

EDITORIAL

At this time when the RPD/JSP has installed a new editorial team, perhaps it is also necessary to change some of its traditions. One of the elements that has changed least since its foundation 25 years ago is the editorials. Until now, they have remained as purely informative sections on the progress made in terms of RPD/JSP visibility, indexing and impact, keeping readers and authors up to date with the continuing establishment and internationalisation of the journal. They have also had the function of “introducing” the articles and the sections that made up each issue; that is to say, they upheld a profile and design that complied strictly to requirements – as a further indicator of quality – that each journal instalment had an introductory Editorial.

However, it is right to recognise that, with the permanent existence of the journal online, the demands calling for the editorial to fulfil a more communicative function, to be more interactive with the readers, are more than justified. Consequently, during the last meeting of the editorial team in October, it was agreed that a more flexible format would be promoted, one that would be more frugal in words yet more adaptable in ideas. This would allow us to respond to the novelties in our field of study and stimulate the most active debates possible, both amongst readers and authors, using not only the journal’s web platform, but also the communication channels available to the RPD/JSP, from You Tube to Twitter.

And as a “debut” for this new editorial format, we would like to propose, on behalf of a group of the journal’s editors, a question that we believe to be highly relevant to the editorials of scientific journals - Does all of the effort that is continually expended to provide more scientific rigour to the works reviewed really have an impact on the daily practice of applied psychology professionals? In our case in the field of sport? Or stated another way - Where do these professionals come by the knowledge that they apply in their work with sportsmen and women? Is it from the tree of forbidden fruit?

At the ISSP World Psychology Congress on Sport held in Seville last July, one could observe two symposia, the first national and the other international. Here, the existing “rift” between these two worlds was patently obvious, with positions that appeared to be quite categorical regarding where the purity of the work resided for the psychology professional in the field of sport. Some of this journal’s editors, who attempt to straddle these two paths, the academic and the professional, expending blood, sweat and effort (above all time and effort), do not understand approaches that are based simply on operationalization and on the technical ability at the core of the field, on personal experience versus the scientific evidence, which ought to be the common objective.

Nowadays, one can know the “traffic” that each digital object has; this is true too for scientific articles. At the RPD/JSP, we know who reads, downloads and cites the articles published in the journal. We can quantify what the “impact” is of each scientific article using different metrics; yet we know nothing about how this hard-gained knowledge models the readers’ behaviour.

This Editorial serves to promote a communication channel, however informal, that gives clues as to where the scientific publication should be heading so that its impact is not limited to the academic world. It also serves, of course, to debate what the objectives ought to be regarding where the dissemination of the results is directed.

Alexandre García-Mas (Senior Editor, Universidad de las Islas Baleares, Spain)