UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Editorial regarding the new submission guidelines at the Journal of Consumer Psychology

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2z44j6vz>

Journal

Journal of Consumer Psychology, 24(1)

ISSN

1057-7408

Author

Pechmann, Cornelia Connie

Publication Date

2014

DOI

10.1016/j.jcps.2013.10.002

Peer reviewed

Editorial Note

Editorial regarding the new submission guidelines at the Journal of Consumer Psychology

In an effort to promote the quality, transparency, and reproducibility of the research conducted in the field of consumer psychology, the Journal of Consumer Psychology (JCP) has changed its submission guidelines as of January 1, 2014. JCP will now expressly require three types of materials upon manuscript submission:

- (1) A detailed description of the study methods, analyses and results in the text or in a methodological appendix that is sufficient to allow for precise replication.
- (2) A methodological appendix that contains the key stimuli and measures that were used in the research.
- (3) Statements about the authors' roles in data collection and analysis and affirmation of compliance with IRB and APA mandates regarding human subject protection and data sharing.

Requirements 1 and 2 are similar to the Journal of Marketing Research's new submission requirements with JCP being more explicit about what requirement 1 entails. Requirement 3 on disclosing the authors' roles in the research is similar to a requirement recently instituted by the Journal of Consumer Research. JCP does not currently require that datasets be posted, as Marketing Science does, but offers this as an option to authors.

We have three primary motivations for making these changes in JCP's submission requirements. Our first motivation is to help authors, especially those who are more junior or less experienced, to submit manuscripts to JCP that reviewers will find sufficiently detailed in terms of the methods, analyses and results. We have always wanted JCP submissions to include these details but previously were not very explicit about this in our submission requirements; now we are.

Our second motivation is to help ensure that researchers and readers find the information they need in JCP papers to understand the research fully and replicate it if they desire without having to contact the authors for additional information. Our third motivation is to help ensure that authors describe their responsibilities with respect to the research and assume key responsibilities rather than delegating these responsibilities to others.

At JCP and other consumer and marketing journals, details on methods, analyses and results have become sparser over the years. This has occurred in part because over the years reviewers, AEs and editors have asked for more and more studies without increasing the page length. Moreover, JCP accepts shorter research reports. With the current initiative, we are trying to reverse the recent trend toward less complete reporting and encourage more transparent reporting either in the text or in a methodological appendix.

The new JCP submission guidelines are consistent with the reporting guidelines specified in the [APA Publication Manual \(2010\)](#) and with recent recommendations offered by [Kashy et al. \(2009\)](#). We expect that these guidelines will not substantially affect the large number of authors who, as doctoral students or young scholars, were fortunate enough to learn about what to report in their journal submissions. Unfortunately, though, not everyone knows this information because training in such matters varies widely. We hope that the new JCP submission guidelines will help level the playing field by making every submission equally transparent and easy to evaluate. When a submission has poor reporting, often reviewers become frustrated and this affects their judgments and recommendations about a paper. The paper could have important insights but if reviewers must struggle to understand what the studies did the paper could be rejected. We hope that the new JCP submission requirements will guide authors in transparent reporting so that important research insights are published in JCP and can be replicated.

As part of this initiative, we also offer new guidelines to reviewers and AEs regarding how to evaluate a research manuscript in light of more transparent descriptions of methods, analyses and results. These guidelines suggest the following.

1. Reviewers should consider the common standard for statistical significance of $p < .05$ but also the pattern of data across studies and the centrality of the relationships.
2. Reviewers should consider being more tolerant of imperfections in the data that may become evident due to more detailed reporting.
3. Reviewers should consider being more tolerant of various methods used to screen or remove participants, such as attention

checks or outlier analyses, provided that the methods are clearly explained, appropriately justified, and generally reasonable.

4. Reviewers should encourage rather than discourage direct and conceptual replications.
5. Reviewers should refrain from reflexively dismissing results that challenge or do not support current theory or are inconsistent with previous research findings.
6. When raising the possibility of alternative explanations for findings, reviewers should specify those alternatives and avoid requesting that authors rule out non-parsimonious alternative explanations, i.e., ones that may reasonably account for findings in one study but not all studies in the submission.
7. Reviewers should avoid a reflexive dismissal of correlational data.
8. Reviewers should avoid a reflexive dismissal of small effect sizes. Instead, they should evaluate observed effect sizes in light of substantive and/or theoretical significance, manipulation strength, and dependent measure malleability.

