

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

The *Journal of Academic Language and Learning* (JALL) is committed to achieving high standards of ethical practice in its handling of submitted manuscripts and only publishing works that have also met ethical standards in research practice. In support of achieving those ends, this Statement provides explicit expectations of [authors](#) submitting work to JALL, their [reviewers](#), and the [JALL editorial team](#).

1. Duties / Responsibilities of Authors

- a. *Ethics* – The authors of submissions to this journal are expected to have followed internationally accepted standards for the ethical and responsible conduct and reporting of research such as are stated in the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#). In particular, research involving human participants is expected to have received appropriate ethics review board approval and this approval is to be provided in the *Declarations* section of the manuscript.
- b. *Originality and plagiarism* – The work submitted must be original and include no plagiarised content.

If *elements* of the work have been previously published by the authors, such as in conference proceedings, submissions must acknowledge this prior publication and in “Comments to the Editor” upon initial submission, include a detailed description as to how the submitted work differs from the previously published work. The prior work should also be appropriately cited and acknowledged at the appropriate places within the submitted manuscript. For such works to be published in JALL, substantial differences from the original publication will be required.

In addition, authors must not submit the same manuscript to more than one journal at the same time and must *not* publish a preprint or draft on their personal researcher social media site, such as *ResearchGate* or *Academia*, as this could prevent double blinded reviewing from being achievable.

Regarding issues around copyright, see Section 1(c).

- c. *Copyright* – Authors must own the copyright to the work being submitted or have the appropriate permission to reuse copyrighted material in the way that they have in the manuscript. (Note that depending on the author’s institution’s intellectual property (IP) policy, the institution rather than the author may own the copyright on any teaching material included in a manuscript. If the author’s institution owns the copyright on any included teaching material, this must be acknowledged in the *Declarations* section, and JALL’s licence statement will acknowledge this condition.)

If the submitted manuscript includes a copy or adaptation of a table or figure from another published work, including the author’s own published works, then JALL must be provided prior to publication, either:

- i. written permission from the copyright owner to republish that copy or adaptation in the submitted manuscript; or
- ii. a statement of the Creative Commons licence under which the previous work was published which allows such republication.

For more detailed information on this issue, see: [Key considerations for using third party content in your article](#).

- d. *Disclosure and conflicts of interest and financial support* – Authors must disclose any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript and acknowledge individuals or organisations who have provided financial support for the research.
- e. *Authorship of the manuscript* – Expectations around authorship are defined in [Authorship: A guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#). Specifically, “an author is an individual who (a) has made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to research and its output, and (b) agrees to be listed as an author.” In addition, “all listed authors are collectively accountable for the whole research output”, and as such, an AI tool cannot be listed or treated as a co-author. The minimum threshold for a “significant scholarly contribution” is that a named author has made a significant contribution in at least one, and preferably two or more, of the following areas:
 - i. “conception and design of the project or output
 - ii. acquisition of research data where the acquisition has required significant intellectual judgement, planning, design, or input
 - iii. contribution of knowledge, where justified, including Indigenous knowledge
 - iv. analysis or interpretation of research data
 - v. drafting significant parts of the research output or critically revising it so as to contribute to its interpretation.”

It is expected that all persons who meet the criteria for authorship are listed as authors and no persons who do not meet the criteria are listed as authors. Contributions to the work which do not meet the criteria for authorship are expected to be stated in an Acknowledgements section. (Note that some contributors, such as data analysts, may not wish to be listed as a co-author if they are unable or unwilling to be held accountable for the work as a whole. Such contributors must be acknowledged appropriately.)

