The Last Word:

An Interview With Frank Pajares: God, the Devil, William James, the Little Prince, and Self-Efficacy

Héfer Bembenutty
Queens College of the City University of New York

Initial Interest in Psychology and Education

JAA: What motivated you to pursue a career in psychology and education?

Pajares: I don't really know how my initial interest in psychology came about. I went to college intending to major in political science, but at some point wandered into an introductory psychology class and became intrigued. Then, I took another class and had to read William James. Well, that did it. However, I had wanted to be a teacher from the day I read James Hilton's *Goodbye, Mr. Chips* in seventh grade. Thus, educational psychology proved a happy marriage of interest and passion.

JAA: Who have been your role models?

Pajares: I'm embarrassed to say that I don't think I have ever actually met anyone I particularly wanted to emulate (in the "role model" sort of way). Thus, I've never seen myself as having had role models, at least living ones. I know that I've been influenced by literary models, though, and by authors of books I've read.

My first literary role model was *El Capitán Trueno* (Captain Thunder!), a comic book character to whom I was deeply devoted in my very early youth. *El Capitán* was a Spanish knight during the Middle Ages, and from him I learned that it was important to be courageous, chivalrous, and kind. Spaniards from my generation who read this will completely understand. I've always believed that the importance of these early exposures to literary or media characters should not be easily discounted. Their effect can be lasting and powerful. I'm glad that Calvin and Hobbes were not around during my childhood or goodness knows how that would have affected me.

My intellectual worldview has been influenced by William James, and my habits of mind as regards psychology and education have been influenced by my affection for the writings of Locke, Maslow, Freud, Freire, and Pinker. My most profound influences, however, lie outside psychology, and I tend to turn to Italo Calvino, Voltaire, Ortega y Gasset, Baltasar Gracián, e. e. cummings, Robert Frost, Joan Manuel Serrat, García Lorca, and Teilhard de Chardin for guidance, inspiration, and direction. I also pay a great deal of attention to Cole Porter, Monty Python, George Carlin, and Saint-Exupéry. And, as I just said, I admit that I am also deeply, deeply influenced by Calvin and Hobbes. Mostly Calvin, of course. His views on education and psychology are pretty much my own.

William James and Education

JAA: You have been a scholar of William James. What do you find most fascinating about his work?

Pajares: I was captured by James from the very start, and it has benefited my life immensely. I have written about this in a chapter for Barry Zimmerman and Dale Schunk's book, *Educational Psychology: A Century of Contributions*, and in that chapter I try to explain why his writing has such a profound influence on me.

This is what I wrote, and I hope it explains why he influences me with such power:

> For over 30 years, I have been smitten with William James. I read him for work and for play. I read him for guidance. I read him for inspiration. I read him when my spirits are low. I read him to discover what I really think. I read him to learn. I am never disappointed. My admiration borders on adulation. How could anyone fail to see the profundity of this man's wisdom, the elegance of his thought, or the simplicity of his uncommon common sense.

All this is still true except that it is now getting close to 40 years. Sigh.

JAA: To me, one of the most impressive legacies of William James was his lecture to American teachers. What is your take on what he said to teachers?

Pajares: My take is that William James is absolutely right about pretty much everything. Clearly, James challenges and exhorts us as teachers to be relevant, profound, broad, and even develop a little flair for the dramatic. He challenges us to be *memorable*. I try to take his exhortation very seriously. It also bears noting that James concludes *Talks to Teachers* with the admonition that if we can view our students as essentially good, and love them as well, we "will be in the best possible position for becoming perfect teachers." Sound advice, don't you think?

Philosophy and Education

JAA: Like me, you are a passionate reader of the work of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. What educational principles did you learn from reading The Little Prince*?*

Pajares: What a delightful, unexpected, and thought-provoking question. Yes, I admit that I love *The Little Prince*. There are so many things I've learned from reading that book I hardly know where to begin. One important lesson that the little prince teaches us, perhaps it is an educational principle, is that one should keep at a question until the answer satisfies us. Once he asked it, the little prince could not let go of a question until he was fully satisfied with the answer. I make that a habitual practice.

I suppose I also learned the critical importance of *taming*—of establishing ties—beginning with small gestures and patiently working toward acquiring that sense of closeness to which we all aspire. I work hard to tame my students, and I invite them to tame me. Well, in truth, a teacher cannot tame all students, as that simply isn't possible, both in terms of time and energy. However, we can tame many of them. The little prince goes on to say that you become responsible forever for what you have tamed. I admit that I find that a bit of an overwhelming thought.

