

Editorial Note / Note de la rédaction

Learned journals are remarkable things. As an editor, I've come to appreciate the kinds of contributions each issue represents. To start, there is all the previous literature the authors have drawn on. Then there is the gift of data (from the Latin *dare*, to give) and the gifts the authors bring to data gathering, analysis, and interpretation. All of this depends on the productive work of typists and research administrators and graduate students prior to submission. Then there is the work of an editorial team and of reviewers (and authors again) to produce the final text, which goes to printers and packers and posties. Remarkable.

However, we tend to focus our attention on the reviewers, defining journals as peer reviewed (or not). For the English-language articles in this issue alone, 14 reviews actually shaped the editorial decisions. Let's look at the results.

Mather and Hanley have given us a vital look at the effects of cohort grouping in teacher education, an examination complemented by Cole's analysis of teacher education reform. O'Sullivan considers reform in the larger context of globalization and identifies two different "paradigms" of change. Critical readers might wonder about the effects of reform in light of what Guppy and Davies tell us about public attitudes. Théorêt and Hrimech's observations regarding the failure of schools to redress employment inequities for women might also lead us to question the impact of reform movements.

However, the articles were not deliberately chosen to address a reform theme. The diversity that characterizes *CJE/RCE* is evident in the remainder of the issue. Noël and Mura present us with the contrasting images that elementary and secondary teachers have of mathematics and discuss the impacts of these images on teaching. Jardine, Clifford, and Friesen seek to extend the discussion of "the unique child" begun by Norquay in the Spring 1999 issue of this journal and she has responded in kind to create a discussion section that is both playful and instructive. This exchange grew out of the review process.

I say all of this not simply to summarize the issue or to heap praise on contributors, but because it is a prelude to a plea. One of the great frustrations of editorship for me has been the number of occasions on which senior academics have refused to review a paper due to the weight of other commitments. Of course this is understandable and it may well be the responsible choice for a potential reviewer at any given point in time. Still, I want to take this opportunity to remind accomplished researchers that their own success depended in part on the voluntary contributions of dozens of reviewers who evaluated (and sometimes re-shaped) their work. We are all indebted to these reviewers and the payback comes in serving as reviewers ourselves.

— William J. Hunter