

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY QUARTERLY

Reviewer Guidelines

We rely on reviews to do the work of the journals. To assist you, please read the guidelines below for reviewing for *Social Psychology Quarterly*.

Keep in mind the following:

1. It is essential that you apply ethics of fairness in evaluating manuscripts. If you have a conflict of interest, please recuse yourself from reviewing the manuscript. Conflicts of interest for example may include reviewing manuscripts from scholars with whom you are currently collaborating, colleagues at your institution, etc. In addition, please do not agree to review manuscripts from research programs you don't feel you can provide an objective and unbiased review.
2. Preserve the full anonymity of the review process. Do not identify yourself in the review. For example, this can be done by overly including citations to your own work.
3. Do not try to identify who the author is. Our experience is that unless you already know who wrote the paper (in which case you may have a conflict of interest) it is difficult to identify the author.
4. Consider the manuscript a confidential document. Do not share the document or your review with anyone.
5. Be timely in your review! We would like a 3 week turn-around time in order to publish cutting-edge research in *SPQ*. Expect to receive reminders that your review is due. If you anticipate being late with a review, let the editor know.

What to look for:

1. What is the contribution of the paper and how does it advance knowledge in social psychology?
2. How carefully crafted is the theoretical argument? Is the appropriate literature reviewed? Do the "hypotheses" or major themes presented in the paper follow from the theoretical argument?
3. How appropriate are the methods to the topic under investigation? Do the authors provide adequate information on sampling, measures, and analysis?
4. Are the statistical techniques presented correct and clear?
5. Are the results presented in a clear manner?
6. Does the discussion tie back to both the theoretical argument and empirical findings in a way that makes the contribution of the research clear?
7. Does the manuscript fit with the intended audience?

How to approach the manuscript and the review:

1. Review the paper submitted in terms of what the author intends. Refrain from framing the paper the way you would do it.
2. Identify the “big picture” or main issues regarding theory, methods, results, and discussion.
3. Avoid lists of page–by–page comments without any overall evaluation or distinction between major and minor problems.
4. When possible, offer ways to rectify the problems that you see. Keep in mind that the point of the review is to improve the manuscript.
5. Consider the clarity of writing of the manuscript and organization of the manuscript.
6. Be professional and respectful in tone in constructing your comments. Think about the feedback that you would like to receive from a reviewer about your own work.
7. Refrain from overly negative reviews and work toward a balance of constructive and critical comments.
8. Recognize that to fully do the job of a reviewer in a professional manner will typically require 1- 3 pages of comments.
9. Please note: Do not include your recommendation (accept, R&R, reject, etc.) in the comments to the author.

Communicating with the “Author” and the Editor:

1. Be sure to make your comments to the author consistent with your recommendation to the Editor. For example, don’t write a highly critical review and then suggest a “conditional accept” or write a glowing review and then suggest a “reject.”
2. If you think that there is evidence of plagiarism in the manuscript please indicate this confidentially to the editors.

Know that editors and authors appreciate the work of their colleagues in the reviewing process!!