ZENA-LISSAN, JOURNAL OF ACADEMY OF ETHIOPIAN LANGUAGES AND CULTURES POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

FOR EDITORS, EVALUATORS AND AUTHORS:

The Zena-Lissan Journal Editorial Committee,

Academy of Ethiopian Languages and Cultures (AELC),

Addis Ababa University (AAU)

June, 2022

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

The Zena-Lissan Journal was started in 1996 by the then Ethiopian Languages Research Centre (ELRC), now the Academy of Ethiopian Languages and Cultures (hereafter AELC), focused especially on the cultures (folklores) and languages of different societies within Ethiopia. Since then, the journal has continued to be published biannually in Amharic and English languages aimed to encourage research and promote dialogue among scholars of interdisciplinary fields to folklore and linguistics and provide a forum for researchers working in the broad areas of Ethiopian languages and folklores. The Zena-Lissan carries materials of great interest not only to linguists and folklorists but also to those involved in literature, anthropology, history and other related areas. As an interdisciplinary journal, it encompasses a wide range of ideas/materials on different topics. Therefore it engages in publishing significant/original research findings and theoretical/methodological analyses presented from different directions and perspectives of culture and linguistics using blind peer reviewed scholarly articles, book reviews, notes, commentaries and obituaries directed to a wide audience. As such the Journal seeks to provide chances to young scholars an opportunity to bring forth their potentials in front of the academic world.

2. MAJOR POLICY PRINCIPLES

The following core values feature as the major policy principles of the Zena-Lissan Journal published by the AELC. They include:

2.1. To accelerate the dissemination and expansion of scientific knowledge with special emphasis on Ethiopian cultures and languages through the publication of quality research manuscripts at national and international standards.

2.2. To build the utmost trust, mutual cooperation, team work and effective academic collaboration between the Journal editors, reviewers, authors and publishing institution through enhancing exchange of ideas, skills, expertise and experiences.

2.3. To appreciate and promote the perspectives, rights and dignity of each collaborating partner through pursuing and maintaining good rapport with them.

2.4. To publish innovative, original and high-quality research works using rigorous peer-review evaluation criteria for quality control.

3. GENERAL EDITORIAL POLICIES

The general editorial policy issues under this section focus on important components such as: (a) accountability and responsibility for the Journal content, (b) independence and integrity, (c) separating academic decision-making from personal or commercial considerations, (d) editors' relationship to the Journal's publisher/owner (i.e., the AELC), (e) The Journal metrics (standards of measurement), (f) confidentiality of authors' material and reviewers' identity. Taking these into minds:

3.1 The editors should take responsibility for everything they publish so they should have procedures and policy guidelines in place to ensure the quality of the material they publish and maintain the integrity of the published record.

3.2 The editors should make decisions on academic merit alone and take full responsibility for their decisions.

3.3 The decision-making process must be in place to separate personal or commercial interests and activities within the Journal from the editorial processes and decisions. For this reason, the editors should uphold the principles of editorial independence and integrity as an important part of the responsibility to make fair and unbiased decisions.

3.4 The editors should ideally have a written contract setting out the terms and conditions of their appointment with the Journal publisher - the AELC.

3.5 The principle of editorial independence should be clearly noted or stated in the contract.

3.6 The editors should take active interest in the publisher's assessing and rating policies and strive for wide and affordable accessibility of the material they publish.

3.7 The AELC (as the Journal publisher) should not have any role in decisions on the Journal content for commercial or political reasons.

3.8 The AELC should not dismiss an editor because of any Journal content unless there was a gross editorial misconduct or an independent investigation has concluded that the editor's decision to publish was against the Journal's scholarly mission.

3.9 The editors should generally ensure that the research papers are reviewed on scholarly grounds and that the authors are not compelled or pressured to cite specific publications for non-scholarly reasons.

3.10 The editors should keep the confidentiality of authors' material or do not share submitted papers with editors of other journals, unless with the authors' agreement or in cases of alleged misconduct.

3.11 The editors are generally under no obligation to provide material to lawyers for court cases.

4. EDITORIAL COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES TOWARD AUTHORS AND REVIEWERS

The editors of Zena-Lissan Journal have responsibilities toward the authors who provide the content of the journals, the peer reviewers who comment on the suitability of manuscripts for publication, the Journal's readers and the scientific community, the owners/publishers of the journals, and the public as a whole.

