

We encourage potential authors to familiarize themselves with both the [Aims and Scope](#) and the [Vision Statement](#) for *Political Psychology*.

New submissions should be made via the [Research Exchange submission portal](#). You may check the status of your submission at any time by logging on to [submission.wiley.com](#) and clicking the “My Submissions” button. For technical help with the submission system, please review Wiley’s [FAQs](#) or contact [submissionhelp@wiley.com](#).

Manuscripts that are not prepared fully in accordance with the guidelines will be returned to the corresponding author without processing. It is the author’s responsibility to ensure all guidelines are met.

- **Scope:** We welcome all articles that focus on the relationship(s) between psychology and politics or governance. Authors should clearly articulate the political psychological dimensions of the concepts, variables, and theories used in their work. An article is accepted if, in the judgment of the editors and reviewers, it makes a significant contribution to development of theoretical, methodological, and/or substantive knowledge in political psychology. Submissions from and about under-represented groups and regions are particularly encouraged.
- **Word Count:** We recommend that the main text of empirical quantitative, theoretical, and methodological manuscripts be no longer than approximately 7,000 words (*not* including tables, figures, references, title page, and abstract). We recommend that the main text of qualitative and mixed-methods manuscripts be no longer than approximately 9,000 words (*not* including tables, figures, references, title page, and abstract). Online supplemental materials may be used for additional details and information across all manuscript types. Please make sure that all online supplemental materials are easy for readers to understand and include only material relevant to the main text.
- **Submission:** *Political Psychology* offers [Free Format submission](#) for a simplified and streamlined submission process.

Before you submit, you will need:

- **Your manuscript:** This should be an editable file (e.g., .doc, .docx, or .tex). You may include text, figures, and tables all in one file or in separate files. All required sections should be contained in your manuscript, including (in the following recommended order) abstract, introduction/theory, methods, data analysis/results, and discussion/conclusion. Figures and tables should have legends. Figures should be uploaded in the highest resolution possible.

References may be submitted in any style or format, as long as it is consistent throughout. Supporting information should be submitted in a separate file or files. Please edit your manuscript carefully. Manuscripts may be returned if text or tables/figures are difficult to understand.

- Transparency statement includes links to shared materials/data/scripts and/or justifications for why they cannot be shared (see transparency policies below). Links and information at links should be anonymized for review.
- Note for LaTeX users: If submitting your manuscript file in LaTeX format via Research Exchange, select the file designation “Main Document – LaTeX .tex File” on upload. When submitting a LaTeX Main Document, you must also provide a PDF version of the manuscript for Peer Review. Please upload this file as “Main Document - LaTeX PDF.” All supporting files that are referred to in the LaTeX Main Document should be uploaded as a “LaTeX Supplementary File.”
- An ORCID ID, freely available at <https://orcid.org>.
- A separate title page of the manuscript, including:
 - A brief informative title containing the major key words. The title should not contain abbreviations
 - A short running title of less than 40 characters
 - The full names of all authors
 - All authors' institutional affiliations where the work was conducted, with a footnote for the author's present affiliation if different from where the work was conducted
 - Acknowledgments
 - Statements relating to our ethics and other policies:
 - Funding statement: list of funding sources (if applicable)
 - Conflict of interest disclosure. If no conflict of interest, this should be stated.
 - Ethics approval statement: list of ethics approvals relevant for the manuscript or statement as to why ethics approval was not necessary
 - Permission to reproduce material from other sources (if relevant)
- In the main text of the manuscript, below the abstract, include a transparency statement—that is, a statement relating to our materials, data, and code transparency policy (see policies and possible constraints on transparency below).

- **At first submission**, materials must be shared. Include a link to the materials or, if complete materials are available in the supplemental materials, include a statement indicating that. If it is not possible to share materials, a statement justifying the reason(s) materials cannot be shared should be included instead.
- **At first submission**, authors are required to state in their transparency statement whether each reported study was preregistered or not, and which core aspects of the study (research questions/hypotheses, methods, analyses) were preregistered. Links to the preregistration(s) should also be included here (see below for more information).
- **When submitting revisions**, raw data and analysis scripts must be shared, in addition to materials. Include a link to the repository where the raw data and scripts are stored. If it is not possible to share data or scripts, a statement justifying the reason(s) data/scripts cannot be shared should be included instead. As described below, we expect authors to make efforts to share their data and scripts.
- **Important:** this journal operates a double-anonymized peer review policy. Please anonymize your manuscript and remember that the title page with author information should be separate.

