AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Journal of Experimental Psychology: General

© 2022 American Psychological Association
ISSN: 0096-3445

https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001327

EDITORIAL

Inaugural Editorial

Sarah Brown-Schmidt
Department of Psychology and Human Development, Vanderbilt University

In what follows, I first introduce myself and then describe my goals for the *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* (hereafter, *JEP: General*).

Who I Am

My name is Sarah Brown-Schmidt. I am Professor of Psychology and Human Development at Vanderbilt University. Over the last 20 plus years I have been conducting experimental research in the field of cognitive psychology. My research includes work with adults from university and online samples, as well as persons with brain injury and neurodegenerative disease from the local community. Areas of focus include ecological validity, memory, language, social(media) communication, individual differences, and quantitative methods. I have trained hundreds of undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students. My pronouns are she/her/hers. My goals as editor of *JEP: General* are shaped by my experiences as a woman and parent in the academy, as a scholar working in the United States at a time of social and cultural change, and as a student of scholarship and testimony of persons from underrepresented, disadvantaged, and minoritized groups.

Goals and Action Plan

JEP: General publishes work in a wide variety of disciplines within the field of experimental psychology with a focus on rigorous empirical research that is of broad impact and interest. My goal for *JEP: General* is to enhance diversity at the journal in multiple ways, such as offering masked review, special issues that highlight diversity science, and emphasizing the importance of inclusive writing. My plan for the journal is guided by the following credo:

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

I am committed to increasing the participation of persons from underrepresented, disadvantaged and minoritized groups in science, including but not limited to Black, Latinx/e, and Asian scholars, women, LBGTQIA+ individuals, and persons with disability. Inclusion of a diverse range of perspectives and lived experiences in science benefits scholarship by bringing new understanding to existing topics and helping direct scientific inquiry to research questions that may otherwise be overlooked. We have a scientific responsibility to ensure that the fruits of our collective scientific pursuits are accessible and available to all persons. Historical, institutional and social factors have resulted in the systematic underrepresentation of particular identities and groups in leadership positions, including in the academy. Institutionalized racism and sexism and profound economic inequalities are among the problematic legacies that persist in affecting who and what we study today.

> It is particularly unfortunate that the representation of women has failed to penetrate the authorship rosters of just those issues that are meant to shape the field, with the result that a new generation of women scientists will fail to recognize themselves in the vision of the future that they offer. (Klatzky et al., 2015, p. 171)

One way to increase diversity in science is to recruit persons to senior positions who reflect the diversity that we aspire to see. Unfortunately, women and persons from minoritized groups remain underrepresented in leadership roles such as editorial positions and fellowships, as well as in awards and funding (Titone et al., 2018; Vaid & Geraci, 2016). To this end, I am excited to announce that *JEP: General* is, at the time of this writing, recruiting six early career psychologists (ECPs) for a paid editorial fellowship program[1]. This program is designed "to elevate leadership opportunities for ECPs from historically excluded groups, particularly Black, Indigenous, and other psychologists of color, as well as members from other communities which have been historically excluded from leadership opportunities in research and publishing." I will work with a team of Associate Editors to mentor the fellows and share institutional knowledge about the ins and outs of the editorial process.

> First, across the past five decades, psychological publications that highlight race have been rare, and although they have increased in developmental and social psychology, they have remained virtually nonexistent in cognitive psychology. (Roberts et al., 2020, p. 1)

In an analysis of over 26,000 empirical papers from the years 1974–2018 in the fields of cognitive, developmental, and social psychology, Roberts et al. (2020) report that only 5% of the articles highlighted race overall, and that this number dropped to 4% when the Editor in Chief was white, and jumped to 11% when the Editor in Chief was a person of color. Findings like this demand change. Designing special issues to highlight the experiences of people of color is one of many recommendations to disrupt racism in our current system (Buchanan et al., 2021). To this end, our team will highlight the importance of a Diversity Science

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sarah Brown-Schmidt, Department of Psychology and Human Development, Vanderbilt University, 230 Appleton Place, Nashville, TN 37203, United States. Email: sarah.brown-schmidt@vanderbilt.edu

[1] https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/resources/call-editorial-fellowships

approach to experimental psychology in a forthcoming special issue, "Learning Diversity: How Contexts and Experiences Shape Perceptions Across the Life Span," coedited by Rachel Wu and Sarah Gaither. Through this special issue I look forward to the Journal showcasing exciting new empirical findings in Diversity Science, as well as scholarship intended to shape the future direction of the field. I look forward to involving our editorial fellows in the development of this special issue and am eager to involve the fellows in shaping and guiding the journal.

> If females are less successful in publishing research on account of their gender, then given the current practices associated with appointment and tenure, and the need for women dramatically to out-compete their male counterparts to be perceived as equal [3] any such publication bias impedes the progress of women to more advanced professional stages. (Budden et al., 2008, p. 6)

In addition to this special issue, I welcome submissions to the Journal from a Diversity Science perspective, including both empirical work and commentaries on the literature and prior publications in *JEP: General.* Commentaries can be an excellent way to sharpen and clarify theoretical debates. In addition, commentaries provide an opportunity for scholars to critique problematic assumptions in the literature, and offer interpretation of research from diverse perspectives (Buchanan et al., 2021).

