UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Editorial

Elliott, J.G.C.; Gilboa-Schechtman, E.; Grigorenko, E.L.; Heathcote, A.; Purdie-Greenaway, V.J.; Uddin, L.Q.; van der Maas, H.L.J.; Waldmann, M.R.

DOI
10.1037/rev0000359

Publication date
2022

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Psychological Review

License
CC BY-NC-ND

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Elliott, J. G. C., Gilboa-Schechtman, E., Grigorenko, E. L., Heathcote, A., Purdie-Greenaway, V. J., Uddin, L. Q., van der Maas, H. L. J., & Waldmann, M. R. (2022). Editorial. *Psychological Review*, *129*(1), 1-3. https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000359

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:15 Sept 2026

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Psychological Review

© 2022 American Psychological Association
ISSN: 0033-295X

2022, Vol. 129, No. 1, 1–3
https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000359

Editorial

Julian G. C. Elliott[1], Eva Gilboa-Schechtman[2], Elena L. Grigorenko[3, 4], Andrew Heathcote[5], Valerie J. Purdie-Greenaway[6], Lucina Q. Uddin[7], Han L. J. van der Maas[8], and Michael R. Waldmann[9]

[1] School of Education, Durham University
[2] Department of Psychology and the Gonda Brain Science Center, Bar-Ilan University, Israel
[3] Department of Psychology, University of Houston
[4] Departments of Pediatrics and Molecular and Human Genetics, Baylor College of Medicine
[5] School of Psychology, University of Newcastle, Australia
[6] Department of Psychology, Columbia University
[7] Department of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences, Semel Institute for Neuroscience and Human Behavior, University of California, Los Angeles
[8] Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam
[9] Department of Psychology, University of Göttingen

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
Content may be shared at no cost, but any requests to reuse this content in part or whole must go through the American Psychological Association.

During its 128 years of operation, *Psychological Review* has exerted a powerful and consistent influence on the field under its long-term sponsor, the American Psychological Association (APA). Notwithstanding changes in ownership,[1] it has always been what it is now—the flagship of the Association and the field. Since its inception, the journal has focused on theoretical analyses (e.g., systematic evaluations of alternative theories) and/or developments (e.g., the generation of novel theories) in the psychological sciences.[2] Thus, the objectives of any incoming editor and editorial board remain steadfast: (a) to maintain and enhance the standing of *Psychological Review* in the field and (b) to correspondingly align its scope, content, and operations with any changes in the Association, the field of psychology in particular, and science and society in general.

It has been a tradition of the journal to regularly publish statements from its editors reflecting on the *Review*'s scope and mission at turning points. These editorials are typically not only vision-oriented, but also data-driven, based on the "vital signs" of *Psychological Review*, such as the number, content, and nature of both submitted and accepted articles, time to review and time to production, citation dynamics, and so forth. A large body of such data is routinely collected, mined, and considered in light of comparative statistics from the APA's family of journals. Three statistics are particularly relevant here. First, the number of submissions has been steadily growing. We, of course, appreciate receiving manuscripts from all over the world. And we think that our authors know that the competition is far from trivial, as the statistics indicate that only ∼15% of the submitted manuscripts are ultimately accepted. Second, whether our authors are proponents of The Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) or "classical" journal metrics, they want to be cited. *Psychological Review* has hosted remarkable contributions to the field with impressive numbers of citations. For example, the three most cited articles (a) ever are: Bandura's "Self-efficacy—toward a unifying theory of behavioral change," 1977—90,194 citations; Miller's "The magical number 7, plus or minus 2—some limits on our capacity for processing information," 1956—37,460 citations; Markus and Kitayama's "Culture and the self—implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation"—29,066 citations; and (b) within the last 5 years are: Maier and Seligman's "Learned helplessness at fifty: Insights from neuroscience," 2015—465 citations; Fleming and Daw's "Self-evaluation on decision-making: A general Bayesian framework for metacognitive computation," 2018—317; Walton and Wilson's "Wise Interventions: Psychological Remedies for Social and Personal Problems," 2018—284 citations. We sincerely hope to continue (and expand) this track record by hosting highly impactful work. Third, editors of scientific journals are highly aware of the shortage of reviewer time in the field. We all get bombarded with requests to review. Yet, reviewing for *Psychological Review* is particularly challenging—our submissions are mostly long, complex, and often highly specialized. Therefore, while being grateful to all reviewers of all journals who take on what can sometimes seem a thankless task that is akin to completing tax returns or doing community service, we are particularly grateful to the 7,278 reviewers in Psychological Review's reserve, especially to those who have done multiple reviews for the journal, with the current record being 37! In fact, we have heard from some reviewers that they like reviewing for the journal, as its typical submissions are of outstanding quality and the reviewers learn a lot from these submissions. We are hoping that the journal's wonderful authors, readers, and other colleagues will continue such service to the journal! Although we really try to keep the manuscripts moving through the system as quickly as possible, our first and foremost concern is the careful consideration of all of our manuscripts, and sometimes we need to go through

