



Environmental Education Research





Environmental Education Research

CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	2
<i>Aims and Scope of the Journal</i>	3
<i>Peer Review Policy</i>	5
<i>Corrections</i>	5
<i>Publishing Ethics, Open Access Policy, and Publication Charges</i>	6
OVERVIEW OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD	7
<i>The Editor</i>	8
<i>Associate Editors</i>	8
<i>Members of the Advisory Board</i>	9
<i>Review of the board membership and structure</i>	9
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EDITOR.....	10
<i>Papers Submitted by the Editor</i>	10
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ASSOCIATE EDITORS	11
<i>Papers Submitted by Associate Editors</i>	12
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS.....	13
<i>Papers Submitted by Advisory Board Members</i>	14
POLICY ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST	15
GUIDELINES FOR MEMBERS OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD OF ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION RESEARCH	16
1. <i>Introduction</i>	16
2. <i>High scholarly standards</i>	18
3. <i>Responsibility to the reviewers</i>	18
4. <i>Choosing reviewers</i>	19
5. <i>Maintaining a civil discourse</i>	21
6. <i>Conflict of interest issues</i>	21
7. <i>Appeals to the Editorial Board</i>	22
8. <i>Obtaining reviews in a timely fashion</i>	22
9. <i>Obtaining author responses in a timely fashion</i>	23
10. <i>Visibility, reward and termination of refereeing roles</i>	23
GUIDELINES FOR REFEREES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION RESEARCH	25
1. <i>Introduction</i>	26
2. <i>Expectations of Reviewers for Environmental Education Research</i>	26
3. <i>Review Guidelines</i>	27
4. <i>Review Content</i>	28
B. <i>Quality of presentation</i>	32
C. <i>Manuscript length</i>	33
D. <i>Unreviewed content</i>	34
MANUSCRIPT TYPES THAT CAN BE SUBMITTED FOR REFEREEING AT ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION RESEARCH.....	36
1. ORIGINAL ARTICLES.....	37
2. RESEARCH DEGREE THESIS SUMMARIES.....	38
3. REVIEW FORMATS IN ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION RESEARCH	40
3.1. <i>A Scholarly Review</i>	40
3.2. <i>A Review Essay</i>	41
3.3. <i>A Review Symposium</i>	43
3.4. <i>A Commentary</i>	43
3.5. <i>A Perspective</i>	44
4. A CORRESPONDENCE	45
5. A RESEARCH REPORT	47
6. A SCHOLARLY ESSAY ON A KEY CONCEPT.....	48
7. VISUAL ESSAYS	50
GUIDANCE ON SPECIAL ISSUES AND RELATED FORMATS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION RESEARCH	52



Environmental Education Research

Overview

The mission of *Environmental Education Research* is to advance research-based and scholarly understandings of environmental and sustainability education. The journal achieves this by publishing peer reviewed research and scholarship on all aspects of environmental education, sourced from around the world and diverse schools of thought and practice in inquiry.

This document sets out the aims and scope of the Journal, the editorial board structure and associated key roles and responsibilities, guidelines for board membership and reviewing, and information about the range of manuscripts accepted for refereeing at *Environmental Education Research*.

The guidance draws on material prepared by the publishers (Taylor & Francis), the original publishing partner and research centre associated with the Journal, *Centre for Research in Education and the Environment* (University of Bath), and guidance available under creative commons licenses.

The documentation is made available to the community of scholars involved with, or interested in, the Journal. It is made available on the basis that principles of good faith and good will towards the work of the editorial office are reciprocally based, and demonstrate direct expressions of the high standards, collegiality, transparency and sensitivity routinely expected in relation to academic publishing for this community and field of inquiry, including the use of this documentation.

The expected review cycle of these materials is every 3 years. Please note though, that the Journal reserves the right to revise any terms and/or terminate any appointment at any time for any of the reasons specified in the policies, procedures, and guidelines of Taylor and Francis, the publishers, related to *Environmental Education Research*, or as a result of operational requirements.

If you have any feedback or questions about these documents, please contact the editorial office, via eer@monash.edu.

Professor Alan Reid (Editor, *Environmental Education Research*) May 2023



Environmental Education Research

Aims and Scope of the Journal

Environmental Education Research is an international refereed journal which publishes papers and reports on all aspects of environmental education.

The purpose of the Journal is to help advance understanding of environmental and sustainability education through a focus on original research articles reporting research and development activities.

The Journal also carries more diverse papers including, for example, conference reviews, literature reviews and retrospective analyses of activities in a particular field, critical commentaries on policy issues, and comparative aspects of environmental education issues.

Environmental Education Research accepts the following manuscript types for refereeing:

- **original research articles** (typically 5,000-7,000 words, on empirical and/or theoretical inquiry),
- **scholarly reviews** (typically, extended essays and surveys of the literature, of 10,000-15,000 words),
- **review essays** (on key questions, breakthroughs, developments, events, publications and trends, typically 3,000-5,000 words),
- **review symposia** (a group of review essays),
- **visual essays** (a primarily visual format combining images and text in a coherent form, in equivalent to 20 pages max of standard printed pages) and
- **thesis summaries** (focused on providing a 350 word synopsis of a research degree thesis).

The Journal also publishes invited **scholarly essays** on key concepts (typically 8,000-10,000 words), **correspondence** (typically 500-750 words), **commentaries** (typically 750-1,000 words), **perspectives** (typically 3,000 words), **research reports** (typically 3,000-5,000 words, focusing on technical aspects of research in the field), and **book reviews** (typically 1,000 words). Manuscripts may be collected together in **special issues, or shorter collections**, e.g. a research symposium.



Environmental Education Research

Recommended word lengths apply to the main body of the text, not the references or any supporting material, such as appendices. The Journal reserves the right to apply limits in strict or softer fashion, depending on the submission and review outcomes.

Currently, the Journal is published 12 times a year. Social media channels are also used by the Editorial Office, via **eerjournal**.

Submitted manuscripts must be:

- the author's own original work, not duplicating any previously published work, including the author's own previously published work;
- submitted only to *Environmental Education Research* and not under consideration, peer review, accepted for publication, in press, or published elsewhere;
- contain nothing that is abusive, defamatory, libellous, obscene, fraudulent, or illegal;
- comply with the Publisher's policies, as set out in the [Instructions for Authors](#).

As part of a prescreening process, the Editor will determine the suitability of the manuscript for review upon receipt. This includes considering the fit of the manuscript with the journal; whether it displays promise in advancing the aims and scope of the Journal; and the quality of the paper including its novelty, coherence, sophistication, manuscript preparation (e.g., follows guidelines in terms of use of templates, formatting, length and style), and its general suitability for the readership. Ambiguity or direct failure on these matters are some of the key reasons why manuscripts are rejected prior to external review. We might also recommend a submission be redirected to another journal or outlet, or require further work before consideration again for refereeing, restarting this process.

Given the aims and scope of the journal, the key criteria for acceptance of manuscripts are that they are analytical and critical; that the ideas being discussed are transferable to other educational systems and cultures; and that they are accessible and relevant to an international audience.

The Journal accepts proposals for guest edited special issues, and mini-collections of articles. For information and guidance on preparing a proposal, please consult the information below.



Environmental Education Research

Peer Review Policy

All research articles published in the Journal undergo rigorous peer review, based on initial editor screening and anonymised refereeing by at least two referees. Our aim is to secure three high quality reviews for each original submission, and provide timely, regular and detailed feedback to authors throughout the peer review process. Our goal is to provide a decision letter within 60 days of a sufficient number and quality of referees having agreed to review the paper. (This is subject to the usual caveats regarding such matters as the rhythm of the academic year, availability and follow through of reviewers and the editorial board and office, and any unforeseen eventualities.) Please note that papers are seldom accepted on first submission, and most papers require 2-3 rounds of revisions before acceptance for publication.

A summary of peer review guidance is available, further information and advice is offered in Publisher's guide, and at the peer review section of the Author Services website, and in the ScholarOne Manuscripts user guidelines. Specific guidance for this journal is provided below.

Please note that *Environmental Education Research* uses text matching software to screen manuscripts for unoriginal material. By submitting a manuscript to *Environmental Education Research*, authors agree to originality checks on their manuscripts during the peer-review and production processes.

Corrections

The Journal may also publish the following, as the need arises, in line with the Publishers' policy:

- **Erratum** - notification of important error introduced during the make up of the journal article
- **Corrigendum** - notification of an important error made by the authors of the article
- **Addendum** - notification of a peer-reviewed addition of information to a paper
- **Retraction** (and **Removal**) - notification of invalid results.



Publishing Ethics, Open Access Policy, and Publication Charges

We support open access publishing, and are a member of the Committee on Publishing Ethics. Check the [Instructions for Authors](#) for the latest developments on open access, publication charges and publishing ethics for authors, referees and board members.



Environmental Education Research

Overview of the Editorial Board

The Editorial Board of *Environmental Education Research* is composed of an Editor-in-Chief [‘the Editor’], a team of Associate Editors (usually 4-6, including the Reviews Editor), and an international advisory board (usually 10-15).

The following key qualities are expected of all members of the Editorial Board:

- a. an ongoing record of high calibre scholarship and editorial experience (e.g., publishing significant scholarly work, guest editing, or serving on an editorial board of another journal);
- b. healthy reputation and good standing in the community of inquiry;
- c. organisational skills to assist with the reviewing, editorial and publication processes, including the ability to work effectively and collaboratively with the editorial board and office, and meet deadlines; and
- d. commitment to promoting the Journal at various conferences and meetings, as part of broader efforts by the Editorial Board to maintain and enhance the Journal’s contribution to the field.

All members of the Editorial Board are expected to have sufficient time, capabilities and resources to devote to their editorial duties. Board members are eligible for an Editor’s letter of recommendation when he or she is evaluated for promotion, tenure or post-tenure review of tenured faculty.

All work on the part of the Editorial Board is voluntary, and *no* formal compensation is given, apart from offers and incentives made available by the publishers.

Names of all Editorial Board members are listed in the journal print edition and webpage, either immediately, or during/up to one year of positive contribution to the Journal, at the Editor’s and Publisher’s discretion.

A short summary of the Editor’s roles and responsibilities is provided below, alongside those of Associate Editors and advisory board members. Further information about each role is also attached.



Environmental Education Research

The Editor

The Editor is approved and appointed by the Publisher for a five-year term (with the possibility of renewal). The appointment is made on the basis that he or she can articulate a compelling vision for the direction of the Journal and has the requisite skills, experience and intentions to discharge the duties of Editor. The roles and responsibilities of the Editor are set out in the Publisher's contract, alongside legal requirements and the terms of reference for the editorial office.

The primary responsibilities of the Editor are: (i) to advance the aims and scope of the Journal, and (ii) to ensure the quality and standing of its output, as a service to the field and community of inquiry.

The primary tasks of the Editor are: (i) to encourage the submission of high quality manuscripts on environmental education and its research to the Journal, and (ii) to ensure that these are refereed and published, according to the criteria for review and publication.

