our past and of the early efforts to professionalize is essential to the discussion, to the debate, and to our future.

So What?

To this point, this paper has reviewed the early efforts to professionalize leisure services in Canada. But, in the words of one Avante reviewer "OK...so given all of this, where do we go from here...and why might this direction be more effective than the marginal past efforts documented?" The answers to those questions can begin in many places, but CAHPERD, CUPR, CPRA, CALS and CCUPEKA are good starting points - five organizations - all starting with "C". What are they? Who are they? Why are they relevant? Avante readers may be familiar with one or more of them.

- CAHPERD is the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. CAHPERD describes itself as "a national, charitable,

voluntary-sector organization whose primary concern is to influence the healthy development of children and youth by advocating for quality, school-based physical and health education" (*Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*).

- CUPR is the Council of University Professors and Researchers - an affiliated council of CAHPERD. CUPR aspires to be "a voice for the university professors in Canada in the fields of physical education and health education, fitness, sport, recreation and active living" (*Council of University Professors and Researchers*).
- CPRA is the Canadian Parks and Recreation Association. CPRA "exists to build healthy communities and enhance the quality of life and environments for all Canadians through collaboration with our members and partners" (*Canadian Parks and Recreation Association*).
- CALS is the Canadian Association for Leisure Studies. CALS is "an organization of Canadian and international scholars and practitioners who share an interest in recreation and leisure research and the delivery of leisure services" (*Canadian Association for Leisure Studies).*
- CCUPEKA is the Canadian Council for University Physical Education and Kinesiology Administrators. Among CCUPEKA's objectives is that it will provide "a common forum for the Executive officers (Deans and Directors) of academic programmes in Canadian post-secondary institutions that offer provincially accredited bachelor degrees, in the general area of physical activity studies" (*Canadian Council for University Physical Education and Kinesiology Administrators*). Several of the academic units represented by CCUPEKA include recreation/leisure studies curricula.

The first answer to the reviewer's question "where do we go from here...and why might this direction be more effective than the marginal past efforts documented?" might be that we have even further fragmented the professionalizing leisure services picture. Two of the early key organizations, the National Council of Women and the Canadian Council on Child Welfare (now the Canadian Council on Social Development), now direct their primary attention to matters other that recreation/leisure services. The Canadian Physical Education Association has morphed into CAHPERD and added CUPR. Recreation is still in CAHPERD's title, but is it in the organizations's mandate? CUPR appears to focus on physical education with little mention of recreation. The Parks and Recreation Association of Canada has evolved into CPRA and focuses primarily on the delivery of recreation services in communities. CALS has emerged to provide a forum for leisure researchers to communicate. CCUPEKA, whose members often have responsibilities for recreation/leisure studies curricula, has recently embarked upon a process of accrediting physical education and kinesiology programs. Will recreation/leisure studies programs be next? Should recreation/leisure studies programs be next? Should there be a debate? Does anyone care?

Where does *AVANTE* fit in? *AVANTE* says that it is "CAHPERD's bilingual research periodical, designed to stimulate and communicate Canadian research and critical thought on issues pertaining to the fields of health, physical activity, sport, physical education, recreation, leisure, dance and active living" (*AVANTE*). However, a review of the articles published in the past ten years shows that few recreation/leisure researchers are using *AVANTE* as a forum for communicating their research. Where do the Canadian leisure researchers publish Canadian research? They publish in many journals not limited to Canadian ones and certainly not limited to leisure journals. One of those journals is *Leisure/Loisir* which is produced by CALS, in partnership with the Ontario Research Council on Leisure. Also on the Canadian scene for over 58 years CPRA and its predecessors published a periodical devoted to practitioners' issues. However in 2003 *Parks and Recreation Canada* was, in the words of CPRA, "put on the shelf" (*CPRA Puts,* 2004). Should part of being a profession include having a professional publication?

If so, what is that publication in Canada? Could *AVANTE* be that publication? Should *AVANTE* be that publication?