I learned also that we must observe the proper rites, and that these rites bring meaning and order to our endeavors and to our life. Observing the proper rites in the classroom is, I think, vital. And, of course, I learned that it is the challenge of each teacher to be alert to the connections that will help define a particular student's wheat field.

There are two other passages from the book that have powerful meaning for me and that inform my teaching. The first is that "it is the time you have wasted for your rose that makes your rose so important." Let me explain, however, that "wasted" is a poor translation of the French word "perdu," which means "lost." Lost time need not have been wasted time. Time can be lost joyfully, liberally, and playfully. I understand that it is the time that I have spent with my students that will make them so important to me. Consequently, nothing is professionally more important to me than giving my students the time they require.

As you know, the most famous passage from *The Little Prince* is that "it is only with the heart that one can see rightly; what is essential is invisible to the eye." Stanley Kubrick once said that "the truth of a thing is in the feel of it, not in the think of it." I'm

enough of a scientist to resist this, but also enough of a poet to know that there is something to it.

JAA: You have been a devoted reader of philosophy. How does philosophy inform your work on psychology and education?

Pajares: Philosophy is the parent of psychology. My philosophical understandings not only form my vision of reality but the manner in which I go about psychology and education. These understandings are the foundational tenets that are at the very core of my psychological theorizing and research. They formulate my questions about teaching and learning, serve as a filter through which I interpret the theories and phenomena I encounter, and guide my explorations into unfamiliar territories. In a very real sense, I *see* psychology and education through the lens that William James, Aristotle, John Locke, Abraham Maslow, Paulo Freire, North Whitehead, Jerome Bruner, and other philosophers (and philosophical psychologists such as Erikson and Freud) offer me.

Philosophy also teaches that the critical questions in human functioning involve matters that cannot be settled by universal prescriptions. Rather, these matters demand attention to the forces that shape our lives, be those forces biological, historical, social, cultural, economic, political, intrapersonal, or interpersonal. Complex human processes must be understood as having both situational and universal properties.

For me, one critical difference between philosophy and psychology, as scholarly endeavors, is that psychologists seem focused on the discovery of universals, even if those universals are chaperoned by contextual factors, whereas philosophers are interested in the *cultivation of judgment*. As you know, psychologists are often criticized for having "physics envy," and there is more truth than humor in that old barb. Our overreliance on conducting "experimental investigations," analyzing "data" by means of statistical "procedures," and publishing these results in "neat little studies," as Bruner described them, should give us all pause. Should anyone really be surprised that the vast majority of

teachers and other school practitioners show little interest in our neat little studies? And what's worse, that they wouldn't be able to make sense of them if they were interested?

Self-Efficacy Beliefs

JAA: A few years ago, I met Professor Albert Bandura during a conference. I found him to be a very intelligent and caring person. You know Professor Bandura personally. How would you describe him and how has his work influenced your scholarship?

Pajares: He is a kind and curious and thoughtful and brilliant man, and I am delighted that he is garnering more attention every day. A recent issue of the *Review of General Psychology* revealed that Freud, Skinner, and Bandura are the three psychologists most frequently cited in introductory psychology textbooks. He was just in Atlanta a couple of months back and my doctoral students and I spent two delightful days with him. His work, as exemplified by his social cognitive theory of human functioning, serves as the theoretical foundation for my own efforts. Were it not for Professor Bandura's thinking and theorizing about the human condition, I would be much poorer intellectually and professionally. When I dedicated a volume focusing on self-efficacy during adolescence, I wrote that Professor Bandura charts the waters I navigate. Without him I would be lost at sea.

JAA: How do you define self-efficacy?

Pajares: I'll try not to break into song here. Or to fall back on oft-repeated phrases and definitions I've written a thousand times. Human beings create and develop many beliefs about themselves, their place in the world, and their relations to things, people, and events. These self-beliefs are important, in great part because, as philosopher Charles Peirce observed, "beliefs are rules for action." We are, to a very great extent, the very beliefs we carry inside our heads.

Self-efficacy is a powerful self-belief that human beings create. In essence, self-efficacy beliefs are the mental assessments we make about what we can and cannot do or can and cannot be. They are judgments of our capabilities. Although self-efficacy should not be confused with the catchword "confidence," I've never really been averse to thinking about self-efficacy in terms of confidence. It's important to emphasize, however, that, as Bandura has pointed out, self-efficacy refers quite specifically to our belief in our capabilities as "agents," which is to say our capabilities to make things happen by our actions, to be proactive in our development, to exercise a measure of control over ourselves and our environments.