Associate Editors

Associate Editors are selected by the Editor from the advisory board, in conjunction with the Publisher. Associate Editors are members of the editorial board, and upon completion of their term as an Associate Editor, may be invited to continue as members of the advisory board, or leave the board.

Selection of Associate Editors is informed by the following protocol: appointments are typically for a term of 3 years (with the possibility of renewal) and are automatically reviewed after 2 years by the Editor and Publisher:

1. according to an identified area of current need. *For example, the Journal may seek to appoint an Associate Editor in areas where there is existing or developing interest, or an increasing workload.*
2. according to a demonstrated track record of upholding and advancing the standards and reputation of the Journal. *For example, providing high quality and/or exemplary reviews as an act of service to the Journal and authors.*



Environmental Education Research

Members of the Advisory Board

Members of the advisory board are selected by the Editor in conjunction with the Associate Editors, and/or in consultation with the other members of the advisory board. Selection is informed by the following protocol; appointments are typically for a term of 3 years (with the possibility of renewal), and are automatically reviewed after 2 years by the Editor and Publisher:

1. according to the broad vision and mission of the Journal. *For example, the Journal may seek to appoint a member of the advisory board in subfields generally silent in environmental education and/or research, but in which it seeks to stimulate interest, and to diversify scholarly interests and perspectives, or geographical regions represented.*
2. according to opportunity. *For example, where members of the editorial board become aware of leading or high calibre scholars who may have an interest in contributing to the work of the Journal in relation to their specific area of expertise.*

Review of the board membership and structure

In order to facilitate the identification, appointment, development and review of members of the editorial board and the board's operations, these topics are a standing item on the agenda of meetings between the Editor and Publisher. Typically, in consultation with Associate Editors, the Editor identifies areas of need and individuals who would be suitable candidates for membership of the advisory board, or take on a role as an Associate Editor. The advisory board may also advise the Editor, in conjunction with the Associate Editors, about where members of the editorial board are needed, and suggest specific individuals who might act as an Associate Editor or member of the advisory board. In response to such requests, the Editor may make recommendations to the Publisher.

Roles and Responsibilities of the Editor

The key qualities expected of those occupying the position of the Editor include the following:

- a. a record of high quality scholarship and editorial experience;
- b. organisational skills to oversee the editorial process and meet deadlines;
- c. reputation and calibre (e.g., record of esteem and significant contributions to the field, and community of scholars);
- d. ability to work effectively with the editorial board and office, reviewers, authors, and others involved in the publication process; and
- e. the ability to articulate a compelling vision for the direction of the Journal.

The major responsibilities of the Editor of *Environmental Education Research* include:

- a. overseeing and directing the manuscript review process, including manuscripts in revision;
- b. soliciting high-quality manuscripts and proposals for special issues from authors and guest editors;
- c. providing a clear vision for the direction of the journal;
- d. promoting the journal at a range of conferences and meetings; and
- e. sustaining and/or improving the Journal's position in the field.

The Editor is also expected to have sufficient time and resources to devote to editorial duties.

It is understood that the final decision concerning publication at *Environmental Education Research* rests with the Editor, for all manuscripts, including guest-edited special issues and collections. NB discharging many of the major technical responsibilities associated with preparing, processing, refereeing manuscripts and forwarding accepted manuscripts to the publishers, is conducted through the online submission system, managed by the editorial office, and hence, the editorial assistant, who also works closely with the publishing staff.

Papers Submitted by the Editor

An Editor may submit their own work for possible publication in the Journal. Advisory board members and referees will be carefully selected by Associate Editors to review these submissions.



Environmental Education Research

Roles and Responsibilities of Associate Editors

Environmental Education Research recognises that the roles and responsibilities of Associate Editors vary between journals, and within a journal, including this, at different times and for diverse needs.

The key role of an Associate Editor at this Journal is strategic, through providing advice, insights and commentary to the Editor about significant scholarly trends and issues that shape the work, development and reputation of the field and community of inquiry, and hence the Journal.

Associate Editors are strongly encouraged to solicit interesting work they see at international research events and meetings, and to have manuscripts or proposals for special issues submitted to the Journal.

Typically, an Associate Editor is assigned a higher proportion of manuscripts to referee than members of the advisory board (e.g., 10-20 p.a.). (NB Associate Editors are not charged with remits or targets to secure papers on particular topics or from particular regions, as if they were regional editors.)

At some times for this Journal (e.g., if the Editor is on leave), an Associate Editor may assume the role of deputy editor, obtaining refereeing reports, and making recommendations to the Editor.

The Editor recognises that Associate Editors should not be overburdened with the work of the Journal, and should obtain some benefit from the ‘opportunity costs’ of their participation, i.e. reputational advantage, publishing opportunities, and recognition of their contribution to advancing the Journal, field and community of scholars. With both facets in mind (not overburdening, and possible benefits), each Associate Editor is expected to discuss with the Editor a realistic approach to his or her role, and any tensions or conflicts of interest with his or her other scholarly work. Of key importance to these discussions is establishing clearly defined goals and outcomes, soundness of motivations for taking on and continuing in the role, and productive working practices (including any needs analysis and support). If an Associate Editor suspects his or her work for the Journal is likely to be interrupted, or no longer prove workable for him or her, s/he must communicate with the Editorial Office immediately. Associate Editors may resign from their role (or may be dismissed) if they are unable or unwilling to prosecute their role and the work of the Journal.



Environmental Education Research

An Associate Editor of *Environmental Education Research* has the following general responsibilities:

1. Advising the Editor on significant scholarly trends and issues that inform the work, development and reputation of the field, and the Journal.
2. Advising the Editor on the quality of proposals for special issues, mini-collections, symposia, review essays, etc., principally in relation to whether it will meet and advance the aims and scope of the Journal.
3. Encouraging the submission of high-quality, scholarly manuscripts of various kinds, that advance the aims and scope of the Journal, including the following:
 - a. Original research (e.g., 1 manuscript every 1-2 years)
 - b. High impact papers from major scholars of international standing (e.g., 1 every 1-2 years)
 - c. Review articles in a specific field (e.g., 1 every 1-2 years).
4. Identifying potential advisory board members who are suited to the Journal (e.g., 1 every year).
5. Identifying potential Associate Editors who are suited to the Journal (e.g., 1 every 3 years).
6. Identifying referees who are willing to be included in the Journal's database (e.g., 4 every years) [these may be colleagues, peers, former students, etc.]
7. Nominating themselves as guest editors for a themed issue (which will require a separate proposal).
8. Promoting the Journal at a range of conferences and meetings.

Papers Submitted by Associate Editors

Associate Editors may submit their own work for possible publication in the Journal. Advisory board members and referees will be carefully selected to review these submissions.



Environmental Education Research

Roles and Responsibilities of Advisory Board Members

Environmental Education Research recognises that the roles and responsibilities of advisory board members vary between journals, and within a journal, including this one, at different times and for diverse needs.

Typically, the key role of an advisory board member is to referee manuscripts (e.g., 5-10 per year). They are also encouraged to offer advice on the field and proposals for special issues, and solicit interesting work they see at research meetings and events, to have manuscripts submitted to the Journal.

The Editor of *Environmental Education Research* recognises that advisory board members should not be overburdened with the work of the Journal, and should obtain some benefit from their participation. To this end, each advisory board member will be asked to discuss with the Editor a realistic approach to his or her role with clearly defined goals, motivations for taking on the role and working practices, and communicate with the Editorial Office immediately if his or her anticipated work is likely to be interrupted, or no longer prove workable for him or her. Members of the advisory board can step down from their role (or be dismissed) if they are unable or unwilling to prosecute their role and the work of the Journal.

A member of the advisory board of *Environmental Education Research* has the following general responsibilities:

1. Providing high-quality reviews of manuscripts submitted to the Journal (typically 5-10 per year)
2. Encouraging the submission of high-quality, scholarly manuscripts of various kinds, that advance the aims and scope of the Journal, including the following:
 - a. Original research (e.g., 1 manuscript every 2-3 years)
 - b. High impact papers from major scholars of international standing (e.g., 1 every 2-3 years)
 - c. Review articles in a specific field (e.g., 1 every 2-3 years).
3. Advising the Editor on trends and issues in scholarship that informs the work, development and reputation of the field, and the Journal.



Environmental Education Research

4. Nominating potential advisory board members who are suited to the Journal (e.g., 1 every 2 years).
5. Identifying referees who are willing to be included in the Journal's database (e.g., 2 each year) [this may be colleagues, peers, former students, etc.].
6. Nominating themselves as guest editors for a themed issue (which will require a separate proposal, e.g., once every three years).
7. Advising the Editor on the quality of proposals for special issues, principally in relation to whether it meets and advances the aims and scope of the Journal.
8. Promoting the Journal at a range of conferences and meetings.

Papers Submitted by Advisory Board Members

Advisory board members may submit their own work for possible publication in the Journal. Carefully selected advisory board members and referees will be selected to review these submissions.

NB When a Special Issue is accepted by the Editorial Board, Guest Editors work with the Editorial Office to oversee and direct the manuscript review process, including manuscripts in revision. Guest Editors must maintain the refereeing protocols and standards of the Journal, and are strongly encouraged to ensure they have assigned a member of the editorial board to each manuscript. Any reasonable deviation in refereeing criteria or process must be negotiated with, and agreed by, the Editor.



Environmental Education Research

Policy on Conflict of Interest

When carrying out their journal duties, the Editorial Board may receive submissions from authors with whom members have close relationships. This includes, for example, former students, recent collaborators, and colleagues from the same institution or research project. In these situations, a potential conflict of interest arises. The Journal recognises that Editorial Board members are often significant or senior people in the field, with many collaborators and former PhD students. Our objective is to ensure that any potential conflict of interest is well managed without sacrificing the quality of the review process or significantly increasing its complexity.

Potential conflict of interest are most likely when the Editorial Office receives a submission from:

1. Authors who collaborated with a board member in the 3 years prior to submission.
2. Current or former PhD students who were advised by a board member and who graduated within the past 5 years.
3. Colleagues from their own department, faculty or institution.
4. Other authors whose relationship to a board member could reasonably be expected to prevent the board member from judging the paper fairly.

In all these cases, the Editor (or Associate Editor, as needs require) will decide the most appropriate process for handling the paper. This would typically entail either ensuring the refereeing of the paper by a different board member or handling the paper directly.



Environmental Education Research

Guidelines for Members of the Editorial Board of *Environmental Education Research*

Description

It is the duty and responsibility of the Office of the Editor to develop and provide members of the Editorial Board, advisory board, and referees with guidance, that:

- introduces roles and fair expectations;
- expresses guidance about ensuring high scholarly standards at the Journal;
- sets out responsibilities of the Editor, Board Members and referees, and vice versa;
- outlines the process of selection of referees and refereeing goals;
- models expectations of civil discourse in the operations of the Journal;
- addresses situations of conflicts of interest;
- identifies appeals procedures; and
- clarifies matters of timeliness in the review process for referees and authors.

