

EDITORIAL

COOPERATIVE EDITING

Recently, after applying for a research grant that was recommended but not awarded to this journal, we were told that the information on our application relative to our rate of acceptance and rejection of manuscripts was not clear and, in the eyes of the granting committee, was somewhat vague. We don't deny that this may be the case because our policy of manuscript acceptance and rejection is a bit different from that of many scholarly journals. For want of a better term, we call it *cooperative editing*. In education, educators have found cooperative teaching and cooperative learning to be beneficial to both students and teachers. As editor of this journal, we have found *cooperative editing* to be beneficial both to authors and to the readership.

This journal has in place a group of highly respected international scholars who act as our editorial review board. They have contributed considerably to the quality of the papers that are published here, and their contributions have not gone without notice. It has been our policy to read each submission to the journal, and each paper that appears to have some merit is sent to three reviewers. These reviewers are generally very helpful. In many instances, it is clear that they have put a great deal of time and effort into making suggestions about how the paper might be improved, how it might be reduced or expanded, how it might be made more interesting and applicable to the field, or why it is not suitable for publication even with revision. Sometimes the reviewers point out embarrassing omissions of important related research that the author may have overlooked. It is not unusual for authors to write to us and comment very favorably on the helpful nature of the comments made by the reviewers. The process is, in a sense, *cooperative editing*.

As communities of scholars in the field of education, we must keep abreast of an avalanche of literature and research ideas everyday. It is

almost impossible to research, write, and edit in isolation. Editors must rely on the expertise of a large, select body of academic experts. It seems to us that the editing of a journal is more than a routine acceptance-rejection factor; it has to be a community effort of scholars. In view of this, it is difficult for us to make an accurate calculation of our acceptance-rejection ratio. What we do know is that we have, through *cooperative editing*, published some very important papers that might have otherwise been set aside.

W.M.T