Editorial 2019

Journal of Cognitive Psychology (JCP) starts off 2019 in a positive position, with the same team of eight established Associate Editors in place as last year, who remain committed to dedicating their time and expertise to ensuring *JCP's* ongoing success. I would like to thank Til, Monica, Jamie, Ruth, Esther, John, Michael and Sue for the hard work that they have devoted to the journal this past year. Likewise, *JCP* retains its full complement of 42 international Editorial Board members, to whom I'm indebted for their expert assistance in reviewing many manuscripts over the past year and for providing high-quality, constructive feedback to submitting authors.

The considerable subject-based diversity of *JCP's* editorial team aligns with the journal's long-standing tradition of striving to cover all areas of the broad domain of cognitive psychology. The success in achieving this ambition is, once again, demonstrated by the wide range of work that has been published in the journal over the past year, extending across all of the main topic areas that make up the discipline of cognitive psychology. It was especially good to see several papers being published reporting work at the interface between cognition and disciplines such as social psychology, developmental psychology, clinical psychology, educational psychology and health psychology. There is clearly considerable interest in such research, as evidenced by the high download counts for articles addressing cross-cutting topics. Indeed, one of the most downloaded articles from last year's volume was that by Pancani and Rusconi (2018), who reported compelling evidence that smokers place the health-damaging consequences of smoking further into the future than do non-smokers. Understanding the cognitive underpinnings of this "onset time-delaying effect" is not only important for theory development relating to the nature of smokers' risk perceptions, but is also vital for applied work such as interventions aimed at supporting smoking cessation.

It was additionally very pleasing that papers were published in last year's volume offering insights into cognition based on the application of diverse research methods such as electroencephalography, pupillometry, eye-movement tracking and gestural analysis. As I mentioned in last year's editorial (Ball, 2018), *JCP* is very keen to receive more manuscripts using methods that complement traditional behavioural analyses. In particular, research on the neural basis of cognitive functioning continues to burgeon and is of increasing importance for theory testing and conceptual development, so do please consider submitting relevant work to the journal that involves the application of techniques such as electrophysiological and hemodynamic imaging. Our editorial team includes specialists whose work cuts across behavioural and neuroscience methods, so *JCP* ensures that it has the requisite expertise to handle neuroscience-based manuscripts effectively.

Over the past year *JCP* has continued to honour its self-stated commitment to the open science agenda, a journey that it embarked upon in 2017 when it became a signatory of *The Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) Guidelines* (cos.io/our-services/top-guidelines). A major aspect of the *JCP*'s alignment with initiatives relating to transparency and open access has been the increasing effort by the journal to encourage authors to make their data available to editors and reviewers during the review process as well as to the public after article acceptance. This open data expectation was given further impetus in 2018 by *JCP* embracing both the "Peer Reviewers' Openness Initiative" (Morey et al., 2016) and the data-sharing policy spearheaded by Taylor & Francis for all of its journals.

It has been pleasing to see authors responding well to data-sharing requests, with many published articles now including a link for readers to access supplementary data from online repositories. The last four issues of *JCP* for 2018 show that 47% of articles are associated with accessible datasets, which is a very positive shift from 2017, when for the whole year a rather modest 20% of articles were linked to accessible datasets. Clearly there is a good way still to go in order to reach the ultimate goal, whereby the vast majority of *JCP* articles are open data compliant, but it is nevertheless encouraging that major strides in this direction have been made in a relatively short period of time.

I am also pleased to announce that a further enhancement to *JCP* is planned for 2019 to align the journal even more closely with the open science agenda, which is to introduce a pathway for the submission and publication of "Registered Reports", whereby researchers are able to pre-register their planned studies. A key aim of this initiative is to improve the transparency of methodological decisions, research hypotheses and planned data analyses, whilst allowing these and other aspects of proposed studies to be supported and enhanced through a rigorous peer-review process. I have yet to determine the precise nature of the evaluation process for Registered Reports and will make an announcement on this later in 2019, when an appropriate procedure has been finalised. In aligning with the increasing interest in the community for Registered Reports it is hoped that *JCP* will make a useful contribution to best practice in scientific research and the avoidance of questionable research practices, as overviewed in my previous editorial (Ball, 2018; see also Bakker, Van Dijk, & Wichters, 2012; Simmons, Nelson, & Simonsohn, 2011; Simonsohn, Nelson, & Simmons, 2014).

