

Editor's Statement

Indexing and Abstracting

Language Learning has now been accepted for coverage in *Psychological Abstracts*, *PsycLIT*, and *ClinPSYC*, as well as in *PsychINFO* online, the American Psychological Association electronic collection of more than 1.5 million references to psychological literature spanning 1887 to the present day. This extends the broad collection of indexing/abstracting agencies listed in the front matter of each issue to more fully reflect the interdisciplinary nature of this journal. Our goal is that interested researchers of language will find work published in this journal whether their starting point lies in psychology, linguistics, cognitive science, educational inquiry, neuroscience, ethnography, sociolinguistics, sociology, semiotics, or beyond.

Statistical Reporting of Effect Sizes

Language Learning, like many journals that publish research using quantitative and statistical methods, is increasingly influenced by the advantages of the reporting of effect sizes. Submitting authors to this journal have to date been referred to the statement in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (4th edition) emphasizing that statistical significance p values are not acceptable indices of effect because they depend on sample size and that "you are [therefore] encouraged to provide effect size information" (APA, 1994, p. 18).

Unfortunately, empirical studies of this and other journals (Wilkinson & the American Psychological Association Task Force on Statistical Inference, 1999) indicate that this encouragement has had negligible impact.

The reporting of effect sizes is essential to good research. It enables readers to evaluate the stability of results across samples, operationalizations, designs, and analyses. It allows evaluation of the practical relevance of the research outcomes. It provides the basis of power analyses and meta-analyses needed in future research. This role of effect sizes in meta-analysis is clearly illustrated in the article by Norris and Ortega that follows this editorial statement.

Submitting authors to *Language Learning* are therefore *required* henceforth to provide a measure of effect size, at least for the major statistical contrasts they report.

More information on effect sizes and their reporting is given in the guidelines of Wilkinson et al. (1999), which can also currently be accessed over the internet at Web address <http://www.apa.org/journals/amp/amp548594.html>. This article cites several key reviews such as Rosenthal (1994), Cohen (1992), and Kirk (1996) that summarize various measures of effect sizes used in psychological and educational research. Consult these articles for information on computing these measures.

Always present effect sizes and their confidence intervals for primary outcomes. These effect sizes might be of various forms. If the units of measurement are meaningful on a practical level (e.g., reading rate, normed proficiency test scores), then unstandardized measures (regression coefficient or mean difference) are appropriate. If not, standardized differences (d) or uncorrected (e.g., r , R^2 , η^2) or corrected (e.g., adjusted R^2 , ω^2) variance-accounted-for statistics should be reported. These effect sizes are required *in addition* to the usual inferential statistical tests of significance; they do not replace them. It is also appropriate in the textual argument of the results section to place these effect sizes in their practical and theoretical context.

Nick Ellis

References

- American Psychological Association. (1994). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*, 155–159.
- Kirk, R. E. (1996). Practical significance: A concept whose time has come. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *56*, 746–759.
- Rosenthal, R. (1994). Parametric measures of effect size. In H. Cooper & L. V. Hedges (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis* (pp. 231–244). New York: Sage.
- Wilkinson, L. & the Task Force on Statistical Inference, American Psychological Association, Science Directorate, Washington, DC (USA). (1999). Statistical methods in psychology journals: Guidelines and explanations. *American Psychologist*, *54*, 594–604.