- f. *Use of AI in the production of the work* – All use of AI in the production of the work must be appropriately acknowledged and checked by human authors. For further details, see the [Journal’s policy on Generative AI Use](#).
- g. *Data access and retention* – Authors may be asked to provide the raw data for their editorial review, and should be prepared to provide public access to such data if possible. Regarding data retention:

“The period for which data should be retained should be determined by prevailing standards for the specific type of research and any applicable state, territory or national legislation. In general, the minimum period for retention of research data is 5 years from the date of publication.” ([Research: A guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#), Sec. 2.3 Storage, retention and disposal.)
- h. *Errors in published works* – If after publication, authors discover errors in their work, they must [notify the journal](#) of such errors to enable retraction or correction of the paper. Such corrections may take the form of a published *erratum* or a correction to the published manuscript with any such updates clearly noted in the title block and with an explanatory footnote in the appropriate place in the manuscript.
- i. *Posting of the final work in other repositories* – Authors may allow their institutions to post a copy of the final, published manuscript in institutional repositories of staff research output, on the condition that a link to the JALL abstract page of the article is provided with their

article. Authors may also post the final published article on their personal researcher social media site such as *ResearchGate* or *Academia*, on the condition that a link to the published work on JALL is provided.

2. Duties / Responsibilities of Reviewers

- a. *Competence to conduct the review* – In accepting or declining an invitation to review, reviewers should consider the scope and relevance of their expertise in the topic and their capacity to assess the manuscript in question in relation to [JALL's review criteria](#). Lacking expertise or experience in some elements of the paper does not necessarily preclude a prospective reviewer from conducting a review, but in such cases, reviewers should let the responsible editor know of any elements they are not able to assess.
- b. *Disclosure and conflicts of interest* – Reviewers should not review manuscripts for which they have a conflict of interest.

Although JALL uses double blind reviewing, if after agreeing to take on a review a reviewer discovers they can determine who at least some of the authors are, they should discuss with the responsible editor whether or not they can continue with the review. If reviewers have a collaborative, competitive or other relationship with those authors, then they should promptly declare this to the responsible editor and not conduct the review.

When it is proving impossible to obtain a second reviewer for a paper, the responsible editor may provide a review. Prior to conducting any such review, however, the responsible editor should discuss the issue with the Managing Editor and declare that they have no conflicts of interest and that they have sufficient relevant expertise to conduct the review. If the responsible editor is the Managing Editor, then they should transparently discuss the issue with an experienced member of the editorial team and declare they have no conflicts of interest.

- c. *Confidentiality* – The contents of papers under review should be kept confidential and treated as privileged information until the paper has been published.
- d. *Review expectations*:
 - i. Reviews should be conducted objectively, with no personal criticism of the author.
 - ii. Reviews should be completed promptly within the time frame allocated by the journal. If reviewers cannot meet journal timelines, they should request as early as possible an extension from the relevant editor (generally given when reasonable) or decline to conduct the review.
 - iii. As editors use reviews to make editorial decisions about submitted manuscripts, critiques of the submitted manuscript should be supported with clear arguments.
 - iv. Reviewers should notify the responsible editor privately of any concerns or suspicions of unethical (or poor) practice by the authors, such as plagiarism (including self-plagiarism), duplication of prior published work, manipulation of data, unacknowledged use of AI in the preparation of the manuscript etc.

3. Duties / Responsibilities of Editors

- a. Editors are responsible for deciding which of the manuscripts submitted to the journal should be reviewed and published, and for working towards improving the quality of the journal. In working towards these aims, editors are committed to following the code of conduct and aspire to following best practices as indicated in the COPE [Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors](#). In particular, the sole basis for deciding on whether or not to

publish a submission is determined by evaluation against the [published review criteria](#) and whether the authors have met the [expectations described above](#).

- b. *Investigations* – If issues arise, investigative processes will be guided by the relevant [COPE flowchart](#).
- c. *Submissions by members of the editorial team* – Members of the editorial team are permitted to submit papers to JALL. The editorial oversight of these submissions will be undertaken by another member of the editorial team, with double blind reviewing ensuring that reviewers are not influenced in any way by knowledge that they are reviewing a paper submitted by one of JALL's editors. The OJS software JALL uses is also designed to protect the identities of reviewers from being determined by the submitting editor.