CODE OF ETHICS FOR AUTHORS

These guidelines are adapted from the Elsevier Ethics in Research and Publication documents available at http://www.elsevier.com/about/publishing-guidelines/publishing-ethics

Authorship

Authorship issues in research can be complicated. Generally speaking, the authors of a given publication are all those individuals who made significant intellectual contributions to it. Their specific contributions to a work and relative weighting of their contributions is declared by the corresponding Author before publication in the publishing agreement (license). Individuals who did *not* make significant intellectual contributions should not be listed as Authors. Contributors whose contribution is not significant enough for authorship (e.g., language consultation, data collection, provision of research apparatus) can be acknowledged in an Author's Note, mentioning the role they played in the research project. Listing individuals who have not made significant intellectual contributions is not acceptable. Examples of this include: "gift" authorship, granted as a favour to another researcher; "guest" authorship, granted to those whose stature in the field is assumed to increase chances of publication. Conversely, "ghost" authorship, wherein one person is the true Author but is *not* listed among the Authors of a given work is also unacceptable. The Authors list should accurately reflect who contributed to the research being described.

All authors are accountable for all contents of the published work, unless contribution break-down is specified in an Author's Note. It is strongly recommended that a discussion about authorship (including order of authorship) be conducted among potential co-authors before embarking on a joint research project.

Disputes regarding authorship (a contribution not acknowledged, or contribution indicated where none existed) will be investigated by the Editorial Board.

Conflict of interest

Any conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest must be explained and/or disclosed. A conflict of interest arises when the basic goal of the pursuit of scientific truth might be compromised by a researcher's other, concurrent goals. Research funding is one area of concern. A common example is research funded by an organization that could benefit from particular patterns of results. Conflicts can also arise in non-financial contexts. For example, conducting research involving human participants who are also one's students involves the competing interests of obtaining valid results from voluntary participants as well as maintaining a power-imbalanced teacher-student relationship.

Full disclosure of *actual or potential* conflicts of interest must be made to the journal Editor in a cover letter; the Editor will then decide whether the conflict merits a footnote in the publication itself.

Simultaneous submission / Duplicate publication

Submitted manuscripts should represent original materials that have not been published before. Submitting a manuscript simultaneously runs the risk of duplicate publication, which would violate this assumption of originality and misrepresent the reliability of the findings. Moreover, it takes up the resources (time, effort) of two editorial teams whose work is likely to overlap. Submitters should wait for feedback from one publisher before submitting the same work to another (if necessary).

Exceptions to duplicate publication can be agreed upon in some circumstances before submission, e.g., translations of original articles, with the explicit approval of the prior publisher. These exceptions must be clearly disclosed at the time of submission and fully cross-referenced at the time of publication.

Salami publication

Salami publication refers to the practice of preparing separate publications based on a single study. These 'slices' use the same sample and methodology, often the same hypotheses, while being presented as

independent. This can be misleading to readers, creating an unwarranted illusion of reliability and limiting the readers' ability to interpret results in light of all relevant data. When a large data collection is used in separate publications, testing different research questions, Authors should clearly define the relationship of the specific elements described in one manuscript relative to the study procedure as a whole.

Plagiarism
Plagiarism occurs when one Author uses another Author's work (words, phrases, data, or ideas) without due acknowledgement. Specific instructions regarding formatting for referencing ideas, data, or specific words, are given in the APA Publication Manual. All words, data, and ideas *not* formatted as a reference, using appropriate formatting, are assumed to be the submitting Author's.

A special case of plagiarism occurs when an Author uses the contents of her/his own previous publication without due indication. This is a type of duplicate submission and should also be avoided.

Research fraud
Research fraud is a grave lapse of ethics. Such fraud occurs when data are presented that were not collected in the way described in the Methods section of a manuscript, or when conclusions are drawn that are not merited by the research conducted. Authors must be extremely careful in describing methodology, apparatus, materials, sampling, and analyses to eliminate the possibility of presenting a false representation of the research as conducted. Images (of materials, processes, equipment, results) should not in general be tampered with. In some cases, improvements can be made for clarity and precision, but these cases must be clearly indicated in the manuscript and discussed with the Editor before submission.

To permit verification of research procedures, raw data must be retained (while protecting confidentiality of participants) for 5 years after the publication of any works that include them.

More detailed guidelines are available at the Elsevier Publishing Ethics Research Kit (PERK). http://www.elsevier.com/about/publishing-guidelines/publishing-ethics

CODE OF ETHICS FOR REVIEWERS

The Editorial Board of Psychologia Społeczna seeks to provide submitters with high quality, thoughtful, constructive feedback on their work. We expect Reviewers to take time and care in their reviews to avoid common feedback shortcomings: (a) reviews that are purely evaluative, without giving any constructive suggestions for improvement; (b) flippant, even discourteous reviews that insult the Author; (c) reviews that demonstrate that the Reviewer has not, in fact, read the submitted manuscript. These shortcomings should be avoided in reviewing both original submissions and re-submissions.

Below, we outline principles to keep in mind for reviews in Psychologia Społeczna:
- **Reviews should be substantive and accurate**. Reviewers should communicate their honest scholarly judgement of the submission based on its merits and contribution to the extant scientific literature. Reviews should not contain emotional elements and should demonstrate respect for the Author, regardless of the quality of the submission. This is particularly important for young Authors (graduate students, new doctors) who might be discouraged from further publishing by reviews that are discourteous, aggressive, or indicate a lack of intellectual engagement.
- **Reviews should be objective.** Reviews should contain specific, documentable information about the strengths and the weaknesses of the submission.
- **Reviews should be constructive.** Reviews should provide suggestions for improving the submission. These suggestions should be structured in a way that will allow the Author to refer to them when re-submitting (e.g., as a numbered list). In reviewing a re-submission, Reviewers should check whether and how all of these points were addressed by the Author.
- **Reviews should be impartial**. Reviewers who have a conflict of interest resulting from financial,

personal, or other relationships with the Author(s) or others connected to the submission should not agree to review a given manuscript.

- **Reviews should be timely**. If a review cannot be made within the timeline given, the Reviewer should contact the Editor as soon as possible to allow for alternative arrangements.
- **Reviews should end with an unambiguous recommendation.** The Editorial Board does not provide a special form; each review should, nonetheless, conclude with one of four recommendations:
  - **Acceptance;**
  - **Acceptance with minor revisions** – when minor, specifically noted corrections can be made (in this case, the Editor checks whether these corrections have been made in a re-submission);
  - **Re-submission after major revisions** – when corrections are likely to take longer, specific suggestions can be made to the Author(s), who will then have 2 months to incorporate them into a re-submission, which will be sent out to the same Reviewers; resubmissions received after 2 months will be treated as new submissions.
  - **Rejection** – when a Reviewer concludes that a re-submission would be impossible within the time constraints.

Dear Reviewers! We count on your cooperation and efforts for the benefit of the journal, the scientific community, and society as a whole.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR EDITORS

Editors make final decisions regarding submissions to Psychologia Społeczna. As such, they are ultimately responsible for the quality of these decisions and how these decisions are communicated. Guidelines outlined for Reviewers (e.g., concerning timeliness, avoidance of conflict of interest) are also relevant to Editors. In addition, Editors must assess reviews for adherence to the aforementioned guidelines. Each decision should be communicated clearly and respectfully, integrating Reviewer comments and indicating a re-submission deadline (if applicable). Editors should take particular care to not disclose information about submitted manuscripts to third parties or to make use of information from unpublished manuscripts without the express written consent of the Authors.