Global Environmental Psychology

PsychOpen GOLD

Editorial

Check for updates

At a Crossroads: The Future of Global Environmental Psychology

Isabell Richter[1], Åshild Lappegård Hauge[2], Mete Sefa Uysal[3]

[1] *Department of Psychology, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway.* **[2]** *Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.* **[3]** *Department of Psychology, University of Exeter, Exeter, United Kingdom.*

Global Environmental Psychology, 2026, Vol. 4, Article e22811, https://doi.org/10.5964/gep.22811

Published (VoR): 2026-08-04

Corresponding Author: Isabell Richter, Department of Psychology Faculty of Social and Educational Sciences, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway. Tel: +4740611965. E-mail: isabel.richter@ntnu.no

GEP Progress

Dear Readers of Global Environmental Psychology!

We would like to thank our contributors and readers for their continued interest in and support for Global Environmental Psychology. Since the journal's launch, we have received a growing number of submissions: currently totalling 132 manuscripts, reflecting the relevance and timeliness of environmental psychology across diverse contexts. To date, 36 articles have been published, with several additional manuscripts currently under review or in copyediting.

At the same time, the journal has evolved in its editorial structure. Since its foundation, members of the editorial and associate editorial team have transitioned, with some colleagues stepping down and new colleagues joining. We are very pleased to welcome Åshild Lappegard Hauge and Mete Sefa Uysal to the Editor-in-Chief team. We also want to express our sincere gratitude to Adrian Brügger for his relentless work in establishing the journal, and for his continued support behind the scenes. We are further delighted to welcome several new Associate Editors: Yeliz Vural, Kevin Winter, Svein Åge Kjøs Johnsen, Ana Leal, Karen Hamann, Sean Finnerty, and Gulnaz Anjum. We very much look forward to working together in shaping the journal's next phase. Thematic developments within the journal are also progressing. A forthcoming special issue on the Dynamics of Eco-Emotions, edited by Helen Landmann, Panu Pihkala, and Gisela Böhm, is scheduled for publication at the beginning of August 2026. We are excited to see this important and timely contribution to the field.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, CC BY 4.0, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction, provided the original work is properly cited.

Publishing Transition

At the same time, we find ourselves navigating structural challenges. GEP has been operating under a Diamond Open Access model with a non-profit publisher. While this model ensures free access for both authors and readers, it is also inherently resource-constrained and vulnerable to funding cuts. Recent developments indicate that the financial basis of the PsychOpen platform is no longer stable. As a result, all journals currently hosted within this infrastructure, including GEP, are now required to identify a new publishing home. We have therefore decided to temporarily pause new submissions until a sustainable solution is secured. Importantly, manuscripts currently under review will continue to be processed as planned, and all published articles will remain permanently archived through PsychArchives, ensuring their long-term accessibility.

We are actively seeking a new publisher who shares our commitment to Diamond Open Access and can provide the necessary infrastructure, including copyediting and website support. We welcome conversations with potential partners who are interested in supporting this model.

Finally, we would like to be transparent about the current production pipeline. As is common in Diamond Open Access publishing, limited resources may lead to delays in copyediting and production. Accepted manuscripts can be made available online in their accepted form to ensure timely dissemination, with full copyediting and formatting to follow.

GEP Policy

This editorial on GEP progress and our policies on Open Science and AI was planned before the news of the publisher's financial difficulties. We still decided to publish our thoughts on the future policy of GEP, to make our statements clear, and to inspire other journals.

Rethinking Open Science for Qualitative Research

It has always been GEP's mission and vision to promote Diversity and Open Science in Environmental Psychology. However, we want to nuance our understanding of Open Science, especially its role in qualitative research.

GEP supports Open Science but recognises that openness must look different in quantitative and qualitative research. Although the overarching aim of Open Science is the democratisation and transparency of research (UNESCO, 2021), Open Science is often associated with narrower practices for verifying research findings, such as preregistration and open data. Preregistration and open data are important for the rigour and reproducibility of quantitative research, and GEP will continue to promote these practices where appropriate.

PsychOpen GOLD

Many researchers are concerned that Open Science verification practices are increasingly being mandated for all research, and that insufficient account is taken of different research traditions and the considerable variation that exists both within and between quantitative and qualitative methods (Class et al., 2021; Guzzo et al., 2022; Kirschner et al., 2023; Pownall, 2025; Prosser et al., 2023). We believe that the research frontier advances through the ways in which different disciplinary perspectives and methods nuance and challenge existing views. Variations in methods and approaches are critical for scientific development, and lead to richer science and a deeper understanding of the importance of culture and context (Valsiner et al., 2017). Therefore, Open Science practices must be tailor-made for different methodological approaches.

Practices such as preregistration and open data are designed to enable verification of research findings. These verification-oriented practices align with positivist epistemologies but are not always compatible with interpretive qualitative research, where knowledge is context-dependent, co-created, and shaped by the researcher's positionality (Pownall, 2025; Steltenpohl et al., 2023; Willig, 2021). Within epistemic logics for qualitative research, independent verification of decontextualised data is of limited relevance, whereas openness, in the form of discussing one's scholarly position, role, and background, is absolutely fundamental. This is a practice already central to qualitative research: reflexivity (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003; Olmos-Vega et al., 2023). In qualitative research, research questions need to remain flexible and open, and the data are often too sensitive and context-dependent to be shared (Pownall, 2025).