For those who may be unfamiliar with this concept, let me offer a little boiler plate information. Self-efficacy is a central concept in Bandura's social cognitive theory of human functioning. In fact, Bandura contends that, of all the thoughts that affect human functioning, self-efficacy beliefs are at the very core and exercise a powerful influence, for good or, sometimes, for ill.

Self-efficacy theorists contend that these beliefs provide the foundation for human motivation, well-being, and personal accomplishment. This is because unless people believe that their actions can produce the outcomes they desire, they have little incentive to act or to persevere in the face of difficulties. Much empirical evidence now supports the contention that self-efficacy beliefs touch virtually every aspect of people's lives—whether they think productively, self-debilitatingly, pessimistically, or optimistically; how well they motivate themselves and persevere in the face of adversities; their vulnerability to stress and depression, and the life choices they make. Self-efficacy is also a critical determinant of self-regulation, which is another central concept in social cognitive theory.

JAA: How does self-efficacy differ from other self-related constructs, such as self-esteem, self-concept, or locus of control?

Pajares: This is something I've written about extensively. Let me explain that, although past researchers typically contended that

self-concept and self-esteem are distinct concepts, with self-concept performing a *descriptive* function and self-esteem an *evaluative* one, these days motivation theorists do not differentiate, empirically, between the two, which is to say that a factor analysis would not tease out differences between items created to assess each. Thus, in essence, when I speak about self-esteem, I also include self-concept.

Self-efficacy beliefs and self-esteem beliefs are alike in that they are each self-conceptions critical to effective functioning. Moreover, confidence is a critical component of self-esteem, so, in a very real sense, self-efficacy judgments can be viewed as a critical part of one's self-esteem. But recall that self-efficacy is *a judgment of capability* to perform a task or engage in an activity, whereas self-esteem is a *personal evaluation of one's self* that includes the feelings of self-worth that accompany that evaluation. Because self-esteem involves evaluations of self-worth, it is particularly dependent on how a culture or social structure values the attributes on which the individual bases those feelings of self-worth. Self-efficacy is dependent primarily on the task at hand, independent of its culturally assigned value.

Note that when individuals tap into their self-efficacy or their self-esteem beliefs, they must ask themselves quite different types of questions. In school, self-efficacy beliefs revolve around questions of "can" (Can I write an expository essay? Can I solve this mathematics problem?), whereas self-esteem beliefs reflect questions of "being" and "feeling" (Who am I? Do I like myself? How do I feel about myself as a writer? As a student?). The answers to the self-efficacy questions that individuals pose to themselves reveal whether they possess high or low confidence to accomplish the task or succeed at the activity in question; the answers to the self-esteem questions that individuals pose to themselves reveal how positively or negatively they view themselves, as well as how they feel, in those areas.

Moreover, one's beliefs about what one can or cannot do may bear little relation to whether one feels positively or negatively about oneself. Many bright students are able to engage their academic tasks with strong self-efficacy even while their academic

skills are a source of low self-esteem, having been labeled by their classmates as nerds or geeks. Alternatively, many academically weak students suffer no loss of self-esteem when such esteem is nourished by achievements in athletic fields or social arenas.

As regards locus of control, the notion of perceived control is also related to self-efficacy. According to locus of control theory, people expect success to the degree that they feel in control of their behavior, often referred to as internal locus of control, and research supports this contention. People who believe they can control what they learn and perform are more apt to initiate and sustain behaviors directed toward those ends than are those with a low sense of control over their capabilities. In Bandura's social cognitive theory, a sense of control over the significant outcomes of one's life is a key motivator of behavior in addition to self-efficacy. In fact, it is demoralizing for people to believe that they have the capabilities to succeed, but that environmental barriers such as discrimination preclude them from doing so. Self-efficacy is apt to be most influential in predicting behavior when the environment is responsive and allows one to exercise one's capabilities without restraint.

JAA: How is self-efficacy measured?

Pajares: Efficacy beliefs vary in *level*, *strength*, and *generality*, and these dimensions are important in determining appropriate measurement. Imagine that a researcher is interested in assessing the essay-writing self-efficacy of middle school students. First, there are different levels of task demands within any given domain that researchers may tap. In this case, these can range from the lower level of writing a simple sentence with proper punctuation and grammatical structure to the higher level of writing compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure or organizing sentences into a paragraph so as to clearly express a theme or idea. Students are then asked to rate the strength of their belief in their capability to perform the various levels identified. If researchers have adequately identified the relevant levels of writing an essay at this academic juncture, the

efficacy assessment provides multiple specific items of varying difficulty that collectively assess the domain of essay-writing. In addition, the items in this case should be prototypic of essay-writing at the middle-school level rather than minutely specific features of writing (e.g., confidence to form letters). Also, items should be worded in terms of *can*, a judgment of capability, rather than of *will*, a statement of intention.