So what? If professionalization requires that a field be recognized as socially relevant, with members having formal training in a specialized field, and being controlled by a formal organization with legislated responsibilities both to its members and to the recipients of the service, where do we go from here? Applying Sessoms' (1991) and Burton's (1982) criteria to the present day situation yields a mix of results. Scholars and practitioners frequently and eloquently make the case that recreation and leisure are socially relevant; and politicians mouth the platitudes of support. But sceptics (or realists) continue to await the committed, ongoing budgetary support for public programs. Formal training is well past its embryonic state. It is extensive and is supported by sophisticated scholarly activity. Control by any organization is minimal. Is this model of control by an organization relevant to the Canadian situation? Is it needed? Would it be accepted? What organization could pick up this challenge? Legislation continues to be nonexistent. Do we need it? Who could develop it? The reviewer's question has yielded more questions than answers.

References

AVANTE. Retrieved on June 9, 2004 from http://www.cahperd.ca/e/avante/index.htm

Burton, T. L. (1982). *Three views of the leisure professional: Two caricatures and an analysis.* Presentation at the Philip Institute of Technology, Melbourne, Australia.

Burton, T.L.(1991). A model curriculum for a baccalaureate degree in recreation and leisure studies. *Schole 6*, 80-93.

Canada. Department of Health. Records in RG29, National Archives of Canada (NAC) Ottawa, ON.

Canada. National Parks Bureau. Records in RG84, National Archives of Canada (NAC) Ottawa, ON.

Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. Retrieved June 9, 2004 from http://www.cahperd.ca/e/cahperd/index.htm

Canadian Association for Leisure Studies. Retrieved June 9, 2004 from http://www.eas.ualberta.ca/elj/cals/home.htm

Canadian Council of University Physical Education and Kinesiology Administrators. Retrieved on June 9, 2004 from http://www.ccupeka.ca/

Canadian Council on Child Welfare. Records in MG28 I10, National Archives of Canada (NAC) Ottawa, ON.

Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare. Records in MG28 I10, National Archives of Canada (NAC) Ottawa, ON.

Canadian Welfare Council. Records in MG28 I10, National Archives of Canada (NAC) Ottawa, ON.

Canadian Welfare Council.(1936). *Recreation and Leisure Services in Canada.* Unpublished report in the CWC records in NAC MG28 I10, Vol 164, File 10-5-2/2 Vol I

Canadian Parks and Recreation Association. Retrieved June 9, 2004 from http://www.cpra.ca/

Canadian Physical Education Association. Records in MG28 I153, National Archives of Canada (NAC) Ottawa, ON.

Council of University Professors and Researchers. Retrieved on June 9, 2004 from http://www.educ.uvic.ca/Faculty/thopper/Cupr/

CPRA Temporarily Puts Parks and Recreation Canada Magazine "On The Shelf." (n.d.). Retrieved June 9, 2004 from http://www.cpra.ca/cpra-new/Publications/Publications.htm

Dickason, J. (1979). *The development of the playground movement in the United States.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York.

Drysdale, A. C. (1970). Twenty-five years of unity-Canadian Parks/Recreation Association. *Recreation Canada, 28* (4), 18-37.

Gettys, W. E. (1925). Progress 1920-25 and recommendations 1925-30 in education and recreation. *Proceedings and papers - Fifth annual Canadian Conference on Child Welfare*, 46-53.

Gurney, H. (1983). *The CAHPER Story 1933-1983.* Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

Henkel, D. (1985). Professionalization: The saga continues. *Parks and Recreation, 20*(8), 50-54, 69.

Helmes-Hayes, R. C. (1994). Canadian Sociology's first textbook: C. A. Dawson and W. E. Gettys's *An introduction to sociology. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 19*(4), 461-497.

Jones, D. B. (1989). *Playground Association of America: A thwarted attempt at professionalization of play leaders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.

Knapp, R. F. & C. E. Hartsoe (1979). *Play for America: The National Recreation and Parks Association, 1906-1965.* Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Parks Association.

Markham, S. E. (1994). Advocates for national recreation services in the 1930's Well-being? Work? War?." in F. I. Bell and G. H. Van Gyn (Ed.) *Access to active living: Proceedings of 10th Commonwealth and International Scientific Congress (*pp. 87-92). Victoria, BC: University of Victoria.

Markham, S. E. (1995). The early years -1944 to 1951. *Recreation Canada, 53*(3), 6-16.