Guidance to these ends is set out below and is reviewed collaboratively and periodically (e.g., tri-annually) by the Editorial Office, board members, the publishers and critical friends of the Journal. Referee guidelines are publically available on the Journal's website, as well as in the online review system, or from the Editorial Office.

1. Introduction

Accepting a position on the Editorial Board of an international research journal carries with it great opportunity and great responsibility. Members of the Editorial Board for *Environmental Education Research* have the opportunity to exercise considerable influence over what does and does not appear in the Journal. This means that board members and the Editor also have the responsibility to make decisions as impartially, reasonably, and fairly as is humanly possible.

The goal of the Editorial Board of *Environmental Education Research* is two-fold: (i) to foster scholarly and research-based communication about the field, and (ii) to maintain an archive of publications and subsequent communication that can serve as a resource for future generations of



Environmental Education Research

researchers, scholars and students interested in the foci, framings, and findings of environmental education and its research, their debate and development.

A guiding principle for the Journal's Editorial Board members is to foster scholarly debate within *Environmental Education Research*, rather than silencing legitimate discussion, or render debate or dispute inaccessible to the research community or wider community of scholars. Throughout, the highest scholarly standards must be maintained, and all journal content must meet those standards. *Environmental Education Research* will publish those manuscripts meeting those standards, that through the peer review process, can be accepted by the Editor.

Membership of the Editorial Board implies involvement at both individual and collective levels in:

- ensuring the continued health and development of the Journal, in terms of its processes, outputs and profile;
- proposing or reviewing a topic for Special Issues and other formats available to the Journal;
- refereeing a reasonable number of manuscripts that fit with members' areas of expertise;
- developing or refining the pool of reviewers, for articles and other formats, including books;
- developing their own academic contacts;
- collaborating with other researchers in relation to maintaining the Journal's good standing;
- seeing whether their research ideas and passions are shared by others, and remain state-of-the-art;
- examining the relevance and value of their research interests to the field through publishing peer-reviewed papers in the Journal to that effect;
- promoting high-quality scholarship, including possibly their own; and
- maximising networking opportunities for the Journal.

To become a member of the board—normally by invitation—a short CV, recommendation from an existing board member identifying existing or anticipated needs within the Journal, and proposal addressing intended and measurable contributions of the potential member, including his or her contribution to the field/track record, should be sent to the Editor, c/o eer@monash.edu, subject line: Editorial Board nomination.



Environmental Education Research

2. High scholarly standards

To accomplish high-quality, rigorous and progressive debate in the Journal involves a commitment to high scholarly standards, but also to helping researchers and scholars carry on a discussion about their work. High standards are essential, but should not imply any sort of censorship of controversial ideas. The difference between plausibility and implausibility, or what is conventional and radical, can be difficult to decide; what is plausible to one may be implausible to another, and vice versa. This distinction necessarily relates to the topic of choosing reviewers for submissions.

A basic principle for *Environmental Education Research* is that scholarly standards are served well by careful choice of reviewers by the Editor. If the Editor or a nominee (e.g., Guest Editor) has reason to doubt the capabilities of a candidate reviewer, then that reviewer will not be chosen to do a review.

The general review criteria for all manuscripts are that it:

- a. could make a useful and/or significant addition to the literature
- b. has an appropriate focus and contents
- c. has coherent research methods and/or conclusions
- d. will be understood by an international audience.

Further and specific criteria are invoked at other times, e.g., in relation to manuscripts for Special Issues and review papers.

3. Responsibility to the reviewers

Generally speaking, if the Editor has chosen reviewers well, and the peer review policy is followed, the recommendations from the reviewers will form the major and majority basis for the Editor's decision.

We aim to have each paper initially reviewed by at least one member of the Editorial Board as a minimum, as part of a team of three referees, as a minimum, with Board and/or expert members in the majority. Decision letters are stored by the Editorial Office and may be consulted by the Editorial Board members assigned to particular papers upon request, if these are not accessed or accessible via

their online referee centre. Other referees can also request access to decision letters via the Editorial Office, if these are not available via their online referee centre.

In some exceptional situations, the Editor may choose to decide against the majority of reviewer recommendations, even to the point of deciding against all the reviewer recommendations. In such cases, the Editor will be obliged to provide a detailed explanation for deciding against the consensus recommendations of the reviewers to all reviewers, including the Associate Editors of the Editorial Board. (Such decisions will be circulated for later discussion among Board members, e.g., in annual reports to the board.) Although deciding against the consensus of reviewers is likely to be very infrequent, assuming the reviewers are chosen well (see below), such a decision is deemed to be within the authority granted to the Editor. An appeals process for any of the reviewers in such a case is discussed at length in the Reviewer's Guidance.

When the Editor follows the majority in making a decision about the submitted paper, a minority reviewer cannot submit an appeal to the Editorial Office when the paper is accepted. When a paper is rejected, the reasoning for this will not be discussed in public or be used for the basis of a publication by any member of the refereeing panel.

4. Choosing reviewers

One critical way in which the Editor exercises influence over the content of the Journal is in the choice of reviewers. This aspect of the job is easiest when the topic of the paper is within the sphere of competence and expertise of the current members of the Editorial Board. In particular, this means familiarity with who is doing work in the field (and sub- or related fields) and so would be a candidate for reviewing the manuscript. When the content of a submission departs from the domains of expertise of the Editorial Board members and reviewer database, the Editor will seek assistance in obtaining a list of expert or candidate reviewers. Editorial Board members are encouraged to identify possible expert or candidate reviewers for the Journal and update their areas of expertise regularly.

Assistance can include asking the author(s) of the submitted papers for reviewer recommendations, choosing possible reviewers from among the papers listed in a submission's reference list, seeking



Environmental Education Research

suggestions from colleagues, consulting the *Environmental Education Research* reviewer database, and consulting the *Environmental Education Research* Editorial Board. In any case, at least two and preferably three further reviewers beyond the Board member requirement will be chosen for all submissions, but not as to clash with guidance in 3 above.

The Editorial Office of *Environmental Education Research* will maintain, update and share a roster of potential reviewers, containing contact information and relevant specialities, in order to streamline the reviewer recruitment process and expedite timely reviews of submissions. The Editor and Editorial Office are always open to receiving nominations for high-quality scholarly reviewers in any facet of environmental and/or sustainability education research.

Experts within the subfield of a submitted paper do not represent the only possible pool of reviewers. Some sections of the manuscript may have content that could be ably reviewed by someone not specifically working within the entire manuscript's subfield. For example, an environmental education research paper that includes a detailed psychological analysis of some aspect of the topic could usefully be reviewed by a referee who has demonstrated a comprehensive capability with psychology, even if that referee is using that capability in a different subfield to their usual domain of expertise. At the Editor's discretion, any reviewer felt to be capable of contributing important information regarding the paper's content can be chosen by the Editor, even if that reviewer is only capable of reviewing a part of the whole work. Similarly, if a reviewer is capable of providing useful reviews over most of the paper, but is not qualified to comment on some portion of the work, it is nevertheless plausible for the Editor to seek the reviewer's recommendations even if s/he cannot review the entire content.

When a manuscript raises questions about some existing work, the authors of those papers being questioned are prime candidates for being nominated as reviewers. However, the Editor is aware that such reviewers may also have a vested interest in rejecting any submitted manuscript that criticises their work. Thus, although such reviewers are obvious choices, their reviews will be carefully considered in light of what amounts to a natural human tendency to reject criticism. The Editor's task is to make a decision about the suitability of a submitted manuscript for publication, not to decide the



Environmental Education Research

scholarly questions considered. That is, the Editor must judge the validity of any scholarly content that is critical of existing publications. If that content is based on valid scholarly principles, the paper is worthy of publication, irrespective of the responses by the author(s) of papers being criticised. Ensuring scholarly debates is carried on within the contents of the Journal is intended to help the wider research and scholarly community come to its own decisions about the issues. It is not always easy to judge when the debate is a matter of opinion rather than when one party or the other has invalid arguments. In keeping with the basic principles of *Environmental Education Research*, the Editor will allow publication, rather than rejection, when in doubt.

5. Maintaining a civil discourse

A key responsibility of the Editor is to maintain professionalism within the sometimes heated discourse associated with the refereeing and publication of particular manuscripts. Authors and reviewers are expected to avoid ad hominem attacks, and profane or offensive language is not permitted in refereeing correspondence, to the editor or author. Exchanges between reviewers and authors are not permitted to become part of a publication, and all parties should keep the discourse on a professional, not personal, level during the editing process (refereeing, and author responses to decision letters and referees' recommendations). On those rare occasions where this breaks down, the Editor's responsibility is to encourage a civil discussion, and will, for example, consider editing comments made by either party before these are exchanged, e.g., in decision letters. Since *Environmental Education Research* will not publish any content that is unprofessional, this has strong implications for any final decision by the Editor. The Editorial Board is fully supportive of the Editor's final choices in cases involving unprofessional behaviour in the interaction between reviewers and authors.

6. Conflict of interest issues

In cases where there is even the appearance of conflict of interest or partiality on the Editor's (or Guest Editor's) part with respect to a particular submission, that Editor should recuse him/herself from managing the editing and/or refereeing of that manuscript and turn over the responsibility to



Environmental Education Research

another member of the Editorial Board. Examples where this might arise include submissions of papers by:

- (1) current supervisors or mentors of the Editor or Guest Editor, (2) Associate Editors, (3) authors critical of papers on which the Editor was an author or coauthor, (4) students currently or formerly advised by the Editor, (5) subordinates of the Editor, or any other cases where the impartiality of the Editor might reasonably be questioned.

The Editor is responsible for avoiding even the appearance of impropriety in relation to conflicts of interest. Obviously, and likewise, no Member of the Editorial Board should edit or referee a submission on which s/he is an author or coauthor; current supervisor or mentor of the author; or other cases where the impartiality of the reviewer might reasonably be questioned, as previously noted.

7. Appeals to the Editorial Board

The Journal has an appeals process for the reviewers of papers, when the Editor has decided against the recommendations of the majority of reviewers. However, no such appeal process is currently envisioned for authors; the Editorial Board supports the avoidance of bogging down an Editor's duties with appeals associated with rejected papers. Thus, with regard to rejections, the Editorial Board fully supports the decision of the Editor when reflecting the majority recommendations by the reviewers. In the case of a rejection decision that goes against the reviewer consensus, as noted in 3 above, the Editor will submit a detailed explanation for that decision to the Board.

8. Obtaining reviews in a timely fashion

The Editor recommends that reviews should be returned by the reviewers within four- to six weeks, so a decision letter can appear within eight weeks. Candidate reviewers will be contacted before sending a submission to them, and their agreement to submit their review within the deadline set by the Editorial Office will be obtained before proceeding. If a reviewer does not agree to submit a review on or before the deadline, another candidate reviewer will be sought. The Editorial Office's responsibility is to hold the reviewers to that deadline. Not all eventualities can be foreseen, but if a reviewer has a mitigating circumstance arise before the deadline that would compromise that



Environmental Education Research

deadline, he/she will be expected to contact the Editorial Office to obtain permission for an extension of the deadline, which should normally be for no more than one to two weeks. The Editorial Office has the discretion to permit such extensions. In the event a reviewer is unable to meet the deadline, the Editor will seek another candidate reviewer immediately, imposing the shortest possible deadline on that alternative reviewer. The goal is to limit the entire review process routinely to less than two months, and preferably to eight weeks or less.

