

## **Ah, Spring!**

William Purkey has referred to that period of time between the Christmas holidays and the arrival of spring as the “long death march of bleak and weary days.” With the possible exception of skiers and snowboard enthusiasts, most of us look forward to the renewal and the warmer climes of spring. Ah, spring, indeed!

With the arrival of spring, we bring you new offerings in the JITP for your consideration. In the past, some have lamented the paucity of research articles in the journal. This issue brings nourishment for those who hunger for such offerings. Two thought-provoking articles dealing with research issues in invitational education provide additional understanding, and inevitably raise new questions.

Giovanni Valiante and Frank Pajares revisit a research topic when they take a further look at the Inviting/Disinviting Index. Their article, “The Inviting/Disinviting Index: Instrument Validation and Relation to Motivation and Achievement,” complements and expands prior studies using the IDI. This article undertakes a rigorous examination of the validation of the IDI, while at the same time relating these concepts to Bandura’s notions of self-efficacy. Their study examines responses of children in grades 6, 7, and 8 on the IDI and offers some interesting perspectives concerning the IDI specifically and, in a more general sense, the assessment of invitational concepts. This surely will be used as a base for subsequent research in this area, and reminds us, once again, we are dealing with complex notions, not easily distilled.

The second research article is by Frank Pajares and Amy Lapin Zeldin. “Inviting Self-Efficacy Revisited: the Role of Invitations in the Lives of Women with Mathematics-Related Careers” touches two timely and important issues in invitational education: gender based invitations on career paths, and the issues of self-efficacy in this process. This is timely in terms of women and mathematics-related careers coming in conjunction with the recent Smith College announcement of the first all women’s engineering program that will start in the fall of 1999. Pajares

and Zeldin's article is soundly presented, and includes open-ended semi-structured interviews with 15 women who were currently engaged in careers in mathematics, science, or technology. These interviews were analyzed in terms of the respondents' beliefs of self-efficacy and recollection of invitations they received that were related to their career choices.

Often, we are so close to what we are doing in education that we are unable to examine what we really are trying to accomplish. Sometimes, we need to find a way to step back and re-adjust our focus to get a clearer perspective. Margaret Maaka helps in her presentation, "Assessment of School Success: A Student-Centered Approach." Maaka, who has taught in New Zealand and Hawaii, draws upon her experiences in implementing state and/or national educational standards, and presents some of the contrasts with American education. Maaka takes a neutral stance in her presentation, but presents interesting and provocative differences in educational approaches between these different cultures. Perhaps this is most notable in her exposition of testing; both standardized testing and teacher-made tests, among the different cultures. Maaka provides a perspective, which many may find helpful in focusing on contemporary educational issues.

To top off our spring bouquet, it seems appropriate to include some comments to those of you wishing to submit articles to the *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*. While "Guidelines for Authors" are found in each issue of the journal, somehow a veil of mystery remains as to the process of reviewing and accepting articles. When a manuscript is submitted to the journal, all personally identifying information is stripped from the manuscript, and a number is assigned to the manuscript. This is done so members of the Editorial Board may do a "blind review." Typically, a manuscript is sent to four reviewers on the Editorial Board for their assessment and comments. To the extent possible, readers are selected for their expertise in the subject area of the manuscript, although this is not always possible. The reviewed articles are returned to the Editor four to six weeks after being sent out, and the comments are pooled into a summary evaluation, which is sent to the author. Each manuscript also receives a composite rating from the readers that falls

into one of three categories: “accept as is,” “accept with revisions,” and “not acceptable.”

Very few of the articles receive an “accept-as-is” rating after the first reading. Most initial reviews fall into the second category, “accept with revisions,” which includes very specific comments from reviewers as to what might be needed to make the manuscript more acceptable for publication. Additionally, very few articles are rated as “not acceptable,” and in those instances where this is the judgment of the reviewers, alternate publications are often suggested that might be more appropriate for the manuscript under review.

The vast majority of manuscripts fall into the “accept-with-revisions” category. Many manuscripts may be returned to the authors two or more times for revisions. Persistence and the authors’ convictions of the importance of the manuscript become important in this stage of the review process. About 50 percent of the manuscripts returned to the authors for revisions are never returned to the journal. Additionally, not all manuscripts that are revised end up in print. This is all dependent upon the relationship of the topic to the purpose of the journal (i.e., invitational theory and practice), the clarity of presentation, the development of the ideas presented, and the scholarship of the manuscript. Since the journal is published every six months, chances are high that manuscripts submitted will be in a review and rewrite process somewhere in the neighborhood of six to eight months. Hopefully, this helps to clarify the process, and at the same time encourages more readers to submit manuscripts to the journal for consideration.

William B. Stafford  
Editor