Peer Reviewing Criteria for JoAW

As part of the submission process to JoAW, authors are required to check off their submission's compliance with all of the following items, and submissions may be returned to authors that do not adhere to these guidelines.

- The submission has not been previously published, nor is it before another journal for consideration (or an explanation has been provided in Comments for the Editor).
- The submission file is in OpenOffice, Microsoft Word, RTF, or WordPerfect document file format.
- Where available, URLs for the references have been provided.
- The text is single-spaced; uses a 10-point Arial font; employs italics, rather than underlining (except with URL addresses); and all illustrations, figures, and tables are placed within the text at the appropriate points, rather than at the end.
- The text adheres to the stylistic and bibliographic requirements outlined in the Author Guidelines, which is found in About the Journal.
- If submitting to a peer-reviewed section of the journal, the instructions in Ensuring a Blind Review in the Author Guidelines have been followed.

Furthermore, in submitting to JoAW, authors must confirm the following:

- That the content of the article is their own work or, where third party content is utilised, they have obtained permission from the third party to include their materials in this article and (where necessary) the third party has approved the article for publication;
- That they agree to grant an irrevocable, royalty-free, worldwide, non-exclusive licence to Coventry University to publish this article;
- That the article may be licensed under a creative commons licence, as detailed in the Copyright Notice;
- That the article contains nothing that is abusive, defamatory, libellous, obscene, fraudulent or illegal;
- That the decision to publish this article rests solely with Coventry University; and
- That Coventry University may withdraw publication of the article at any time at its discretion without notice in the event that Coventry University becomes aware, or has reason to believe, that the author has not met any requirement(s) set out in this submission checklist.

When reviewing submissions during the double blind peer review process, we ask reviewers the following questions, which serve as our criteria for inclusion:

- Does the submission include an abstract (maximum 200 words) in English?
- Does the abstract convey the paper's main points and outline the results or conclusions?
- Is the paper c. 5,000 words?
- Does the contribution address a topic relevant to the aims of the journal?
- Does the contribution take into consideration the European audience by adequately explaining "local" institutions, structures of educational systems, discourses, etc.?
- Is the paper theoretical, empirical, or experience-based?
- Does the paper refer to existing debates or issues, and make reference to relevant scholarly literature?
- Does the paper offer an explicit original contribution?
- Does the paper demonstrate an appropriate methodology or approach?
- Is the paper's argument well-developed and well-supported?

- Is the title of the paper appropriate/acceptable?
- Does the paper include in-text citations and a list of references?
- If reporting on research, does the paper appear to follow appropriate ethical guidelines, e.g. student permission for use of work?
- Is the paper of an appropriate standard of writing in terms of grammar, punctuation, spelling, and clarity of expression?
- Does the paper contain (or reproduce) any images, tables, charts or figures which have previously been published (and may therefore need copyright permission to appear in the JoAW)?

Having answered these questions as yes/no responses or in greater detail if needed, we ask reviewers to provide summary comments for the author(s) relating to the strengths/weaknesses of the paper as a whole.