McFarland, E. M. (1970). *The development of public recreation in Canada.* Ottawa, ON: Canadian Parks/Recreation Association.

McGill, J. & Hutchison, P. (1991). The pitfalls of increased professionalism in the field of leisure *Recreation Canada, 48*(3), 25-30.

McGill University, Faculty of Education. Records in RG30, McGill University Archives (MUA) Montreal, QC.

National Council of Women. Records in MG28 I25, National Archives of Canada (NAC) Ottawa, ON.

National Council of Women of Canada. (1901) *The Yearbook of the National Council of Women of Canada*. Toronto: National Council of Women of Canada.

National Council of Women of Canada. (1912) *The Yearbook of the National Council of Women of Canada*. Toronto: National Council of Women of Canada.

National Council of Women of Canada. (1913) *The Yearbook of the National Council of Women of Canada*. Toronto: National Council of Women of Canada.

National Recreation Association. Records in National Recreation Association Collection of the National Recreation and Parks Association Archives (NRPA), Arlington, VA.

National Recreation Association. Records in National Recreation Association Collection of the Social Welfare History Archives (SWHA), University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Nogradi, G. (1994).The importance and impact of certification for parks and recreation practitioners in Ontario. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 19(1), 23-40.

Notice of Motion.(1944, mid July) *Ontario Parks Association Bulletin,* 24 (in NAC, RG84, Vol 171, File U125-17 Pt. 1)

Ross, M. G. (1951). *The Y.M.C.A. in Canada: The chronicle of a century.* Toronto: Ryerson Press.

Searle, M. (1986). Accreditation of recreation and park curricula in Canada: Should it be happening now? *Recreation Canada, 44*(4), 30-33.

Sessoms, H. D. (1991). Certifying park and recreation: The American experience. *Recreation Canada, 48*(3), 21-23.

Strong-Boag, V. J. (1976). *The parliament of women of Canada 1893-1929.* (Vol. 18 NationalMuseum of Man Mercury Series) Ottawa, ON: National Museums of Canada.

Syme, J. J. (1937, May). Playground leaders consider national organization. *Canadian Physical Education Association Bulletin, 4*, 5.

Syme, J. J. (1938, October). Reply accepts criticism: Some suggests another method of getting recreation in Canada together. *Canadian Physical Education Association Bulletin, 6*, 5.

University of Texas. (2001). *In memoriam - Warner Ensign Gettys*. Retrieved July 8, 2003 from http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/2000-2001/memorials/SCANNED/gettys.pdf.

Endnotes

[i].Sessoms' list includes variations on lists that were also noted previously by Henkel (1985) and Searle (1986): "a defined body of knowledge; formal academic preparation prior to practice; standards of practice that are restrictive and require continuation of education; professional organization; code of ethics; public acceptance" (Searle, 1986, p. 30 citing Henkel, 1985, p. 50).

[ii].The Canadian Council on Child Welfare (CCCW) changed its name twice during the 1925-1936 period. In 1932 it became the Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare (CCCFW). In 1935 it became the Canadian Welfare Council (CWC). It is now called the Canadian Council on Social Development.

[iii].The history of the work of the Playgrounds Association of America and its successors, the Playgrounds and Recreation Association of America, the National Recreation Association and the National Recreation and Parks Association is well documented and analyzed in Dickason (1979), Knapp and Hartsoe (1979), and Jones (1989).

[iv].Dr. Warner Ensign Gettys was a U.S. born and trained sociologist who taught at McGill University from 1924 to 1926 and then moved to the University of Texas where he worked until his retirement in 1958. He was the coauthor of Canada's first sociology textbook (Helmes-Hayes, 1994, p. 465; University of Texas, 2001).

[v].The distribution and impact of these pamphlets is the topic of an ongoing research project.

[vi].Unfortunately, all of the early work of the Ontario Parks Association has been lost to us as the early records were destroyed. However, rather complete records of the founding and early work of the Canadian Physical Education Association (CPEA) exist in several sources such as the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation collection at the National Archives of Canada (NAC) and Arthur Lamb's documents in the McGill University Archives (MUA).

[vii].While there are no records of the early years of the Ontario Parks Association available, the transformation of the eight year old OPA into PRAC has been well documented by Drysdale (1970) and Markham (1995).