9. Obtaining author responses in a timely fashion

Once the author has been forwarded the reviewer comments, it is in that author's best interests to respond to those comments and revise the manuscript as quickly as possible. The Editor is responsible for setting a reasonable deadline for receiving the revised manuscript. If the reviews are generally favourable and include only minor suggestions, that deadline could be as short as four weeks. If major changes are required, it could be up to three months. Extensions to the Editor's deadline can be granted at the Editor's discretion to accommodate an author's circumstances. Failure to meet the deadline will result in the author having to submit the revised paper as a new submission. The Journal's usual practice is to require resubmitting authors to accompany their manuscript with a commentary on how they have addressed the points raised in the decision letter, including the referees' comments, suggestions and recommendations about revising the paper. This is available to the referees reviewing the resubmission via the online submission system, or the Editorial Office.

10. Visibility, reward and termination of refereeing roles

All work on the part of refereeing is voluntary, and *no* formal compensation is given, apart from offers and incentives made available by the publishers.

Names of all Editorial Board members are listed in the journal print edition and webpage, either immediately, or during/up to one year of positive contribution to the Journal, at the Editor's and Publisher's discretion. Referees are listed each year they review in the final issue of that Volume's print edition.



Environmental Education Research

The Journal reserves the right to terminate any board member appointment at any time for any of the reasons specified in the policies, procedures, and guidelines of Taylor and Francis related to *Environmental Education Research*, or as a result of operational requirements.



Environmental Education Research

Guidelines for Referees for Environmental Education Research

Description

It is the duty and responsibility of the Office of the Editor to develop and provide referees for the journal with guidance that:

- introduces roles and fair expectations;
- expresses guidance about ensuring high scholarly standards at the Journal;
- sets out responsibilities of the Editor, Board Members and referees, and vice versa;
- outlines the process of selection of referees and refereeing goals;
- models expectations of civil discourse in the operations of the Journal;
- addresses situations of conflicts of interest;
- identifies appeals procedures; and
- clarifies matters of timeliness in the review process for referees and authors.

Guidance to these ends is set out below. It is reviewed collaboratively and periodically (e.g., tri-annually) by the Editorial Office, board members, and critical friends for the Journal. Please note that the Publishers provide extensive resources for authors and referees, and these should always be considered in conjunction with this guidance. A [summary](#) of peer review guidance is available, further information and advice is offered in Publisher's [guide](#), and at the [peer review section](#) of the Author Services website, and in the ScholarOne Manuscripts [user guidelines](#).

The general review criteria for all manuscripts are that it:

- a. could make a useful and/or significant addition to the literature
- b. has an appropriate focus and contents
- c. has coherent research methods and/or conclusions
- d. will be understood by an international audience.

Further and specific criteria are invoked at other times, e.g., in relation to manuscripts for Special Issues and review papers.



Environmental Education Research

1. Introduction

This guide is mostly about the principles and considerations that a reviewer should consult when called upon to assist us in maintaining high scholarly standards for *Environmental Education Research*. The guidance includes some technical information, but our primary emphasis is to provide our reviewers with a reference point to understand how to approach reviews for this particular journal.

Reviews and author responses to those reviews will not become part of the public archive associated with the article. Reviews will be anonymous. In the interest of keeping the editorial decisions as concise as possible, the Editor will not include as part of the decision letters to authors comments/responses of a trivial nature, such as grammatical issues, the insertion of commas or typographical errors (the so-called technical comments), but they will still be included within the material of a review and response between the author and reviewer, as raised by the decision letter and response.

A decision about publication is entirely the Editor's responsibility. In most cases, the Editor will follow the will of the majority of the reviewers (usually a minimum of 2, typically 3, for an initial submission), but in some cases, that might not happen. If such a case arises, the Editor will be expected to provide reviewers and the Editorial Board with substantive reasons for not accepting the recommendations of the majority of reviewers.

2. Expectations of Reviewers for Environmental Education Research

Reviewers invited to review for the Journal are expected to:

- read and be abreast of state-of-the-art and seminal research;
- evaluate the literature (and the discussion of that literature in a submission) that describes, applies, assesses or critiques environmental and/or sustainability education research or research accomplishments;
- constructively contribute to the professional development of a colleague submitting their work for peer review;
- influence and enhance the quality of research in the field of environmental and/or sustainability education by advising the Editor of the quality of the paper against the review criteria;



Environmental Education Research

- share research experience with others (authors and the Editor), as appropriate and relevant to the manuscript being refereed;
- provide input into research issues, and reasonable and actionable recommendations to authors; and
- read reviewing guidelines.

Normally, researchers are invited by the Editor to join the pool of reviewers. To express interest, potential reviewers should contact the Editor at: eer@monash.edu, subject line: Referee nomination. Potential reviewers should provide documentation outlining their contribution to the field, professional background and areas of expertise, fit with scope of the journal, and keywords.

All review work is voluntary, and *no* formal compensation is given apart from offers and incentives made available by the publishers. Reviewers are eligible for an Editor's letter of recommendation when they are evaluated for promotion, tenure or post-tenure review of tenured faculty.

Referees are listed each year they review in the final issue of that Volume's print edition. Referees are strongly encouraged to review their contact details, areas of expertise and interest, each year.

The Journal reserves the right to terminate any referee appointment at any time for any of the reasons specified in the policies, procedures, and guidelines of Taylor and Francis related to *Environmental Education Research*, or as a result of operational requirements.

3. Review Guidelines

First and foremost, the goal of the review process is to determine and/or improve the scholarly quality of the submission. Reviewers offer feedback and commentary to the author via the Editor to ensure and raise scholarly integrity. Constructive criticism is a necessary part of this collaborative effort and as such should be offered and received in a professional manner.



Environmental Education Research

The Editor's role includes that of being a moderator, in a literal way, of the discourse between reviewers and authors, and he or she will enforce ethical standards of behaviour in the review and response process.

Reviewers are expected to return their reviews within four to six weeks, unless otherwise specified by or negotiated with the Editor. The reviewer may request an extension from the Editor.

4. Review Content

There are two basic components to the review of a manuscript for *Environmental Education Research*: (1) scholarly content in relation to the aims and scope of the Journal, and (2) quality of the presentation. Either or both of these can be grounds for acceptance, rejection or revision of the submission and all options should be considered within the review.

The general review criteria for all articles in this journal are whether the article:

- a. could make a useful and/or significant addition to the literature
- b. has an appropriate focus and contents
- c. has coherent research methods and/or conclusions
- d. will be understood by an international audience.

Further and specific criteria are invoked at other times, e.g., in relation to manuscripts for Special Issues, and review papers.

A. Scholarly content

Although there can be no simple formula for what is acceptable scholarly content, there are some basic principles that generally apply (e.g., as discussed by the professional research associations of American, British, Australian, and European educational researchers), while due reference to existing or prior literature, ideas, concepts, trends, and approaches from the field are strongly encouraged. The standards for a manuscript depend somewhat on the category of submission, but some general considerations apply for all manuscripts:



Environmental Education Research

1. *References in support of an assertion.* Generally, references are used to provide additional support for the arguments and assertions within a paper. There is no simple way to determine which arguments or assertions do or do not require substantiation. It is within the purview of a reviewer to request references if the reviewer believes a reference is needed where none was provided. Poor practices in scholarship, such as using secondary rather than original sources, overreliance on others' arguments in lieu of developing one's own, overuse of pieced-together quoted material, and/or recycling of established material, and so on, will be actively discouraged in *Environmental Education Research*. The use of "principal source" references (e.g., the original source of information and appropriate page citations or references) is encouraged whenever possible. Generally, refereed publications are more acceptable for this purpose than unrefereed material; thus, if the author uses an unrefereed reference, this may not be considered acceptable support. Authors should note that, if the availability of an unrefereed reference becomes an issue when used to support an argument within a manuscript, the author may be asked to provide a copy of the source to the Editorial Office.

2. *Speculation.* For the most part, ungrounded or unwarranted speculation is not acceptable in a scholarly manuscript for *Environmental Education Research*. In this instance, speculation is defined as an unreasoned, unsound or unsubstantiated assertion, argument or hypothesis, where these could or should be provided. This position is taken with due acknowledgement that conceptual and substantive innovations may be grounded in speculative or unproven ideas, and novel or original applications or developments are to be encouraged in scholarly work, particularly in theoretically- or conceptually-driven material. Thus limited speculation is possible but in general in the case of an empirically-focused manuscript, it should usually be confined to the end of the paper, e.g., within a "discussion" of the paper's content or areas of future research, and it should be clearly identifiable as speculation.

3. *Significance of arguments or results.* Whenever possible, authors are expected to analyse, ruminate and comment on the intellectual significance of their work and/or findings for the field. The use of analysis to assess the confidence that can be placed in findings and their interpretation based on sound data, is essential to any scholarly paper. Generally, failure to provide analysis of material, results or commentary on the strengths and weaknesses of theory (applied, tested or developed) are not acceptable. For example, sample size is an important aspect of statistical confidence limits and small



Environmental Education Research

samples need to be identified as such. Verification of analytical schemes and their substantiation should be as rigorous and extensive as possible and any limitations to their credibility acknowledged, such as identifying failure to consider false positives, negative cases, or counter interpretations.

4. Reproducibility. It should be possible for anyone reading the manuscript to comprehend the logic, methods and research design, and where appropriate, be able to reproduce or replicate results, even while different interpretations of their significance may be offered. The manuscript, therefore, should provide any and all information necessary for a reader to comprehend the steps of any research approach documented therein. (This applies to theory-focused as well as empirical forms of research.) While any withholding of necessary information is unacceptable, the use of references to accomplish this is acceptable. To the maximum extent possible and consistent with a concise presentation, a manuscript should be self-contained. Extensive analytical procedures or instrumentation can be moved to an Appendix. Large datasets and detailed software information need not be provided, although it is encouraged to make reference to software and data available whenever possible, perhaps by the World Wide Web or via an unrefereed technical paper.

5. Proof. Reviewers should recognise that in a formal sense, “proof” of scholarly ideas is never possible. While proof is arguably feasible in pure mathematics, it is not possible in those human sciences that use quasi-experimental data, observations, or theory in support of ideas. Thus, it is not appropriate for a reviewer to ask for proof, unless it refers to mathematical issues. Rather, it is appropriate to review how convincing, plausible and credible the supporting analysis is in terms of accepting some interpretation, contention, or hypothesis. The intellectual rigor of the logic of the analysis or the test is the primary means of judging how convincing, plausible or credible the evidence and argumentation are, not adherence to proscriptions for method. Data sample size, accuracy and precision and limitations of the data, for example, and the degree to which the data permit an unambiguous interpretation all contribute to these ends, but do not guarantee that the findings are intellectually valuable or compelling. Thus, these matters are all fair issues for a reviewer to consider when reviewing the scholarly content. Of course, for statistical content, the logic must follow the appropriate rules without error, including such issues as the existence and uniqueness of outputs and their qualifications, but statistical significance should not be confused with academic significance.



