

THE ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS OF *JOURNAL OF FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES IN SPLIT*

The publisher and the Editorial Board of *Journal of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split*, in their obligations and all requirements of an ethical nature, rely on the published recommendations of the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Croatia (<http://public.mzos.hr/Default.aspx?art=7966&sec=2142>) and act according to the guidelines of best editorial practice by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) for editors of scientific journals. Also, the ethical principles of the Editorial Board are guided by the existing editorial standards of international scientific journals, known within a set of written and/or unwritten rules that apply equally to editorial and authoring processes in the process of writing and submitting papers, editorial and reviewing procedures, and the publication of scientific and other papers in *Journal of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split*. The summarized basis of the ethical principles and standards of the *Journal* consists of these rights and obligations for all participants involved in the process of collecting, reviewing, and publishing contributions:

1. Authors

Authors edit manuscripts according to guidelines published in the printed and online issues of *Journal*.

Authors are responsible for the originality of their papers, they guarantee that they have submitted the paper for the peer review process to nowhere else but *Journal*, and that their paper has not been published elsewhere either in the original language or in any other foreign language. Authors are obliged to cite other authors and sources, ideas, and information correctly, and to include as authors all and only the real authors and/or co-authors. In the event of an error, omission, or inaccuracy in the published paper, the Editorial Board should be informed immediately.

Manuscripts can be written in Croatian, English or Italian. Authors of manuscripts are responsible for the accuracy and appropriateness of the language style.

Journal publishes only previously unpublished scientific and professional papers as well as papers that have been fully or partially presented at a scientific conference but have not been

published in the conference proceedings. The Editorial Board must be informed in advance about the publication status of the paper.

When submitting a manuscript, authors are required to submit a statement of the manuscript's publication status to the journal's email address (zbornik.ffst@gmail.com).

Authors are obliged to obtain permission from any copyright holder to publish illustrations, photographs, tables and similar materials protected by copyright law. Copyrighted material may only be reproduced with the appropriate permission.

Only those persons who have made a significant contribution to the creation of the manuscript and have participated in its drafting are considered authors of the manuscript. Persons who did not participate in the manuscript may not be included as authors of the manuscript. The author who submits the manuscript to the Editorial Board is obliged to make sure that the list of authors includes all those who participated in its drafting, as well as that all authors have approved the final version of the manuscript and that they agree to submit it to the *Journal*.

Authors are expected to respond to editorial and review comments in a professional and timely manner. If the author decides to withdraw a manuscript that has already been submitted to the peer review process or does not wish to accept reviewers' suggestions after the peer review process has been completed, the author is obliged to inform the Editor-in-Chief as soon as possible.

If the author determines at any time that there are any errors or incorrect information in the submitted manuscript, they are obliged to immediately notify the Editor-in-Chief of such errors or incorrect information. If errors or incorrect information have been noticed in the published paper, the author is obliged to inform the Editor-in-Chief as soon as possible and in cooperation with them to prepare and publish the appropriate correction of the misstatement. In the event of more serious mistakes, disputed work will be withdrawn from the journal.

2. Editorial Board

Editorial Board members may not submit their papers either for the peer review process or publication, but only for non-reviewed texts (editorial, review, news, etc.). Authors and reviewers are unknown to one another, and all papers undergo at least a double-blinded peer review (i.e. papers are subjected to more reviews for cases where one review is unfavorable or there is a significant disagreement over a paper's evaluation). Reviewers of *Journal* are not

employees of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split. After the peer review process, the paper is referred to editorial review / evaluation. Members of the International Advisory Committee of *Journal* may participate in the peer review process as external consultants.

The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for maintaining the integrity and confidentiality of any manuscript submitted for the peer review process and during its evaluation for publication. All members of the Editorial Board and International Advisory Committee are expected to treat submitted manuscripts as confidential documents.

Upon submitting, the paper is referred for editorial review / evaluation. Gender, age, sexual orientation, religious and worldview beliefs, nationality, author's citizenship, political beliefs, and scientific or social status are not taken into consideration during the admission process, the selection of reviewers, and the editors' decision to accept a paper,

If the paper is estimated to meet all conditions in the *pre-vote* step (the Editor-in-Chief's assessment), they are referred to the *vote* step, in which the members of the Editorial Board of *Journal* further evaluate the submitted paper. At this stage, the evaluation of the Editorial Board members refers to a concise commentary on the quality of the paper and to an assessment of the compliance of the paper with the guidelines for the authors of *Journal*. Submitted papers that were accepted in the first and second steps are referred to the third step, in which the Editorial Board members suggest potential reviewers and the manuscript is submitted for the peer review process.

