
From the Editor

This issue marks the beginning of the third year of publication of *Advances in Nursing Science*. The results of the recent reader's survey and a concurrent in-depth evaluation by the editorial board indicate that ANS has been received with enthusiasm, and that we have made significant strides in accomplishing our stated purposes. I would like to acknowledge the contribution that many individuals have made toward the initiation and development of ANS—the editorial board members, the authors who have contributed their work, the editorial staff, and the readers, especially those who have communicated their reactions to specific articles and issues by writing to the editor. Each of you have given valuable assistance and suggestions that we have taken seriously, and we are gradually incorporating changes that will improve the quality and usefulness of the journal.

One of the specific concerns that emerged from the reader's survey and the editorial board evaluation concerned the projection of issue topics and the need for communicating to prospective authors the types of articles that will be considered for publication in each issue. Basic to this concern was a debate about whether to continue publishing ANS as a topical journal. The responses we received indicated a strong preference for continuing to use a topical format with some provision for including articles of significance that do not necessarily reflect the topics projected. In an effort to better communicate the nature of projected topics and to assist prospective authors in identifying future issues of ANS for possible publication of their work, we are now including a descriptive list of future topics, along with deadline dates for receipt of ar-

ticles, in the "Information for Authors" section of each issue. The topics are broadly conceived, and I hope that the descriptions will stimulate a wide range of theoretical, analytical, and research articles.

The ultimate quality and contribution of a professional journal is vitally dependent on the quality of scholarship and level of professional development of those who contribute to the journal. While editorial policy and judgment influences the final outcome of each published issue, the nature and quality of the material submitted to be considered for publication is the substance to which policy and judgment apply. ANS has received a predominant number of articles that focus on analysis of concepts, model-building, value and ethical problems, literature reviews, and practical application of theory. As one reader responding to the reader survey commented, many of the contributing authors are young scholars, not yet fully developed in their area of inquiry.

The need for further development in nursing science is clear and is reflected in all nursing journals that publish research and theory development articles. Yet, as the articles in this issue show, nursing scholars are seriously searching for ways to view reality that are consistent with the philosophic foundations of nursing science and practice—foundations that have not been traditionally viewed as congruent with the development of science. We are, as a discipline, immersed in a period of development that we cannot presently fully comprehend, but which appears to indicate an important period of exploration, thinking, and analytical testing.

I am optimistic that the contributions made

to ANS provide a substantial stimulus to the individual and collective development of nursing science. From an editorial standpoint, we have conceived a broad concept of "science," recognizing the philosophic, ethical, and political forces that influence the development of our science. Inherent in this conceptualization is the basic assumption that the nursing science we develop must have

meaning in our practice of nursing. We need to hear from you as readers, in the form of letters and articles, to let us know what you are thinking, what you are doing, and how you are developing. Your contribution to this effort will help us all to grow and develop.

Peggy L. Chinn, R.N., Ph.D.
Editor

CORRECTIONS

In "From the Editor" (ANS 2:4, p. xiii), under the heading "Editor's Note," the initiation of the Nursing Theory Think Tank Group should have been credited to the Pennsylvania State University School of Nursing.

In "Analysis and Expansion of the Roy Adaptation Model: A Contribution to Holistic Nursing" by Margaret Fisk Mastal and Helen Hammond (ANS 2:4), Figures 1 to 3 (pp. 76, 78, and 80, respectively) were incorrectly credited. The credit lines should have read "Adapted from Roy, S.C. . . ."

In the same article, on p. 72, under the heading "Concept of 'Person,'" the next to last line was incorrectly stated. The line should read "A person's biological nature . . ." On p. 73, right column, line 9, the sentence beginning "They describe the cognator . . ." should read "Roy and Roberts describe the cognator. . . ."

Authors Mastal and Hammond also wish to acknowledge the assistance in preparation of the article of Mary Cipriano Silva, Associate Professor of Nursing, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia.