

## Recommendations for authors

The recommendations below are meant to clarify the expected quality of the journal and its articles.

The authors can send the electronic version of articles at: [resjournal@e-uvv.ro](mailto:resjournal@e-uvv.ro)

The sent papers shall be submitted under a peer-review from the members of our Editorial Board and beyond. The scientific criteria used by them are bellow.

### *Editing criteria:*

1. The accepted publishing languages is English
2. The words and quotes in foreign languages are written in Italics. The quotes in Romanian are written normally.
3. Citations should be indicated in parentheses the author, year of publication, page, can be easily identified with a complete reference to the citation from the end of the article. For example, if references to an author who had two publications in the same year, 2010, will be written including one bibliography 2010b works, to be easily identified. Footnotes should be used only in exceptional cases, if necessary annotations by the author.
4. Every author shall insert his name below the title of the paper, upper right on the paper, with a foot note that shall stipulate: academical title, institution, city, country, e-mail.
5. Every text shall be preceded by an abstract; every abstract should be up to followed by the key-words section up to 5 key-words. The abstract and the key-words section should be up to 800 characters; the abstract and key-words shall be written both in Romanian and English.
6. Each abbreviation shall be explained only at first use.
7. The bibliographical references must include at least one author listed by ISI or quoted in ISI articles.
8. At least 30% of the references must include papers published in the last five years.

### *Technical criteria:*

1. page - A4;
2. page setup: up – 2cm; down – 3 cm; left – 3 cm; right – 2 cm;
3. length of paper: 8-10 pages (max. 30 000 characters, including bibliography and abstract);
4. the abstract and key words shall be submitted in English (and Romanian, if possible);
5. page setup: justified, line spacing: 1,5;
6. title: aldine (bold), 14p;
7. text: Cambria, 12;
8. first line indent: 1 cm;
9. bibliographical references, listed in alphabetical order, APA Style

<http://www.bibme.org/citation-guide/apa/>

## Scientific evaluation criteria for the journal of educational sciences articles

| CRITERIA  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>A. Scientific merit of the paper</b>   |   |   |   |   |
| A.1. The importance and the actuality of the discussed topic, as well as the relevance of the discussed question  |   |   |   |   |
| A.2. The level of information (e.g. actuality and relevance of the publications from the bibliography) and the quality of the description of the current progress of knowledge in the |   |   |   |   |
| A.3 The argument and basis of the discussed problem are well clarified and defined (e.g. conceptual clarifications, separating the aspects which shall not be discussed); the         |   |   |   |   |
| <b>B. Potential contributions to developing scientific</b>  |   |   |   |   |
| B.1 The research question is adequately answered, raising conclusions related to the theoretical basis presented in the article and the shared new ideas.                             |   |   |   |   |
| B. 2 The type and the authenticity level is achieved by the   |   |   |   |   |
| B.3 The set of conclusions represents a synthesis built on a personal interpretation of the prior exposed results, with references to further developments on the discussed           |   |   |   |   |
| <b>C. Argumentative procedure</b>   |   |   |   |   |
| C.1. The research design is correct, the hypothesis are relevant, the methods and empirical investigation instruments are transparent and the interpretation of data is               |   |   |   |   |
| C.2 The affirmations are sustained by credible data from research or current theoretical elaborations.  |   |   |   |   |
| <b>D. Structure and presentation of the article</b>   |   |   |   |   |
| D.1. A logic sequence/connection (the ideas are logically linked together, the transit from an idea to the other is easy to follow, the order in which the parts of the paper are     |   |   |   |   |
| D.2 The used language is coherent, grammatically correct, meeting the scientific standards of expression  |   |   |   |   |
| D.3 The imposed structure of the paper is respected: abstract of approximately  |   |   |   |   |

800 characters, relevant

**EVALUATOR'S CONCLUSIONS:**

I recommend the publishing of the article

I recommend the publishing of the article after revise of the author

I do not recommend the publishing of the article

**Final comments:**

Note: the evaluation scale of meeting the criteria presents itself as follows: 1 – done; 2 – partially done (requires further revise or annexation); 3- not done, does not fulfill the criterion; 0 – not the case, does not apply.

<sup>h</sup> Please provide explanations regarding the reasons for rejecting the article or list (on a separate sheet) with the concrete revision requirements