

Additional Instructions to Authors: Registered Reports

Journal of Personnel Psychology

The *Journal of Personnel Psychology* is joining a growing number of journals in many fields of empirical research and now invites article submissions in the format of *Registered Reports*. These are a form of empirical article in which the introduction, methods, and proposed analyses are pre-registered and reviewed *prior* to research being conducted. This format of article seeks to neutralize a variety of inappropriate research practices, including inadequate statistical power, selective reporting of results, undisclosed analytic flexibility, and publication bias (Chambers, 2013). Pre-registered submissions based on already conducted research (or secondary data) are also welcome at the *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, but represent a different type of submissions (called *Hybrid Registered Reports*), detailed guidelines for which are described in a separate document.

Initial submissions will be triaged by the action editor (e.g., comprehensiveness, clarity, etc). Those that pass triage will then be sent for in-depth blind peer review (Stage 1). Following review, the article will then be either rejected, returned for revision and resubmission, or accepted in principle for publication. Following in principle acceptance (IPA), the authors will then conduct the registered research and finally produce a more traditionally formatted manuscript that includes a Results and Discussion section (Stage 2). Pending quality checks and a sensible interpretation of the findings, the manuscript will be published regardless of the results.

Guidelines for Authors and Reviewers

Stage 1: Initial manuscript submission and review

Before sending for in-depth peer review, the editorial team will assess registered report submissions for adherence to basic requirements. These Stage 1 submissions should include the manuscript (details below) and a brief cover letter.

The cover letter should include:

- A statement identifying any conflicts of interests.
- A statement identifying whether data are planned to be collected in the registered research but to be reported in any other publication and if so how and why.
- A statement confirming that, following Stage 1 *in principle acceptance*, the authors agree to register their approved protocol on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/>) or other recognised repository, either publicly or under private embargo until submission of the Stage 2 manuscript. Accepted protocols can be quickly and easily registered using a tailored mechanism for Registered Reports on the Open Science Framework: <https://osf.io/rr/>

Research Proposal

Stage 1 submissions should include the following sections:

- **Introduction**
 - A review of the relevant literature that motivates the research question and a full description of the study aims and hypotheses. A strong theoretical and/or conceptual rationale is provided. The work proposed can be inductive or deductive in nature. Also welcome are independent replications of earlier work using either the exact same (direct replications) or advanced methods (e.g., extensions to multiple sources, to longitudinal or experimental designs, more adequate sampling, etc.), or multiple replication studies including both types.
- **Methods**
 - Full description of proposed sampling methods, including criteria for participant inclusion and exclusion, and (if applicable) description of procedures/practices for defining outliers or excluding data. Proposed sampling methods should be discussed to assure that the research questions can be answered in a fair and appropriate manner (e.g., no floor or ceiling effects, no systematic bias due to sampling).
 - A detailed description of research procedures. These procedures must be consistently reported in the Stage 2 manuscript or the paper will be summarily rejected (unless any

deviation from the procedures outlined at Stage 1 is approved by the editors in advance of Stage 2 submission).

- Proposed analysis pipeline, including a precise description of all planned analyses, as well as a rationale for the choice of analyses. Any planned covariates or regressors must be stated, including a rationale for their inclusion. Often, proposed analyses involving covariates should be reported with and without the covariate(s) included. Where analysis decisions are contingent on the outcome of prior analyses, these contingencies should be specified. Only pre-planned analyses can be reported in the main Results section of Stage 2 submissions. However, unplanned *post hoc* analyses will be admissible in a separate section of the Results.
- Studies involving null hypothesis significance testing must include *a priori* statistical power analysis. Estimated effect sizes for power analysis should be justified with reference to the existing literature; we ask study proposals to be able to detect an adequate effect size on the basis of the existing literature in the area. For studies involving Bayesian hypothesis testing, the predictions of the theory must be specified so that a Bayes factor can be calculated.
- In replication studies, the form of replication (direct, advanced, or both) must be indicated. Direct replications should adhere to the guidelines of the Open Science Collaboration (2012, p.658) for conducting replications, although neither public sharing of all materials nor restriction to experimental designs is required. With advanced replications, it should be explained in which way the methodological variation improves the rigor and reliability of the original research.
- **Preliminary Data**
 - An overview of preliminary data, such as pilot studies and additional (e.g., non-registered) studies, should be provided as supplementary material.

In considering Stage 1 papers, reviewers will be asked to assess:

- The significance/importance of the research and research question(s).
- The logic, rationale, and plausibility of the proposed hypotheses and/or research questions.
- The soundness and feasibility of the methodology and analysis pipeline (including statistical power analysis where applicable).
- Whether the authors have proposed measures and procedures that are of sufficient methodological rigor to ensure that the results obtained are able to test the stated hypotheses.
- Whether the proposed sampling methods and sample size provide a good test of the stated hypotheses or permit answering the research questions (e.g., sufficient power, no major floor or ceiling effects, no systematic bias or distortion).

