

Table of contents

Editor's note/overview.....	2
Reviewers' comments.....	2
Potential.....	2
Theoretical Strength, Justification, Structure and Coherence.....	2
Style/form.....	4
Decision.....	5
Reviewers' letters.....	6
Reviewer #26's letter.....	7
Potential.....	7
Structure.....	7
Theoretical strength.....	8
Integration and justification.....	8
Form.....	8
Reviewer #2's letter.....	10
Potential : If the articles can be improved to a higher level.....	10
Theoretical contribution.....	10
Structure.....	10
Coherence.....	10
Justification	11
Form.....	11
Reviewer #12a's letter.....	12
Potential.....	12
Theoretical contribution.....	12
Structure.....	12
Coherence.....	12
Justification.....	13
Form.....	13
Reviewer #16's letter.....	14
Potential.....	14
Theoretical Contribution.....	14
Structure.....	14
Coherence.....	15
Justification.....	15
Form.....	15

Editor's note/overview

Your manuscript yields an interesting theoretical potential but requires extensive work to bring it in line with the Jiriri's field of interest and improve its clarity.

Reviewers have been unable to establish the link between the findings you bring forth and the essence of our journal (interpersonal relations, intergroup relations, and identity). A recurrent criticism is that your manuscript is at times confusing and plunges into statistical intricacies without guiding the reader in their interpretation. Some reviewers felt that such complexity stems from what was described as a “kitchen sink” approach.

Reviewers' comments

Potential

Reviews were mixed on the potential of this study. Some reviewers praised your theoretical contribution, while others stated that there are many similar studies in the existing literature (with topics revolving around correlating personality with intelligence).

Many were disappointed that the inconclusive results seemed to prevent that particular contribution from truly shining. Note that reviewers usually stated or implied that it is *difficult* to evaluate the true value of this contribution due to various factors presented below.

Theoretical Strength, Justification, Structure and Coherence

There was some consensus among reviewers that the literature review was quite long, complex, and would benefit from subdivisions. I added emphasis (bold typeface) on some of those comments for your convenience:

“All the different components that you are measuring are very confusing (perhaps it is because I am not familiar with them). But, I think it is of great importance that you really simplify this section. What is the purpose of each questionnaire, what will it help you find in the end, how are they related to your hypothesis, etc. [...]

The pertinence of some of the studies mentioned is not always clear. I find that they are not always relevant to the goal or even to the idea preceding (see track changes in the manuscript).

Furthermore, **some terms need to be defined** in order to understand what they exactly mean. Several times I felt the flow of the paragraph or the idea was brought to an abrupt stop because I did not understand the exact definition of a term. If it's a 'technical term' it must be defined. (Example, on p.3, what are Alpha and Beta exams?) [...]” (reviewer #26)

“This paper was fairly well organized, but could be improved with **subheadings**. I found the transitions between topics to be choppy and awkward, as well as the description of some key concepts pertaining to decision making. [...] The end of the introduction is a melting pot of hypotheses and difficult to read, as is the results section. Some sentences aren't complete.” (reviewer #12a)

“Reading the article is frustrating, since it deals with established psychological constructs and still manages to produce confusion [...] There are good arguments in the text, but too scattered. The author gives away points by not focusing and **getting straight to the point** throughout the whole article. [...] Since the theoretical part is very long it would be helpful to **include subheadings**. Further, the article deals with many variables, which in this case derogates structure and clarity. Maybe the author should exclude emotional intelligence and well being, and focus on the main relations announced in the abstract. The author could improve the thread or leitmotif.” (reviewer #16)

Reviewer #26 criticized the perhaps hasty presentation of the various types of intelligence, with some very helpful hints on making the slope easier for the reader to climb:

“In the first paragraph, I find that the different types of intelligence are too quickly brought forth and not developed enough. As you do not know who will be reading your article, it would be important to start with a global definition of intelligence.

