tion, and provide an organizing framework that will help improve the identification of theoretical bases in future research.

In the next article by Sobal, “Research Ethics in Nutrition Education,” the author discusses theoretical foundations for research ethics, ethical concepts and issues in nutrition education, and offers suggestions for preventing misconduct and fraud. Although misconduct has not been a major issue in nutrition education research, Sobal recommends awareness and training in research ethics to insure future high-quality research and avoid controversy. He suggests the development of an explicit code of ethics for nutrition education researchers.

Axelson and Brinberg, in “The Measurement and Conceptualization of Nutrition Knowledge,” review recently published research from the perspective of the conceptualization and measurement of nutrition knowledge, focusing especially on the validity of measurement procedures. They consider two scenarios for the relationship between knowledge and behavior, suggest that this relationship as currently described by empirical evidence is weaker than the actual relationship, and make several suggestions for improving measurement and addressing conceptual weaknesses contributing to this problem.

The final articles in the special theme issue focus on target audiences for whom nutrition education programming and related research are frequently focused. Contento, Manning and Shannon, in the article “Research Perspective on School-based Nutrition Education,” review work since 1980, thus updating previous reviews. They conclude that recent studies have improved in quality, and discuss these improvements in relation to the issues of research design and methods, theoretical frameworks, and appropriate attention to issues of educational outcomes and teaching strategies. They make important suggestions for both nutrition education research and related practice in the future.

Nitzke and Voichick focus on reaching low-literate audiences in “Overview of Reading and Literacy Research and Application in Nutrition Education.” They point out that little research in nutrition education for this audience has yet been conducted, provide guidance for applying findings from general low-literacy educational research to nutrition education, give examples of materials and programs in nutrition education for low-literate audiences, and identify issues and questions for future research. The need for an operational definition of “functional nutrition literacy” is emphasized.

“Consumer Behavior and Nutrition Education: An Integrative Review,” by Glanz, Hewitt and Rudd, is structured around three common concerns: nutrition labeling, consumer shopping behavior, and point-of-purchase/choice nutrition education. Based on their review of 83 research and review articles, they make useful suggestions for improving the effectiveness of nutrition education programs targeted to consumers, and argue for the use of theories of consumer information processing and social cognitive theory as frameworks for future research and practice.

Note: Gillespie and Bron are guest co-editors for this special theme issue of the Journal of Nutrition Education. It celebrates the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Society for Nutrition Education. In relation to the entire project, it was Dr. Gillespie who assumed the greater editorial role.

ERRATUM

In the RESULTS AND DISCUSSION section of “Evaluation of a Motivational Education Program for Cardiovascular Risk Reduction: Effects on Knowledge and Behavior” by Kim D. Travers et al. (JNE, Vol. 24, No. 3, 1992, pp. 109-116), the fifth paragraph under Knowledge and the first paragraph under Maintenance (pp. 112-113) should actually follow the first paragraph under Post-test and follow-up (p. 113). We regret any inconvenience caused by this error.