4.1. EDITORIAL COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES TOWARD AUTHORS

Some of the main editor's responsibilities toward authors include:

4.1.1. Providing guidelines to authors for preparing and submitting manuscripts.
4.1.2. Providing a clear statement of the Journal's policies on authorship criteria.
4.1.3. Treating all authors with fairness, courtesy, objectivity, honesty, and transparency.
4.1.4. Establishing and defining policies on conflicts of interest for all involved in the publication process, including editors, staff (e.g., editorial and sales), authors, and reviewers.
4.1.5. Protecting the confidentiality of every author's work.
4.1.6. Establishing a system for effective and rapid peer review.
4.1.7. Making editorial decisions with reasonable speed and communicating the author in a clear and constructive manner.
4.1.8. Being vigilant in avoiding the possibility of editors and/or referees delaying a manuscript for suspect reasons.
4.1.9. Establishing clear guidelines for authors regarding acceptable practices for sharing experimental materials and information, particularly those required to replicate the research, before and after publication.
4.1.10. Establishing a procedure for reconsidering editorial decisions.
4.1.11. Describing, implementing and regularly reviewing policies for handling ethical issues and allegations or findings of misconduct by authors and anyone involved in the peer review process.
4.1.12. Informing authors of solicited manuscripts that the submission will be evaluated according to the journal's standard procedures or outlining the decision-making process if it differs from those procedures.
4.1.13. Developing mechanisms, in cooperation with the publisher, to ensure timely publication of accepted manuscripts.
4.1.14. Clearly communicating all other editorial policies and standards.

4.2. EDITOR RESPONSIBILITIES TOWARD REVIEWERS

4.2.1. Assigning papers for review appropriate to each reviewer's area of interest and expertise.
4.2.2. Establishing a process for reviewers to ensure that they treat the manuscript as a confidential document and complete the review promptly.

4.2.3. Informing reviewers that they are not allowed to make any use of the work described in the manuscript or to take advantage of the knowledge they gained by reviewing it before publication.

4.2.4. Providing reviewers with written, explicit instructions on the Journal's expectations for the scope, content, quality, and timeliness of their reviews to promote thoughtful, fair, constructive, and informative critique of the submitted work.

4.2.5. Requesting that reviewers identify any potential conflicts of interest and asking that they recuse themselves if they cannot provide an unbiased review.

4.2.6. Allowing reviewers appropriate time to complete their reviews.

4.2.7. Requesting reviews at a reasonable frequency that does not overtax any one reviewer.

4.2.8. Finding ways to recognize the contributions of reviewers, for example providing letters that might be used in applications for academic promotion; offering professional education credits; or inviting them to serve on the Advisory board of the Journal.

5. EDITORIAL POLICY PROCESS

5.1. The Journal editors should adopt editorial policies that encourage maximum transparency and complete, honest reporting important to advance knowledge in the scholarly fields and to understand why a particular work was done, how it was planned and conducted and by whom, and what it adds to the existing knowledge in the area of Ethiopian cultures and languages.

5.2. Reviewers should be given evaluation criteria for assessment and be asked to turn in their reviews within fixed days or in other words, the editors should tell peer reviewers and authors what is expected of them.

5.3. The editors should guard the integrity of the published record by issuing corrections and retractions (when needed) and pursuing suspected research work and publication misconduct meaning author's, reviewer's and editorial unethical conduct.

5.4. The editors should have appropriate policy mechanism in place for handling editorial conflicts of interest summary.

5.5. The editors evaluate submitted manuscripts exclusively on the basis of their academic merit (importance, originality, study's validity, clarity) and relevance to the journal's scope (i.e., without regard to the authors' identities or institutional affiliations).

5.6. The Journal benefits from the advisory board members in many ways. Therefore, the Academy(the publishing institution), with inputs from the Journal editors, should consider at least the following factors in selecting the members and setting up the advisory board:

a. The reachability of the representative board members to the journal,

b. The expertise of the representative board members to the journal's scope,

c. The appointment of the representative board members from key research institutes,

d. Suitability of the experiences of the representatives, for example, as former guest editors of special issues or key or top reviewers.

e. Members should be making the members aware of their responsibilities when invited to join the board.

6. DUTIES OF THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS
6.1. DUTIES OF THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

6.1.1 The editorial committee members must ensure that all submitted manuscripts being considered for publication undergo peer-review by at least two reviewers who are expert in the field.

6.1.2 Decisions to edit and publish are not determined by the policies of government or any other agencies outside of the Journal itself.

6.1.3 The editorial committee members must hold no conflict of interest with regard to the articles they consider for publication.

6.1.4 Editorial committee members who feel they might be perceived as being involved in such a conflict do not participate in the decision process for a particular manuscript.

6.1.5 The information and ideas presented in submitted manuscripts shall be kept confidential or/and must not be used for personal gain without the authors' explicit or written consent.

6.1.6 The editors will take appropriate measures to all allegations/suspicions of research or publication misconduct raised by readers, reviewers, or other editors.

6.1.7 The editors shall take all reasonable measures to ensure that the authors/reviewers remain anonymous during and after the evaluation process in accordance with the type of reviewing in use.

6.1.8 The editors will not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, editorial advisers and the publisher, as appropriate.

6.1.9 The editors shall keep themselves safe from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships with any of the authors, companies or institutions

connected to the papers; instead, they will ask another member of the editorial board to handle the manuscript.

6.1.10 The editors actively and timely respond to reactions, responses, criticisms and concerns by other researchers, readers, authors or editors on published research work and, thereby, encourage scholarly debates.