Transparency Policies

Political Psychology mandates materials sharing as a condition for submission and publication. We also strongly encourage authors to share their data and scripts when submitting their manuscripts; however, sharing data and scripts is not required unless the manuscript is invited for revision. Materials/data/scripts can be shared privately while in the review process; however, if accepted, all materials/data/scripts will be publicly available.

Authors are required to provide a transparency statement after their abstract and before the start of the main text of the manuscript. This statement should include a link to the repository where the materials, data, and/or scripts are stored. Exceptions may be granted at the discretion of the editor (see constraints on transparency section).

- **Materials Sharing:** Authors are required to share all original study materials used in the manuscript upon submission of their manuscript unless there are unresolvable constraints. All materials, including stimuli, necessary for the evaluation and

replication of each reported study should be shared—in the manuscript itself, supplemental materials, trusted public online repository, or some combination. This typically includes all stimuli, manipulations, measures, instruments, and interview questions, as well as procedure details (e.g., instructions to participants, instructions to coders, consent forms) and custom software. One way to enhance transparency is to also include screen recordings or video protocols to communicate study methods.

- **Data Sharing:** If invited for revision, authors should share their first digital version of the raw data. Two alterations are permitted. First, the data should be anonymized. Second, variables that are not necessary for the analyses and conclusion of the manuscript can be removed. For example, if authors conducted an online survey experiment, they should share the data file they downloaded from their survey provider (examples are provided below). If authors conducted a paper-and-pencil survey, they should share the data file of raw responses after being inputted into the database. If authors conduct a multi-investigator survey using an online survey providers, they should share the data file they downloaded from their survey provider excluding variables from other investigators. If authors used existing/secondary data that is publicly available, they should provide a link where the data can be downloaded as well as the version of the data that was used.

We recommend that authors *also* share their *processed data* (i.e. data that have been altered in some way beyond digitization and anonymization) that are ready to be analyzed (e.g., scales are created, conditions are coded) to facilitate the analysis and reanalysis of their data.

For both quantitative and qualitative data, authors should follow best data sharing practices, such that data are handled responsibly while transparency is maximized (Gilmore et al., 2018; Levenstein & Lyle, 2018; Meyer, 2018). For some types of data, simply removing names, dates, and locations is not sufficient to anonymize the data for sharing and so additional steps will need to be taken by the authors to maximize transparency responsibly. The best way to maximize transparency responsibly will likely depend on the precise type of data being collected. Sharing qualitative data usually takes special care. We recommend authors of qualitative studies consult sources focused on this type of data. For example, see Campbell et al., 2023, DuBois et al., 2018, and information available via [The Qualitative Data Repository](#).

- **Script Sharing:** If invited for revision, authors are required to share all scripts, code, software syntax, or step-by-step instructions for analyses. Scripts should *completely* document all of the steps performed to transform the raw data into the primary/processed data (if any), and then into the values reported in the manuscript. This includes all data cleaning procedures, filters, case exclusions, visualizations, etc.

Ideally, computer scripts are shared in an open format (R, Python); however, other formats are accepted. All scripts should be clearly documented so that they can be used by someone not on the author's research team. (Some software, such as SPSS, has a point-and-click interface; however, SPSS syntax can be created from this interface. Such syntax should be shared for all SPSS analyses.)

- **Trusted Public Online Repositories** for materials/data/code sharing include (but are not limited to) the [Open Science Framework](#), [Dataverse](#), [Databrary](#), [Figshare](#), [Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research](#), and [The Qualitative Data Repository](#). Some repositories allow for restricted access which may be valuable for resolving some of the constraints on transparency (see below). The following are not considered "sharing" by *Political Psychology*: promising materials/data/code sharing upon request, materials/data/code posted on authors' own websites, and cloud storage of materials/data/code (e.g., Dropbox).
- **Preregistration:** Authors are required to state in their transparency statement whether each reported study was preregistered or not, and which core aspects of the study (research questions/hypotheses, methods, analyses) were preregistered.
 - Preregistration of studies involves registering the study design, variables, treatment conditions, and analysis pipeline prior to conducting the research in an independent, institutional registry (e.g., [ClinicalTrials.gov](#), [Open Science Framework](#), [American Economic Association RCT Registry](#), [Registry for International Development Impact Evaluations](#), [AsPredicted](#)).
 - When an author has chosen to preregister a study, a link to an anonymized version of the preregistration in an institutional registry must be included in the transparency statement (after the abstract). This preregistration should be private/anonymized for the purposes of peer-review.
 - Authors should also state if any deviations from the preregistration occurred. It may be valuable to refer readers to a preregistration deviation disclosure table in online supplement materials (e.g., Willroth & Atherton, 2024). Major

deviations from the preregistration should be reported clearly in the main text.

