



Universidad del Turabo

Gurabo, Puerto Rico

School of Social and Human Sciences

Language Research Center's (LRC)

Ambilingual Interdisciplinary Journal

Glossa

Policy Manual

The LRC Ambilingual Interdisciplinary Journal Policy Manual

Language Research Center (LRC)

The Language Research Center (LRC) is a research center founded in 2005 by the School of Social and Human Sciences at the University of Turabo, Gurabo, Puerto Rico. LRC is devoted to research and publishing in the emerging area of Social Sciences and Humanities, covering a broad range of topics with emphasis in the field of human communication, language, and psychology. This area of interest reflects different disciplines, investigating diverse aspects of the phenomenon of language and its effect on humanity.

The LRC Academic Journal is called “*Glossa*” which in Greek signifies ‘tongue’, ‘speech’, or ‘language’, depending upon the context in which it is used, and in this case, implying ‘the science or the study of’ language’. Greek philosophers in the 5th century BC discussed the origins of human language and its effects. They were the first in the West to view language as philosophy and worthy of scientific pursuit. The first complete Greek grammar, written by Dionysus Thrax in the 1st century BC, was a model for Roman grammarians, whose work led to the medieval and Renaissance language systems. From Greek, the word ‘*Glossa*’ was incorporated and transliterated into Latin (*Glossa*), and subsequently Spanish (*Glosa*), altering the original meaning of ‘*Glossa*’ from tongue’, ‘speech’, or ‘language’ to an explanation, elucidation, exposition, or process of stating a precise meaning or implication of an obscure word, or words of a text. The study of language or linguistics has universally been considered to be a science since the 19th century.

Description of the LRC Ambilingual Interdisciplinary Journal *Glossa*

Glossa, the first and only linguistic Academic Journal published in Puerto Rico, appears bi-annually hosting articles, commentaries, responses to commentaries, reviews, and key concepts. It provides a forum devoted to the discussion of topics and issues in the study of language, which is of interdisciplinary significance. It publishes contributions from researchers in all fields relevant to the study of human communication. The investigation of language and its significance for humanity are to be treated as a concern shared in common by those working in any research domain within Social Sciences and Humanities.

Emphasis is placed on the implications of current research for establishing common theoretical frameworks within which findings from different areas of study may be accommodated and interrelated. By focusing attention on the many ways in which language is integrated with other forms of communication activity and inter-action behavior(s), the development of a science of communication, which is not restricted to, or by, existing disciplinary boundaries, is to be explored.

The LRC Academic Journal is published bi-annually, (and later, possibly quarterly) by the LRC under the auspices of the University of Turabo's School of Social and Human Sciences, Gurabo, P.R. 00778. The telephone number is: 1 (787) 743-7979; ext. 4795; the fax is: (787) 743 - 7979; ext. 4134. Subscriptions for the LRC Academic Journal *Glossa* is (**please refer to our website**) for individual subscribers and institutions. *Glossa* articles will be available online free of charge for 6 months after which only staff, faculty and students of the University of Turabo will be able to access them. *Glossa* will be made available in printed form for other patrons.

Copyright Notice

Authors contributing an entry or entries to the Academic Journal *Glossa*, except as provided herein, retain the copyright to their entry or entries. By contributing an entry or entries, authors grant to the LRC, School of Social and Human Sciences at the University of Turabo, an exclusive license to publish their entry or entries on paper, as well as on the Internet and the World Wide Web, including any future technologies or media that develop to supplement or replace paper, the Internet or World Wide Web, on the terms of the 'Licensing Agreement' set forth below. The rights granted to the LRC include the right to enforce such rights in any forum, administrative, judicial, or otherwise. All rights not expressly granted to the LRC, School of Social and Human Sciences at the University of Turabo, including the right to publish an entry or entries in other print media, are retained by the authors. Copyright of the Academic Journal *Glossa* itself is held by the LRC. All rights are reserved. No part of the Academic Journal *Glossa* (excluding individual contributions and works derived solely from those contributions, for which rights are reserved by the individual authors) may be reprinted, reproduced, stored, or utilized in any form, by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including printing, photocopying, saving (on disk), broadcasting or recording, or in any

information storage or retrieval system, other than for purposes of fair use, without written permission from the copyright holder. All communications should be directed to the Principal Editor.

Licensing Agreement

By contributing an entry or entries to the Academic Journal *Glossa*, authors grant to the LRC, School of Social and Human Sciences at the University of Turabo, a perpetual, exclusive, worldwide right to copy, distribute, transmit and publish their contribution on paper as well as on the Internet and the World Wide Web. The authors also grant to the LRC School of Social and Human Sciences at the University of Turabo, a perpetual, non-exclusive, worldwide right to copy, distribute, transmit and publish any and all derivative works prepared or modified by the Review Editors from the original contribution, in whole or in part, by any variety of methods on all types of publication and broadcast media other than the Internet, now known or hereafter invented. Author(s) also grant to the LRC School of Social and Human Sciences at the University of Turabo, a perpetual, non-exclusive, worldwide right to translate their contribution, as well as any modified or derivative works, into any and all languages for the same purposes of copying, distributing, transmitting and publishing their work.

Statement of Liability and Indemnity

By contributing an entry or entries to the Academic Journal *Glossa*, authors grant to the LRC, the Principal Editor, the Management Board, members of the Advisory Board, the Review Board and Staff Assistant(s), the School of Social and Human Sciences at the University of Turabo and its officers, trustees, agents and employees ('UT Parties'), immunity from all liability arising from their work. All authors are responsible for securing permission to use any copyrighted material, including graphics, quotations, and photographs, within their entries. The LRC, the Principal Editor, the Management Board, members of the Advisory Board, Review Board and Staff Assistant(s), and the 'UT Parties' therefore disclaim any and all responsibility for copyright violations and any other form of liability arising from the content of the Academic Journal *Glossa* or from any material linked to the Academic Journal *Glossa*. Authors agree to indemnify and hold the 'UT Parties' harmless from any claims of copyright infringement or other alleged wrongdoing in connection with the author's manuscripts. Alleged copyright

violations should be brought to the attention of the author and the Principal Editor, so that such issues may be dealt with promptly.

