

Editor's Note

Daniel Robinson

Published online: 9 May 2009
© Springer Science + Business Media, LLC 2009

This year *Educational Psychology Review* (EPR) celebrates its 20th birthday. In this note I would like to acknowledge this milestone, report a few changes to the masthead, and provide an update on how the journal is doing. Rich Mayer, Ken Kiewra, and Steve Benton have written brief reflections to commemorate the 20th birthday. I clearly recall the conversation I had with Ray Kulhavy at Arizona State in the spring of 1990 concerning the news of John Glover's untimely accidental death. Kulhavy expressed concern that this nice little purple journal that Glover had started might not continue to flourish. Most folks in the educational psychology community likely shared this concern and were impressed with the way Steve Benton not only kept the journal going but also took it to new heights. As a graduate student, EPR was definitely my "first" journal in that I was permitted to receive the issues addressed to Royce Ronning, a professor at the University of Nebraska, who had recently passed away. Thus, I still have that very first issue of EPR, Volume 1, Number 1, March 1989 here on my bookshelf at the University of Texas. It has traveled with me in boxes to several locations along my academic path. This little purple journal has been my constant companion as we are roughly the same age, academically.

I remember distinctly the festschrift for John Glover in October 1990 in Chicago. I was struck by the outpouring of emotion by presenters and audience members. Glover was obviously loved by many. I also enjoyed my time spent with the late John Zimmer in the basement lounge of the Bismarck Hotel. His advice was always so clear and pointed. Although these individuals have left us, they have made us better scholars.

I am happy to introduce eight new members of the editorial board: Roger Azevedo, Lisa Bendixen, Robert Carson, Lyn Corno, Jake Marszalek, Annemarie Palincsar, Gale Sinatra, and Jessica Summers. Each of these outstanding individuals brings unique expertise to the journal. The reason why I have expanded the board is the ever-increasing numbers of submitted manuscripts. The number of manuscripts submitted electronically in 2006 was 33 and in 2007 it was 38. In 2008, 69 manuscripts were submitted! When I invited people to serve on the editorial board 3 years ago, I promised that I would not send them more than

D. Robinson (✉)
Department of Educational Psychology, The University of Texas at Austin, 1 University Station D5800,
Austin, TX 78712-0383, USA
e-mail: dan.robinson@mail.utexas.edu

three to four manuscripts per year. With the increase in submissions, I have simply had to expand the board to avoid being a liar!

The University of Texas has been very supportive of my editorial efforts. The Office of Graduate Studies has funded an editorial assistant for the past 2 years. I wish to thank Josh Walker and Michael Mayrath for serving in this capacity and would like to welcome Priya Nihalani who will serve for the next 2 years.

Our publisher, Springer, has also been very supportive, from hosting editorial board meetings and receptions during the AERA meeting each year to increasing the page limits for the journal. Judy Jones has been so helpful since the beginning and now Marie Sheldon has taken over and provides endless support.

In terms of our performance, in 2006 the average number of days from when a manuscript was first submitted to a decision was 51. By 2008, we had this average down to 38. Providing authors with timely and quality reviews has always been our goal and we will continue to strive to improve. My hunch is that the increase in submissions is directly related to the high-quality reviews provided to authors in a timely way, along with the increasing visibility and impact of the journal. I thank the reviewers for their role in this achievement.

I receive several papers each year that are rejected by EPR simply because they report original empirical findings and are simply not appropriate. I would like to further clarify (beyond my June 2006 editorial) a few of the types of manuscripts that are appropriate. I served as feature editor for “research into practice” articles from 2001 to 2005, a type of manuscript created by Ken Kiewra when he was editor. The idea was for an author to take an educational intervention that was sufficiently supported by the literature and describe in layman’s terms how it could be implemented into practice. Some authors have submitted empirical works under this classification and have obviously misinterpreted its purpose. Please remember, EPR does not publish primary empirical reports. It does, however, publish replications of original empirical studies. Let me clarify the type of manuscript that fits my expectation of a replication study. As I said 3 years ago,

these articles must contain multiple experiments. The first experiment must follow the method used in the original study—the only difference should be the participants. If the original study’s results are replicated, then a second experiment should extend the replication by changing one aspect of the method besides participants. This might involve different materials, a longer exposure to materials, a greater delay between acquisition and testing, and so forth. Finally, an experiment that results in different results based on the extension should be replicated one more time. Thus, I see replication articles that successfully replicate the findings for an original empirical study to require at least three experiments.

For those replications that fail to replicate the results of the original study, a second replication should follow the first. Then, if the results cannot be replicated after two attempts, a third experiment should contain an extension that the authors believe would allow for replication of the original study’s results. In this way, we can begin to identify the boundary conditions of the effect (Robinson 2006, p. 116).

Another type of manuscript that is appropriate for EPR is the “reflections on the field.” These papers are less technical and more conversational than typical manuscripts. Their purpose is to allow researchers who have spent a considerable amount of time serving the field to “air their laundry” concerning certain topics. The present issue includes such a

paper by Phil Langer. I feel strongly that such papers are needed in our field and help us to discuss controversial issues that we sometimes avoid.

In closing, I'd like to thank the authors who have submitted their best work and the readers for making EPR a popular source of disseminated knowledge in the field of educational psychology. I hope that the late John Glover would be pleased with how his journal has evolved.

References

Robinson, D. H. (2006). Editorial. *Educational Psychology Review*, 18, 115–117.