6.1.11 Whenever genuine errors in published work are pointed out, the editors publish a correction or erratum as soon as possible. The online version of the paper may be corrected with a date of correction and a link to the printed erratum. If the error renders the work or substantial parts of it invalid, the paper would be retracted with an explanation as to the reason for retraction (i.e., honest error).

6.1.12 The editors are the first recipients of information about such concerns and should act, even in the case of a paper that has not been accepted or has already been rejected beyond the specific responsibility for the Journal's publications.

6.1.13 The editorial committee is accountable for ethical publishing. The editorial committee is therefore obliged to assist reviewers with additional information on the manuscript, including the results of checking manuscript for plagiarism.

6.1.14 The focus of the editors' editing activities will be only on the quality or merit of the research manuscript. The editorial committee must adopt a stance to prevent plagiarism.

6.1.15 The editorial committee will automatically reject any manuscript which shows obvious signs of plagiarism and take retraction measure (when necessary).

6.1.16 When the editors discover plagiarism in a manuscript that has already been published by the Journal, the editorial committee will take required retraction of an article in such a case of false (fake) claims of authorship, plagiarism, fraudulent use of data or any major academic misconduct based on measures and procedures.

6.1.17 In cases of possible plagiarism or duplicate/redundant publication can be assessed by the editors themselves. However, in most other cases, the editors can request an investigation by the institution or other appropriate bodies (after seeking an explanation from the authors first and if that explanation is unsatisfactory).

6.1.18 The editors should make full and honest reporting using the reporting guidelines in order to ensure that whether all published papers have substantial new contributions to their field area.

6.1.19 Regarding this, the editors discourage and avoid the so-called 'salami publications,' meaning, duplicate or redundant publication of research paper unless it is fully declared and acceptable to all (e.g., publication in a different language with cross-referencing), while encouraging authors to place their work in the context of previous work, i.e., to state why this work was necessary/done, what this work adds or why a replication of previous work was required, and what readers should take away from it.

6.1.20 In case of a misconduct investigation, it may be necessary to disclose a material to the third parties (e.g., an institutional investigation committee or other editors).

6.1.21 The editors with the publisher institution (AELC) will take responsive measures when ethical concerns are raised with regard to a submitted manuscript or published paper. Every reported act of unethical publishing behaviour will be looked into, even if it is discovered years after publication.

6.1.22 Retracted papers should be retained online, and they should be prominently marked as a retraction in all online versions, including the PDF, for the benefit of future readers.

6.1.23 The Editorial Committee Member(s) encourage readers to inform at any time of suspected unethical behaviour or any type of misconduct by giving the necessary credible information or evidence to start an investigation.

6.1.24 Any evidence will be treated (during the investigation) as confidential and only made available to those strictly involved in the process.

6.1.25 The accused will be given the chance to respond to any charges made against them. If it is judged at the end of the investigation that misconduct has occurred, then it will be classified as either minor or serious.

6.1.26 Minor misconduct (with no influence on the integrity of the paper and the journal, for example, when it comes to misunderstanding or wrong application of publishing standards) will be dealt directly with authors and reviewers without involving any other parties. In this case, the outcomes may include:

   a. Sending a warning letter to authors and/or reviewers.

b. Publishing correction of a paper, e.g. when sources properly quoted in the text are omitted from the reference list.

c. Publishing an erratum, e.g. if the error was made by editorial staff.

6.1.27 In the case of major misconduct, however, the Editorial Committee may adopt measures including:

a. Publication of a formal announcement or editorial describing the misconduct.

b. Informing officially the author's/the reviewer's affiliating institution.

c. The formal, announced retraction of publications from the journal in accordance with the retraction stance.

d. A ban on submissions from an individual for a defined period.

e. Referring a case to a professional organization or legal authority for further investigation and action.

f. The above actions may be taken separately or jointly. If necessary, in the process of resolving the case relevant expert organizations, bodies, or individuals may be consulted.

6.1.28 In dealing with such unethical behaviours, the editorial committee must rely on the guidelines and recommendations provided by the committee on publication ethics.

6.2. DUTIES OF THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

6.2.1 The editor-in-chief has full authority over the entire editorial content of the journal and the timing of publication of that content.

6.2.2 The editor-in-chief is responsible for deciding which of the manuscripts submitted to the journal will be published, based on the validation or merit of the work, its importance to researchers and readers, the reviewers' comments, and such legal requirements as are currently in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism.

6.2.3 The editor-in-chief may confer other editors or reviewers to make such a decision.

6.2.4 The editor-in-chief is the lead editor and ultimately responsible for the academic content of the journal.

6.2.5 The editor-in-chief directs the overall strategy of the journal (in cooperation with the publisher and the society, as applicable).

6.3. DUTIES OF THE ASSOCIATE EDITOR

The Journal will have two or more associate editors. The exact role of the associate editor will include:

6.3.1. Evaluating manuscripts fairly and solely on their intellectual merit.

6.3.2. Ensuring confidentiality of manuscripts and not disclosing any information regarding manuscripts to anyone other than the people involved in the publishing process.