Our editorial team will be implementing a number of other initiatives at *JEP: General* aimed at supporting diversity at the journal. First, I encourage authors to take advantage of our masked review policy, which supports double-masked review of articles. The aim of masked review is to increase the equity of the review process as biases associated with author institution, prestige, and gender may introduce inequities into the peer review process (Budden et al., 2008; Darling, 2015; Okike et al., 2016). Second, we now ask authors to include a Constraints On Generality (COG) statement (Simons et al., 2017) that clearly specifies and justifies the population of interest for the reported research. Third, authors should report detailed and relevant demographic information about participant samples such as age, disability status, race, ethnicity, and gender. Authors should use trans-affirming and gender inclusive language in their writing (Zimman, 2017). When describing participant demographics, I encourage authors to describe how this information was collected (e.g., drop-down menu with options; open response fields), as this can affect how participants self-identify. APA guidelines for inclusive language are available for guidance.[2]

> As the field adopts a new culture, language, and awareness of its complicity in maintaining white supremacy, all parties can vigilantly monitor processes that can create inequalities in psychological science. (Buchanan et al., 2021, p. 1104)

Open Science, Rigor, and Reproducibility

I view open science through an equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) perspective (see Fuentes et al., 2022 for a critical discussion of open science and antiracism in psychology). The pursuit of knowledge is a fundamental human activity, and the fruits of this labor should be shared with society at large. To this end *JEP: General* will be adopting a number of new submission requirements and guidelines.

Authors will now be required to share de-identified data and code associated with reported research unless ethical and/or legal restrictions make this impossible. Advantages of data sharing include not only advances within the original topical domain (e.g., meta-analyses, replication-extensions), but the raw data from published work can be used to develop novel quantitative techniques to advance the field. From an EDI perspective, however, it is critical to note that data sharing is not always possible due to ethical and/or legal reasons. Participants may not give approval for their data to be shared. Consider that a participant may consent for their data to be shared in a study of individual differences in Stroop task performance, but *if they had been asked*, they would not consent for their data which included, say, demographic information about age, gender, race, and ethnicity, to be reanalyzed in a study examining gender or racial differences in inhibitory control (see Fox Tree et al., 2022). Some data may not be fully de-identifiable, including, for example, interview transcripts, structural MRI of the brain (Takao et al., 2015), and EEG data (Armstrong et al., 2015). Some populations may be small enough that with a few demographic indicators, individuals are identifiable. Barriers to data sharing may affect some research communities more than others, and inequity in institutional resource allocation may be relevant to the ability to engage in data sharing, as well as attitudes toward data sharing (Anane-Sarpong et al., 2018). I look forward to working with authors to balance the ideals of transparency and openness with legal requirements and ethical principles we must uphold as scientists. Knowing that it is okay to ask for an exception to a policy is a potential source of inequity and gatekeeping in the review process, and why it is important to state explicitly. The article submission instructions will make clear that thoughtful requests for an exemption to the data sharing policy will be considered.

Another new initiative is that *JEP: General* is now a Peer Community In Registered Reports (PCI RR) interested journal[3]. PCI RR is a community that provides peer review for registered reports—empirical articles that describe research (i.e., methods, hypotheses, etc.) that has yet to be conducted. At this PCI RR–interested journal, our team will be alerted when articles receive Stage I (predata collection) or 2 (postdata collection) acceptance by the PCI RR community, allowing us to consider those papers for further review and/or publication in *JEP: General*. The Journal will also publish replication studies, including persuasive failures to replicate findings previously reported in the Journal. If a primary finding was interesting enough to be published in *JEP: General*, then a quality failure to replicate that finding should also be interesting enough to publish in *JEP: General*. Methodologically rigorous and theoretically impactful null results are just as important as statistically significant findings and will be considered as well. A former student of mine had so many persuasive failures to replicate prior findings in her dissertation that I wrote lyrics to the tune of "You've Got to Hide Your Love Away" (Lennon & McCartney, 1965), and our lab performed the song at her postgraduation celebration.

> Here I stand, replication in hand
>
> Waiting for R to converge

[2] https://apastyle.apa.org/blog/inclusive-language-guidelines

[3] https://rr.peercommunityin.org/about/pci_rr_interested_journals

If my betas are small, I'll still stand tall

One more null result . . .

Hey, you've got to publish null results . . . (Brown-Schmidt, 2016)

The Future of *JEP: General*

I believe that journals serve a critical role in society at large and in the microcosm that is our world of experimental psychology. The editorial process serves important functions such as improving science communication and curating a collection of impactful scientific discoveries. I am particularly fond of broad-scope journals such as *JEP: General* as they showcase how interdisciplinary and collaborative approaches to science can yield field-changing discoveries that bring together narrow research questions under unifying themes. *JEP: General* publishes empirical work in the field of experimental psychology that is of interest to our diverse and broad readership, methodologically rigorous, and theoretically impactful. Breadth of impact can be achieved by integrating approaches and insights across multiple subdisciplines, by examining core phenomena through a new lens, perspective, or population, and by inclusion of underrepresented perspectives and populations in our research, among other approaches.