Environmental Education Research

While for qualitative content, the interpretative logic must follow the appropriate rules or procedures for the method, as appropriate, including addressing matters of over-interpretation, under-interpretation and counter-interpretations, bias, partisanship, and advocacy.

6. *Relevance.* The only issue of the relevance of a paper that is appropriate for a reviewer to consider is whether the content of the presentation fits within the guidelines of what is acceptable content for the Journal as noted in its aims and scope, a wider knowledge of the field, and the archive of publications in the Journal. While the reviewer may offer an assessment of the relevance of a manuscript for publication in Journal, the final judgement is the Editor's.

7. *Originality.* It is our belief that papers reproducing already published work may or may not be acceptable. If the manuscript simply reproduces the framing, argumentation, findings, or results of an already published work with no change and adds little or nothing else, this is unlikely to be acceptable for the Journal. In some cases, it is valuable to the community if a particular piece of work can be confirmed. In particular, if the analysis or findings of an already published work are reproduced, but with a different set of data, or an expanded or comparative data set, this is quite likely to be acceptable.

8. *Comparisons with existing work.* To the maximum extent possible, comparisons within a manuscript with already published work should be as unambiguous as possible. If a comparison with previous work is made, the same definitions should be used, as well as the same or equivalent theory or data. If it is felt that the definitions, theory and/or data of an existing work have problems, then a comparison with that existing work should be done both with the original definitions, theory and/or data, as well as with the changed definitions, theory and/or data.

9. *Negative results.* The Editor determines whether papers reporting negative results may or may not be acceptable for publication. Based on the reviews, the Editor decides whether to accept any manuscript reporting negative results for a research design, findings or analysis. We believe that negative results can be useful to the scholarly community.



B. Quality of presentation

Again, there is no simple formula to follow for a successful presentation. The Editorial Board is minded to accept a variety of stylistic choices, permitting authors to express themselves in their own unique way. The Journal generally follows the British Educational Research Association guidelines for basic style issues, since those formats are familiar to most of our authors and the publishing house, but the Journal allows flexibility (e.g., including allowing the use of first person within the text, a reference within an abstract) where this is established to be appropriate and reasonable. Reviewers can find the British Educational Research Association's Guide online at www.bera.ac.uk. The following include some basic recommendations for authors to follow and reviewers to consider.

1. Quality of the English. For non-native English speakers, and perhaps even for some native English speakers, the grammar, spelling, usage, and punctuation of the text are very important for an effective presentation. The Editor, including Guest Editors, will generally not put a paper into review if the English presentation is inadequate. Furthermore, if the reviewer feels the paper is not readable, the reviewer may reject such a paper on those grounds alone. Likewise, some papers may be recommended for publication, but still require further or extensive work on expression, syntax, grammar, etc., including recommendations to employ the services of a specialist. The Journal does not have the staff or capacity to correct English expression, and cannot be expected to offer this, although some referees may want to provide suggestions, e.g., through 'track changes' or comments on hard copy.

2. Organisation. The quality of presentation includes the issue of how the paper is organised. To some extent, the organisation of the content is a style issue and the author should be allowed to do whatever she or he wishes, provided the resulting content can be followed reasonably easily. However, it is appropriate for a reviewer to make recommendations for reorganising a paper's content in an effort to improve the presentation. Again, there is no magic formula for a proper organisation, but this is a fair topic for a reviewer.

3. Completeness. An important issue is whether everything that needs to be in the manuscript is actually there. Of particular significance is that all the literature citations should be included in the

reference list, and all the items in the reference list should actually be cited somewhere in the text *and contribute to the argument*. All figures and tables should have captions that describe their content sufficiently well that interpretation of their content is straightforward.

4. *Quality of figures*. Figures should be legible as well as easy to read and understand. Generally, figures provide supporting documentation and illustrate some important point within the paper. Thus, reviewers should pay close attention to the figures and offer specific suggestions for changing them, if need be, to help the authors improve the presentation.

5. *Use of templates*. The Journal provides authors with templates for submissions to hasten the preparation of papers accepted for publication. Referees are strongly encouraged to remind authors and the Editorial Office where these are not in use, or used effectively, particularly in relation to presentation, citation and referencing conventions for the Journal.

C. Manuscript length

The Editorial Board wishes to keep manuscripts within some bounds. Hence, any original research manuscript that exceeds 6000 words in length (title page, abstract, text of manuscript, and acknowledgments), and/or deviates from manuscript templates, may need to receive special consideration and permission from the Editor. The Editor reserves the right to recommend the use of supplementary material.

It is in the author's interest to avoid 'deadwood' in the text, such as extensive rehearsal or description rather than commentary and evaluation of the significance of the literature cited, using material of dubious relevance to the argument, or repeating the content of findings in the discussion. These are common problems with submitted manuscripts. Reviewers should be prepared to offer specific suggestions for shortening long manuscripts.

When reviewers offer suggestions, it is common to ask for more supporting evidence and additional or more critical analysis. Reviewers are asked to be mindful that, when the paper is at or near the length limit, asking for more material may put the author in the position of having to remove other



content to stay within the advised length limit. Reviewers are asked to be considerate of the author when asking for additional material and to offer specific suggestions where the manuscript can be trimmed to accommodate the requested content.

D. Unreviewed content

Sometimes, reviewers choose to not review some parts of the content, for any of a number of reasons. If, for any reason, a review does not consider some part of the manuscript's content, that should be specifically noted by the reviewer. Examples might include the details of research instrumentation, or some aspect of the paper upon which the reviewer is not qualified to comment. There can be many good reasons for this, but it is important for the reviewer to inform the Editor about any such omission.

Review Organisation

In addition to making a recommendation to the Editor, reviewers are expected to provide detailed comments to the author, describing any shortcomings and recommending changes that would address those shortcomings. In general, there are two types of comments: substantive and technical, as described in *Responding to Reviewer Comments in the Author Guidelines*. To assist the Editor in working with the review and responses by the author as part of an accepted paper, it is the reviewer's responsibility to divide the review content into separate sections for substantive and technical comments, and avoid repeating the same material in comments to the Editor and Author.

Reviewer Recommendations

Every review will include a recommendation to the Editor. This recommendation will be one of the following:

- The paper is accepted in its present form.
- The paper is acceptable with very minor revisions and no further review is requested unless major changes are made in accordance with other reviews (at the discretion of the Editor).
- The paper may be acceptable with minor revisions, but send the revised manuscript back for further review.



Environmental Education Research

- The paper may be acceptable with major revisions. Further review of the manuscript by the reviewer is automatic, unless the reviewer requests otherwise.
- The paper is rejected. Further review of the manuscript by the reviewer is possible if the Editor decides against the reviewer's rejection recommendation, requests a resubmission in light of the feedback, or unless the reviewer requests otherwise.
- The paper should be rejected outright.

Given that the first option is unlikely following an initial submission, reviewers might probably see a manuscript at least twice as a minimum, unless they specifically request otherwise.

If a reviewer has a problem with the way an Editor has responded to his/her recommendations, the reviewer can submit a complaint to the Editorial Board for review, following standard conflict resolution procedures. The Board will review all such disputes and render a decision as soon as possible after receiving them. Decisions of the Board are final.



Environmental Education Research

Manuscript Types that can be submitted for refereeing at *Environmental Education Research*

1. Original Articles
2. Research Degree Thesis Summaries
3. Review Formats in *Environmental Education Research*
 - 3.1. A Scholarly Review
 - 3.2. Review Essays
 - 3.3. A Review Symposium
 - 3.4. A Commentary
 - 3.5. A Perspective
4. A 'Correspondence'
5. A Research Report
6. Scholarly Essays on key concepts
7. Visual Essays



Environmental Education Research

1. Original Articles

Original research articles are the mainstay of the Journal. Manuscripts presenting primary and original research should communicate new knowledge that fits with, or advances, the aims and scope of the Journal, clearly demonstrating a scholarly contribution to understandings of environmental and sustainability education through critical discussion of research and development activities.

Research articles should discuss original theoretical and/or empirical studies relevant to the field. The Journal is not exclusively committed to any particular schools of thought or methods of research, and aims to promote the highest standards of study and scholarship in respect of environmental and/or sustainability education, drawing on work in cognate fields where relevance can be clearly established. The Journal seeks to publish original articles from across the disciplinary spectrum, and from scholars and research throughout the world. The degree of originality, and the study's relation to the existing literature, are key considerations in the peer review process.

The Journal encourages novel ways of thinking about emerging issues (conceptual, empirical, historical, or methodological) and the use of varying research methodologies (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed) and narrative styles, as appropriate to the material and genre, including critique of existing research and ideas relevant to the field.

Research articles are typically 5,000-7,000 words, excluding references, and additional material. A typical manuscript will not exceed 7,000 words including tables, captions, footnotes and endnotes. Manuscripts that greatly exceed this will be critically reviewed with respect to length. As with all manuscripts, authors are strongly encouraged to consider the pertinence, clarity and accessibility of the title, abstract and keywords, particularly for an international and diverse Journal readership. The general review criteria for all articles in this journal are whether the article: *could make a useful and/or significant addition to the literature; has an appropriate focus and contents; has coherent research methods and/or conclusions; will be understood by an international audience*. Further and specific criteria are invoked at other times, e.g., in relation to manuscripts for Special Issues, and review papers.



Environmental Education Research

2. Research Degree Thesis Summaries

The Journal accepts summaries of completed research degree theses in the field of environmental and/or sustainability education research, that provide a synopsis of each thesis, as they arise.

Rationale

A publically available list of theses is an important resource for appreciating the range, trends and shifts within both a key strand and entry point to current and future inquiry in this field, over time and ideally from around the world. Summaries of theses also allow readers to follow through on such studies as well as alert them to the names of colleagues who are new entrants to the field, particularly those who may not usually publish in an English language context but would benefit from having their work noted or engaged in that arena. The onus is on candidates or their supervisors to alert the Journal's Editorial Office of news of success, while members of the international advisory board are also encouraged to signal when and where notification of studies is timely and beneficial to other researchers and the field.

Description

This publication format offers an open invitation to have the following information published in the Journal:

- Title of research thesis/dissertation
- Author name, Award/Degree type
- Keywords
- Synopsis
- Supervisors
- Conferring University
- Further information about the study, e.g., published papers.