6.3.3. Actively seeking the views of other editorial committee members, reviewers and authors on how to improve/ increase the image and visibility of the Journal.

6.3.4. Giving clear instructions to potential contributors on the submission process and what is expected of the authors.

6.3.5. Ensuring appropriate reviewers are selected/ identified for the reviewing process.

6.3.6. Assisting the editor-in-chief in communicating in matters relating to journal peer reviews (e.g. ethical issues and appeals) and in developing surveys, content ideas, and publications concepts of the Journal publication.

6.3.7. Deputizing for the editor- in -chief managing the journal activities during his/her absence and in the execution of tasks related to the development of the journal publishing programme and associated activities.

6.4. DUTIES OF THE MANAGING EDITOR

The managing editor of the journal oversees the journal editing done by the editorial committee members and any other members of the editorial staff and coordinates the publication's editorial activities with responsibilities of setting and enforcing deadlines. The major duties of the managing editor include:

6.4.1. Managing and overseeing efficient operation of the peer-review process to ensure high-quality and timely reviews and preparing for publication of the journal including any special issues/supplements.

6.4.2. Working with the journal publisher to meet all deadlines for the production of each issue.

6.4.3. Communicating the editorial committee in the compilation of the journal issues and assisting editors in liaison with the publisher institution and external contacts on matters relating to the journal.

6.4.4. Preparing and managing an annual budget for the journal and ensuring that the best value is achieved with it.

6.4.5. Receiving submitted manuscripts and communicating with authors on the status of their submissions.

6.4.6. Coordinating activities related to resource developments and announcing calls and meetings of the editorial committee, preparing agenda, taking and distributing minutes for such meetings and calls.

6.4.7. Responding to routine correspondence and inquiries related to the journal, organizing, updating and maintaining office files related to the journal.

6.4.8. Initiating and developing opportunities for the journal and advising the editorial committee on matters relating to marketing for the journal.

6.4.9. Overseeing the journal website information and communicating necessary updates to the Zena- Lissan journal editorial committee.

6.5.DUTIES OF TECHNICAL(DESIGN /EDITOR

Formatting is equally important to the editing activities. Therefore, the responsibilities and duties of the formatting technical expert include:

6.5.1. Preparing camera ready of each edited issue, volume, timely for print as per the journal's formatting style guiding points stated for writers in detail especially under *Section 8*: Subsections of this policy document.

6.5.2. Making the layout visible for readers by synchronizing verbal texts in harmony with the visual items: figures, pictures, tables, charts, etc.

6.5.3. Arranging margins of pages accordingly to the journal's styles of presentation.

6.5.4. Posting or making available the final camera ready issue(s) for online access.

6.6. DUTIES OF ADVISORY BOARD

The main duties of the Advisory Board include:

6.6.1. Proving advice on the journal's strategy, meeting periodically to evaluate the journal's strength and to discuss the overall goals and performance on every three years basis.

6.6.2. Working as a ready team of potential reviewers with active interest in the success of the journal.

6.6.3. Adding credibility to the journal and/or celebrating important experts in the field of culture and language and related subject areas.

6.6.4. Suggesting for new members joining, stepping down or continuing for another term.

7. PEER REVIEWERS: POLICY, PROCESS, CRITERIA AND RESPONSIBILITIES
7.1.POLICY: **The purpose of peer review is to:**

- Assist the editorial committee in making decision of whether to accept or reject a manuscript.
- Help authors in improving their papers, and
- Maintain the quality and reputability of the journal.

7.2. PROCESS:

- Prior to the review process, each manuscript is screened within the shortest given time by the member of the editorial committee to check its suitability for favour of publication. If it can be considered for publication than of the corresponding author will receive a notification of peer-review process.

- The Journal strives to return reviewers' comments to authors within four weeks (30 days). Manuscripts will be published five to six months after acceptance.

- The Zena-Lissan Journal applies double-blind review approach for all submitted manuscripts.

- Each manuscript is reviewed by at least two reviewers: one from internal and another from outside who are selected based on their relevant expertise for evaluating the manuscript.

- The reviewers will act independently so that they are not aware of each other's identity.

- No suggestions of individual reviewers by the author(s) of the manuscript will be accepted.

- Manuscripts are sent for review only if they pass the initial evaluation regarding their form and thematic scope.

- A special care is taken that the initial evaluation does not last more than necessary.

- Under normal circumstances, the review process takes up to four weeks, and only exceptionally up to two months.

- During the review process the managing editor or editor-in-chief may require authors to provide additional information (including raw data) if they are necessary for the evaluation of the manuscript. These materials shall be kept confidential and must not be used for any other purposes.

- The entire review process takes place under the supervision of the managing editor or editor-in-chief in an online environment system that also allows the authors to track the entire process of reviewing the manuscript.