Board of Editors

The Board of Editors consists of the Dean of the School of Social and Human Sciences, the Management Board, the Advisory Board, and the Review Board. The Dean is ex-officio member of the Management Board. The Principal Editor, that is the Director of the LRC, in consultation with the Dean and the Directors of the Department of Communications, Modern Languages, and Psychology, controls and monitors the daily management of the Academic Journal and defines the orientation of the policies. The Management Board is composed of the Dean, the Principal Editor, Associate Editor, and 3 Assistant Editors who are Directors of the Department of Communications, Modern Languages, and Psychology, respectively. In addition to the Management Board, the Advisory Board (composed of University of Turabo staff and supplementary academicians and professionals outside of our academic institution), the Review Board (subject editors composed of University of Turabo staff and academicians outside of our academic institution), constitute the Board of Editors who assist in the publication of the Academic Journal *Glossa*.

Editorial Policies

1. Contributions to the Academic Journal are normally solicited by an invitation from a member of the Management Board within their respective area of expertise. However, qualified potential contributors may send a proposal to write on a relevant topic, along with a curriculum vita, to the Principal Editor.

Please note that by qualified, (a) it is meant, those persons with accredited, academic or professional doctorates, in Social Sciences or Humanities (or a related discipline) who have published refereed works on the topic of the proposed entry. By refereed works, it is meant, either articles in respected, peer-reviewed journals or books, which have been published by respected publishing houses and which have undergone the usual peer review process prior to publication. However, if a member of our Management Board is familiar with the work of the potential contributor, the latter may be certified as qualified.

By relevant topic, (b) it is meant, a subject-matter that is suitable for a reference work in the academic area of Social Sciences and Humanities and is (i) either listed in the LRC's areas of interest for publication in the Academic Journal, or (ii) falls within the area of expertise of one of the members of our Management Board and / or Review Board. Since the Academic Journal currently does not yet have subject editors for every specialized area of Social Sciences and Humanities, some topics suitable for a reference work in academic domain might fail condition (iii). LRC reserves the right to determine whether such entry proposals (in specialized areas for which the Academic Journal lacks subject editors) should be pursued at this time. The Management Board also reserves the right to compare the qualifications of any person submitting an unsolicited request with those of other potential authors who would be qualified to write the entry in question.

2. All manuscripts, whether solicited or approved, will be refereed by one or more of the subject editors on our Review Board or by one or more external referees who have been approved by a member of the Management Board in consultation with the Principal Editor. Authors are expected to engage any constructive criticisms they receive during the referee process, prior to publication. ***Authors should note, however, that no matter whether they have been invited or approved by one of these review editors, our goal of producing a high-quality reference work requires us to admit the possibility that some submitted entries may not be accepted for publication.***
3. Readers of the Academic Journal are encouraged to contact authors directly with comments, corrections, and other suggestions for improvements.
4. It remains the responsibility of authors to maintain their manuscripts and to keep them current. Authors are expected: (a) to update their entries regularly, especially in response to important new research on the topic of the entry, and (b) to revise their entries in a timely way in light of any valid criticism they receive, whether it comes from the subject editors on our Review Board, other members of the profession, or interested readers. Concerning (a), authors should update the Bibliography and Other Internet Resources sections of their entries regularly, to keep pace with significant new publications, both in

print and on the web. Concerning (b), the validity of criticism shall be determined by the Principal Editor, typically in consultation with the relevant members of the Management Board. The length of time required for a ‘timely’ revision will be negotiable and will both respect the author’s current commitments and reflect the seriousness of the criticism. However, entries which require revision, but which are not revised within the negotiated timetable may be retired from the active portion of the Academic Journal and left in the LRC’s Archives until such time as the entry is revised so as to engage the valid criticisms in question.

5. The views expressed by the authors in their entries are their own and do not necessarily reflect those of the University of Turabo, the University of Turabo’s, School of Social and Human Sciences, the CSL, the Academic Journal’s Management Board or of anyone else associated with the Academic Journal.

The Management Board

The Principal Editor, in consultation with the Management Board, makes editorial decisions concerning the Academic Journal, including decisions concerning its content, format and distribution.

The Principal Editor engages in assembling a Board of Editors, which includes a Advisory Board, Review Board, and selection of Staff Assistant(s). The members of the Advisory Board, Review Board, and Staff Assistant(s) are selected in consultation with the Dean of the University of Turabo’s School of Social and Human Sciences. The Principal Editor arranges the design of the Academic Journal, selecting desktop publishing software, finding a printer, and calculating the cost. Ongoing responsibilities include having the final responsibility for organization, implementation of the policies, operations and publication of the Academic Journal *Glossa*. The Associate Editor is concomitant to the Principal Editor. In case of the latter’s absence, s/he assumes the role of Principal Editor.

Assistant Editors (i.e., the Director for Communications, Director for Modern Languages, Director for Psychology) contribute by offering suggestions, calling on the staff from their respective departments to submit manuscripts for publication, as well as inviting qualified academicians and professionals from outside to submit manuscripts for publication, making sure

that the manuscripts are submitted on time for publication and that all the manuscripts meet the requirements for publication in the Academic Journal.

Staff Assistant(s) are directly responsible to the Principal Editor. They head or are the team responsible for coordinating the success of the issues related to marketing, sales, production and distribution of the Academic Journal *Glossa*. Staff Assistant(s) are hands-on personnel that look after the day-to-day activities while providing feedback to the Principal Editor.

The Management Board meets regularly to identify and discuss issues and determines the editorial position and / or formulation of the Academic Journal *Glossa*. These editorial opinions are reflected on the editorial pages and do not affect specialized content and coverage.

Advisory Board

The Advisory Board is a group of distinguished academicians and professionals who serve foremost as policy adjudicators, assisting the Management Board in deciding the very best strategy for operation of *Glossa*. Advisory Board members also advise the Management Board on various issues regarding editorial and administrative policies. The Advisory Board also advises the Principal Editor on the basic policies governing the operation of the Academic Journal.

Every 3 years (if applicable) one third of the Advisory Board's membership rotates off and new members are appointed, ensuring a continuous influx of fresh perspectives and insights. The Academic Journal *Glossa* cannot be a preminent venue for publication of language science scholarship and practice without such contributions.

Responsibilities and Rights of Editors

Responsibilities

1. The Principal Editor and the Board of Editors are responsible for establishing and maintaining the highest possible standards in the contributions that fill the pages of *Glossa* and for maintaining the integrity of the Academic Journal itself.
2. The Principal Editor, in consultation with the Management Board, has total responsibility, authority, and accountability for editorial content of the Academic Journal.