Members of the Editorial Board and, if necessary, members of the International Advisory Committee select expert reviewers, considering their scientific and professional qualifications, who are of the same or higher academic title as the author's, and who have knowledge of the language in which the paper is written. All unpublished articles and received information are confidential and may not be forwarded elsewhere or used arbitrarily by the Editorial Board. Ethics complaints must be considered jointly by the Editorial Board members and the publisher, and these should be addressed to the relevant academic institutions if necessary. All non-anonymous reports of violations of ethical principles must be investigated independently of the time elapsed from publication of the paper.

Based on suggestions from the members of the Editorial Board, the Editor-in-Chief chooses two or more reviewers with appropriate professional competence to evaluate the manuscript and

instructs them to carry out the peer review process set out in a separate document. The Editorial Board is responsible for the objectivity of the peer review process and its timeliness.

In case the manuscript is rejected in the *pre-vote* step, in the *vote* step, or after the peer review process is completed, the Editorial Board is obliged to provide authors with a clear explanation of the decision.

The Editor-in-Chief may require all members of the Editorial Board, members of the International Advisory Committee, authors, and reviewers to declare possible conflicts of interest related to submitted manuscripts, such as competitive, collaborative, or other such and similar relationships with one of the authors.

If the Editor-in-Chief or another member of the Editorial Board, i.e. member of the International Advisory Committee is in a conflict of interest, that person will be excluded from the process of evaluating the manuscript and deciding about its publishing. His / her obligation will be assumed by another member of the Editorial Board.

The Editor-in-Chief is obliged to investigate all complaints of breaches of ethical standards and to take appropriate measures to correct any omissions and errors. These measures primarily involve communication with the author or authors of the paper but may also include forwarding the complaint to competent authorities in academic or research institutions. If the complaint relates to an unpublished manuscript, its publication will be suspended until the complaint is resolved.

If significant errors or incorrect information are found in the submitted manuscript or published paper, the Editor-in-Chief will ask the author to correct the errors, i.e. they will prepare and publish the appropriate correction of the misstatement. If the author refuses to correct the errors observed, the Editor-in-Chief may decide to withdraw the disputed paper from the journal.

3. Reviewers

Reviewers are consultants to the Editor-in-Chief and members of the Editorial Board. Through indirect communication with the author of the paper, the reviewer contributes to improving the quality of the submitted paper. The reviewer considers its value and suggests the academic category of the paper and whether the article should be published, while the Editor-in-Chief together with members of the Editorial Board makes the final decision.

Before accepting a review assignment, the reviewer should consider whether the paper is within his / her area of expertise and check if there is a potential conflict of interest during the peer review process. By accepting the review assignment, the reviewer acknowledges that there is no conflict of interest between the review and other professional or personal roles. The paper and a review form, in which reviewers later enter their evaluation of the manuscript and suggest its categorization, are sent to reviewers. If a selected reviewer is unable to evaluate the paper or feels that they are not qualified to review a manuscript, they are obliged to inform the Editor-in-Chief as soon as possible. After that, members of the Editorial Board suggest another reviewer. In the process of the evaluation of a paper, Croatian, as well as foreign reviewers, participate.

If the reviewer is in a conflict of interest, he or she is expected to be excluded from the peer review process and notify the Editor-in-Chief about that fact.

The peer review should be objective and scientifically based. Reviewers critically and constructively evaluate the received manuscript and make their own clear and constructive views, suggestions, and comments. Reviewers are obliged to warn about relevant published works that authors failed to cite and to draw the attention of the Editor-in-Chief to possible cases of plagiarism, copyright infringement, or other unacceptable actions.

Reviewers should not use the information described in the paper they received for peer review in their research.

Reviewers must not communicate directly with authors, disclose or disseminate news about research that has been rejected and has not been published. Also, they must not use the research information for their own research and they are required to treat received manuscripts as confidential documents. Reviewers are not allowed to talk to anyone about the received manuscripts, excepting the Editor-in-Chief.

Inappropriate and personal comments are considered inadmissible.

In reviewing the article, the reviewer must identify:

- whether the subject of the paper is scientifically relevant
- whether the summary and title match the content
- whether scientific methods were used
- whether appropriate literature was cited
- whether the paper is clearly, logically and linguistically accurate
- whether professional terminology was used

- are there any repetitions in the paper
- are there any errors in information processing / analysis
- does the paper create new scientific knowledge
- are other authors cited correctly.

The review of the paper in the peer review form must be accompanied by a minimum of 100 words of explanation.

Each manuscript is judged impartially, based on intellectual content and independent of the gender, race, citizenship, and ethnicity of each author, as well as his / her religious, ideological or political beliefs, scientific title, institutional affiliation, reputation in the academic community, or other similar determinations.