- In the case that the authors have serious and reasonable objections to the reviews, the editorial committee makes an assessment of whether a review is objective and whether it meets academic standards.

- When there is a doubt about the objectivity or quality of the review, the editorial committee will assign additional reviewer(s). Additional reviewers may also be assigned when the reviewers' decisions (accept or reject) are contrary to each other or otherwise substantially incompatible. The final decision on the acceptance of the manuscript for publication rests solely with the editor-in-chief.

7.3. **Evaluation criteria**

7.3.1. The review process will focus mainly on the following most essential evaluation criteria vital to value the quality of all manuscripts:

a) *Originality:* i.e**.,** innovativeness and newness and relevance of the research topic and protected from plagiarism.[1]

b) *Applied theoretical framework and research method.*

c) *Text structure/arrangement.*

d) *Logic and integrity of the discussion***:** content, cohesiveness and coherence between/among the article's sections /sub-sections, the scientific relevance of discussion presented in the manuscript.

e) *Readability*: The style of presentation and clarity of the language.

f) *Plausibly of constructed concluding remarks***,** with the significance/implication of findings.

g) *Formatting, citations and references***.**

7.3.2. All manuscripts should be graded upon the completion of the evaluation as:

- *Accepted (excellent)*
- *Accepted with minor revision (very good)*
- *Accepted with major revision (good)*
- *Rejected or declined*

7.4.Responsibilities and Duties of Peer Reviewers

7.4.1. The reviewers are required to provide the qualified and timely assessment of the scholarly merits of the manuscript using the essential measurement criteria listed above (under 7.2.8 (a - g)).

7.4.2. The reviewer must not be in a conflict of interest with the authors or funders of research. But if such a conflict exists, he/she is obliged to promptly notify the managing editor or editor-in-chief.

7.4.3. The reviewer must not accept for reviewing papers beyond the field of his/her full competence.

7.4.4. Reviewers shall alert the editor-in-chief or managing editor of the publisher to any well-founded suspicions or the knowledge of possible violations of ethical standards by authors.

7.4.5. Reviewers should recognize relevant published works that have not been considered in the manuscript.

7.4.6. The reviewers are expected to improve the quality of the manuscript through their suggestions; so, if they recommend correction of the manuscript prior to publication, they are expected to specify the manner in which this can be achieved.

7.4.7. Manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents.

7.4.8. The reviewers must not use unpublished materials disclosed in submitted manuscripts without written consents of the authors.

7.4.9. Upon the completion of the review process, the assessment result is submitted to the editorial committee through the online system where it is stored permanently.

8. AUTHORSHIP RESPONSIBILITY AND GUIDELINE FOR AUTHORS/WRITERS

8.4. AUTHORSHIP RESPONSIBILITY

Our journal works with a clear policy on authorship guidance for authors on what is expected of them. The main authorship responsibilities include:

8.1.2 Each manuscript should have one, two or more authors who will take responsibility for the conducts and its validity. Authors have the responsibility of ensuring only new and original work is submitted.

8.1.3 Authors will be held accountable for any shortcoming in their work. Individual contributions, roles and responsibilities must be stated in the contributor section.

8.1.4 All authors are expected to have contributed significantly to the work and to be familiar with its entire content. However, in case of two or more authors of a manuscript the first

written name of an author is considered as the first contributor and responsible for its validity.

8.1.5 By the same token, an author whose name is written following the name of the first author will be considered as the second co-author/contributor and bearer of responsibility, and so on.

8.1.6 When there are undisputed changes in authorship for appropriate reasons, the editors should require that all authors (including any whose names are being removed from an author list) agree these in writing.

8.1.7 Authorship disputes or disagreements on who should or should not be an author before or after publication cannot be settled judicially by the editors and should be resolved at institutional level or through other appropriate independent bodies for both published and unpublished manuscripts. The editors should then act on the findings, for example, by correcting authorship in published papers.

8.2. GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS/WRITERS

Authors are required to read and check all of the following guiding points as part of the submission process. Submissions may be returned to authors that do not adhere to the following guidelines:

8.2.1   Authors are exclusively responsible for the contents of their submissions or views expressed in the journal are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the publisher officers or the Journal's editors.

8.2.2   Authors must warrant that their manuscripts are their original works that they have not been published before, and are not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

8.2.3   Parallel submission of the same paper to another journal constitutes misconduct and eliminates the manuscript from further consideration.

8.2.4   The work that has already been published elsewhere cannot be reprinted in Zena-Lissan Journal.

8.2.5   Authors need to affirm that the article contains no unfounded or unlawful statements and does not violate the rights of third parties.

8.2.6   Authors will make sure that their author team listed in the manuscript includes all and only those authors who have significantly contributed to the submitted manuscript.

8.2.7   If persons other than authors were involved in important aspects of the research and the preparation of the manuscript, their contribution should be acknowledged in a footnote or the Acknowledgments Section.

8.2.8   In case a submitted manuscript has been presented at a conference in the form of an oral presentation under the same or similar title, detailed information about the conference shall be provided in the same place.