Guidelines for submissions, including an online portal and checklist, are available at <https://bit.ly/eejournal-thesis-summary>



Environmental Education Research

Questions, inquiries or comments about thesis summaries should be addressed to the Editorial Office, email: eer@monash.edu, Subject header: thesis summary re: [theme]

Notes

1. While there is likely to be strong overlap, when a synopsis of the thesis is included in the listing, by default it is not the abstract as it stands but a reworking of this for a wider audience, e.g., to note its contribution to a research programme, subsequent papers that have published issuing from the thesis, further work, updates or impact, etc.
2. Information about Research Degree Theses will be reviewed before acceptance for publication and will be published at the Editor's discretion. As with a Correspondence, this will be with due regard to not interrupting the regular flow of research manuscripts in the Journal.
3. For the sake of completeness of the Editorial Office's records, and in case of inquiries at a later date, we encourage candidates to consider appending names of examiners to the information requested above, albeit noting these will not be published in the Journal.
4. In light of the logistics of developing, maintaining and publishing such a list, the Journal reserves the right to publish this list periodically, and/or on a rotating basis, e.g., to invite or collect together studies regionally, or cluster them by theme, methodology, etc.
5. As of Volume 20, the list will invite notification of current completions, but limit inclusion of research degree theses completed recently to within the preceding 2 years of the volume.



3. Review Formats in Environmental Education Research

In addition to the standard formats of research articles published in the Journal, researchers of environmental and/or sustainability education are encouraged to consider using other formats, in this instance, those that focus on or prioritize providing timely, critical, analytical and synthetic ‘reviews’ in a variety of forms.

Rationale

Review formats are an important way for authors and readers to use or appraise other formats for representing and legitimating work in a research field. They can also demonstrate both better fitness for purpose and a keener awareness and appreciation of the ‘opportunity costs’ of employing a wider range of manuscript formats than those typically used in the Journal.

Descriptions

3.1. A Scholarly Review

A Scholarly Review is an extended essay. It normally offers an authoritative, balanced and scholarly survey of recent developments in or as they relate to the research field. It is typically oriented towards addressing substantive questions related to theory, concepts, quality, methodology and/or empirics, and offer, where appropriate, a critical exploration of educational implications and recommendations. The requirement for balance need not prevent authors from proposing a specific viewpoint, but if there are controversies in the field, the author(s) must treat them in an even-handed way. Scholarly reviews would normally be 10,000-15,000 words, and illustrations and worked examples are strongly encouraged. References are limited to 100, with exceptions possible in special cases. Citations would be selective and, in the case of particularly important studies ($\leq 10\%$ of all the references), we would encourage authors to provide short annotations explaining why these are key contributions. The scope of a Scholarly Review should be broad enough that the work of a single research group or approach, and particularly that of the author(s), does not dominate it.

Scholarly review authors must provide a competing interests statement before publication. Scholarly reviews will always be peer reviewed to ensure factual accuracy, appropriate citations, scholarly balance and integrity. They should be submitted as per standard research articles for the Journal,



Environmental Education Research

flagging they are ‘reviews’ at the appropriate point, for the attention of the Editor. Reviews that are published will include received/accepted dates.

3.2. A Review Essay

A Review Essay normally engages the central theme of a set of significant research events, breakthroughs, developments, or publications (typically books), with the goal of providing the Journal’s interdisciplinary and international readership with an original argument about key questions and emerging or persistent trends in environmental and/or sustainability education research and scholarship. Although the Editors would typically commission review essays, unsolicited proposals are also invited.

Short review essays are between 2,000-3,000 words, will be reviewed as per a standard refereeing process, and will be accepted on the decision of a minimum of two members of the Editorial Board. The same will apply to longer review essays, often up to or about 5,000 words (cf. 3.1. **Scholarly Reviews**). Proposals for a review essay to the Journal should be sent to the Editorial Office in the first instance, to discuss ideas, and/or request guidelines for submission. To initiate this, prospective authors should first email: eer@monash.edu. Subject header: review essay re: proposed theme. Review essay authors must provide a competing interests statement before publication.

We expect the purpose of most review essays will not be simply a ‘long’ (more detailed) review, as published by the Journal (i.e. as with a book review, not to address: *is this a good book, who should read it, etc.*). Rather, a review essay will offer an extended discussion of wider issues related to the research field such as, *this is a research event, breakthrough, development, publication, book, or collection of books [see 1 below] that:*

- potentially has a major impact on an existing field or sub-field of environmental and/or sustainability education research, opening up research and/or theoretical questions that demand extended discussion of its empirical and/or theoretical implications;
- may open up an entirely new field or sub-field of environmental and/or sustainability education research: it breaks new ground, demanding extended discussion in order to explore the empirical and/or theoretical possibilities that it gives rise to;



Environmental Education Research

- brings together an extant body of work or literature in such a way as to suggest that this is a genuine field or sub-field of environmental and/or sustainability education research, and demands extended discussion in order to evaluate its claims and consider its potential consequences;
- invites us to reconsider what we thought we knew and understood about a major thinker, set of ideas, principles or practices, either per se or in terms of how different works or approaches are connected, and therefore demands extended discussion so that current or future work in this regard can be re-mapped, reconceived or re-oriented.

The style of a review essay will be exploratory, not combative. If a research event, breakthrough, development or publication merits a longer review essay, it is (by definition) significant, i.e. worthy of wider and serious attention. In other words, it is an underlying assumption of a review essay for the Journal that the ‘research’ in question is significant in some way [see 2 below]. As per standard publication reviews, review essays that are published will not include received/accepted dates.

Review essays will typically be characterised by a focus on a:

[1] Research event, breakthrough, development or infrastructure (e.g., conferences, symposia, seminars, networks, collectives, research programmes, etc.), publication, or collections of publications. For example, it might be:

- a) books by the same author (this seems most likely when the author is dead, retired, or has remaining works that are emerging, e.g., given the emergence of a Festschrift or Gedenkschrift, retrospective or other symbol that proverbially “passes the torch” or attempts to discern the significance of that person’s work for the field);
- b) books by different authors making compatible contributions to the same field or sub-field;
- c) books by different authors that make incompatible but equally intriguing contributions that open up possibilities within a field or sub-field;
- d) edited books that bring together a field or sub-field in a new way. Where the review considers more than one event or publication, the number of events or publications to be covered is, roughly, 3-4.



Environmental Education Research

[2] The essay should seek to be ‘critical’, in terms of the field first and foremost, and then in terms of a sub-field. Always, the reviewer needs to be mindful that they are evaluating the implications of a research event, breakthrough, publication or book (or collection of books) for environmental and/or sustainability education research, or a part of environmental and/or sustainability education research.

NB As with all material for review, correspondence should be addressed to the Editorial Office, c/o eer@monash.edu.

3.3. A Review Symposium

A Review Symposium offers a **group** of review essays by different authors on a current issue or development in environmental and/or sustainability education research, in contrast to jointly or single authored **Review Essays** or the more substantial **Scholarly Review**. Individual commentaries should not normally exceed 5,000 words, including references. Individuals wishing to organise a Symposium should contact the Editorial Office before proceeding. Email: eer@monash.edu, Subject header: review symposium re: proposed theme. Review symposia that are published will include received/accepted dates. Proposers of the review symposium must provide a competing interests statement for each author before publication.

3.4. A Commentary

A Commentary offers a flexible review format for the Journal. The purpose may be to review policy, research and society or purely environmental or sustainability issues. The main criteria are that a commentary should be of immediate interest to a broad readership and should be written in an accessible, non-technical style. Its length is typically 750-1,000 words, although some may be longer (consideration should be made as to whether the material is or should be better placed in a **Correspondence** or as part of a **Perspective**). Because the content is variable, the format is also flexible. Commentaries do not normally contain primary research data, although they may present ‘sociological’, ‘historical’ or other such ‘contextual’ data (funding trends, demographics, bibliographic data, etc.). Non-traditional formats, e.g., poetry or vignettes, will also be considered. References are limited to 25.



Environmental Education Research

Commentary authors must provide a competing interests statement before publication. Commentaries will be peer reviewed, and published at the Editor's and Review Editor's discretion. Commentaries that are published do include received/accepted dates.

3.5. A Perspective

A Perspective offers a format for review and discussion of the primary research literature and field that is either too technical or theoretical for a **Commentary** (3.4) yet does not meet the criteria for a **Research Report** (5)-either because the scope is too narrow, or because the author is advocating a controversial position or a speculative hypothesis or discussing work primarily from one research group or approach. A minimum of two reviews advocating different sides in a research controversy would normally be published as Perspectives. Each perspective should not normally exceed 3,000 words. References are limited to 25.

Perspective authors must provide a competing interests statement before publication.

Received/accepted dates are not included. Perspectives are always peer reviewed.



Environmental Education Research

4. A Correspondence

This format provides an opportunity for researchers of environmental and/or sustainability education to write a concise letter to the Journal on an issue of current interest or concern, and see these published.

Rationale

Letters that highlight key aspects of or respond to articles, comments, reviews, research events or conferences, editorials, special issues, etc. are welcome by the Editorial Office and advisory board. Given the current rate of publication of the Journal (6 issues per year), the publication of correspondence may also help reduce timelag in responses between researchers and/or scholars, and may stimulate other forms of timely and strategic engagement, comment and reflection in the field.

Description

Correspondence is generally be a maximum of 500-750 words. Contributors should address the substance of their topic and issues in a way that avoids personal attacks. Named authors or proponents of positions or approaches will be offered the opportunity to reply, where appropriate.

An earlier example is: Aaron Morehouse, 2008. A deeper meaning of place. *Environmental Education Research*, 14, 6: 693-697. Although this letter responding to a mini-collection in the Journal on 'critical pedagogy of place' amounts to 1,200 words, its content and approach offer helpful examples of what is possible as a correspondence.

Correspondence should include the name of the author, affiliation, and contact email. They should be sent to the Editor, c/o: eer@monash.edu, Subject header: correspondence re: [theme]

Notes

1. A Correspondence (typically or formerly 'Letters to the Editor') is a flexible format that is intended to alert the Journal's readers to matters of interest to researchers in this field, from policy debates to announcements to 'matters arising' from research papers, methodologies, research programmes, etc.



Environmental Education Research

2. A Correspondence may describe primary research data, but only in summary form; as a format it is not intended for full presentation of data, methods or theory, or replace other formats available to the Journal.
3. Correspondence should generally not amount to more than two printed pages of the Journal; it is usually expected to be one or two page in length.
4. The number of references should generally not exceed 10 for either the Correspondence or its Reply.
5. Titles for correspondence are finalised or supplied by the Editor.
6. Authors must submit a competing interests statement, which is printed only if they declare that they have competing interests. In cases where a correspondence is critical of a previous research paper or study, the authors of said work are normally given the option of publishing a brief reply, ideally, but not necessarily, in the same issue of the Journal. Criticism of opinions or other secondary matter does not involve an automatic right of reply.
7. Correspondence is published at the Editor's discretion, with due regard to not interrupting the regular flow of research manuscripts in the Journal. Refutations are always peer reviewed; other types of Correspondence will be peer reviewed as befits the nature and tenor of the submission.



Environmental Education Research

5. A Research Report

A research report presents primary commentary or data on a new research technique or method that is likely to be influential. This format is not a review of research methods or techniques per se, but its primary report in this literature and/or field. It may inform the field of a new research design (for data collection or analysis) or statement of ‘proof of concept’ related to the usefulness of a research technique, methodology or approach, although this is not a requirement. Research Reports have a format broadly similar to that of standard articles, though most Research Reports will be shorter (3,000-5,000 words). They begin with an unreferenced abstract (typically 150 words) followed by separate sections; for the purpose of illustration, e.g., Introduction, Literature Review, Method, Results, and Discussion (with optional subheadings). If statistical testing was used to analyse the data, the Method section must contain a subsection on statistical analysis. If the Research Report is about theoretical or conceptual innovations, it should be modified accordingly. There is no strict limit on the number of illustrations or example items, but good sense is expected. References are normally limited to 30, but this can be flexible and discussed, at the Editor’s discretion.

