

## PUBLICATION ETHICS

Analele Universității din Oradea Fascicula Limba și Literatura Română (ALLRO)

ISSN 1224-7588

Annals of the University of Oradea Romanian Language and Literature Fascicule

The BASE of ALRRO's CODE OF CONDUCT and the definitions of ALLRO's ETHICAL GUIDELINES are rooted in two main sources which provide the publication measures, the publication regulations and the awareness on the legal frame for our journal's publication ethics.

THE TWO MAIN SOURCES ARE:

### 1. COPE - CODE OF CONDUCT AND BEST PRACTICE GUIDELINES FOR JOURNAL EDITORS

[https://publicationethics.org/files/Code\\_of\\_conduct\\_for\\_journal\\_editors.pdf](https://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors.pdf)

Our journal is actively involved in the process of receiving COPE membership- (we are waiting to be able to update info on this. We are currently receiving COPE newsletters). We have decided to apply for journal membership after realizing the importance of belonging to a community of scientific journals guided by the principle of integrity.

Our journal's core principles in committing to our work are:

- The principle of integrity
- The principle of transparency
- The principle of committing ourselves - 100%- to promoting value through our journal
- The principle of being in readiness to improve our journal
- The principle of helping younger generations of researchers and readers grow and benefit from the interaction with our journal
- The principle of respecting the benefits of WRITER-READER interaction. We want to let it be shaped by modern technology but not crushed or reduced or zeroed in its human potential. Digital book printing is a new reality. New software, new methods and new habits are developed. However, the WRITER-READER interaction will keep the same quest for meaning, value and emotion as the result of interrelatedness.

### 2. UNIVERSITY OF ORADEA'S ETHICAL CODE.

THE CODE is called THE CODE OF ETHICS AND ACADEMIC DEONTOLOGY ("Codul de Etică și Deontologie Universitară")

<https://www.uoradea.ro/display204>

Article 9 chapter III stipulates that plagiarism and intellectual fraud are forbidden. (see page 5).

The Faculty of Letters, University of Oradea, has the software necessary for the detection of plagiarism.

Best practices as emphasized by COPE and our exposure to people having the intent of publishing in an academic journal have shaped our definition of boundaries, of good practices and of our improvements of the publication ethics.

## 1. DUTIES OF EDITORS

- 1.1. Editors should assume responsibility for what is published in the journal (in terms of doing their best to ensure the presence of articles reflecting value).
- 1.2. Editors must be free of bias and prejudice when dealing with potential authors who want to publish their work.
- 1.3. The responsibility of the opinions, ideas, attitudes expressed in this journal belongs solely to the authors. Such opinions and ideas cannot be identified as belonging to the editorial team of the journal. Editors must support the freedom of expression in the context of our journal.
- 1.4. Our journal shall NEVER be a vehicle for harming people through words, directly or indirectly.
- 1.5. Editors should be ready to publish corrections and apologies, if necessary.
- 1.6. Editors shall never interfere in the publication process in favour of a person or another.
- 1.7. The section editors from the editorial team do not have the power to decide upon the table of contents. They must agree with the fact that they may be consulted or not by the editor-in-chief, by the editorial secretary and by the associate editor-in-chief who establish the table of contents for the yearly issue.
- 1.8. All of the accepted manuscripts, after they are improved with revisions, must be published. They cannot be delayed on purpose or neglected or dismissed. Once the decision to publish a paper is taken, assumed, this decision cannot be reversed. It can be reversed only in the case that there is new evidence that the respective article is, in fact, not publishable because of fraudulent conduct.
- 1.9. The editor-in-chief, the editorial secretary and the associate editor-in-chief have the duty to be watchful and to safeguard the journal against any attempt of prospective authors to publish manuscripts that make fraudulent use of somebody else's intellectual work and intellectual property.

- 1.10. All our editors should report to the editor-in-chief if they come across evidences of plagiarism in the articles sent to our journal.
- 1.11. Submitting author's copy-right is protected by ALRRO's reviews editors who mediate the sending of the manuscript to peer-reviewers. The act of submitting a manuscript to ALLRO is safe from the point of view of intellectual property.
- 1.12. In case of maternity or paternity leave for ALLRO's executive editors, which can have a two-year duration, according to Romanian legislation, the executive editors in charge keep their position inside the journal. This is granted irrespectively of the quantity of work for the journal during that interval.
- 1.13. In case of retirement or the year near retirement (since the journal is yearly) of the editor-in-chief, the associate editor-in-chief, the editorial secretary, they must take into account that these positions cannot remain vacant. The position of the editor-in-chief, of the associate editor-in-chief respectively of the editorial secretary require more responsibilities than that of section-editors, therefore their continuation on these jobs must be assumed. Should any of them express their willingness to interrupt the activity for ALLRO, somebody else must be chosen through vote, either in a meeting, or through online vote. The participants for the vote are the all the executive editors of ALLRO plus two members of the management of the Faculty of Letters, University of Oradea- dean and head of department.
- 1.14. The editor-in-chief, the associate editor-in-chief and the editorial secretary must present an assessment of their activity, in their chosen form of expression, to the other executive members, before they retire from the job of executive editors for ALLRO.
- 1.15. In case of retirement or the year near retirement (since the journal is yearly) of any of the section editors, their continuation on the job is not implicit. An evaluation of the activity may be initiated and subjected to discussion by any of the executive editors of ALLRO.
- 1.16. If new members are co-opted, their role should be clearly specified.