3. The Principal Editor will report on a regular basis to the Dean of the School of Social and Human Sciences, and will be involved in discussions and decisions involving the Academic Journal.
4. The Principal Editor is responsible for maintaining an Editorial Policy Manual for use by the Board of Editors, i.e., the Management Board, Advisory Board, Review Board, Staff Assistant(s), authors, and by future members of the boards.
6. The Principal Editor will not publish in the Academic Journal during her or his term of office.
7. The Principal Editor, in consultation with the Management Board, is responsible in selection of editors who will serve on the Advisory Board and the Review Board of qualified scholars who represent the professional diversity of the field.
8. The Principal Editor is responsible for ensuring that submitted manuscripts receive fair reviews by qualified reviewers.
9. The Principal Editor is responsible for ensuring that decisions regarding publication are fair, unbiased, and justified.
10. The Principal Editor should not have personal financial involvement in manuscripts considered for publication. Any editor on the Management Board and Review Board should disqualify herself / himself from any decision-making role on a manuscript addressing a subject on which s/he has a potential conflict of interest.
11. The Editor(s) on the Management Board and the Review Board may disqualify herself / himself from evaluating submissions by students or by local colleagues or friends. In these instances, the Principal Editor may ask a guest editor to oversee the review process and to make the final decision on the manuscript. The Board of Editors is responsible for ensuring that issues of the Academic Journal are published on time and that each issue is within the page limit set by the CSL.
12. The Principal Editor will return reviews and make decisions within 12 weeks from the time the manuscript is sent out for review, except when there are extenuating circumstances.
13. The Principal Editor will act proactively and contact authors when decisions about manuscripts will be delayed.

14. The Principal Editor is responsible for summarizing the status of the Academic Journal operations (e.g., the number of submitted and accepted manuscripts, average time an author has to wait for an editorial decision and average time it takes for an accepted manuscript to be published). Ordinarily, this will be done during a meeting with the Management Board at regular conferences.
15. The Principal Editor will inform the Dean, the Management Board, the Advisory Board and the Review Board of any political, commercial, or other incidents that could impair the scientific credibility of the publication and will take measures necessary to ensure that such incidents do not affect the decisions that s/he is called on to make.
16. The Principal Editor will advise the Dean, the Management Board, the Advisory Board and the Review Board of any adverse consequences to be expected if her/his professional judgment is overruled and will ensure that proposed alternative actions do not impair editorial integrity.
17. The Principal Editor and members of the Board of Editors will not disclose confidential information unless authorized by the source of that information, unless allegations of ethical misconduct require access to that confidential information for proper investigation, or unless the Principal Editor is required by law to disclose that information.
18. The Principal Editor and the members of the Board of Editors will refrain from using confidential information for personal gain and shall take reasonable steps to ensure that such information is not used for the advantage of other parties.
19. If the Principal Editor becomes aware of a contravention of these guidelines, s/he will report it to the Dean, the Management Board, the Advisory Board and the Review Board.
20. The Principal Editor and the Management Board will assist the Advisory Board, the Review Board and Staff Assistant(s) in the education and training of new editors.

Rights

The Principal Editor must be free to authorize publication of peer reviewed and other appropriate research reports, critical analyses, theory papers, and other materials, and must be free from unilateral, biased, or otherwise arbitrary interference that may detract from the long-standing tradition of a free scientific / academic press. The University of Turabo's

Administration is, as a rule, responsible for financial and other management issues, but they must always recognize, accept, and respect the Academic Journal's scientific / educational integrity and the editorial independence of the Principal Editor and the Board of Editors.

The Principal Editor and the University of Turabo's Administration should enter into a clear signed and witnessed contract to ensure proper editorial freedom and responsibility. Such a contract should identify to whom the Principal Editor is primarily responsible. Furthermore, the contract should state clearly the job description, reporting responsibilities, and performance measurements. These should include statements of academic, scientific, editorial, and administrative expectations of all parties; terms of reference under which the Academic Journal is published; the length of the contract; financial conditions; including operating expenses and remuneration (if any); and terms for termination by either party.

Review Policies

The Principal Editor appoints members for the LRC Review Board for a maximum duration of three-years. They may be reappointed, or may be replaced for cause by the Principal Editor at any time.

All reviews will use a double-blind review process. The Principal Editor has the final authority for the acceptance or rejection of any article. No formal articles by the subject editor may be submitted or accepted for publication in *Glossa* during the subject editor's term of office, unless approved by the Principal Editor.

Review Board

The procedures guiding the selection of manuscripts for publication in *Glossa* require that no manuscript be accepted until the Principal Editor and at least two subject editors have reviewed it. The decision of the Principal Editor to publish the manuscript is influenced considerably by the judgments of these subject editors, who are qualified in their respective fields. The author's name and credentials are removed prior to forwarding a manuscript to a subject editor so as to maximize objectivity and ensure that a manuscript is judged solely on the basis of its content and contribution to the field.

Evaluation Criteria

Manuscripts submitted for publication consideration in *Glossa* are judged on the basis of their potential contribution to the advancement of the science. For a manuscript to be published in *Glossa*, it must meet three minimum criteria:

1. It must make a contribution to knowledge in study of the language. It must provide new insights, new ideas, and / or new empirical results.
2. It must be based on sound evidence, whether literature review, theory, or empirical research. It is expected that articles submitted for publication consideration to *Glossa* will be more theory based, more literature based, and / or more rigorously empirical relative to those articles published in journals, whose primary target audience is researchers, academicians, educators and / or practitioners, and students.
3. It must be of value to those who comprise the readership of *Glossa*. That is, the information must be considered new, insightful, and important by the researchers, academicians, educators and / or practitioners, and students.

The Review Process

Upon submission, all authors will receive an acknowledgement of receipt. Following a brief editorial review, each manuscript will be blind reviewed by two members of the Review Board (who can use research assistants - usually graduate students). The review process will take approximately 4 weeks. At the end of the review process authors will be notified as to the status of their manuscripts, i.e., accept, revise and resubmit, or reject - and will receive substantive feedback from the reviewers (subject editors).

Members of the Review Board's responsibilities include reviewing manuscripts submitted to the Academic Journal, providing feedback to authors on how to improve the manuscripts, and providing the Principal Editor and Management Board with recommendations for acceptance or rejection of manuscripts for publication in *Glossa*. Review Board members must agree to review one manuscript approximately every two to three months and complete the review within 21 days.