The move toward accepting the submission of Registered Reports is very exciting and will bolster the traditional reporting formats that *JCP* will retain. In this respect it seems worthwhile reiterating what these formats entail. In summary, in addition to Registered Reports, *JCP* is happy to consider the following manuscript types:

> *Full (Regular) Articles*: These typically take the form of papers that report substantive empirical work, but theoretical papers are also welcome that review the literature and advance cognitive psychological theory. For Full Articles, manuscripts of any length will be considered, so long as the word length can be justified. For empirical papers such justification might relate, for example, to the number of studies being reported and/or the need to provide full details regarding research methodology and data analysis.

> *Brief Articles*: These are intended to enable the relatively fast dissemination of novel, theoretically important findings, whilst not exceeding 4000 words (inclusive of the abstract and figure captions). Importantly, brief articles are not meant to encourage the piecemeal publication of research findings, but are rather a means to allow authors to report methodologically rigorous research that has clear, original and important theoretical implications warranting more rapid communication to the scientific community.

I should stress that in general terms the preference is for *JCP* to receive and publish a substantially greater number of Full Articles than Brief Articles. This is because most empirical research inevitably requires further replication, development and extension to provide rigorous and compelling evidence that can justify authors' claims to be making original and important theoretical advancements. Occasionally a Brief Article might be able to achieve such a high threshold of quality, but this is likely to be a relatively rare occurrence. Would-be authors are,

therefore, encouraged to think very seriously about the originality, rigour and significance of a Brief Article before making a decision to submit it in this format.

In the case of empirical papers – whether Brief Articles or Full Articles – it is also useful for me to take this opportunity to reiterate *JCP*'s keen desire to receive research reports that fall within the *experimental* tradition, given the journal's long-standing emphasis on publishing work that facilitates a *causal* understanding of underpinning cognitive mechanisms. Similarly, *JCP* welcomes reports based on well-controlled longitudinal studies that speak to causal mechanisms. In contrast, research that is based around correlational designs is unlikely to be attractive to the editorial team as such research often raises more questions than it answers.

JCP will also continue its long-standing tradition of publishing occasional special issues (around one per year) that focus on an important theme of contemporary interest and that contribute to defining a strong research agenda for the future. Some of these special issues will be solicited by myself or my Associate Editors, but authors are also very welcome to email me directly with a special issue proposal. Such a proposal needs to address a single topic of current importance, ideally presenting empirical papers that afford contrasting theoretical and methodological perspectives. The inclusion of a theory-driven literature review is often a good way to commence a special issue, but this is not essential. One of the Associate Editors who is an expert in the special issue's topic area will assist the guest editor(s) in supervising the editorial process. All papers will follow the journal's standard manuscript reviewing procedures.

To conclude, I look forward to another exciting year stewarding *JCP* with the help of my Associate Editors and with the valuable input of our Editorial Board. We all remain committed to maintaining *JCP*'s reputation for publishing high-quality, world-leading research in the broad field of cognitive psychology. We encourage you to submit some of your best work to *JCP* over the coming year and we look forward to receiving your manuscripts.

Linden J. Ball
University of Central Lancashire, Preston, UK

References
Bakker, M., van Dijk, A., & Wicherts, J. M. (2012). The rules of the game called psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*, 543-554.

Ball, L. J. (2018). Editorial 2018, *Journal of Cognitive Psychology, 30*, 1-4.

Morey, R. D., Chambers, C. D., Etchells, P. J., Harris, C. R., Hoekstra, R., Lakens, D., Lewandowsky, S., Morey, C. C., Newman, D. P., Schönbrodt, F. D., Vanpaemel, W., Wagenmakers, E. J., & Zwaan, R. A. (2016). The Peer Reviewers' Openness Initiative: Incentivizing open research practices through peer review. *Royal Society Open Science, 3*: 150547, 1-7.

Pancani, L., & Rusconi, P. (2018). The onset time delaying effect: Smokers vs non-smokers place the adverse consequences of smoking further in the future. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *30*, 257-269.

Simmons, J., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychological Science, 22*, 1359-1366.

Simonsohn, U., Nelson, L. D., & Simmons, J. P. (2014). P-curve: A key to the file-drawer. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 143*, 534-547.