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Elena L. Grigorenko, Department of Psychology, University of Houston, 3695 Cullen Boulevard, Houston, TX 77204-5022, United States. Email: elena.grigorenko@times.uh.edu

[1] The journal was founded and owned by James Baldwin of Princeton and James Cattell of Columbia in 1894, then sold to Howard Warren of Princeton in 1908, who sold it to APA in 1925.

[2] It is important to note that surveys of the literature (e.g., scoping, systematic, or meta-analytic reviews), problems of method and design, or reports of empirical findings that do not lead to new theoretical products are not appropriate and should be submitted to different relevant journals.

cycles of invitations to secure the needed reviewers. Yet obtaining reviews from experts in the field is the everyday bread and butter of the journal's operation. Both authors and reviewers can help streamline this process in several ways. Authors might help us by (a) attempting to limit the length of their submissions to 8,000 (ideal)–12,000 (desired) words, as lengthy articles generally prolong the time from submission to publication; (b) making sure that their writing takes into account the diverse audience of the journal, allowing their manuscripts to be appreciated by experts from a broad range of fields; (c) providing 5–6 names of suggested reviewers at submission; and (d) being patient with the process. Our reviewers could help us by providing their wonderful (often quite spectacular in terms of their depth and breadth) reviews on time, within 1 month from accepting the invitation to review. Our average number of days in review is ~1.05 months with a large dispersion. We would like to reduce both the average and dispersion, but we cannot do this without the invaluable help of both authors and reviewers, for which we would be most grateful.

Such statistics are highly important for the appearance of *Psychological Review*, but the spirit of the journal is in its mission and vision. Here we look to the history of the journal as represented in a string of 21st century editorials from the past four editors of *Psychological Review* (Anderson, 2011; Holyoak, 2016; Mischel, 2001; Rayner, 2004). The vision of the next editorial period of *Psychological Review* is deeply rooted in their "doings" and guided toward the preservation and heightening of the journal's eminence and tradition, yet at the same time we seek to introduce threads of innovation to the texture of the journal. Our Board is diverse and international; we represent many facets of the psychological sciences, locally and globally. But we are all unified by our belief in scientific integrity and its current vocabulary—open science, reproducibility and replicability, transparency, and respect. The shared convictions of the Board define the changes we intend to implement. First, *Psychological Review* does not have a defined page limit and, thus, is not ceiled by the Publisher with regard to the number of articles/pages for each issue. It works with both authors and reviewers to generate as unbiased an outcome as possible, with acting editors who serve as moderators of the dialog between the authors and the field, helping authors to realize the value and contribution of their work as accurately as possible. Yet, what is used in publishing now is still a ubiquitously subjective process; that is why *Psychological Review* operates a straightforward appeal system that has been developed with the support of APA. Second, *Psychological Review* allows preprints (e.g., via PsyArXiv), and permits references to preprinted manuscripts in reviews if these manuscripts have generated enough traction to solicit feedback from the field. Third, although it is not required of all submissions, there is an expectation that the relevant data sets of simulated or real data, as well as the relevant computer code and/or crucial analyses, are deposited through APA portals or alternatives such as the Open Science Framework (OSF) repository and made available for subsequent research.