Because the students' beliefs differ in generality across the domain of writing, if these beliefs are to be compared with students' actual writing, the researcher's next task is to select a writing task on which the levels were based and on which the confidence judgments were provided—in other words, an essay (rather than a poem or a creative short story or the yearly grade in language arts). Students are unlikely to judge themselves as efficacious across all types of language arts activities or even across all types of writing. Self-efficacy beliefs will differ in predictive power depending on the task they are asked to predict. In general, efficacy beliefs will best predict the performances that most closely correspond with such beliefs. Thus, understanding that beliefs differ in generality is crucial to understanding efficacy assessment.

Reasonably precise judgments of capability matched to a specific outcome afford the greatest prediction and offer the best explanations of behavioral outcomes because these are the sorts of judgments that individuals call on when confronted with behavioral tasks. This is an especially critical issue in studies that attempt to establish causal relations between beliefs and outcomes. All this is to say that capabilities assessed and capabilities tested should be similar capabilities. When self-efficacy assessments lack the specificity of measurement and consistency with the criterial task that optimizes the predictive power of self-efficacy beliefs, results minimize the influence of self-efficacy.

Correspondence between belief and performance is critical in studies that attempt to establish an empirical connection between the two; requirements of specificity will differ depending on the substantive question of interest and the nature of the variables with which self-efficacy beliefs will be compared. To be

both explanatory and predictive, self-efficacy measures should be tailored to the domain(s) of functioning being analyzed and reflect the various task demands within that domain. In the final analysis, evaluating the appropriateness and adequacy of a self-efficacy measure requires making a theoretically informed and empirically sound judgment that reflects an understanding of the domain under investigation and its different features, of the types of capabilities the domain requires, and of the range of situations in which these capabilities might be applied.

JAA: Is self-efficacy teachable? How can a teacher teach self-efficacy?

Pajares: I don't think I see self-efficacy as something that should be "taught," and I don't think I work to teach my students self-efficacy nor would I exhort other teachers to teach it. Rather, I would ask teachers to keep at the forefront of their mind that, as they go about the art of teaching their students, they must keep a dual focus on the importance of their students developing confidence *and* competence.

Teachers have the responsibility to nourish and protect the self-efficacy beliefs of their students. The aim of education should always transcend the development of academic competence. Schools have the added responsibility of preparing fully functioning and resilient individuals capable of pursuing their hopes and their aspirations. To do so, they must be armed with optimism, confidence, self-regard, and regard for others, and they must be shielded from unwarranted doubts about their potentialities and capacity for growth. Teachers can aid their students by helping them to develop the habit of excellence in scholarship while at the same time nurturing the confidence to maintain that excellence throughout their adult lives.

JAA: What does your research tell you about the contribution of self-efficacy to academic achievement?

Pajares: It tells me that the two constructs are powerfully related, which is certainly intuitive. During the past 3 decades, a wealth

of empirical evidence has shown that self-efficacy relates to and influences numerous academic outcomes, and that it mediates the effect of skills, previous experience, mental ability, and other self-beliefs on these outcomes, which is to say that it acts as a filter between prior determinants and academic indexes. For example, the mediational role of self-efficacy beliefs has been demonstrated in the selection of career choices, where findings indicate that college undergraduates choose majors and select careers in areas in which they feel most competent and avoid those in which they believe themselves less competent or less able to compete. Self-efficacy is a powerful determinant of achievement in varied fields. Correlations between self-efficacy and academic performances in investigations in which self-efficacy corresponds to the criterial task with which it is compared have ranged from .49 to .70; direct effects in path analytic studies have ranged from β = .349 to .545. Self-efficacy explains approximately 25% of the variance in the prediction of academic outcomes beyond that of instructional influences. Basically, the effect of those numbers and Greek letters is to suggest that self-efficacy beliefs make a powerful contribution to the prediction of academic achievement.

JAA: How has the international community of psychologists and educators received the construct of self-efficacy?