Research Reports include received/accepted dates. They may be accompanied by supplementary information. Research Reports are peer reviewed, and authors must provide a competing interests statement before publication.



6. A Scholarly Essay on a Key Concept

In addition to standard articles, special issues and mini-collections, *Environmental Education Research* provides environmental and/or sustainability education researchers with an opportunity to engage in scholarly debate through essays about key concepts, ideas and theoretical concerns that advance the framing and development of research in the field.

Rationale

A scholarly essay on key concepts in the Journal is expected to make a significant conceptual, methodological and/or theoretical contribution to the advancement of environmental and/or sustainability education research. Education and broader social research are the contexts addressed by such invited essays. The scholarly essay will deal critically with the major ideas informing environmental and/or sustainability education research that are most directly relevant and responsive to compelling issues and problems challenging the field. A scholarly essay will be published with response/s. The Journal will also invite commentaries or correspondence to appear in later issues.

Scholarly essays will be published with the expectation they could become seminal papers that act as ‘key’ to the field’s development. As the metaphor suggests, we expect scholarly essays will address the ‘locking and unlocking, closing and opening’ of thinking and deliberations about compelling issues in the field’s research philosophies, priorities and practices - including their grounding.

Description

In this submission format, a leading contemporary scholar is invited by the Editorial Board to write a scholarly essay for the Journal. While the essay of 8,000-10,000 words will most likely be authored by someone with the necessary familiarity and expertise to address the Journal’s audience, we expect it to be accompanied by one or, ideally, two 3,000-word response papers, written by leading scholars representing viewpoints and argumentation from within and outwith the field, as agreed by the Editor. The response paper will enhance the field’s reflexivity by relating the scholarly essay to developments, trends and issues in, or pertinent to, environmental and/or sustainability education research. The scholarly essay and response/s will be independently reviewed by at least three members of the Editorial Board. Peer reviewed ‘commentary’ (750-1,000 words) or ‘correspondence’



Environmental Education Research

(500-750 words) may appear in later issues of the volume in which the scholarly essay and response paper were published.

The critical dimension of the scholarly essay could be to unsettle orthodox (academic and/or lay) assumptions, understandings and operationalisations of research, researching and researches associated with the key concept. To address this remit, the author might apply a genealogical method and, where appropriate, given the Journal's international readership, a culturally comparative account.

Invited authors will exercise significant scholarly judgment in communicating the substance, critical balance and import of the essay so that a wide variety of environmental and/or sustainability education researchers, and other interested persons, research groups and postgraduate students will appreciate and understand the value and potential usefulness of the scholarly essay and response/s and, hence, engage seriously with the 'cutting edge' contribution envisaged here. The style of the scholarly essay should be critical, reflective and exploratory, not combative nor overly complex. Prose should be elegant and inspiring, rather than pedestrian or obtuse.

Notes

1. In some cases, it may be necessary or appropriate to have more than one respondent to the scholarly essay or more than one round of response for this format in the first issue of each volume, e.g., inviting the author of the scholarly essay to submit a response to the respondent, as can be found in other journal formats fostering scholarly debate. Initially, the Editors expect to proceed with one essay and response paper, with the commitment to review conventions after the first three essays and response sequences.
2. Scholarly essays might contain material that reviews an idea, concept, issue, theme, etc., but the Editors' explicit purpose here is not to have the essay repeat or duplicate the review essay format already available to the Journal; thus, prose that is descriptive or reviews rather than argues, clarifies or criticises, should be kept to a minimum in a scholarly essay.
3. Published scholarly essays will include received/accepted dates. Authors and respondents must provide a competing interests statement for each contribution before publication.



Environmental Education Research

7. Visual Essays

Environmental Education Research welcomes visual essays. These submissions should be primarily visual and combine images and text in a coherent form. All visual essays are double-anonymous peer reviewed. When preparing a visual essay, please consult the general instructions for authors first, including about image specifications and reproduction charges, and keep the following points in mind.

Visual essays:

- Should be prepared with the following common elements to a research article in the following order: *title page; abstract; keywords; main text with figure call-outs; acknowledgments; references; appendices* (as appropriate); *figure(s) with caption(s)* (on individual pages); *figures in separate files; all figure captions* (as a list)
- Should be presented clearly and in engaging ways for images and accompanying text
- Should typically be no more than the equivalent of 20 of the journal's standard printed pages (typically 7-12 pages of images and 8-13 pages of text, or 3200-5200 words), inclusive of figures, references, figure captions, endnotes. (In visual essays where the image dominates, with text reading more like captions, the accompanying text should be approximately 1000 words and the combined image and text should be designed to occupy no more than 20 printed pages.)
- Should select and craft images and accompanying text in ways that drive the research narrative forwards (i.e. avoid using visuals merely illustratively for conceptual, theoretical, and/or empirical aspects, as the images should form the primary focus of the visual essay format)
- Should have all visuals uploaded separately, in good resolution, and indications for where to include follow standard protocols, as per the general Instructions for Authors, e.g. please indicate where in the text the figures should be placed (i.e. "insert figure 1 here"). NB If figure captions are not used, relevant/needed information regarding figures should be included in a "Note on figures" preceding the reference list
- Should contextualize the images/project within the text, addressing the who, when, where, what and why of the project
- Should establish the scholarly/intellectual significance of the project through thoughtful commentary and citation practices in line with the narrative intent of the manuscript and a clear sense of the manuscript's original contribution to the field



Environmental Education Research

- Should consider the use of supplementary material to support the work of the visual essay (<https://authorservices.taylorandfrancis.com/publishing-your-research/writing-your-paper/enhancing-your-article-with-supplementary-material/>)
- Should be clear about the authorship, originality, validity and legality of all images and text as covered by COPE guidelines and the article publishing agreement.

A manuscript including both text and figures, indicating the essay's preferred layout, may be included as an additional file with the online submission.

If deviating from the above, the content and length of visual essays will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

NB Select Visual Essay in the submissions system, when submitting the essay.



Environmental Education Research

Guidance on Special Issues and related formats for *Environmental Education Research*

Overview

Environmental Education Research is an international peer-reviewed journal that publishes high-quality, conceptual and empirical research and scholarship on all aspects of environmental education. Manuscripts are sourced from around the world and diverse schools of thought and practice in inquiry. Over 12 issues per volume, the Editorial Board seeks to prioritise the publication of original research papers, literature reviews and special issues on matters of central importance to advancing research-based and scholarly understandings of environmental and sustainability education.

The Editor invites proposals for special issues that are clearly defined, focused and significant, and help advance high-quality scholarship and research on cutting-edge topics. Our policy is to consider only promising proposals that are within our aims and scope, have broad appeal, and will support focused conversations on key topics in this and related fields.

Key features of a Special Issue for *Environmental Education Research*

Special Issues provide an excellent opportunity to develop a more sustained and critical understanding of important topics in environmental and sustainability education and their research. This may be achieved by reviewing a topic, examining gaps in scholarship, or encouraging new approaches and domains of research than is possible in single journal articles. Examples of special issues and related formats can be found at the journal's [website](#), and to date, have included thematic, regional and methodological coverage.

A full special issue typically comprises 8-10 articles (around 8,000 words in length), plus a 5,000 word introduction or/and guest editorial.

We also publish research symposia, special sections and mini-collections of 3, 4 or 5 articles, plus a shorter introduction or guest editorial.

Our main criteria for assessing whether to support a special issue proposal are:



Environmental Education Research

- (Expected) quality and impact of the articles and overall issue;
- Originality of the theme and/or the methodology of the research in relation to extant scholarship.

Proposals for consideration should be a maximum of 8 pages. In brief, a proposal should communicate a clear account of a researchable area, research topic, and associated research question(s), as appropriate. Proposed guest editors should outline their general approach to these, examples of themes and subthemes, a work schedule, the relevance of the guest editors, the names of 3-4 proposed contributors and provisional titles, and include a brief description of the proposed content of the special issue.

By default, our special issues are open for general submissions. Decisions about manuscript inclusion are quality based, relying on the normal process of peer review. While some contributions may be invited, our general principle is proposals for a research symposium, special section or mini-collections are better suited to material originally associated with an 'invitational event', e.g. derived from a conference symposium, research workshop, or on a topical issue related to the work of the journal that don't merit a full special issue.

The successful guest editor(s) take on the coordinating task and responsibilities of soliciting, managing and refereeing submissions, and maintaining the standards and processes of the journal. Participating authors should submit their papers individually to the journal's on-line system for review, marking them up with SI + first guest-editor's surname/topic.

Note: if Guest Editors would like to submit a refereed paper for publication in the issue, they must follow the [Committee of Publication Ethics' Codes of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines](#) for journal editors when preparing, assessing and refereeing their own papers for publication in the special issue. As a rule of thumb, a Guest Editor should not be contributing more than one authored or co-authored article in a Special Issue.

Guest Editors have responsibility for all editorial decisions on the manuscripts submitted for peer review, save that final decisions to accept for publication are subject to confirmation by the Editor-in-



Environmental Education Research

Chief. Manuscripts submitted for publication in a Special Issue are subject to all the rules and procedures of double-blind peer review applied to all manuscripts submitted to the Journal. A Guest Editor communicates to the Editorial Office their final recommendations for acceptance following peer review. In the spirit of quality-first and cooperation, the Editor-in-Chief's decision supersedes a Guest Editor's, is final without appeal.

Board members are expected to support Guest Editors in refereeing and advising, and be present on each manuscript sent out for refereeing. Guest Editors must maintain regular contact with the Editorial Office on progress towards milestones, developments in work (published, forthcoming) on the topic, and any challenges or obstacles that need addressing.

Proposals should be sent to the Editor-in-Chief, who ensures they are considered by the editorial team of *Environmental Education Research*, c/o eer@monash.edu.

There is no deadline for submission of a proposal, nor publication, although *timeliness is a key consideration in both the proposal and publication process*. We evaluate proposals when they come in. We do not have a set number of special issues we publish each year.

If the Editors of the Journal deem a proposal stands little chance of acceptance, the proposers will be advised of this immediately, in order to enable them to approach other journals (or book publishers) without undue delay. Typically, negotiation and revision occur.



Environmental Education Research

Guidelines for Proposals of Special Issues of *Environmental Education Research*

These guidelines are intended to help in the preparation of a special issue proposal for *Environmental Education Research*. We have no template; potential guest editors are expected to work with the spirit of the guidelines, and respond collegially to queries raised by the Editor(s) where clarification, further explanation or revisions are invited or sought.

Potential guest editor(s) should address *in no more than 8 pages* the following notes and questions using the headings provided. Supporting material isn't counted/may not be read.