The Editorial Review Process Policy

Once a manuscript is submitted to the LRC, it will typically go through the seven steps of the editorial review process:

1. The Principal Editor examines the manuscript to determine whether it is appropriate for the Academic Journal and if it should be reviewed. If it is not appropriate, the manuscript is rejected outright.
2. The Principal Editor sends the manuscript - identifying information having been removed by the author - to two reviewers. Typically, one or both of these is from the LRC's Review Board. Others, if required from outside our academic institution, are specialists in the subject matter represented by the manuscript. The Principal Editor asks them to complete the review in three weeks and encloses two forms: (a) comments to the author(s) and (b) comments to the Principal Editor. Comments to authors are about the appropriateness and adequacy of the theoretical or conceptual framework, literature review, method, results, and discussion. Reviewers often include suggestions for strengthening the manuscript. Comments to the Principal Editor are in the nature of the significance of the work and its potential contribution.
3. The Principal Editor examines the reviews and decides whether to reject the manuscript, invite the author(s) to revise and resubmit the manuscript, or seek additional reviews. In rare instances, the manuscript is accepted with almost no revision. Almost without exception, reviewers' comments (to the author) are forwarded to the author. If a revision is indicated, the Principal Editor provides guidelines for attending to the reviewers' suggestions and perhaps additional advice about revising the manuscript.
4. The author(s) decide whether and how to address the reviewers' comments, criticisms and the Principal Editor's concerns. The author(s) submit a revised version of the paper along with specific information describing how they have answered the concerns of the reviewers and the editor.
5. The Principal Editor sends the revised paper out for review. Typically, at least one of the original reviewers will be asked to examine the article.
6. When the reviewers have completed their work, the Principal Editor examines their comments and decides whether the paper is ready to be published, needs another round of revisions, or should be rejected.

7. If the decision is to accept, the paper is in press and the article should appear in print (in the next issue of *Glossa*). A member of the LRC's Board of Editors (Copy Editor) reads it for correct style (in-text citations, the reference list, and tables are typical areas of concern), clarity, and grammar. The authors are asked to respond to the member of the Board of Editor's (copy editor's) queries. Following these corrections, page proofs are mailed to authors for their approval. At this point, only essential changes are accepted. Finally, the article appears in the pages of the Academic Journal and is posted on-line.

The Academic Journal APA Style Policy

A modified American Psychological Association style; all page references are to the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 5th ed., 2001. If the article uses any other format it will be automatically published under '*other*'.

Guidelines for Reviewers

The Reviewer's Obligations and Opportunities

The essential task of a reviewer is to provide a critique and evaluation that is: prompt, constructive, thoughtful, and fair. The essential goal of the peer review process is to maximize the quality of published research in a field of scholarly inquiry. Reviewers acknowledge as they write their review that they have obligations to three audiences: (a) the Principal Editor of the Academic Journal, (b) the author(s) of the paper, and (c) scholars / scientists who are doing research in this field.

The Principal Editor of the Academic Journal relies upon reviewers who will be thorough, prompt, and fair. The Principal Editor expects to be provided with detailed but concise assessments of manuscript quality; a clear recommendation about whether the paper should be rejected, revised, or accepted; and feedback to authors that will be helpful in crafting a revision (or submission to another journal). The Principal Editor expects reviewers to extend their expertise - not every manuscript sent to a review editor for appraisal will fall squarely within her / his primary area of specialization.

The authors rely on reviewers to be constructive, reasoned, explicit, and ethical. A submitted manuscript is confidential: review editors are not to discuss it; not to copy it, not to

quote it. They are to identify both the strengths and the weaknesses of the paper. Reviewers are to be aware of their biases or preferences, not to be superficial or dismissive. They are to focus on those limitations that are serious threats to the internal and external validity of the study. They are to think of themselves as an unpaid consultant to the authors. Reviewers must consider how they can help authors to improve their study and write in this spirit of constructive criticism. Above all review editors are to remember the golden rule of reviewing: 'Do unto these authors, as you would have them do unto you as an author'.

Other scholars rely on reviewers to maximize the quality of research published in their field. Journals are perhaps the single most important vehicle for dissemination of research findings. (Reviewers are helping to set the standard for quality. They have the opportunity to advance the quality of research in their field, to update their awareness of current research, and to learn new knowledge and skills. Being a reviewer is one of the best and most effective ways to continue their own education as a scholar.)

Responsibilities and Rights of Peer Reviewers

Responsibilities

Reviewers are obliged to treat the author and the manuscript with respect. When reviewers have a bias against the researchers or the research, they must recuse themselves. When they have a conflict of interest with the research or its sponsors, they must make it known to the editors or recuse themselves.

Reviewers should provide an honest and constructive assessment of the value of the manuscript. An appropriate assessment includes an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the study; suggestions on how to make the manuscript more complete, relevant, and readable; and specific questions for the authors to address to make any revision of the manuscript acceptable and useful to the intended audience. Whenever possible, complete citations should be provided for important work that has been omitted.

Reviewers must maintain confidentiality about the manuscripts they review. Using the data from such manuscripts before they are published is inappropriate. Sharing the data with colleagues is equally inappropriate, as is reproducing the manuscript for any purpose. If

reviewers wish to use information from a manuscript that has been accepted for publication, they should ask the Principal Editor to contact the author(s) for permission.

Reviewers must not use the peer-review process as a means to further their own research aims, specifically by requiring authors to respond to questions that are interesting to the reviewers but that the study was not designed to answer or by suggesting that the Principal Editor reject work that contradicts or is in conflict with their own. Reviewers must also not use the peer-review process or recommend acceptance simply to further the careers of their students or colleagues.

Reviewers who receive invitations to review manuscripts with which they have a clear conflict of interest should decline the invitation and reveal the specific conflict of interest. Conflicts of interest can be defined as sets of conditions (such as academic competition or particular philosophic values and beliefs) that could result in a biased or unfair evaluation of the manuscript. The Principal Editor may deliberately choose a reviewer with a known stance on a particular issue in order to obtain a balanced review of the manuscript. Reviewers who have any questions in this regard should consult with the Principal Editor.

Reviewers who have reviewed a manuscript before for another journal should inform the Principal Editor before they complete the review. The Principal Editor can then decide whether a re-review is appropriate. Unless appropriate, reviewers should resist the temptation to use their reviews as an opportunity to suggest that their own published work be referenced.

Reviewers who receive a request to review a manuscript and cannot do so within the specified time period should decline the request. Review Board members are expected to complete 4 to 6 reviews annually, or as agreed with the Principal Editor, and to do so in a timely manner. Those who consistently decline to complete reviews or who do not complete them on time will be asked to leave the Review Board.

Reviewers who agree to review a manuscript must complete their reviews within the specified time period. If it becomes impossible to complete the review on time, reviewers should so inform the Principal Editor and ask for guidance about whether to decline to review the manuscript or to take an additional specified period of time.

