



## Editorial

Boele De Raad and Dick P.H. Barends  
University of Groningen, The Netherlands

Karl Schweizer  
Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany

Oliver P. John  
University of California, USA

Lazar Stankov  
University of Western Sydney, Australia

Rex E. Jung  
University of New Mexico, USA

The IJPP is a fact. With this editorial, members of the World Association for Personality Psychology (WAPP) are invited to submit papers for publication. In fact, only WAPP members can freely submit; in case of multiple authorship, the first author needs to be member. For membership-application, one is advised to go the WAPP-site ([www.perpsy.org](http://www.perpsy.org)). No further costs are involved, once a paper is accepted for publication. The IJPP is an electronic-only, open access journal. Downloads are free for everyone.

One of the advantages of an e-journal is that there is virtually no limit regarding space. Therefore there is no need to give specific instructions about the number of words one may not exceed. Yet, there are good reasons to ask from authors to be succinct and not to indulge oneself too much in elaborations. This does not mean that authors are not allowed to provide a good context/background/etc. for their work, and a clear and decent line of argumentation. Yet, readers should be protected from having to struggle through unnecessary pages of text, reviewers should be protected from having to evaluate dysfunctional textual elaborations, and also authors themselves may be protected from sometimes time consuming detours. Moreover, a demand for succinctness requests the authors to think twice about the necessity of certain lines of reasoning in relation to the goal of a paper. An average paper probably counts between 5,000 and 10,000 words.

Another advantage of the e-journal format is that accepted individual papers are put online as soon as they have completed the proof-reading process. For the time being, papers are organized in four issues per volume, with one volume per year.

The general editorial philosophy is that where authors have gone through the painstaking process of creating an interesting data-set, or, in case of a theoretical, non-empirical paper, where the authors have succeeded in pulling off a constructive and analytically fine line of reasoning, the submitted material deserves a fair chance to be disseminated.

Submissions are subjected to a blind peer review pro-

cedure. Reviewers are given the option to reveal their identity. Before papers enter this review procedure, the editors will make a first evaluation of the possible value of the paper, and they may decide that there is no use to trouble reviewers in cases of clearly expected rejection of the paper. We aim at a one-round review process, with evaluations possibly from two or three reviewers, and where the (acting) editor is supposed to summarize the reviews and list the necessary steps for improving the paper for publication, or where the arguments are listed to reject the paper for publication. In case the editor cannot make a decision on the basis of the available reviews and his/her own reading, an additional reviewer might be asked for specific issues of the paper or for the whole paper. The general intention is that a paper does not go back to reviewers for additional rounds.

Such a one-round review process demands extra effort from (action)editors, from reviewers, and from authors.

Authors are requested to write succinctly, cogently and logically, leaving out rhetorical expressions as much as possible. Papers should be delivered in correct English, and written according to APA style. Each and every line written should be clear and its content accounted for in argument or through reference. Reviewers expect to receive papers where they can fully focus on content and not be distracted by details of style, command of English, and so forth.

Reviewers are requested to focus on content. In case of empirical research, they may decide first whether the data set and the way it is obtained would form interesting material that needs to be documented. In case of a theoretical, non-empirical paper, or in case of the non-empirical part of a paper, they may decide about the validity of the arguments used and about the adequateness of the conclusions drawn.

Editors do not simply send their conclusion (e.g., a “reject” or a “conditional accept”) with a reference to the included reviews. The editors build their own arguments, exploiting the evaluations of the reviewers. The editor may decide not to send the reviews to the authors.