8.2.9   Authors are required to properly cite sources that have significantly influenced their research and their manuscript.

8.2.10 Parts of the manuscript, including text, equations, pictures and tables that are taken verbatim (word for word) from other works must be clearly marked, e.g. by quotation marks accompanied by their location in the original document (with page number).

8.2.11 Full references of each quotation (in-text citation) must be listed in the separate section (References Section) in a uniform manner, according to the citation style used by Zena-Lissan Journal. As such, the References Section should list only quoted/cited materials used for the preparation of a manuscript.

8.2.12 When authors discover a significant error or inaccuracy in their own published work, it is their obligation to promptly notify the editor-in-chief/managing editor (or the publisher) and cooperate with him/her to retract or correct the paper.

8.2.13 Authors are required to disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might have influenced the presented results or their interpretation.

8.2.14 The submission has not been previously published, nor is it before another journal for consideration (or an explanation has been provided in comments to the editor).

8.2.15 The submission file will be documented in Microsoft Word file format.

8.2.16 Copyrights for articles published in the Zena-Lissan Journal are retained by the Academy of Ethiopian Languages and Cultures.

8.2.17 The journal/publisher is not responsible for subsequent uses of the work. It is the author's responsibility to bring an infringement action if so desired by the author.

8.2.18 We do not provide authors printed copy of the published issue. But, we may serve the assistance to deliver printed issue only upon the request of the author.

8.2.19 By submitting a manuscript the authors agree to abide by the editorial policies, guiding lines and guiding styles of the Zena-Lissan journal.

8.2.20 Authors should not reproduce work that has been previously published in other journals. They also should not submit any articles that are being reviewed or considered by the journal to other journals simultaneously.

8.2.21 Authors are only allowed to publish their work elsewhere after receiving a formal rejection from the journal or if their request to withdraw their work is officially accepted by the journal.

8.2.22 Authors are expected to inform the managing editor or chief editor or the publisher of any inaccuracy of data in their published work so that correction or retraction of a manuscript can be done.

8.3. FORMATING STYLE(S) GUIDING POINTS FOR WRITING MANUSCRIPTS

8.3.1. Length of manuscripts should not exceed to 30 pages including references and appendix. Manuscripts that do not adhere to this rule will not be considered for review.

8.3.2. Each manuscript must have an abstract.

8.3.3. Authors are required to send manuscript in word.docx and PDF formats.

8.3.4. The authors' names do not appear anywhere in the manuscript or in the filename to facilitate the double blind review process. Authors' names, designations and institutional addresses should be held in a separate file.

8.3.5. Authors are to check manuscripts for accuracy of language before submitting to the journal. This means that the editorial committee will not edit submitted manuscripts for style or language.

8.3.6. The editorial committee reserves the right to make editorial changes to any manuscript accepted for publication to enhance clarity and style.

8.3.7. Authors are encouraged to submit their paper electronically by using the online submission and are required to use the style template format accordingly before submission.

8.3.8. If authors want their manuscript to be considered for publication, they are required to conform to the Citation and Referencing Style Guidelines given by American Psychological Association (APA) Styles.

8.4. STRUCTURAL ARRANGEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PAPER/ARTICLE

The basic structural organization of a research paper/article should follow the pattern provided as follows:

8.4.1 The First Page of the Manuscript Must Contain:
a)   Title (topic of the research)
b)   Author(s) profile
c)   Abstract
d)   Key Concepts/Terms

8.4.2 The Main Body (The Text) of the Research Paper Should Contain the Following Sections:
1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND EXPLANATION
2. LIETARTURE REVIEW
3. THEORIES/METHODS
4. DISCUSSION: DATA ANALYISIS/INTERPRETATION
5. CONCLUSIONS

FOLLOWED BY:

- ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS (optional)
- REFERENCES
- APPENDICES (if any)

8.4.3 SOME CLARIFICATIONS

RESEARCH TITLE: Articles in the Journal of Zena-Lissan begin with the title of the research topic followed by the author's/authors' names. The title must contain a maximum of 10 words. Longer title can be accommodated in a subtitle structure. The initial words of the title of the manuscript should be typed in capitals. The main title should not be *italicized* or put in *quotation marks* nor should it have *end punctuation*. If there is a sub-title, it goes under the main title in *italics*. As such, *the title* must properly reflect the subject of the paper and it should be aligned to the center.

AUTHOR(S) PROFILE (S): The author(s) is required to type his/her full name(s), academic rank(s) or position(s), professional expertise, experience and affiliations/institutional address with e-mail address and telephone number of each author (indicating the corresponding author). The name(s) should be typed in regular type and be printed at the bottom of the first page of the article. Its purpose is to identify the author(s) and to permit the Journal readers to write/contact the authors directly, if they so wish to do. If the authors have several titles and addresses they ordinarily use in their professional correspondence, only one title and address should be included in each statement of affiliation (e.g., if an author is chair of a department, director of a research centre, and editor of a journal, etc. only one of those titles and addresses could be used). The author's name should be aligned to the right.