All reviews of Review Board members and occasional reviewers are scored on both timeliness and quality. High quality and timely reviews are essential to the Academic Journal's goal of publishing high quality work in a timely manner. Reviewers who complete high quality

reviews in a timely manner are providing an essential service to the field and to the University Journal, and they are likely to be asked to review again.

Rights

Reviewers can expect to be informed of the Principal Editor's decision regarding manuscripts they reviewed for the Academic Journal. Reviewers can expect to receive the comments of other reviewers for their edification. Reviewers can expect to be thanked for the time they take to review manuscripts. A list of the members of the Review Board will be published in each issue of the Academic Journal. Ad hoc reviewers will be identified in a list of occasional reviewers published in the last issue of the publication year.

Guidelines for Reviewers

The following nine points should be considered as you (the Review Board member) examine the manuscript and write your review:

1. Look for the 'intellectual plot-line' of the article. You can do this from first skimming through the manuscript and then giving it an once-over read. As you do this, ask the five major questions that are central to the research review process:
 - i. What do the researchers want to find out?
 - ii. Why is that important to investigate or understand?
 - iii. How are the researchers investigating this? Are their research methods appropriate and adequate to the task?
 - iv. What do they claim to have found out? Are the findings clearly stated?
 - v. How does this advance knowledge in the field? How well do the researchers place their findings within the context of ongoing scholarly inquiry about this topic?
2. Look at the organization of the article. Can you find answers to the above questions quickly and easily? Can you trace the logic of investigation consistently from the opening paragraphs to the conclusion?

3. Then go back to the opening paragraphs of the article. Are the research question specifically stated? Is it clear what the authors want to find out? Do they make the case that this is an important area for research inquiry?
4. The next section is usually a review of the existing research literature on this topic. Do the authors present a convincing line of argument here - or does it appear that they are just name - dropping (citing sources that may be important, without a clear underlying logic for how they may be important)? Do the authors focus on ideas, or merely on discrete facts or findings? Have they given sufficient attention to theory - the cumulative attempts at prior explanations for the questions they are investigating? Are the research questions or hypotheses clearly derivative of the theory and the literature review? In short: How well do the authors set the stage for the research problem they are reporting?
5. The methods and procedures section is usually next; and this is where neophyte reviewers often start (unwisely) 'to sharpen their knives'. The selection of methods by which the researchers collect data always involve compromises, and there are few studies that cannot be criticized for errors of commission or omission in terms of textbook criteria for research design and data collection procedures. You could focus on three questions here:
 - i. Do the authors clearly describe their research strategies? Do they present sufficient detail about the sample from which they have collected data; the operationalization of measures they have attempted to employ; and the adequacy of these measures in terms of external and internal validity? In addition, there should be no surprises here: the measures should be clearly matched to the research questions or the hypotheses.
 - ii. Are their choices of methods adequate to find out what they want to find out in this study? Would other methods provide a substantial improvement; if so, would employing these methods be feasible or practical?
 - iii. Do they provide some justification for the methods they have chosen? Does this appear to be adequate?

6. The section presenting research results is surely the heart of the article - though not its soul (which the reader should find in the opening paragraphs and in the discussion section). Reviewers might consider four questions here:
 - i. Does the 'results section' tell a story - taking the reader from the research questions posed earlier to their answers in the data? Is the logic clear?
 - ii. Are the tables and figures clear and succinct? Can they be 'read' easily for major findings by themselves, or should there be additional information provided? Are the authors' tables consistent with the format of currently accepted norms regarding data presentation?
 - iii. Do the authors present too many tables or figures in the form of undigested findings? Are all of them necessary in order to tell the story of this research inquiry; or can some be combined? Remember that tables and figures are very expensive (from the standpoint of the University Journal) and that undigested data obscure rather than advance the cumulative development of knowledge in a field.
 - iv. Are the results presented both in a statistically and substantively meaningful way? Have the authors stayed within the bounds of the results their data will support?

7. The discussion section is where the authors can give flight to their findings, so that they soar into the heights of cumulative knowledge development about this topic - or crash into the depths of their CV's, with few other scholars ever citing their findings. Of course few research reports will ever be cited as cornerstones to the development of knowledge about any topic; but your review should encourage authors to aspire to these heights. Consider the following as you evaluate their discussion section:
 - i. Do the authors present here a concise and accurate summary of their major findings? Does their interpretation fairly represent the data as presented earlier in the article?

- ii. Do they attempt to integrate these findings in the context of a broader scholarly debate about these issues? Specifically: do they integrate their findings with the research literature they presented earlier in their article - do they bring the findings back to the previous literature reviewed?
 - iii. Have they gone beyond presenting facts - data - and made an effort to present explanations - understanding? Have they responded to the conceptual or theoretical problems that were raised in the introduction?
This is how theory is developed.
 - iv. Do the authors thoughtfully address the limitations of their study?
8. The writing style is important. Consider the three guidelines for successful communication - to be clear, concise, and correct - and whether the authors have achieved it:
- i. Is the writing clear? Do the authors communicate their ideas using direct, straightforward, and unambiguous words and phrases? Have they avoided jargon (statistical or conceptual) that would interfere with the communication of their procedures or ideas?
 - ii. Is the writing concise? Are too many words or paragraphs or sections used to present what could be communicated more simply?
 - iii. Is the writing correct? Too many promising academicians, researchers, scientists have only a rudimentary grasp of grammar and punctuation that result in meandering commas, clauses in complex sentences that are struggling to find their verbs, and adjectives or even nouns that remain quite ambiguous about their antecedents in the sentences. These are not merely technical issues of grammar to be somehow dealt with by a member of the Editorial Board (Copy-Editor) down the line. Rather they involve the successful communication of a set of ideas to an audience; and this is the basis of scholarship today.

9. Your evaluation to the Principal Editor: Should this paper be (a) rejected for this Academic Journal? (b) or does it show sufficient promise for revision, in ways that you have clearly demonstrated in your review, to encourage the authors to invest weeks and months in revision for this Academic Journal?

Your bottom-line advice to the Principal Editor is crucial. Make a decision; state it clearly (in your confidential remarks to the Principal Editor on the page provided). Remember that only a few of the articles submitted to the Academic Journal will result in publication.

Some reasons to reject a manuscript: (a) The research questions have already been addressed in prior studies; (b) the data have been collected in such a way as to preclude useful investigation; (c) the manuscript is not ready for publication - incomplete, improper format, or error-ridden. Most rejected articles do find a home in other journals.

Good Reviews and Bad Reviews

A good review is supportive, constructive, thoughtful, and fair. It identifies both strengths and weaknesses, and offers concrete suggestions for improvements. It acknowledges the reviewer's biases where appropriate, and justifies the reviewer's conclusions.