Psychological Review was conceived to encompass all domains, types, and forms of psychology. Understandably, depending on the editor and the constellation of the board, the journal has leaned more or less toward a particular subfield of psychology. We want to reiterate the original intention of the journal founders: to consider submissions from all domains, types, and forms of psychology. Similarly, the "article type" portfolio has varied somewhat with each editor and their boards, as each editorship has reflected not only particular editorial "tastes," but also certain time-specific fashions in the field. Nonetheless, there has been continuous editorial commitment to the unique mission of the journal clearly articulated by Mischel (2001): "The editor's task is to nurture this journal's tradition as the primary venue for major theoretical advances in all of scientific psychology and retain the standards of excellence that have given *Psychological Review* its special distinction for more than a century" (p. 3). Anderson (2011) and Holyoak (2016) and their teams explicitly supported this statement; we wholeheartedly subscribe to it as well. The pages of *Psychological Review* have carried the thoughts and words of such founders of the field as William James and John Dewey; they have reflected ideas of multiple leading figures of our science. While treasuring our traditions, we will be open to multiple types of contributions because there are many ways to advance new theories of psychology as our field constantly deepens, widens, and grows in response to the ever-changing world and our place and role in it. Specifically, four possibilities for new types of entries are being discussed by the Board. First, we encourage submissions from adversarial collaborating groups so that scholars with clashing theoretical-ideological views may engage in best practices for resolving scientific disputes. Second, we would like to see submissions addressing controversial topics in the psychological sciences. The Board is open to considering new formats for their discussion of such topics in *Psychological Review*, including, but not limited to, commentaries from a relevant body of professionals looking for innovative ways to present and discuss controversial topics and theories. Third, for almost 2 years now, we have been watching in disbelief as the world as we knew it has changed in so many different ways under the invasion of the novel corona virus. Add to this ongoing concerns about civil unrest, global warming, and changing military and political balances. Various psychological professional organizations and societies have sought to address these crises. As part of this movement, numerous professional journals have opened their pages to "rapid response" publications, understanding the importance of capturing and sharing the relevant knowledge here and now. As we are in the midst of this unprecedented process of change, we think that the typically slow-paced and reflective nature of *Psychological Review* might pivot slightly to create a platform for the rapid theory-enhancing syntheses of time-sensitive literature that may serve to push the boundaries of psychological theory and practice. This would not change the overall structure of the journal but could open a few of its pages to nascent and urgent topics. Whether in the form of a round table of opinion exchanges, or some other format, *Psychological Review* will diversify its portfolio to exert not only reflective, but also predictive psychological theory development. Fourth, *Psychological Review* is, by definition, an outlet that reflects the state of affairs in those areas of psychology that are developed enough to support important theoretical advances. Yet, there are areas of our field that develop rapidly, and it is important to be both aware of and sensitive to these developments. These rapidly developing areas of research need to be "watched" and given an opportunity to capture our attention. Of course, the journal will continue to be primarily driven by the field and led by author-initiated submissions. Yet, we would like it to be open to promising areas, perhaps by occasionally soliciting special issues on pertinent questions, special sections on emerging areas, and time-sensitive commentaries on debates and controversies in psychological science. *Psychological Review* welcomes proposals for all of these different formats.

Psychological Review is committed to systematically and conscientiously practicing a strong and clear commitment to diversity. We believe that knowledge accumulation often occurs on the edges of disciplines and theories, where the juxtaposition of diversities produces innovation.

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
Content may be shared at no cost, but any requests to reuse this content in part or whole must go through the American Psychological Association.

Psychological Review's attitude toward diversity should be multifaceted and implemented across the range of the journal's activities, from being a constant item on the Board's agenda, to working with establishments and organizations that focus on promoting diversity. The Board is working hard to increase and enhance diversity in the journal's content, management, authorship, reviewership, and readership. Psychology cannot evolve as an isolated, USA-centric discipline. Psychology is not owned by any particular group. We would like to diversify both the content and representation of *Psychological Review* and eagerly await the field's suggestions and leadership in this domain.

In closing, as the journal's new senior editorial team, we are excited to navigate *Psychological Review* through the ever-changing landscape of psychology at this time of multiple challenges, referred to by the United Nations Secretary General António Guterres as "the greatest cascade of crises in our lifetime." Although we are initiating a number of changes, we will do our best to maintain *Psychological Review*'s excellence. This will involve our capacity to reflect on and disseminate new theoretical developments, enriched and inspired by current trends in science in general and in psychological science in particular, while maintaining an overarching commitment to advancing the field through the incorporation of diverse perspectives.

References

Anderson, J. (Ed.). (2011). Editorial. *Psychological Review*, *118*(1), 1–2. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022225
Holyoak, K. J. (2016). Editorial. *Psychological Review*, *123*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000012
Mischel, W. (2001). Editorial. *Psychological Review*, *108*(1), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.108.1.3
Rayner, K. (2004). Editorial. *Psychological Review*, *111*(3), Article 587. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.111.3.587

Received January 4, 2022
Accepted January 4, 2022 ■

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
Content may be shared at no cost, but any requests to reuse this content in part or whole must go through the American Psychological Association.