THE ABSTRACT: Use Times New Roman for English and If the text is written in Amharic, it should be written with Nyala font, and typed in **1.0 line spacing**, **11 font size**. Each article-

length manuscript must begin with an abstract that should be 150-200 words containing the summary of essential points and findings of the paper, not an introduction or a mere list of topics. Or to put it in other terms, the abstract must provide an accessible summary of the paper. The keywords should accurately reflect the content of the manuscript. An abstract is not considered as a part of the main text of a research paper so that it will not be paginated. As such, its subsequent paragraphs are presented in normal indentation on both sides. An abstract is fully self-contained, a capsule description of the essential elements of the research paper. The abstract should end with a list of no more than five key concepts/terms/words or phrases that will be put in brackets **[ ].**

THE MAIN BODY (THE TEXT) OF MANUSCRIPTS:

Please know that the text is the main body of the research manuscript. If the manuscript is written in English language, the text should be written in Times New Roman with font size 12 and if the manuscript is written in Amharic language, the text should be written in Nyala with font size 12. In both cases, use 1.15 line spacing for the text paragraph that should also be justified. Margins should be set at 1.7 inch (4.318 cm at all sides) and paper size at A4 (21 x 29.7cm). The main body of the research should start immediately after the abstract in the introduction/background.

1**.** INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND EXPLANATION**:** The main purpose of this *Section* is to set the stage for the main discussion of the manuscript the length of which should not exceed to 500-700 words. Please know that there are several essential components of a good introduction that should be briefly inform readers. They include:

- The *concern* that motivates the author to undertake the specific research topic.
- The *significance/importance* or the *rationale*: The *rationale* of the research paper is a brief explanation of *why* your research topic is worthy of study and may make a significant contribution to the body of already existing knowledge/research.
- The *research problem* that will be addressed and the *significance of addressing the research problem, gaps of research* (if any).
- Therefore, in this Section, the author/writer should inform readers about the rationale, purpose and the research question(s) to be addressed.
- The *purpose of the research paper*: The *purpose* refers to the *goal* or *objective* of the research. The statement of the *purpose* is not simply a statement of why the research

is being conducted rather it is what the *rationale* statement is for. The purpose statement should thus answer questions: "What is (are) the objective of my research?" and "What do I expect to discover or learn from this research?"

- The central *research question(s)*: The research question(s) should be related to the research purpose and be focused and clear. A summary sentence may also be added here on *how* the answer of your research question will contribute to the overall of the study.

- Indicate the theoretical and *methodology* (*or data collection methods*) chosen and employed to address the research question and achieve the objective.

- Explain contribution of the *findings* for future research and policy and actions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW: Literature review is a critical summary, classification, and evaluation of existing theory and research on your topics. Its purpose is to bring the reader up-to-date with current literature on the specific research topic and form the basis for another goal, i.e., the justification for future research in the area. A good literature review:

- Gathers information about the particular subject from many sources
- Sets out the argument

- Summarizes recent research related to the topic

- Highlights gaps in the current understandings or debating points in the current knowledge

- Establishes the originality of the research aims by demonstrating the need for investigations in the topic area

- Gives a clear idea of the target readership, why the research is carried out and the novelty/originality and topicality of the manuscript

- Addresses the specific and well-defined questions or set of questions that outlines the background and history of the research problems

- Identifies possible methods for your study and assesses the strengths and weaknesses of previous studies.

Literature review is not the place to express your own opinion or point of view so that all statements should be drawn from the cited works. Many a times, literature review can be integrated in the *Introduction Section*, or can be separately presented as *Literature Review Section*. In any case, the literature review section should be:

- *Comprehensive*: evidence should be gathered from all relevant sources.
- *Fully referenced*: allowing others to follow the path of the author to the paper's conclusion.
- *Selective*: using appropriate search strategies to find the key evidence.
- *Relevant*: focusing on pertinent data.
- *A synthesis* of key themes and ideas.
- *Balanced*: between different ideas and opinions.
- *Critical*: in its appraisal of the literature.
- *Analytical*: developing new ideas and understandings from the evidence.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHOD*(S):* The method section describes: when, where and how was the study done. What materials were used or who was included in the study. The description includes: approach/context of the study, participants, instrument, procedures, data analysis techniques. Method section should be straightforward description of the methods used in your study. Each method should be described in a separate section. Begin in a single section with a statement of the materials used in this study so that readers have the capability to repeat the work in their own intention. Next, describe in separate sections each key procedure and technique used in the study. Keep the explanation brief and concise. Write the method section in the past form. Passive voices are probably most appropriate.