A bad review is superficial, nasty, petty, self-serving, or arrogant. It indulges the reviewer's biases with no justification. It focuses exclusively on weaknesses and offers no specific suggestions for improvement.

Note to Authors

Introduction

Manuscripts submitted for publication in the Academic Journal *Glossa* are evaluated based on their potential contribution to the advancement of scholarship. Therefore, manuscripts ought to meet three minimum criteria:

1. The manuscript should contribute to existing knowledge in study of the language and its facets. It should provide original insights, novel ideas, and / or new empirical results.

2. The manuscript should be based on rigorous corroboration, whether it is a literature review, theory, or empirical research. It should be comparative to articles published in other academic journals, whose primary target audience is researchers, academicians, professors and / or professionals, and students.
3. The manuscript should be deemed valuable by those who will read it. That is, the information should be considered insightful, novel, and beneficial by researchers, academicians, professors and / or professionals, and students.

Submission of a manuscript must imply acceptance of the following four conditions: 1) The manuscript reports unpublished work; 2) The manuscript is not being submitted to any other journal; 3) You are fully authorized to submit the material for publication; and 4) If accepted, the manuscript will not be republished without the consent of the publisher.

Manuscripts should be accompanied by a covering letter from the author responsible for correspondence regarding the manuscript. In addition, the package must contain “Forms for Authors” (provided by the LRC) which includes (a) Certification of Authorship; (b) Disclosure of Competing Interests; and (c) Copyright Transfer.

The covering letter should contain a statement that the guidelines for publishing in the Academic Journal *Glossa* (How to Publish [in Glossa]) have been read by the author(s) and that he, she or they are in full agreement. The covering letter should also contain a statement that the manuscript has been seen and approved by all authors and should give any additional helpful information. If there has been prior publication of any part of the work, this should be acknowledged and appropriate written permission from the original author or copyright holder must be included. (Please note: If color illustrations are included, [which LRC strongly discourages] a statement that the author(s) is (are) willing to assume the cost of color separation and reproduction is requested.)

The Principal Editor’s decision is final. Manuscripts should be written in English or Spanish in non-sexist, non-racist language. Acceptance for publication will be sent to the author by the Principal Editor and will be followed by dispatch of proofs. These should be returned immediately and alterations kept to a minimum. LRC may charge for excessive alterations. LRC does not acknowledge receipt of proofs. LRC cannot guarantee publication in a particular issue. Two reprints (or one per author when there are more than two authors) will be provided free of

charge. The principal author will be sent a copy of the issue in which the manuscript appears. Acceptance of a manuscript for publication implies assignment of copyright to LRC.

General Guidelines

Manuscripts should attempt to present research, innovative theoretical and/or practical insights in relevant general Social Sciences and Humanities. Manuscripts should be maximum 6000 words (including abstract, references, endnotes and space taken by tables/figures - calculated on approximately 500 words to a journal page) in length, typed in 12 pt font Times New Roman on 8-1/2" x 11" paper, on one side only, paginated and double-spaced with ample margins (1inch on all sides, except on A4 paper size).

Contributors should follow guidelines for academic articles, and attempt to review in terms of related and current literature and scholarly debate. They should be aware that they are addressing an academic international audience. Authors should use a non-discriminatory language.

Manuscripts in the Academic Journal *Glossa* are typically presented in five formats: Main Articles, Commentaries, Responses to Commentaries, Reviews, and Key Concepts. Main Articles are typically 3,000 to 5,000 words. Special instructions for the remaining article formats follow below.

Because Academic Journal *Glossa* is a cross-disciplinary journal, it is especially important to adopt a style that is user-friendly, in particular: (a) a title/subtitle that signals what the paper is about, (b) an initial abstract, (c) a clear paragraph structure, (d) use of subheadings as signposts to the discussion, and (e) a conclusion section that summarizes the main points of the manuscript and indicates future directions but avoids introducing new material. Jargon should be avoided if possible. When employed, they should be clearly defined or illustrated.

Manuscript Preparation and Formatting

The Principal Editor reserves the right to return to authors, without a peer review, improperly formatted manuscripts. The writing should be most carefully checked before submission, especially for clarity of meaning and avoidance of ambiguity.

Manuscripts should be written in English or Spanish. English spelling and hyphenation should be consistent and should follow Webster's Dictionary. Spanish spelling and hyphenation

should be consistent and should follow *Diccionario de la Lengua Española* by Real Academia Española.

Manuscripts should be double-spaced (including references and footnotes), throughout with generous (1 inch) margins on all sides, printed on one side only. Italic, bold, and alien words and symbols should be clearly indicated as such.

Placement of page numbers should be bottom center, with the title page as page 1. All pages should be numbered sequentially. The manuscript should be in a plain fashion - right-hand flush margins and word-processing codes should be avoided. Only a plain-text typeface or font (Times New Roman) should be used. Font sizes should be uniform throughout, and in 12- point size. All characters that appear in the journal article proper should be visible in the manuscript. If utilizing an A4 (European) paper, two inches blank at the bottom should be left to facilitate photocopying onto 8-1/2" x 11" paper.

The manuscript should be kept as short as possible. Background information should be minimized but well supported by citing published work. Data may be presented as a table or as a figure, but not simultaneously in both forms. New terminology that is introduced must be defined, especially if it is not to be found in the dictionary. It should not be introduced at all if perfectly good words exist already. Uncommon abbreviations and acronyms should be defined the first time they are used. The order of headings should be indicated as 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. Numbering of sections is needed only when reference is made to these sections within the paper. Footnotes, or anything, which disturbs the continuity of the reading and argument, should be avoided as much as possible. Endnotes should not be used. Foreign language words / phrases, if they are in common use, will appear in Webster's Dictionary and need not be italicized. If they are not in the dictionary, they should be explained and italicized the first time they are used. Capital letters should be used sparingly. Job titles or academic subjects should not be capitalized. Double quotation marks should be used to indicate only verbatim quoting. Single quotation marks should be used for a quote within a quote. They can also be employed to indicate an unusual meaning or usage but should only be used when that meaning is introduced. Computer commands, programs, or output should be clearly indicated as such, as they are set in a different typeface. Publisher of computer programs should be provided. Acknowledgements should appear at the end of the text, before the references.

New paragraphs should be indented, rather than having extra line space between them. Major and minor headings should be differentiated. Any illustrations, figures, or tables should be on separate sheets at the end of the manuscript but keyed in the text. Footnotes should not be used. Endnotes are permissible but should be kept to a minimum, preferably none but no more than 5-8. Endnotes and references should go at the end of the manuscript, double-spaced. The alphabetized reference list should be titled “References” with entries following the American Psychological Association system (APA Publications Manual, 5th edition, 2001). Note that names of journals or periodicals are not abbreviated and instead spelled out fully.