It is really important to clearly set the stage and take the reader by the hand through each step of your reasoning. Once you've defined what intelligence is, tell us why it is important to study this subject further. If you are writing an entire paper on it, it is probably because there are still some unanswered questions, tell us what those questions are. Then, take the time to describe intelligent behavior, do we have a precise definition of it? How is it really different from intellectual intelligence and why should they be related to one another. This is a question that I had throughout reading your text: why and how is intelligent behavior linked to intellectual intelligence and why is it important to link the two? Aren't they two completely different things?" (reviewer #26)

Reviewer #12a also contested the overuse of direct quotations:

"The article varies in levels of coherence. The author seems to have a grasp on certain concepts rather than others, but relies on direct quotations to explain a number of ideas [...] [and] seems to rely on review articles when discussing main ideas, when it would be more beneficial to access the original article and discuss it in more detail." (reviewer #12a)

Note, however, that other reviewers did not seem to mind; reviewer #2 even warned about paraphrasing. All things considered, I would argue that your use of quotations was generally adequate, but could be further improved by clearly establishing the link between the goals of your study and the previous works (the "getting straight to the point" comment from reviewer #16). Guiding the reader in understanding exactly why you are presenting theory X or Y will go a long way in making your manuscript much more enjoyable.

Style/form

While being criticised by reviewer #16 for missing page numbers, "textual errors and wrong quoting", your article has generally been praised by reviewers for its compliance to the APA guidelines and for being within reasonable length boundaries. Detailed corrections are available throughout the reviewers' annotated versions of your article. Some more high profile problems are the incorrectly referenced figures:

The author has two figures labeled “Figure 1” and “Figure 3” and they are incorrectly referenced within the manuscript.” (reviewer #12a)

... and the subjectivity of some of your statements. :

‘there are too many sentences beginning with “It is natural...”, “It makes sense...”, “Clearly, we can think of...”, “The idea... is not questioned” ’ (reviewer #16)

In their annotations, reviewers pointed out portions that were considered too subjective, one example of which is the following:

“Clearly, we can think of people who are intelligent and yet engage in non-intelligent behavior such as driving drunk, making careless financial decisions, **failing in their marriage**, and others.” (*emphasis mine*)

Unless you clearly define the notion of a failing marriage *and* have strong evidence to back it up as an example of “non-intelligent behavior”, this statement will appear to lack objectivity. There are other instances where reviewers voiced their disagreement regarding the phrasing, and wrote various annotations pointing out suspicious wording or assumptions throughout your article.

Decision

Rest assured that your article *does* have an interesting potential. However, it requires some extensive cleanup. At least three major points must be addressed:

1. Its clarity must be improved in such a way that the non-expert reader can easily comprehend the greater picture without getting lost in all the variables, references and technicalities;
2. It must establish a clear link with identity, intergroup relations or interpersonal relations;
3. It needs to be examined for imprecise or subjective statements.

Thus, your manuscript is currently **rejected with the suggestion to resubmit**. Once you have resolved the issues, we will be happy to review your article again.

Cheers,

The editor for manuscript 2009-12

Reviewers' letters

Provided for your convenience, left unmodified.

Reviewer #26's letter

Dear author,

I have read your manuscript with great interest and believe that it can bring a significant contribution to this Journal. However, before accepting your manuscript for publication, I believe that significant changes are necessary. I have divided my comments into six categories: potential, theoretical strength, structure, integration, justification and form. Furthermore, I have added comments directly into the manuscript when I judged that these comments would be better understood in this fashion.

Potential

Although the subject of this article is quite interesting, it is important to consider that the main focus of the JIRIRI revolves around identity and intergroup relations. However, not once has these two subjects been mentioned. I believe that it would be interesting, and necessary, to make a link between intelligence, personality and identity. Perhaps the following question should be answered: in what way would finding a link between intelligence and personality further the literature on identity or even on intergroup relations?