4. DISCUSSION: DATA ANALYSIS/INTERPRETATION: The section is presented in adherence to the research questions. It presents the main data and the results of data analysis. An interpretation and discussion should not be inserted in the result section. You should provide an overview of primary results at the first section, and flow the results in a step-by-step fashion. This overview should follow directly the data analysis plan stated in the method. It requires you fully describe the results of data analysis so that readers can gauge how the findings of your study answer the research questions. Then, present primarily findings followed by any secondary and subgroup findings. Use table, figures or excerpts, such as citation or quotation from interview data, to demonstrate the characteristics of major findings. Avoid redundancy between text, tables, figures, or excerpts. The section should address the objective, research question(s), problems and limitations based on primary and secondary data. The purpose is to arrive at major findings through interpretation of data enlightened and guided with the theories and methodological perspectives chosen for the task. It explains how the findings relate to the purpose of the study by taking into account each research question. Also describe how the results are related to education in general. Simply explains the results in clear language that is easy for a non-researcher to understand.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATION: In the conclusion section should reflect upon the aims and briefly summarize the overall outcomes of the data analysis based on the purposes of the study. Explain the importance of the major findings to research and educational purposes or practices. Typically, in conclusion section the author should:

- Summarize and conclude the results of analysis by restating the main argument, and presenting key conclusions and recommendation;
- State how the finding applies to the world of practice;
- State what are the implication for further research;
- Say to what extend your original questions have been answered; and
- State the limitations of your research.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: (Optional): If you received any significant helps in thinking up, designing or carrying out the work, or received materials of funding from someone who did you a favour by supplying them, you must acknowledge their assistance and the services or materials provided. Place any acknowledgement here. Acknowledgment should be written immediately after the conclusion of the manuscript.

7. REFERENCE: Primary sources restated or paraphrased and directly cited from written literature must take place 10-15% of overall references in your paper using the American Psychological Association (APA) style. You also need to check referencing for accuracy, adequacy and balance. References should be relevant, recent and readily retrievable

8. APPENDIX (OPTIONAL): should be written following after the references of the manuscript. It is supplementary material that is not an essential part of the text itself but which may be helpful in providing a more comprehensive understanding of the research problem.

8.4.5 FORMATING, CITATION AND REFERENCING STYLES

A. FORMATING: LEVELLING HEADINGS AND INSERTION OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Authors are required to level headings, sub-headings and sub-subsections while writing their papers using the following formatting categories:

1. First Level Sub-Heading: First word *initial* letter capitalized, font size 12. Use numbers sequentially 1, 2, 3… in the heading. No spacing between paragraphs.

1.1. Second Level Sub-Heading: First word *initial* letter capitalized, font size 12. Use numbers sequentially 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 … in the sub-headings. No spacing between paragraphs.

1.1.1. Third Level Sub-Heading: First word *initial* letter capitalized and *italic,* font size 12. Use numbers sequentially 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3**...** in the Sub-sub-headings**.** No spacing between paragraphs.

Abc/

Tables: You can refer to tables in this way: Table 1, 2, 3, 4 and so on. Refer to Table 1 first, then, only insert Table 1 below the text or paragraph. Table 1. Insert title of Table 1 (font 11). Then, give source information under the Table in font size 10.

Figures: For Figure: Figure 1, 2, 3, 4 and so on. Refer to Figure 1 first, and then only insert Figure 1 below the text or paragraph and give source information under the Figure in font size 10.

B. CITATION AND REFERENCING STYLES

Please know that the Zena-Lissan Journal of the Academy of Ethiopian Languages and Cultures (AELC) uses the most favoured worldwide APA citation and referencing style guide available online on our website http://www.----------- The APA style is a widely used author-date system of referencing or bibliographic citation. Authors/contributors are thus required to follow the APA citation and referencing styles guide while writing their papers. The references should be arranged first alphabetically and then further sorted chronologically. Taking this into account, the APA citation and referencing style guidelines cover basic explanations and examples for the most common types of citations used by users across the world. Current information can also be obtained via the internet from the official APA Style website: http://www.apastyle.org which includes a quick reference guide. Corrected sample papers can also be found on its (APA's) Style website.

9. MAIN REFERENCES

The American Psychological Association (APA) Referencing Style Guide. 2020. Website: http://www.apastyle.org

Double-Blind Peer Review Guidelines. Website: https://www.journals.elsevier.com/social-science-and-medicine/policies/double-blind-peer-review-guidelines

Kleinert, Sabine & Wager, Elizabeth. 2011. "Responsible research publication: international standards for editors. A position statement developed at the 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity, Singapore, July 22-24, 2010. Chapter 51 in: Mayer T & Steneck N

(eds) *Promoting Research Integrity in a Global Environment*. Imperial College Press / World Scientific Publishing, Singapore (pp 317-28).

Policy Guides of the Zena-Lissan Journal of the Academy of Ethiopian Languages and Cultures (AELC), AAU, 2008.

"Style Guide and Information for Contributors to the Journal of American Folklore: *The Journal of American Folklore*, Apr. - Jun., 1988, Vol. 101, No. 400 (Apr. - Jun., 1988), pp. 219-226 (Published by: American Folklore Society).

University of Chicago Press. 2010. The Chicago Manual of Style. 16th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.