To address this we plan to: 1) update our webpage on GEP's Open Science practices to clarify that the requirements for preregistration and open data and materials apply only to quantitative, hypothetico-deductive research, where these practices are appropriate for verification. Qualitative research conducted within different epistemologies with the aim of understanding phenomena in particular contexts should not have to be preregistered or share data for epistemological reasons (some qualitative researchers preregister for other reasons or share their data for reuse if the data are not too sensitive). Rather, they should follow practices aligned with their epistemological approach: Examples include reflexivity, positionality, and transparency in methodological and analytical decisions. Other openness criteria include transparency in methodology and analysis (Pratt et al., 2020), and user participation that engages a broad range of stakeholders (Trivedi & Wykes, 2002).

In addition, in GEP, we have planned to: 2) expand GEP's word limit for qualitative papers, from 5750 to 7000 words, to make it clear that we welcome qualitative papers. To support GEP's aim of *diversity* in research, we consider it important to welcome studies that demonstrate cultural differences in environmental psychology and employ methodological approaches to uncover them, rather than seeking universal solutions. More critical, diverse and context-sensitive perspectives are needed (Anjum & Aziz, 2026). According to UNESCO's (2021) Open Science recommendations, open dialogue

PsychOpen GOLD

with other knowledge systems, including indigenous peoples, marginalised scholars, and local communities, is central to Open Science. This is also in line with GEP's Open Science aims.

Artificial Intelligence in Research Practice

Artificial intelligence has become a transformative force in society and in researcPh. We support the AI-policy developed by APA: APA Journals policy on generative AI: Additional guidance.

We want to emphasise that authors are responsible for the accuracy of the information in their article, and must verify it, including any citations generated by an AI tool. Authors may use AI tools but must disclose their use for specific purposes, such as editing. Use of AI is prohibited in the peer review process to protect both the integrity of the process and the confidentiality of authors' work.

We also support the position article against the use of AI in reflexive qualitative research (Jowsey et al., 2025). AI is rejected in these analyses because interpretative qualitative research should remain a human practice. Meaning-making is a human practice. This paper also stresses the environmental impact of the AI corporations and their disproportionate effects in the Global South.

We look forward to securing a new publishing home for GEP and to continuing to build this journal together with our community.

Yours sincerely,

Isabel Richter, Mete Sefa Uysal and Åshild Lappegard Hauge

Openness and Transparency Statements

Acknowledgments. The authors have no additional (i.e., non-financial) support to report.

Funding. The authors have no funding to report.

Competing Interests. The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

References

Anjum, G., & Aziz, M. (2026). Responsibilized and powerless? Unpacking the individualization of climate mitigation. *Energy Research & Social Science, 133*, Article 104585. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2026.104585

Class, B., de Bruyne, M., Wuillemin, C., Donzé, D., & Claivaz, J. B. (2021). Towards Open Science for the qualitative researcher: From a positivist to an open interpretation. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 20*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211034641

PsychOpen GOLD

Guzzo, R., Schneider, B., & Nalbantian, H. (2022). Open science, closed doors: The perils and potential of open science for research in practice. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 15*(4), 495–515. https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2022.61

Jowsey, T., Braun, V., Clarke, V., Lupton, D., & Fine, M. (2025). We reject the use of generative artificial intelligence for reflexive qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004251401851

Kirschner, S. R., Levitt, H. M., Osbeck, L. M., & Hammack, P. L. (2023). A decade of Qualitative Psychology: Reflections and recommendations from associate editors. *Qualitative Psychology, 10*(3), 383–390. https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000270

Mauthner, N. S., & Doucet, A. (2003). Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Sociology, 37*(3), 413–431. https://doi.org/10.1177/00380385030373002

Olmos-Vega, F. M., Stalmeijer, R. E., Varpio, L., & Kahlke, R. (2023). A practical guide to reflexivity in qualitative research: AMEE Guide No. 149. *Medical Teacher, 45*(3), 241–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2022.2057287

Pownall, M. (2025). Bridging qualitative methods and open research. *Nature Reviews Psychology, 4*(9), 556–557. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-025-00477-3

Pratt, M. G., Kaplan, S., & Whittington, R. (2020). Editorial essay: The tumult over transparency: Decoupling transparency from replication in establishing trustworthy qualitative research. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 65*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839219887663

Prosser, A. M. B., Hamshaw, R. J. T., Meyer, J., Bagnall, R., Blackwood, L., Huysamen, M., Jordan, A., Vasileiou, K., & Walter, Z. (2023). When open data closes the door: A critical examination of the past, present and the potential future for open data guidelines in journals. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 62*(4), 1635–1653. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12576

Steltenpohl, C. N., Lustick, H., Meyer, M. S., Lee, L. E., Stegenga, S. M., Reyes, L. S., & Renbarger, R. L. (2023). Rethinking transparency and rigor from a qualitative open science perspective. *Journal of Trial and Error, 4*(1). https://doi.org/10.36850/mr7

Trivedi, P., & Wykes, T. (2002). From passive subjects to equal partners: Qualitative review of user involvement in research. *British Journal of Psychiatry: The Journal of Mental Science, 181*(6), 468–472. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.181.6.468

UNESCO. (2021). *UNESCO recommendation on open science*. UNESDOC Digital Library. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379949

Valsiner, J., Chaudhary, N., & Benetka, G. (2017). *From methodology to methods in human psychology* (pp. 1–92). Springer International Publishing.

Willig, C. (2021). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology* (4th ed.). Open University Press.

PsychOpen GOLD