Pajares: They have embraced it with interest and enthusiasm. I am frequently asked to speak throughout the world, and Professor Bandura is in constant demand, as are self-efficacy theorists such as Barry Zimmerman and Dale Schunk. I keep a Web site in which I provide the names and areas of interest of doctoral students throughout the world currently engaged in research on self-efficacy (see http://des.emory.edu/mfp/self-efficacy.html). There are more than 50 countries represented on that list. In addition, university researchers throughout Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America are publishing important articles, book chapters, and books on self-efficacy. Notable among these are Gian Vittorio Caprara in Italy, Ralf Schwarzer in Germany, and

Eugenio Garrido Martín in Spain. Indeed, Bandura's books are regularly translated and published in numerous languages, and, thanks to the efforts of Professor Caprara, a volume that Tim Urdan and I edited entitled *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents* was recently published in Italian.

JAA: How is self-efficacy related to self-regulation of learning?

Pajares: First, let me say that here I am cognizant of the fact that I am speaking to Professor Héfer Bembenutty, one of the foremost experts in this area. I should actually reverse the tables on you and let you answer this question. [Laughs]

JAA: Thank you for the compliment, but I know that you are teasing me. You can answer that question.

Pajares: If I could use a metaphor, I think of self-efficacy and of self-regulation as kissing cousins. There certainly have a symbiotic relationship. Students regulate and manage their academic progress through the process of self-regulation, a metacognitive process that requires students to explore their own thought processes so as to understand and evaluate the results of their actions and to plan pathways to success. Students must evaluate their own behavior if they are to guide subsequent behavior in a process of self-direction and self-reinforcement. Researchers have found that academic self-efficacy beliefs are influential during all phases of self-regulation—forethought, performance, and self-reflection. Students who believe they are capable of performing academic tasks use more cognitive and metacognitive strategies, and, regardless of previous achievement or ability, they work harder, persist longer, and persevere in the face of adversity.

Students with high self-efficacy also engage in more effective self-regulatory strategies. Confident students monitor their academic work time effectively, persist when confronted with academic challenges, do not reject correct hypotheses prematurely, and solve conceptual problems. As students' self-efficacy increases, so does the accuracy of the self-evaluations they make about the

outcomes of their self-monitoring. Self-efficacy has also been found to be positively related to the strategy of reviewing notes and negatively related to relying on others for assistance. Studies tracing the relationship between academic self-efficacy and the self-regulatory strategy of goal setting have demonstrated that self-efficacy and skill development are stronger in students who set proximal goals than in students who set distal goals, in part because proximal attainments provide students with evidence of growing expertise. Students' self-efficacy beliefs influence their academic motivation through their use of self-regulatory processes such as goal setting, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and strategy use. The more that students view themselves as competent, the more challenging the goals they select.

JAA: What do we know about the self-efficacy of gifted learners?

Pajares: Gifted students typically have stronger self-efficacy beliefs than do nongifted students, which makes sense given that they are more academically capable. Gifted students are also better calibrated, which is to say that they are better at knowing what they know and do not know than are regular education students.

JAA: What does the research suggest about the self-efficacy of minority students?

Pajares: This is an area of research that still requires attention, and I urge doctoral students and researchers to explore this important area. What few results there are suggest that the self-efficacy of minority students is lower than that of their counterparts. This stands in contrast to the results of studies of self-esteem, which show that minority students tend to report strong self-esteem in the fact of achievement difficulty.

JAA: How can teachers promote their students' self-efficacy beliefs during a traditional 45-minute lesson? For example, if the lesson objective in a math class is, "At the end of the lesson, students will be able to

identify geometric shapes in the classroom," how can a teacher promote the students' self-efficacy beliefs during that 45-minute lesson?

Pajares: The "specifics" of what a teacher might do during any classroom activity to foster self-efficacy will depend on the student and the context of the situation. As you know, there are no recipes to teaching. As I said earlier, however, I think that the art of teaching consists of teachers keeping a dual focus on the importance of their students developing confidence *and* competence. During any 45-minute period, teachers can influence their students' self-efficacy in numerous ways, not the least of which are the modeling practices in which they engage, the verbal persuasions they provide, the type of feedback they offer, the manner in which they help their students interpret their own mastery, and the stress, anxiety, or serenity they bring to the classroom activity. Every action a teacher takes toward a student helps shape that student's competence and the beliefs that accompany that competence. I do not want to be self-promoting (or maybe I do!), but I recently published a chapter entitled "Self-Efficacy during Childhood and Adolescence: Implications for Teachers and Parents" in the book *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents*, and I hope some useful insights can be found there.

JAA: How do you enhance the self-efficacy beliefs of your own doctoral students?