- Preregistered and non-preregistered analyses should be distinguished clearly in the text.

Constraints on Transparency

- We recognize that not all materials/data/code can be shared for legal, ethical, and/or practical reasons. Authors should take necessary steps to resolve or reduce constraints. This might include seeking permission to share third-party materials/data, anonymizing datasets, or sharing the materials/data in a third-party repository that manages restricted access (e.g., [Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research](#), [The Qualitative Data Repository](#)).
- We recognize that constraints cannot always be fully resolved. In such cases, the constraints must be stated and justified in the manuscript. Supporting documentation should be provided where possible (e.g., a data use agreement or letter from the local ethics board summarizing why the materials/data cannot be shared). For example, if primary data cannot be shared in any capacity, authors should state explicitly, “Primary data cannot be publicly shared because [insert justification].” If primary data can only be shared under limited circumstances (e.g., sharing requires further IRB approval) these circumstances should be explicitly stated.
- If authors are using materials/data/analysis scripts from a third party source (e.g., secondary data, proprietary stimuli), and they are unable to re-share those files alongside their own manuscript, the authors should clearly state how other researchers can obtain the resources in the manuscript. Such statements should be accompanied by appropriate citations/references (including DOI) to the third party source.
- If authors are unsure how to address constraints on transparency, the Editors-in-Chief are always ready to discuss potential constraints on transparency with authors.

Data and Software Citation

Authors are required to cite and list in the reference section (including DOI) all **data** (e.g., secondary sources), **software program and packages** (e.g., SPSS version used, R packages) and **other tools used to conduct the study**. Such materials are recognized as original intellectual contributions and afforded recognition through citation.

Ethics

- By submitting research to *Political Psychology*, the authors attest that it has been conducted in accordance with appropriate ethical guidelines, and, when appropriate, with the approval or guidance of an independent ethical authority. The journal requires that you include in the title page details of IRB approvals, ethical treatment of human and animal research participants, and gathering of informed consent, as appropriate. Authors should also discuss ethical dimensions of study design in the main text of their manuscript if relevant. For example, if using deception, authors should discuss why this choice was justifiable and why it was not possible to use methods without deception. You will be expected to declare all conflicts of interest, or none, on submission. Please review Wiley's policies surrounding [human studies, animal studies, clinical trial registration, biosecurity, and research reporting guidelines](#).
- We will check all manuscripts for plagiarism.
- Use of Artificial Intelligence to write original text or generate data is not permitted. Use of AI to discover scholarly sources, edit text, or assist with data analysis is permissible but must be disclosed. Authors bear responsibility for all of the contents of their manuscript. If an author has used this kind of tool to develop any portion of a manuscript, its use must be described, transparently and in detail, in the Methods or Acknowledgements section. The author is fully responsible for the accuracy of any information provided by the tool and for correctly referencing any supporting work on which that information depends. The final decision about whether use of an AIGC tool is appropriate or permissible in the circumstances of a submitted manuscript or a published article lies with the journal's editors.
- *Political Psychology* requires that all individuals who meet standard criteria for authorship be listed as authors and that individuals who do not meet such criteria be excluded from authorship (with their contributions listed in the acknowledgements, as appropriate). Authors are expected to 1) make a substantial contribution to the work and 2) be accountable for the work and its published form. (Lead authors may not restrict authorship by preventing those who fulfill the first requirement from fulfilling the second if desired.) A "substantial contribution" may include an intellectual contribution, active supervision, original data collection, data analysis, and/or manuscript drafting. Individuals whose role is restricted to mentoring, training, funding, editing, or routine technical assistance usually will not receive an author credit. Authors should determine amongst themselves author order, which may vary by discipline.

- This journal follows the core practices of the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](https://publicationethics.org/core-practices) and handles cases of research and publication misconduct accordingly (<https://publicationethics.org/core-practices>).

Additional Policies

- *Political Psychology* **does not provide pre-assessments** of manuscripts, abstracts or any form of document prior to formal submission. Please do not email the journal requesting pre-assessment.
- By submitting a manuscript, all authors attest that the manuscript has not been previously published and is not currently under consideration for publication in any other venue.
- This journal is a subscription journal that offers an Open Access option. You'll have the option to make your article open access after acceptance, which will be subject to an Article Publication Charge (APC) unless a waiver applies. Read more about [APCs here](#).
- *Self-Archiving Definitions and Policies*: Note that the journal's standard copyright agreement allows for [self-archiving](#) of different versions of the article under specific conditions.
- In-house submissions by Associate Editors or Editorial Board members will be handled by Associate Editors unaffiliated with the author. Submissions by the Editors-in-Chief will be handled by a person not on the editorial team but with relevant experience, such as a former *Political Psychology* Editor-in-Chief.