1. Proposal summary

A first page, containing:

- A provisional title of the Special Issue
- Name, affiliation and position of proposed Guest Editors
- In 200 words or fewer, a synopsis summarising what your special issue is about? (What are the major ideas, main themes, and publication objectives?)
- Indication of acceptance by the proposed Guest Editors that they will adhere to the peer review and publication ethics policies of the Journal and Publisher, and will solicit and process manuscripts in full accordance with the normal editorial policies of the Journal, and general guidelines.

2. Rationale

A second and ensuing pages, *articulating a brief, concise and compelling description of the rationale behind the proposal.*

This should offer a summary of the justification of the identified topic and scope, identify the innovative nature of the proposed SI in relation to existing published work in the particular field, and offer an indication of its likely appeal to readers not specialising in that particular field. Other considerations may include: the broader theoretical or methodological focus of the proposed special issue, and/or projected theoretical, practical and policy implications. The description should not exceed 1500 words.



Environmental Education Research

Prompts (and key considerations for review of the proposal by the editorial board):

- What are you proposing to do differently/more innovatively/better than has already been done on the topic (in *Environmental Education Research* specifically, as well as in the field more generally)?
- Why is now the time for a special issue on this topic?
- Why is *Environmental Education Research* the most appropriate venue for this topic?
- What are the main competing works on the topic? (e.g., edited books, other special issues, etc.)

In this section, include a list of any other Special Issues or publications on the proposed or related topic that have been recently published, and/or you are aware will be published, as articles, collections, or by other journals, *to ensure you have indicated how the proposed special issue develops a distinct contribution to the field.*

3. Qualifications

- Why are you the right person(s) to edit a special issue on this topic? (Why are you an expert in this area? What have you previously written or edited on the topic?)
- Have you edited/co-edited a special issue before? (If yes, please give the citation/s)
- Have you edited/co-edited a book before? (If yes, please give the citation/s)
- Do you currently serve on any journal editorial boards or journal advisory boards? (If yes, please list)

(In addition to the proposal, please provide a brief (two page maximum) curriculum vitae for each person involved in the proposal, including a list of 5 major publications and editorial experience.) In this section, please note any considerations for project management and completion (e.g. time/assistance available, anticipated sabbaticals or leave, ongoing or administrative commitments, etc.), conflicts of interest, etc..



4. Sketch of proposed contents

- Do you have a preliminary list of potential authors interested in submitting to such a special issue? Are you able to list them? (this, of course, in no way obligates you or them to produce potential papers).

Assuming you do, provide names, affiliations and positions of all likely contributors and reviewers for the Special Issue (including for each manuscript, a named board member to attach to the refereeing team for the paper*), and where possible, 200-word abstracts for each proposed article, together with an indication of the intended authors' readiness, suitability and commitment to contribute to the special issue **.

* In order to avoid conflicts of interest, for the list of proposed reviewers for each piece, aim to ensure no one is linked to the contributors through institutional affiliations and work collaborations (past or present). You may also want to signal who is not appropriate, and why, as per standard guidance on 'opposed referees' or contributors.

** It is appreciated that the draft abstracts are indicative, but it is usually important to prepare this to indicate and assess the likely contributions to the field, working through the alignment of the proposal with the aims and scope of the journal, and to determine whether contributors are 'signed up' and not just on a wish list. Since all of the papers for the Special Issue will be subject to standard peer review, you may also want to factor in that not all papers will necessarily make it through that process. Hence, submitting a proposal with eight proposed papers (8000 words being the standard article length), puts the guest editors at risk of losing several papers as a result of peer review. We thus encourage submissions containing more than eight paper proposals. Otherwise the issue will default to a shorter format (research symposium, special section, mini-collection).

NB The planned word count of each paper and confirmation that the total word count of the special issue is not likely to exceed 64,000 words excluding references, notes, diagrams and tables. This is a key publisher consideration. A 5000-word introduction/editorial has to be considered too, and any deviations from standard publication formats that are anticipated and justified (e.g. photo essays, interviews with key stakeholders, uses of supplementary material, etc).



Environmental Education Research

5. Project management

- Outline the division of labour in the guest editorial team: e.g. roles of lead and secondary guest editors, in who is expected to write the editorial, handle the papers and refereeing process, and support the launch or dissemination of the SI.
- Given that it may take approximately 12-18 months to complete a special issue, please provide a detailed timeline of anticipated project management ‘milestones’, including named responsibilities, estimated dates or time frames for the following basic steps (include additional steps as appropriate, e.g. writing workshops):
 - Call for papers ***
 - Submission deadline
 - Review process
 - Revision process (typically assume 2-3 rounds of revision)
 - Copy editing (include plans for in-house, institutional or commercial aspects)
 - Final editing

*** if accepted, a one- or two-page public ‘call for papers’ flyer will be required, that can be circulated or used for notification purposes, e.g. in social media and the journal’s website.

- With an eye to publication, have you identified a publication strategy? This should outline international contacts, events, and key researchers in the field that you will contact requesting they advertise the Special Issue/and or submit papers, or could be used to help generate content or support uptake of the collection.



Environmental Education Research

Further notes

All Guest Editors have to treat as confidential all information accessed and received during the peer review process, maintain the integrity of the peer review process, inform the editorial office of all major considerations or decisions made (including any disruptions to the workflow), and ensure the good order of the journal.

Guest Editors are accountable to the timeline set for the production of the Special issue, including the double-blind review process and managing all submitted manuscripts, in conjunction with the editorial office team. Special issues are managed, on a day to day basis, by the Guest Editor(s), via the Scholar One online submission and review system used by the Journal, subject to the general guidance (and help) of the Editors and journal team.

Feedback will be offered on all aspects of a proposal, as/where necessary, e.g. to recommend amendments regarding quality and proposed content of articles and editorials, to ask about methods and processes to ensure the highest quality standards, and to confirm processes and principles for the Journal are understood and will be enacted. A final review of the output from the process will happen before committing to publication, e.g. to check on alignment, deviation and developments since the proposal.

Special Issue proposals are reviewed by the Editorial Board. One member of the editorial team is usually assigned to mentor, shadow or work with Guest Editors when it is accepted, typically the Editor-in-Chief or an Associate Editor, assuming no conflict of interest.

Normal submission expectations for manuscripts for this journal apply to Special Issues: *Manuscripts should be scholarly, analytical and critical. Ideas discussed and advanced should be transferable to other educational systems and cultures (where possible), and papers should be accessible to an international readership.*

A Guest Editor will use best endeavours to ensure that all contributing authors are aware of their own responsibilities regarding quality, copyright and legal issues, and that authors are aware that, if their



Environmental Education Research

contribution is accepted, they will be required to sign a publishing license and warranty in this respect.

Further details on the review and publication process can be provided by the Editor upon acceptance of the Special Issue, or viewed at the journal website. Advice, guidelines and templates for preparing manuscripts of a range of types are available in the [Instructions for Authors](#) and [Environmental Education Research general guidelines](#), including on authorship and contributorship, and other facets of publishing ethics. *The Editor-in-Chief, rather than the Guest Editor(s), makes the absolute final editorial decision on all of the manuscripts being considered for possible publication in the Special Issue.*

The Publisher prepares and publishes the Special Issue in the Journal, reserving the right to make such editorial changes as may be necessary to make the Special Issue suitable for publication; and reserving the right not to proceed with publication for whatever reason. In such an instance, copyright in the Special Issue will revert to the Guest Editor.

The Publisher reserves the right to postpone or cancel publication of a Special Issue should there be failure to meet an agreed deadline.

Guest Editors of a Special Issue may be able to organize, say, a workshop at a Research Symposium, SIG, and Network event if they wish to bring together their contributors and to refine their Issue, or pursue institutional support for such work. Likewise, accepted organisers of symposia or workshops at a high-quality relevant conference in this field may wish to submit a proposal for a Special Issue, research symposium, mini-collection, etc. as appropriate, connected with that (typically after the event, and feedback addressed).

We strongly encourage that all proposals consider inclusion in terms of gender, career stage, and location, especially in proposed contributors (except for location, for regionally-focused special issue proposals). We particularly welcome contributions to Special Issues from researchers and scholars working in institutions or settings not usually represented in the journal's volumes.



Environmental Education Research

Warranties – indicative example for the publishing agreement for a Special Issue

1. The Guest Editor hereby warrants to the Publisher that s/he has full power to enter into this Agreement.
2. The Guest Editor hereby warrants that included in the text of the Special Issue will be an appropriate statement should the Guest Editor or any of the contributors have a financial interest or benefit arising from the direct applications of the research published in the Special Issue.
3. In consideration of the publication of the Special Issue, the Guest Editor assigns to the Editor and the Publisher with full title guarantee all rights of copyright and related rights in the Special Issue. This assignment includes the right to publish the Special Issue in all forms, now known or developed in the future, including electronic and digital forms, for the full legal term of the copyright and any extension or renewals, and to sub-license to others. The contributors will retain the right to use the substance of the contributions they make to the above work in their own future works, including lectures, press releases and reviews, provided that they acknowledge their prior publication in the Journal, in accordance with the Author Rights policies of Taylor & Francis. If the Guest Editor Accepts these Terms and Conditions s/he is invited to sign and deliver contract to the Journal.

The final decision on publication and scheduling remains with the Journal editors and the publisher. All special issues are eligible for consideration for publication in book form, in the Environmental Education Research series published by Routledge.

In case you have any further questions, feel free to get in touch with the Editor.



Environmental Education Research

Appendix - Special Issues at *Environmental Education Research* – a Guest Editor Checklist

- ✓ Prepare a proposal in light of the preceding considerations, mindful of what other Special Issues have been published in this and related journals, and reflecting on what they have achieved (or could be expected to achieve) in preparing your proposal.
- ✓ Upon acceptance, sign agreement with Journal on submission of a special issue.
- ✓ Complete, publish and promote call for papers.
- ✓ Receive an account and password from the Editorial Office to the editorial website.
- ✓ Inform authors of preparation and uploading instructions to the manuscript processing site (each author must open an account and submit individually, and provide an ORCID).
- ✓ Negotiate and monitor timelines and deadlines with authors for submission of papers.
- ✓ Appoint an advisory group to help review papers for final submission, e.g.
 - Three scholars in the field for each paper, minimum of one from the editorial board for each manuscript
 - Submit names and contact information to Editorial Office to assist in the refereeing process (consider contacting them first to ensure they will serve)
 - Draw on advisory group, other guest editors, critical friends approved by the journal, and editorial board in making final selection of papers for publication.
- ✓ Ensure that all Guest Editors, referees and all authors have read and adhere to the Journal's Aims and Scope, Guidelines to Authors, and Guidelines to Referees.
- ✓ Write introduction or/and editorial to Special Issue and submit with the other articles.
- ✓ Ensure that relevant and distinctive keywords, titles and abstracts are prepared for each manuscript, to ensure Search Engine Optimisation. Prepare social media if appropriate.
- ✓ Monitor reviews regularly, in consultation with the Editorial Office; collate reviews and convey written advice to authors; be open to project revisioning (or failure).