Address

Authors’ first names are usually required. The address recorded should be where the work was done; the current address, if different, should be given as a footnote. E-mail addresses should be included.

Title Page

The manuscript proper (page 1) should include: (a) title page as the top cover sheet with full title of the paper; (b) a short title for use as a running head; (c) author’s name as it should appear in print; (d) contact information (institutional postal address/telephone/email/ fax); (e) best address for correspondence (the address recorded should be where the work was done; the current address, if different, should be given as a footnote); (f) a brief biographical paragraph (no greater than 100 words) and (g) indication of the author responsible for correspondence related to a manuscript submission. The biographical paragraph typically involves two or three sentences describing academic affiliation(s), scholarly interests, and a recent publication or two. The manuscript title should be descriptive of the article content and not exceed 10 words (50 letters) or 80 characters in length. The name and version of word-processing software used (e.g., Microsoft Word 12) should be listed and total word and character count (including notes, spaces, and references).

Abstract Page

The second page of the manuscript should include the title, no author information, an abstract should be brief, (100-150 words), report only the content of the manuscript, indicating

the need for the article, problem(s) to be considered, methodological approach, and conclusion(s), and a list of keywords (6-8) not mentioned in the title. Background and content information should be minimal, and are best avoided altogether. References should not be included in the abstract.

The main text then follows, starting on the following page.

Special additional instructions for manuscript types:

Commentaries and Responses to Commentaries

Commentaries and responses to the commentaries are by Board of Editors invitation only. However, authors interested in being the journal commentators are encouraged to contact the Principal Editor with their interests. Commentaries and responses are typically 1,000-3,000 words in length. The Management Board must approve longer commentaries in advance. An abstract should not be included with commentaries and responses. Commentaries/responses are not peer reviewed but are subject to review and approval by the Management Board. For manuscript titles of commentaries and responses, conventions such as “Commentary On...” or “Response To...” should not be used. Instead, manuscript title reflecting the content or ideas presented in the manuscript should be given. Otherwise, commentaries and responses follow the standard LRC Academic Journal Policy publication guidelines and instructions for authors.

Review Articles/Manuscripts

The Principal Editor and the Management Board before submission must approve topics for review articles in the journal *Glossa*. Review articles, including invited ones, are subject to Review Board editors as with Main Articles. Review articles should be focused on a topic relevant to *Glossa* editorial objectives and formatted according to standard instructions and other LRC Academic Journal Policy guidelines. “Review Article” followed by the descriptive title of the material, however, should precede titles. The Principal Editor encourages potential authors of review articles to choose a focus involving both journal articles and book-length monographs. Consultation with the Principal Editor is required to assure a similar review article is not being prepared elsewhere. Authors interested in doing book reviews may consider doing a review article for the Academic Journal *Glossa*.

Key Concepts

Key Concepts articles are intended to educate the reader about important terms or concepts relevant to the language and its aspects. Authors should approach a Key Concepts manuscript as they would approach the writing of an encyclopedia entry. The length should be about 3000 words. The Key Concepts manuscript should focus on a single concept or term and (a) provide a definition or concise discussion of the meaning of the concept or term (b) review the philosophical and scientific importance of the concept (c) sketch the most important problems and/or controversies regarding the concept (d) raise unexplored scientific or philosophical issues with the concept and (e) provide no more than ten of the most important references on the concept. Key Concepts manuscripts are typically initiated by the Management Board invitation, but potential authors are encouraged to contact the Management Board with their ideas. Key Concepts manuscripts are peer-reviewed by the Review Board. Key Concepts manuscripts should be titled with the “Key Concepts:” prefix followed by the concept/term to be considered, as in “Key Concepts: Autonomy”. Otherwise the Key Concepts manuscript is subject to the CSL Academic Journal Policy guidelines and instructions for authors.

Completing the Submission

One original manuscript and three hard copies should be submitted, and a CD-ROM or a jump drive, in a recent version of Microsoft Word. Word-processing files can only be accepted in MS word format. Manuscripts may also be sent as e-mail attachments to the Principal Editor at the address above. Files should be scanned for viruses with updated antivirus software before sending. Files greater than 1 megabyte in size should not be sent via e-mail. The author should make sure that the electronic version is the final updated version. For electronic files, the manuscript should be given a file name according to the convention [author last name]-[keyword][month-year] followed by the apropos Windows file extension. Examples of acceptable electronic file names include: Torres Rodriguez-autonomy4-05.doc.

Manuscripts that are accepted for publication cannot be placed into the print queue until a completed publication agreement is received by the CSL. Principal Editor will advise authors about the publication agreement at the time of an acceptance of a manuscript.

Tables and Captions to Illustrations

Tables should be typed out (double-line spacing) on separate sheets and not included as part of the text. The captions to illustrations should be gathered together and typed out on a separate sheet. Tables should be numbered by Roman numerals and figures by Arabic numerals. The approximate position of tables and figures should be indicated in the manuscript. Combine small and related tables whenever feasible. Grouping several tables and figures together when there is very little text should be avoided. Large tables of data already available elsewhere should not be included; alternatively, putting tables in HTML format for publication as an adjunct on the journal website is recommended. Every table must have a caption, which makes the data in the table understandable without reference to the text. Captions should include keys to symbols.

Figures

It is the author's responsibility to obtain any necessary copyright permission (including permissions for web publication) for figures and photographs and to fulfill the copyright holder's requests for payment or copies of the paper. Copies of permissions granted with the figures must be sent.

Figures should be in separate files from the text. Figures should be computer-generated, not simply scanned in, and sent on CD-ROM. High-quality laser-printed copies must accompany them. Lettering on figures should appear as required on the hard copy but should be removed from the electronic copy (with the exception of maps as we do not re-letter these). All figures should be numbered consecutively throughout the paper. Each figure should have a caption explaining it, and this explanation should be independent of the text. Figures should not be sent by e-mail without prior consultation. Figures will not be returned unless specifically requested.

Computer-generated figures should be sent in the following formats only: EPS (from vector graphics packages such as Adobe Illustrator); TIFF and BMP (from raster graphics packages such as Adobe PhotoShop) note that the resolution must be no less than 600dpi (300 dpi for grayscale); PDF; MS-Word.

Figures in any other format should not be sent. If the figure is not available in any of these formats, a hard copy (not a photocopy) should be sent of the figure to be scanned.