Structure

My main concern with regards to the structure is the introduction. In my opinion it is the section of the manuscript that most needs attention. In the first paragraph, I find that the different types of intelligence are too quickly brought forth and not developed enough. As you do not know who will be reading your article, it would be important to start with a global definition of intelligence. It is really important to clearly set the stage and take the reader by the hand through each step of your reasoning. Once you've defined what intelligence is, tell us why it is important to study this subject further. If you are writing an entire paper on it, it is probably because there are still some unanswered questions, tell us what those questions are. Then, take the time to describe intelligent behavior, do we have a precise definition of it? How is it really different from intellectual intelligence and why should they be related to one another. This is a question that I had throughout reading your text: why and how is intelligent behavior linked to intellectual intelligence and why is it important to link the two? Aren't they two completely different things?

My second concern was around the purpose of the study. It is mentioned three different times in the introduction but it is never really thoroughly explained. Seeing that there are many components to your experiment, perhaps it would be better to breakdown your hypothesis in different categories. Maybe one for each questionnaire? Or for each different component studied? Also, adding an example or clearly stating the link that is expected would help clarify your hypothesis.

My third concern stems from the second concern. All the different components that you are measuring are very confusing. (Perhaps it is because I am not familiar with them.) But, I think it is of great importance that you really simplify this section. What is the purpose of each questionnaire, what will it help you find in the end, how are they related to your hypothesis, etc.

Theoretical strength

The theoretical contribution was difficult to decipher. However, I do believe that once the author will have clarified the points mentioned in the previous section, that the theoretical contribution will be more visible to the readers eye.

Integration and justification

The pertinence of some of the studies mentioned is not always clear. I find that they are not always relevant to the goal or even to the idea preceding (see track changes in the manuscript).

Furthermore, some terms need to be defined in order to understand what they exactly mean. Several times I felt the flow of the paragraph or the idea was brought to an abrupt stop because I did not understand the exact definition of a term. If it's a 'technical term' it must be defined. (Example, on p.3, what are Alpha and Beta exams?)

Also, in the introduction, it is important to explain statistics that someone, an outside reader, would not understand. Please avoid technical statistical terms such as 'variance'. If you think it is important to include, take the time to explain what it means in "real people" terms. But, such terms would be appropriate when reporting the results.

Form

Particular attention needs to be focused on spelling and grammar.

****Final thoughts:** Even though I have questioned core issues in your manuscript, please keep in mind that I believe that it has great potential and that it can add a particularly interesting contribution to the JIRIRI. I look forward to reading further drafts of the manuscript.

****Verdict:** Rejected with invitation to resubmit

Reviewer #2's letter

Potential : If the articles can be improved to a higher level

The writing calibre of the article must be strengthened

For example, the use of the same word multiple times in a sentence occurs repeatedly throughout the article and distracts the reader from the topic at hand

Furthermore, a rather informal style and tone of writing are often employed and should be revised

Theoretical contribution

The main idea of the article of the article is an interesting one. However, studies correlating personality with intelligence testing are abundant, making it more difficult to produce a truly novel study. Although the theoretical originality may be considered fairly high.

The correlation between intelligence testing and personality factors could prove to have a very important theoretical contribution.

Structure

Logical organization of the ideas: The article shows a rather good flow of ideas. However, the level of writing and informal writing style does take away from the consistent flow and development of these ideas throughout the article.

Clarity of the ideas: Clarity and development of ideas could be strengthened. The paragraph (immediately before the Method section), should be revised in order to more clearly report on the main ideas being investigated in the study.

Coherence

Although there are a few areas of incoherence, the entire article can be regarded as a whole. Some flow and consistency could be improved.

Through the description of the historical background and the present study, the article does establish links between the main ideas being evaluated.

Justification

The historical background does properly support main ideas. However, problems with previous personality-intelligence studies could be included to strengthen the main idea of the article.

The quality of references throughout the article seemed quite good. Would be advised to watch out for paraphrasing in some areas through.