Manuscript Decision Process

All manuscripts will first be read by one of the Co-Editors-in-Chief, who will determine whether a manuscript will be considered for review. Manuscripts will be rejected at this stage when it is believed they have a low chance of success in the peer-review process. Most desk rejections occur for one or more of the following reasons: 1) manuscript is clearly out of journal scope (for example, literature reviews, commentaries, or lack of engagement with either politics or psychology); 2) poor study quality (for example, major errors in study design or data analysis); 3) narrow or weak empirical foundation (for example, a descriptive study based on one small, unrepresentative sample).

Manuscripts that are not rejected by the Co-Editors-in-Chief will be assigned to the Associate Editor (AE) with the most relevant expertise (with workload balance also considered). Associate Editors may also decide to reject manuscripts without sending

them for review. These decisions will be made when the AE, based on their expertise, believes a manuscript is not suitable for the journal, whether due to quality, scope considerations, or other reasons. All desk rejections will be accompanied by a rationale for the rejection.

Manuscripts assigned to an AE that are not rejected will be sent for review. Reviewers will be determined by the relevant AE. Authors will have the option of proposing and opposing reviewers upon submission, although AEs are not beholden to these suggestions.

Manuscripts that are not rejected after peer review will usually receive a “revise-and-resubmit” decision. Authors will have 6 months to complete their revised manuscript (extensions may be provided upon request) along with a detailed memo addressing the AE’s and reviewers’ concerns and suggestions. Note that AEs aim to provide “revise and resubmit” decisions only when they foresee a successful manuscript completed after one round of revision. Revised manuscripts may or may not be sent back to reviewers, depending on the scale of the revisions. Finally, note that revised manuscripts may be rejected if the AE/reviewers believe the manuscript still requires substantial revision.

The editorial team seeks to evaluate manuscripts without prejudice relating to authors’ demographic characteristics, social identities, home discipline, institution, rank, or political perspectives. Our practice of masking all manuscripts prior to review – by editors and external reviewers – will facilitate this.

Appeals

Authors are able to formally appeal a decision to reject their manuscript after peer review. The corresponding author should email the relevant Associate Editor *and* Editors-in-Chief with a memo indicating why they believe the decision was made in error. Appeals will only be considered if 1) the Associate Editor or a reviewer made significant factual errors that may have affected the decision outcome, or 2) there is evidence of inappropriate bias in the review process. The Associate Editor and at least one of the Editors-in-Chief will work together to decide whether to: 1) uphold the original decision; 2) seek one or more additional reviewers; or 3) allow the author to progress to the next stage of the publication process.

Manuscript Types

Original Article: The vast majority of manuscripts submitted to *Political Psychology* will be original articles. Most of these articles will report on original empirical quantitative and/or

qualitative studies. The journal also accepts manuscripts that describe a substantial and novel methodological or theoretical advance in political psychology.

Registered Report: Registered reports is a publishing format that requires peer review prior to data collection. If articles pass peer review at this first stage, they receive a Stage 1 “in-principle acceptance” (IPA) and the journal commits to publishing the results of the study if the authors follow through with the registered methodology. We accept a wide variety of registered reports, including those addressing novel research questions, replicating published work, using secondary data, using experimental data, using cross-sectional survey data, and using qualitative data. Note that the word count suggestions above are for final, accepted manuscripts. Therefore, Stage 1 registered report submissions should likely aim for lower word counts in the anticipation that the final version, including full results and discussion, will be longer.

Titles of registered reports should begin with “Registered Report.” Initial submissions must include a description of the key research question and background literature, hypotheses, experimental or other procedures, analysis pipeline, a statistical power analysis (or Bayesian equivalent), pilot data (where applicable), and timeline for data collection. Stage 1 manuscripts are reviewed based on the importance of the research question, the soundness of the design analysis pipeline, and whether the methods are sufficiently detailed to replicate the proposed procedures. Including evidence, such as pilot data or existing research, that indicates that the study procedures work as intended (e.g., the treatment will manipulate the intended psychological construct) will increase the success of Stage 1 manuscripts.

Following Stage 1 in-principle acceptance, the authors will register their approved protocol on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/>) or other recognized repository (see list in section on preregistration). Following registration, the authors will conduct the study as planned. We expect data collection for most registered reports to take less than 1 year; however if a longer timeline is necessary we will consider this. The final Stage 2 manuscript will be submitted for re-review. If the study was conducted with sufficient quality and interpreted sensibly, the manuscript will be published regardless of the results.