Electronic copies of scanned figures should not be sent.

Color versions of figures that are to be printed in black and white should not be sent. When color has been used to indicate differences in a figure, it is highly likely that different colors (for example, blue and red) will convert to the same gray values, and that pale colors (such as yellow) will effectively disappear. In addition, black lettering which is readable against color may disappear against dark gray.

Gray tones in figures (especially maps) should be chosen so that they are distinct on the final printout. A difference of at least 15% is recommended. Line widths in figures at the final output stage should be no less than 0.2mm. Complicating figures by adding 3D effects where this is not necessary (for example, in bar charts) is not recommended. Three-D figures have much larger file sizes and tend not to print well.

Disks should be labeled clearly with the authors name and the title of the paper. Figures should be identified according to their respective numbers in the text. For example, fig1.eps, fig3.eps, especially when, say, figure 2 has not been computer generated. It should be stated which software packages have been used.

It should be noted that there is a significant difference between what appears on the screen and a laser printout. It is therefore essential to check that printouts are satisfactory before being sent.

Non-computer-generated figures (such as photographs or drawings) must be sent as originals and not as scanned copies. Hard copies for scanning (except for maps) should ideally have no lettering. Lettering on maps must be large enough to allow for reduction in print; these are not re-lettered. Photographs (or half tones) should be supplied as good quality prints on glossy paper, either in color or in black and white.

Graph lines should be made bolder than the axes. (Color printing can be undertaken but is expensive, and authors will be charged at cost.)

References

APA format is required. In text the surname of the authors and year of publication should be given. (For example: Torres (1996) or (Torres, 1996; Rodriguez, 1986); using 1996a, 1996b, etc when two or more references to the same author have the same year and et al., when a publication has more than two authors. The page number for any quotation taken from a citation

should be given. Citations should be in alphabetical order unless there is a good reason for them to be chronological (e.g., a historical overview of the subject).

At the end of the text, references should be listed in alphabetical order by author, and in ascending chronological order for each author. All authors and editors should be listed. First and last page numbers are required for journal articles and book chapters. Titles of books and journals must be given in full, and the publisher and town of publication should be given for books, conference proceedings, etc. A translation of foreign-language titles should be given in English and / or Spanish. Details of availability must be supplied for unpublished work. Any text, which cannot be obtained, even from the author, should not be included. Full addresses must be given for organizations or government departments. References to newspaper articles should have the full date, the title of the article and / or page number (preferably both), and the name of the journalist if known. Full references for legal judgments, statutes, government publications, etc., should also be provided. Full Internet addresses/URLs are needed for electronic publications.

LRC recommends these areas of interest for publication in the Academic Journal *Glossa*:

1. Psycholinguistics
 - a. psycholinguistics
 - b. language and cognition
 - c. syntactic processing
 - d. semantic processing
 - e. child language acquisition
 - f. verbal learning: paired associate, serial learning, memory, recognition
 - g. psychoacoustics/speech perception
 - h. neurolinguistics
 - i. phonological processing
 - j. morphological processing
 - k. lexical processing
 - l. bilingual language processing
 - m. speech production

2. Applied Linguistics
 - a. applied linguistics
 - b. native language pedagogy
 - c. non-native language instruction (languages other than English)
 - d. non-native language learning (languages other than English)
 - e. language testing and assessment
 - f. adult language development/literacy studies
 - g. reading readiness/acquisition
 - h. reading instruction and remediation
 - i. reading processes
 - j. reading testing
 - k. writing: instruction, acquisition, processes, and testing
 - l. bilingualism, bilingual education
 - m. translation (human generated)
 - n. English as a second/foreign language instruction
 - o. English as a second/foreign language learning

3. Phonology
 - a. phonology

4. Syntax
 - a. syntax
 - b. syntax-morphology interaction
 - c. syntax-phonology interaction
 - d. syntax-semantics interaction

5. Semantics
 - a. semantics
 - b. pragmatics
 - c. lexical semantics

6. Morphology
 - a. morphology

7. Discourse Analysis / Text Linguistics
 - a. discourse analysis
 - b. text linguistics
 - c. stylistics
 - d. corpus linguistics

8. Theory of Linguistics
 - a. linguistics pedagogy, philosophy, and theory
 - b. research design, methodology, and tools
 - c. history of linguistics
 - d. history of linguistics (general and modern)
 - e. history of linguistics (prior to 1945)

9. Anthropological Linguistics
 - a. anthropological linguistics
 - b. language and culture

10. Descriptive Linguistics
 - a. descriptive linguistics
 - b. diachronic linguistics
 - c. comparative linguistics
 - d. computational and mathematical linguistics/ machine translation
 - e. language universals
 - f. languages in contact/borrowing
 - g. language area studies
 - h. dialectology
 - i. international languages
 - j. onomastics

- k. creole/pidgin studies
 - l. paleolinguistics/ paleography
 - m. language origins
 - n. language history
11. Lexicography / Lexicology
- a. lexicography
 - b. lexicology
 - c. etymology
 - d. terminology
12. Orthography, Writing Systems
- a. orthography, writing systems
13. Language Classification
- a. typological classification
 - b. genetic classification
 - c. areal classification
14. Interpersonal Behavior, Relationships, and Communication
- a. interpersonal behavior, relationships, and communication
 - b. communication in groups
 - c. mass media/ advertising
 - d. cross-cultural communication and behavior
15. Sociolinguistics
- a. sociolinguistics
 - b. language planning/policy
 - c. language usage

16. Poetics / Literary Theory
 - a. poetics
 - b. literary criticism
 - c. literary theory
 - d. historical text studies

17. Non-verbal Communication
 - a. human non-verbal language
 - b. animal/interspecies communication
 - c. art as language
 - d. sign language

18. Semiotics
 - a. semiotics

19. Philosophy of Language
 - a. philosophy of language
 - b. logic of language

20. Phonetics
 - a. phonetics
 - b. speech synthesis/recognition

21. Hearing and Speech Physiology
 - a. hearing and speech physiology

22. Hearing - Pathological and Normal
 - a. hearing – pathological and normal

23. Language - Pathological and Normal
 - a. language and speech pathology

- b. aphasia
24. Learning Disabilities
- a. learning disabilities
 - b. reading and writing disabilities
25. Mental Retardation and Disorders
- a. mental retardation and disorders
26. Linguistics and Psychiatry
- a. linguistics and psychiatry
27. Special Education
- a. special education
 - b. hearing therapy
 - c. language and speech therapy
 - d. augmentative and alternative communication