Pajares: Let me assure you that this is often a tricky enterprise. You would think that by the time individuals reach that level of scholarship, they should have a fairly profound confidence in their own academic capabilities. Unfortunately, that is not always the case. Moreover, strong doctoral programs are typically demanding enough to bruise the confidence of all but the hardiest students. In truth, I don't go about this any differently than I go about caring for the self-efficacy beliefs of my undergraduates. One of my favorite axioms is that academic work should be hard enough that it energizes, not so hard that it paralyzes. Doctoral students have selected a profession in which they will have to

face their share of rejection and evaluation, so I am always cognizant of the fact that I must help build their emotional armor without damaging their soul. Oh, and I never use red ink.

A Famous Speech

JAA: A few years ago, I had the privilege of attending one of your presentations during a conference. During the speech, you spoke of God, the Devil, and solving the mystery of human development. The entire audience laughed for several minutes as you told the story of the Jesuit priest and the Catholic nun. I laughed a lot, too. Could you please tell me the story again? And what does this story have to do with psychology and education?

Pajares: I'm glad you enjoyed it. The story is that as a small boy growing up in Spain, I had a tendency to try to complete my schoolwork as quickly as possible so as to create time for the important demands of play. Invariably, this meant that in my great haste, I would overlook critical aspects of the particular assignment at hand—the minus sign in a mathematics equation, the critical comma in a compound sentence. One day, my teacher, an old Jesuit priest who was troubled by my haste, leaned over me and whispered softly, "*Manolito, el diablo está en los detalles.*" The Devil is in the details, he said.

    I have always had a vivid imagination, and I was only 7 years old, so you can imagine that the image of the Devil lurking in the details of my academic work was not an easy one to dispel. It was one thing to tell me to be more careful. That, I could have more easily understood. But to tell me that the Devil's hand was at play in the fields of my schoolwork, that seemed both confusing and deeply troubling. And so the image and phrase remained with me—the Devil is in the details. Years later, when I was an elementary school student in the United States, carelessness as a result of haste still often got the better of me. One day, in a scene reminiscent of the one that had taken place years earlier in Spain,

a nun leaned over my shoulder and, as had my Jesuit teacher, whispered, "*Frank, be more attentive. God is in the details.*"

That was disconcerting. For years I had been wrestling with the troubling enough notion that the Devil was in my details. Suddenly, and without warning, I had to deal with the idea that both God and the Devil resided in those pesky nooks and crannies of my academic work. By now, I have heard each of those expressions used many times in many contexts, as probably have you.

So what does all this have to do with psychology and education? No doubt what my teachers were trying to tell me, each in his and her own way, was that knowledge and ignorance, truth and deception, goodness and mischief were all potentially present in my schoolwork. Their admonition seems clear to me now: unless I paid attention to the details of my work, I would not come to fully understand matters that were clearly important to understand, whether those matters emanated from the construction of proper sentences or the knowledge of historical facts or, much later of course, the interpretation of statistical results.

Current Projects and Legacy

JAA: You have been a fruitful book writer. Are you working on a new book?

Pajares: I have three exciting book projects going on. The first is to translate *El Oráculo Manual y Arte de Prudencia* into English. The *Oráculo* is a delightful book of aphorisms published by the Spanish Jesuit priest Baltasar Gracián. Gracián is excruciatingly difficult to translate. In fact, he is referred to as "the untranslatable" because of his laconic and artificial epigrams. Secondly, Tim Urdan and I are currently editing our sixth volume in our *Adolescence and Education* series, tentatively entitled "Making a Teacher Eternal: Scholars Describe the Teacher Who Made a Difference." In this volume, some of the finest scholars in the fields of education, educational psychology, adolescence, and

adolescent development provide short stories describing their most memorable teacher, followed by a brief analysis that draws from theory and research in education, psychology, and human development to identify key concepts and principles that apply in explaining why the selected teacher was so effective and memorable. At the end of the volume, Tim Urdan and I will offer a chapter that revisits the common themes present in the stories. Finally, Tim and I will begin coauthoring subsequent volumes in the prestigious series, *Advances in Motivation and Achievement*.

JAA: How would you like the fields of education and psychology to remember you? What do you consider your legacy to be? How would you describe your legacy?

Pajares: You know, I just don't think that way. Actually, I don't much care how I am remembered by the fields of education and psychology. I'd be delighted if at times the thought of me would spark a smile in the face of one of my former students, though.

Editors' Note

Frank Pajares is an internationally recognized scholar in the field of motivation and self-efficacy.