Please note that deviations from the planned procedures, regardless of how minor it may seem, could lead to rejection of the manuscript. When the Stage 1 protocol is changed after IPA due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g., change of equipment or unanticipated technical error), the authors should consult the Associate Editor immediately for advice, and prior to the completion of data collection. All deviations must be reported in the final manuscript. All registered analyses must be included. Additional unregistered analyses

can also be included in a final manuscript if clearly labeled as such (e.g. Exploratory Analyses). The introduction and stated hypotheses of the Stage 2 manuscript cannot be altered with the exception of minor stylistic revisions. Similarly, proposed methodology should only be changed so that it is written in past tense. Any relevant literature that appeared following the date of IPA should be covered in the Discussion.

Registered reports are often used for original data collection of quantitative studies (e.g., experiments). However, we also encourage authors to consider additional types of studies for registered reports (see Henderson & Chambers, 2022). Registered reports with existing data are possible. We will accept registered reports in this case when the authors can demonstrate that they do not yet have access to the data (i.e., they are not the owners of the data, have not been sent the dataset, and have not otherwise been given access to the data). Creating registered reports for qualitative studies is a newer idea (Jacobs, 2020; Karhulahti et al., 2023), and we welcome such submissions. Choosing to conduct a qualitative study as a registered report allows authors to receive peer reviewer feedback in the design phase of the project. Although not typically focused on testing hypotheses, many aspects of qualitative research can be specified prior to conducting the study.

Dialogue: In lieu of traditional book reviews, *Political Psychology* will publish critical dialogues. Dialogues take two main forms. The most common form involves the authors of two or three books on similar topics reviewing each others' work and, separately, writing a response. We will also consider dialogues that involve several individuals providing separate reviews of one book and the author(s) of that book providing a response. If you would like to propose a dialogue, please contact the Co-Editors-in-Chief. In your proposal, please summarize the book(s), describe why a critical dialogue is valuable for the topic, and include a proposed timeline for the dialogue. If proposing a dialogue for a single book, please include suggestions for potential participants and a justification for why the book deserves its own dialogue.

Special Issues/Sections: Potential guest editing teams can propose special issues (~9-10 articles) or sections (~3-6 articles) on topics in political psychology. If you would like to propose a special issue or section, please contact the Co-Editors-in-Chief. Proposals should include a summary of the topic of the special issue/section, a discussion of the added value of a special issue/section for the topic, the procedure for soliciting manuscripts, plans to recruit a demographically and geographically diverse set of authors, and the editorial experience of the guest editing team. Please also include the text for a call to submissions that could be posted on the ISPP website, as well as text to use in announcements for the special issue on social media (e.g., BlueSky, Facebook). If

proposing a special issue, please justify why the topic deserves an issue. All articles for special issues/sections must undergo peer review and are subject to the same expectations as all other manuscripts in the journal.

Contact

- Please contact the Editorial Team at POPS@american.edu with any questions or concerns.

References:

Campbell, R., Javorka, M., Engleton, J., Fishwick, K., Gregory, K., & Goodman-Williams, R. (2023). Open-Science guidance for qualitative research: An empirically validated approach for de-identifying sensitive narrative data. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 6(4), 25152459231205832.

DuBois, J. M., Strait, M., & Walsh, H. (2018). Is it time to share qualitative research data? *Qualitative Psychology*, 5(3), 380–393. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000076>

Gilmore, R. O., Kennedy, J. L., & Adolph, K. E. (2018). Practical solutions for sharing data and materials from psychological research. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 1(1), 121-130.

Henderson, E. L., & Chambers, C. D. (2022). Ten simple rules for writing a Registered Report. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 18(10), e1010571.

Jacobs, A.M. (2020). Pre-registration and Results-Free Review in Observational and Qualitative Research. In C. Elman, J. Gerring, and J. Mahoney (Eds.), *The Production of Knowledge: Enhancing Progress in Social Science* (pp. 221-266). Cambridge University Press.

Karhulahti, V. M., Branney, P., Siutila, M., & Syed, M. (2023). A primer for choosing, designing and evaluating registered reports for qualitative methods. *Open Research Europe*, 3.

Levenstein, M. C., & Lyle, J. A. (2018). Data: Sharing is caring. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 1(1), 95-103.

Meyer, M. N. (2018). Practical tips for ethical data sharing. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 1(1), 131-144.

Willroth, E. C., & Atherton, O. E. (2024). Best laid plans: A guide to reporting preregistration deviations. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 7(1), 25152459231213802.