## 2. DUTIES OF MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY BOARD (THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE)

- 2.1. The members of the ADVISORY BOARD (THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE) of ALLRO must allow a good communication with ALLRO's executive editors.
- 2.2. They should respond to questions about the guidelines of the journal.
- 2.3. They should be willing to offer their expertise.
- 2.4. They should offer their know-how for the questions they are consulted.
- 2.5. They should inform the executive editors about new opportunities, allowing thus the journal to grow.
- 2.6. They should offer their feedback and advice about the development of the journal.
- 2.7. They should show their willingness to offer their point of view in case of dilemmas.
- 2.8. The members of the Advisory Board that have undertaken the responsibility of peer -reviewing for ALLRO have the respective guidelines below, **at 3.** (See the list of reviewers here [http://analeromana.uoradea.ro/list\\_peer\\_reviewers.pdf](http://analeromana.uoradea.ro/list_peer_reviewers.pdf) Not all the members of Advisory Board are reviewers, according to their initial agreement with ALLRO).
- 2.9. If the members of the Advisory Board are required by ALLRO executive editors to collaborate and give their advice about networking, they should be available for it.
- 2.10. They should communicate about new tendencies and novelties in the field of research and the best methods to embrace them or to respond to them
- 2.11. They should offer critical approaches, either related to ALLRO's evolution or related to the evolution of the scientific environment and academic world.
- 2.12. They should be willing to embrace the role of mentors.

### 3. DUTIES OF PEER-REVIEWERS AND GOOD PRACTICES RELATED TO PEER-REVIEWERS

- 3.1. The peer-reviewers are the people who provide vital help with the quality assurance of our journal. We can say that they provide "the quality control" necessary for ALLRO's publication and progress.
- 3.2. The peer-reviewers have a peer-review form to be used. See here: [http://analeromana.uoradea.ro/model\\_bun\\_pr.pdf](http://analeromana.uoradea.ro/model_bun_pr.pdf)  
The peer-review form is conceived and changed and improved by the editorial team. The peer-reviewers are free to use this form and they are free, as well, to simply write notes, observations on submitted manuscripts regardless of our peer-review form. Feedback in the form of written notes, free structure, is fully accepted.  
The peer-reviewers must agree with the fact that our peer-review policy is single-blind, not double-blind. See the detailed peer-review process here: <http://analeromana.uoradea.ro/peerreview.pdf>
- 3.3. Peer-reviewers must submit their reviews in due time.
- 3.4. The peer-reviewers must agree with our option for a transparent peer-review process, which means seeing openly the name of the author of the manuscript, but with no extra-info on the person. Thus the peer-reviewer is positioned as a reader who knows the name of the potential author.
- 3.5. The question number 18 on the peer-review form is very important because it means the reviewer's vote "yes" or "no" for the article. The peer-reviewer must submit a yes or a no at the question: "Is the article worth-publishing?" "Worth-publishing" means either one of the following situations: 1. no corrections are necessary 2. minor corrections are necessary 3. major changes are required but the article has the potential of becoming a better article through revisions and deepening.  
If the article does not get at least 3 votes out of 5 it cannot be published. Two votes come from the peer-reviewers and three votes come from: editor-in-chief (one vote), editorial secretary (one vote) and associate editor-in-chief (one vote).
- 3.6. The peer-reviewers must signal if they come across mistakes.
- 3.7. The peer-reviewers must report if they have suspicions that the submitted article may not give credit to the sources. The peer-reviewers must announce any suspicion of plagiarism. The peer-reviewers communicate with the reviews editor. The reviews editor communicates with the editor-in-chief.

- 3.8. Suppose the principles of the peer-reviewer and the general principles of our journal are not the same. Whose should be the guiding principle? The peer-reviewer must respect the fact that our peer-review process is single-blind. Other than that, the peer-reviewer must have the freedom to respect his/her own principles while assessing the manuscript, rather than respecting the journal's principles. For example the journal might have the principle of encouraging growth and potential, the peer-reviewer might have other principles. The journal should guarantee the peer-reviewer the necessary trust without imposing the journal's principles.
- 3.9. Peer-reviewers should declare conflicting interests.
- 3.10. Peer-reviewers should remain free from bias and prejudice during the whole process.
- 3.11. Peer-reviewers should seek to be constructive in their feedback.
- 3.12. Peer-reviewers' work should be acknowledged. We are grateful to our peer-reviewers. We have published a list with our peer-reviewers on the site of our journal.

#### 4. DUTIES OF AUTHORS

- 4.1. Author submitting a manuscript must create an original work.
- 4.2. In theory, the concept of originality can be infinitely debated. We, the journal editors, refer to 'the originality of a manuscript' in a measurable sense. We do not enter the core of the concept and we do not intend to rock the boat at this point in this context. We, the editors, simply want to say that authors submitting a manuscript who copy somebody else's words and do not cite them shall be banned from further manuscript submissions.
- 4.3. In a measurable sense, no ten consecutive words (with nominal group and verbal group) can be alike with what has been published before, either in print form or online. It is true that there are ideas hard to be traced and parcelled as intellectual property. But prospective authors should enter a dialogue in writing with the very people who had the same ideas before. In this way, somebody else's words, acknowledged, can enlighten the new research.

- 4.4. By creating an original work we mean a work that has not existed in this unique form before being invented by its author. In this unique form, all the words that have been invented by other authors in their unique crystallization and novelty or in their unique blend are properly recognised. They are not stolen, because they are attributed to who invented them, therefore they contribute to a better crystallization of incipient revelations.
- 4.5. Author(s) should not send the same manuscript concurrently to another journal, at the same time.
- 4.6. An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research with what he or she has previously published. If there are changes they should be mentioned. Duplication should be avoided. Counting duplication as a new paper to one's list of articles is lack of honesty.
- 4.7. Prospective authors should be guided by a genuine interest in developing knowledge or in discovering new sources of amazement through the work they do.

© ALLRO ETHICAL GUIDELINES