



---

## Editorial: The JPOR is expanding

Lars-Gunnar Lundh<sup>1</sup> and Lars R. Bergman<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, Lund University, Lund, Sweden

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

---

With the publication of this new issue of the *Journal for Person-Oriented Research* (JPOR), we are happy to acknowledge that the launching of this new journal has met a positive response, and that it is already expanding in several directions. The JPOR obviously seems to fill a gap in the existing range of journals devoted to the advancement of psychological science.

### New section of the JPOR: Subject-specific studies

We are happy to announce that the JPOR will henceforth include a special section for *subject-specific studies*, with Peter Molenaar as the editor. Subject-specific studies represent an important form of idiographic research which makes use of methodological advancements in both data collection (e.g., ecological momentary assessment) and data analysis (e.g., time series analyses), and may have important implications for the future development of psychological science. One of Peter Molenaar's most well-known articles has the telling title "A manifesto on Psychology as idiographic science: Bringing the person back into scientific psychology, this time forever." From November 2015 Peter Molenaar is also the chief editor for the journal *Multivariate Behavioral Research*. Peter Molenaar is professor at the Pennsylvania State University in the US, which means that the editorial board of the JPOR is no longer only based in Scandinavia, or Europe.

### Upcoming special issue from the Vienna conference, 2015

The next issue of the JPOR (Issue 4, 2015) will be a special issue on methodological topics in studying individual development, with Wolfgang Wiedermann from the University of Vienna as the main editor. This special issue will build on material presented at a conference about person-oriented research, which was held in Vienna on May 7-9, 2015

### The articles in the present issue

Looking at the articles in the present issue, we are pleased to see that they contain material from several different areas of psychological research, and include theoretical papers as

well as empirical ones. The empirical papers cover three different areas of psychological research: work and health psychology, the psychology of motivation, and clinical psychology.

In the first empirical paper, Anne Mäkikangas and her associates use latent profile analysis to identify subgroups of individuals with different profiles of well-being (as defined in terms of activation/energy and pleasure) at work. Apart from the expected groups of Engaged individuals and Burned-out individuals, they also identify a subgroup which they call "Ordinary" (because they have average scores on all well-being indicators) and a subgroup they label as "Bored-out" (and which is differentiated from the Burned-out group). Further, they also examine how these types of well-being are related to personality profiles (as defined in terms of patterns of scores on the Big Five) that have been identified by latent profile analysis in previous research. An additional interesting feature of this study is that the authors present the correlations between all the variables involved – which makes the reader able to compare the results from the person-oriented approach with what might be concluded from a traditional variable-oriented analysis. The article by Mäkikangas et al. is followed by a short commentary by Magnus Sverke, professor of work and organizational psychology at Stockholm University.

In the second paper, Julia Moeller and her associates use a person-oriented approach to the study of passion. Previous research shows that people can be more or less passionate in their activities. But are there individual differences in passion in the sense that some individuals are passionate in a harmonious way, and others are passionate in a more obsessive way? Harmonious passion and obsessive passion, as measured by self-report questionnaires, have been found to correlate differently with other variables in previous research – harmonious passion correlating positively with well-being, positive affect, and control, whereas obsessive passion has been associated with loss of control, negative affect, and ill-being. On the basis of these findings it has been suggested that there are different "types of passion" – some individuals being harmoniously passionate, and others being passionate in an obsessive way. Most previous attempts to test this hypothesis has been done by means of a

*z*-score based grouping procedure, and have apparently produced support for the hypothesis of two different “types of passion”. By focusing on raw scores, rather than *z*-scores, and by the use of person-oriented methods (cluster analysis and latent profile analysis), however, Moeller and her associates find no support for the existence of different subgroups of individuals characterized by these two different types of passion. To account for the results, they suggest an alternative hypothesis: passion is a “double-edged sword”, in the sense that passionate individuals may have both harmonious and obsessive experiences, alternating over time. Their results also lead them to question the use of *z*-score based grouping procedures more generally.

In the third paper, Maria Tillfors and her associates use cluster analysis to examine subgroups with different individual profiles of symptoms of social anxiety, social avoidance and psychological inflexibility in a non-clinical sample. “Psychological flexibility” refers to the ability to be in full conscious contact with the present moment, and to act flexibly in the service of chosen values according to what the situation affords – the absence of this kind of flexibility is assumed to be associated with psychopathology. The results of the present study are in line with what could be expected. Two of the clusters that emerged were characterized by relatively high levels of psychological inflexibility. One of these clusters combined high psychological inflexibility with high social anxiety and social avoidance, whereas the other combined it with average levels of social anxiety and social avoidance – both clusters, however, were characterized by equally high levels of depression. Research on psychological inflexibility is still in its infancy, and the results from the present study suggest that person-oriented analyses may have a role to play in this research.

In the fourth article Lars Bergman comments on a paper by Brett Laursen from the previous issue of JPOR, where Laursen initiated an important discussion of the person-oriented approach and its status in the field of psychological research. Among the issues touched on here are terminological problems, the relative lack of statistical software for person-oriented analyses, unclarities about the nature of the knowledge that is produced, the status of the “types” that are identified, and the relation to modern statistical thinking.

Finally, this issue concludes with two theoretical papers which both focus on the concepts of holism and interactionism as used in the person-oriented approach, and calls for conceptual clarification in this area. The papers, however, are written from two different perspectives. In the first paper, Artur Nilsson argues that the concepts of holism and interactionism need to be disentangled, and in the second paper Lars-Gunnar Lundh argues that holism and interactionism should be combined. What Nilsson argues for is a disentanglement of the holism of “intentional systems” from the causal interactionism of “mechanistic systems”. One of Nilsson’s main arguments is that more attention should be devoted to a detailed understanding of a person’s intentional states, and that this represents another level of description

than a description in terms of causal processes at the mechanistic level. Lundh, on the other hand, traces the concept of holism from its origin in biological thinking over discussions about holism in physics, philosophy, and psychology, and he argues for the importance of establishing strict criteria for differentiating between holistic and non-holistic systems. He also argues that David Magnusson made an important conceptual innovation, which has not been given the attention that it deserves, when he combined holism and interactionism into his “holistic-interactionistic paradigm”.

### **David Magnusson 90 years**

Finally, we like to mention that David Magnusson celebrated his 90<sup>th</sup> birthday on September 5<sup>th</sup> 2015. David Magnusson is a pioneer in person-oriented research, and it is significant that all six papers in the present issue of the JPOR include references to his work in one way or another. It may also be of interest to the readers of JPOR that David Magnusson is still productive, and engaged in writing new papers.