Following Stage 1 peer review, manuscripts will be rejected outright, offered the opportunity to revise, or receive in principal acceptance (IPA) indicating that the article will be published pending accurate and complete realization of the proposed research and analyses, as well as a defensible and evidence-bound interpretation of the results. Note, IPA decisions are time bound. The usual time limit for Stage 2 submissions after an IPA is granted is 12 months. Time extensions will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Please note that any deviation from the planned research procedures or inconsistencies between methods from Stage 1 to Stage 2, regardless of how minor it may seem to the authors, could lead to rejection of the manuscript. If authors feel that circumstances may force them to deviate from pre-approved procedures, they should inform the action editor in detail about proposed deviations and await his/her response before implementing any changes. The action editor may decide on a case-by-case basis to seek the external reviewers' advice on suggested changes before making a decision. Note that registered analyses must be undertaken, but additional unregistered analyses can also be included in a final manuscript.

Should authors wish to withdraw their submission after IPA, the journal will publicly record these submissions in a section called *Withdrawn Registrations*. Information given in this section will include authors, title of the submission, abstract approved in stage 1, and a brief statement concerning the reason(s) for withdrawal. Partial withdrawals are not possible (e.g., withdrawal of one study for proposals containing a series of studies).

Stage 2: Full manuscript submission and review

Authors prepare and resubmit their manuscript for full review. This is a full and traditional manuscript, with the following additions:

- **Background and Rationale**
 - Please note that **the Introduction should not be altered from the approved Stage 1 submission, and the stated hypotheses should not be amended or appended**, unless changes are explicitly suggested in an editorial decision letter prior to Stage 2. Depending on the timeframe, new relevant literature may have appeared between Stage 1 and Stage 2. Any such literature should be covered in the Discussion. The manuscript must also contain the URL of the approved Stage 1 protocol on the Open Science Framework or other recognised repository. If the protocol was registered under a private embargo then the embargo must be released and the protocol made fully public at the point of Stage 2 submission.
- **Methods**
 - The Stage 1 description of planned sampling methods should be revised to describe actual sample characteristics. Of course, samples larger than planned *a priori* are permitted without justification. However, any other deviation from sampling methods pre-approved in a decision letter may lead to rejection.
 - Stage 1 descriptions of proposed instruments and procedures should be edited for language to describe actual methods, and be amended by information on psychometric properties in the present research. Yet no substantive changes to these subsections should be made except with editorial approval in writing.
 - Planned analyses must not be altered substantively from the approved Stage 1 submission, but the respective section should be shortened to a format sufficient to inform regular readers of the published article.
- **Results and Discussion**
 - The outcome of all registered analyses must be reported in the manuscript, except in rare instances where a registered and approved analysis is subsequently shown to be logically flawed or unfounded. In such cases, the authors, reviewers, and editor must agree that a collective error of judgment was made and that the analysis is inappropriate. In such cases, the analysis would still be mentioned in the Methods but omitted with justification from the Results.
 - It is reasonable that authors may wish to include additional analyses that were not included in the registered submission. For instance, a new analytic approach might become available between IPA and full review, or a particularly interesting and unexpected finding may emerge. Such analyses are admissible but must be reported in a separate section of the Results titled “*Additional analyses.*” Where the interpretation depends on inferential statistical analysis, authors should be careful not to base their conclusions entirely on the outcome of statistically significant exploratory tests.
 - Exact *p* values and effect sizes must be reported for all null hypothesis significance tests, as well as for all exploratory/additional analyses.
- **Miscellaneous Information**
 - Any other pertinent information. It is better to provide too much information than too little information.

The resubmission will ideally be considered by the same reviewers as at Stage 1. In considering papers at Stage 2, reviewers will be asked to decide:

- Whether the Introduction and Methods are the same as in the approved Stage 1 submission. (If the action editor should have approved any substantive changes between Stages 1 and 2, this will be explained to external reviewers in the invitation letter.)
- Whether results are reported clearly, appropriately, and consistently with what was registered.
- Whether any unregistered additional statistical analyses are justified, methodologically sound, and informative
- Whether the authors’ conclusions are justified given the data (e.g., absent meaningful bias).

- Whether the discussion section effectively contextualizes the results theoretically, conceptually, and practically.

Basically, Stage 2 reviews are consistent with current practices for reviewing results and discussion sections.

Crucially, reviewers will be informed that editorial decisions will not be based on the support or lack of support of the hypotheses.

There is little risk for the authors in Stage 2 reviews, provided adherence to these guidelines. The authors may be asked to revise and resubmit, however, based on reviewer/editor feedback.

References

- Chambers C. D. (2013) Registered reports: A new publishing initiative at *Cortex*. *Cortex*, 49, 609-610.
- Open Science Collaboration (2012). An open, large-scale, collaborative effort to estimate the reproducibility of psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 657-660.

July 2020