Full details about JCP's new submission requirements are in the "Guide for Authors" and similarly in the "Author Information Pack" on the JCP website. In particular, review the appendix. The website link is: <http://www.elsevier.com/journals/journal-of-consumer-psychology/1057-7408/guide-for-authors>.

A new required appendix, called the Methodological Detail Appendix or MDA, will be requested as part of the submission process. It should include information about key stimuli and measures such as:

- Full phrasing of the questions and scales used for the reported findings;
- Full text of any scenarios or vignettes used;
- Pertinent details about the procedure (e.g., instructions, filler task); and
- Additional details about the method, analyses and results as specified in the Author Information Pack.

Method sections should include the following information. These details can be reported either in the body of the manuscript (including footnotes) or in the Methodological Detail Appendix (MDA), as suggested in the table below.

Required method information	Body	MDA	Either body or MDA
Demographic characteristics of samples, including gender, age, ethnicity, and other factors that may be relevant to the research context	X		
Sampling method (e.g., convenience, probability) and method of recruitment (e.g., subject pool, specific online panel, compensation)	X		
Sample sizes and how any missing data were handled. Explanation for substantial amount of missing data	X		
Enough details so that readers can understand the manipulations used in the study (full instructions, vignettes, or scenarios may be included in MDA)	X		

(continued)

Required method information	Body	MDA	Either body or MDA
All experimental conditions, including control groups and factors, that were part of the original design	X		
Pertinent details about the procedure (e.g., session size, task sequence, filler task)			X
A priori screening rule(s) for excluding subjects from data collection and rationale (e.g., study restricted to women only, to participants age 55+, to native English speakers, etc.)			X
Any method used to screen the data after data collection (e.g., elimination of outliers, attention screens, comprehension screens, content analysis to determine if directions were followed on a writing task, time spent on an item, etc.), including (a) cut-offs for any screening measures (e.g., ± 2 SD from mean, less than 2 sec to answer an item, etc.), (b) how many observations were eliminated for each screening method, and (c) distribution of excluded participants across conditions			X
Content and endpoints of any scale used for the reported research, with explicit information on how summary scores were computed (e.g., average, sum, factor score, etc.)	X		
Full phrasing of all questions used in the reported research			X
Reliability coefficients for multi-item scales and multi-person coding	X		

ANOVA-based result sections should include the following information. Again, these details can be reported either in the body of the manuscript (including footnotes) or in the Methodological Detail Appendix (MDA), as suggested in the table below. Additional information, marked as "Optional", may be included in the MDA at the authors' discretion.

ANOVA			
Required information	Body	MDA	Either body or MDA
Full specification of the analysis design and the levels of each factor (e.g., "a 3 [arousal: low, medium, high] $\times$ 2 [scenario: vacation or appliance] mixed design with arousal as a between-subject factor and scenario as a repeated factor")	X		
Degrees of freedom for each F-test	X		
Cell means (for ANOVA) and/or proportions (for logistic regression), standard deviations, and cell sizes for the main dependent variables and the substantive part of the design			X
If covariates are used (ANCOVA), report whether the covariate is significant and the statistical results if covariates are not included			X
Optional: full ANOVA table for all analyses (or logistic regression if applicable) including MSE		(X)	
Optional: standard measures of effect sizes			(X)
Optional: in the analysis of multiple-outcome variables, consider providing a table of correlations among the independent/predictor and dependent/outcome variables		(X)	

Other types of analyses have different reporting requirements. Please see the appendix to: <http://www.elsevier.com/journals/journal-of-consumer-psychology/1057-7408/guide-for-authors>.

In closing, I want to sincerely thank the Society for Consumer Psychology's (SCP) Super-Committee on Scientific Practices set up by Michel Pham as 2012 SCP President to initiate this important work. The committee Chair was L.J. Shrum and the members were Daniel Bartels, Katherine Burson, Amitava Chattopadhyay, Carolyn Costley, Gerald Gorn, Wesley Hutchinson, Chris Janiszewski, and Ashesh Mukherjee. I also want to thank the SCP Publications Committee that finalized the relevant documents which included Michel Pham (Chair), Darren Dahl, Susan Broniarczyk, Tina Lowrey, CW Park and Larry Compeau.

References

- American Psychological Association (2010). *The publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (Sixth Edition) Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Kashy, D. A., Donnellan, M. B., Ackerman, R. A., & Russell, D. W. (2009). Reporting and interpreting research in PSPB: Practices, principles, and pragmatics. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(9), 1131–1142.

Cornelia (Connie) Pechmann

12 October 2013