Form

The article follows APA style

The article is not overly long and is within reasonable limits of the maximum allowed pages

Reviewer #12a's letter

After reviewing this manuscript, my suggestion would be to reject this article for publication.

Potential

I think it is important to look at some of the possible mediating factors of intelligence and intelligent decision making, but the current paper doesn't find any significant effects or relationships. If more studies were conducted and significant relationships found, it could potentially relate to identity and decision making processes.

Theoretical contribution

This paper proposes no real theoretical originality. Although the relationship between intelligence and intelligent behavior is interesting, as well as the theory behind the lack of a relationship between intelligence and subjective well being, I'm still uncertain about the findings or lack thereof in this domain. The argument needs to be developed and explored further. The explanation for hypothesizing the relationship between some of the personality variables and intelligent behavior is weak. The author seemed to "throw in the kitchen sink" looking for an effect without providing a rational argument.

Structure

This paper was fairly well organized, but could be improved with subheadings. I found the transitions between topics to be choppy and awkward, as well as the description of some key concepts pertaining to decision making. The description and rationale of the measures used in the study should be in the introduction instead of the method section. Some of the assumptions the author made were not logical or supported by previous research, and those ideas or statements need to be expanded and explained.

Coherence

The article varies in levels of coherence. The author seems to have a grasp on certain concepts rather than others, but relies on direct quotations to explain a number of ideas. The use of subheadings and explanation would add to the coherence of the article. The section requiring the most work pertains to decision making. The end of the introduction is a melting pot of hypotheses and difficult to read, as is the results section. Some sentences aren't complete. The labels for the figures are incorrect.

Justification

The author seems to rely on review articles when discussing main ideas, when it would be more beneficial to access the original article and discuss it in more detail. Some of the arguments are shaky with little to no research to back up a claim. The author clearly states that he or she is “unsure of the relationship” between variables, and is throwing them in to test.

Form

The paper has few problems pertaining to APA style. The author has two figures labeled “Figure 1” and “Figure 3” and they are incorrectly referenced within the manuscript.

Reviewer #16's letter

Potential

The article certainly can be improved to a higher level

Reading the article is frustrating, since it deals with established psychological constructs and still manages to produce confusion within the reader due to a lack of structure, consistency, clear definitions and consistent use of words e.g. even the author does not draw a stringent line between intellectual abilities and intelligent behaviour.

Further the article disrespects basic formal demands e.g. no page numbers, coarse textual errors and wrong quoting.

Although, explaining intelligent behaviour by investigating intellectual abilities and non-intellective factors such as personality is not of secondary interest for psychologist, I have trouble seeing how the article falls into the field of Interpersonal relations, intergroup relations and identity.

Because of the sampling strategies and a rather complicated outcome measure for intelligent behaviour the article could not replicate major findings e.g. the relationship between personality dimensions and IQ, nor could it show any evidence for the proposed hypothesis.

Theoretical Contribution

Since the article does not provide a satisfying overview of the literature within the field; it is hard to state on the theoretical contribution. The author itself misses that part as well.

There are good arguments in the text, but too scattered. The author gives away points by not focusing and getting straight to the point throughout the whole article.

The Discussion is to be excluded from previous criticism. The author addresses good points here and provides a clear structure.

Structure

Since the theoretical part is very long it would be helpful to include subheadings.

Further, the article deals with many variables, which in this case derogates structure and clarity. Maybe the author should exclude emotional intelligence and well being, and focus on the main relations announced in the abstract.

The author could improve the thread or leitmotif.

Coherence

Is to be improved

Justification

There are too many sentences beginning with “It is natural...”, “It makes sense...”, “Clearly, we can think of...”, “The idea... is not questioned”

The author needs to make sure, that the hypothesis are theoretically verified or pointed to as research questions, do not just talk at large at any point.

Form

The article shows common stylistic errors like informal and colloquial, florid and imprecise language (see above for examples)