Working with an editorial team to shepherd findings with strong and broad impact to the pages of the journal organizes new knowledge in a way that is accessible to the community. While rapid-access mechanisms for science communication such as social media currently play an important role in knowledge dissemination, I worry that online popularity of a scientist, rather than the quality of the work, may drive what content people encounter and read. This process could put researchers at less well-known institutions or who are less prominent online at a disadvantage. When guided by a team who appreciates the importance of diversity in science, an edited journal such as *JEP: General* plays a critical role in not only the dissemination of science, but also in terms of leveling the playing field in a way that allows quality research to have influence in the field, independent of the popularity of the authors.

Moving forward, I will continue to explore, discuss, evaluate and implement new initiatives to enhance the diversity and quality of the Journal. I encourage authors to post their postreview preprints of papers published in *JEP: General* online, including links to their data and code. I look forward to learning from and learning with our editorial team to understand how we can better support authors from diverse perspectives and use the platform that is *JEP: General* to support an increasingly representative and diverse range of perspectives in experimental psychology. I also look forward to learning from potential authors and readers, and will be holding office hours at major conferences in our field to offer guidance and receive feedback. I look forward to reading your papers.

References

Anane-Sarpong, E., Wangmo, T., Ward, C. L., Sankoh, O., Tanner, M., & Elger, B. S. (2018). "You cannot collect data using your own resources and put it on Open Access": Perspectives from Africa about public health data-sharing. *Developing World Bioethics*, *18*(4), 394–405. https://doi.org/10.1111/dewb.12159

Armstrong, B. C., Ruiz-Blondet, M. V., Khalifian, N., Kurtz, K. J., Jin, Z., & Laszlo, S. (2015). Brainprint: Assessing the uniqueness, collectability, and permanence of a novel method for ERP biometrics. *Neurocomputing*, *166*, 59–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2015.04.025

Brown-Schmidt, S. (2016). *You've got to publish null results* [Unpublished song lyrics]. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Buchanan, N. T., Perez, M., Prinstein, M. J., & Thurston, I. B. (2021). Upending racism in psychological science: Strategies to change how science is conducted, reported, reviewed, and disseminated. *American Psychologist*, *76*(7), 1097–1112. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000905

Budden, A. E., Tregenza, T., Aarssen, L. W., Koricheva, J., Leimu, R., & Lortie, C. J. (2008). Double-blind review favours increased representation of female authors. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *23*(1), 4–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.07.008

Darling, E. S. (2015). Use of double-blind peer review to increase author diversity. *Conservation Biology*, *29*(1), 297–299. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12333

Fox Tree, J., Lleras, A., Thomas, A., & Watson, D. (2022). *The inequitable burden of open science*. Blogpost [08-30-2022 retrieved 10-24-2022]. https://featuredcontent.psychonomic.org/the-inequitable-burden-of-open-science/

Fuentes, M. A., Zelaya, D. G., Delgado-Romero, E. A., & Butt, M. (2022). Open science: Friend, foe, or both to an antiracist psychology? *Psychological Review*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000386

Klatzky, R. L., Holt, L., & Behrmann, M. (2015). The representation of women in cognition. *Cognition*, *141*, 170–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2015.03.010

Lennon, J., & McCartney, P. (1965). You've got to hide your love away [record]. *On Help!* London: Parlophone.

Okike, K., Hug, K. T., Kocher, M. S., & Leopold, S. S. (2016). Single-blind vs double-blind peer review in the setting of author prestige. *JAMA*, *316*(12), 1315–1316. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.11014

Roberts, S. O., Bareket-Shavit, C., Dollins, F. A., Goldie, P. D., & Mortenson, E. (2020). Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *15*(6), 1295–1309. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620927709

Simons, D. J., Shoda, Y., & Lindsay, D. S. (2017). Constraints on generality (COG): A proposed addition to all empirical papers. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*(6), 1123–1128. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617708630

Takao, H., Hayashi, N., & Ohtomo, K. (2015). Brain morphology is individual-specific information. *Magnetic Resonance Imaging*, *33*(6), 816–821. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mri.2015.03.010

Titone, D., Tiv, M., & Pexman, P. M. (2018). The status of women cognitive scientists in Canada: Insights from publicly available NSERC funding data. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie Expérimentale*, *72*(2), 81–90.

Vaid, J., & Geraci, L. (2016). V. An examination of women's professional visibility in cognitive psychology. *Feminism & Psychology*, *26*(3), 292–319. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353516641139

Zimman, L. (2017). Transgender language reform: Some challenges and strategies for promoting Trans.-affirming, gender-inclusive language. *Journal of Language and Discrimination*, *1*(1), 84–105. https://doi.org/10.1558/jld.33139

Received October 14, 2022
Accepted October 14, 2022 ■