



Editorial office - Naše společnost/ Czech Society
Public Opinion Research Centre
Institute of Sociology
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
Jilská 1
110 00 Prague 1, Czech Republic
tel/fax: +420 286 840 129

e-mail: redakce.ns@soc.cas.cz, <http://cvvm.soc.cas.cz/casopis/o-casopisu>

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

Naše společnost/Czech Society is a multidisciplinary journal concerned primarily with the topic of public opinion, further also with sociology, political science, demography, economics, media studies, historiography and other social science disciplines. The journal is published twice a year in print and electronic formats by the Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. It was founded in 2003 and has been peer-reviewed since 2007.

The journal has a peer-reviewed section (original research and scientific papers) and a non-reviewed section (information, book reviews and commentaries). These two sections are distinguished by different layout properties, formal and graphical features.

The preparation and publication of the journal are governed by the following Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement, which is binding for authors, the Editor-in-Chief and other editors, reviewers, members of the Editorial Board and the publisher. Compliance with the Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement is the responsibility of the Editor-in-Chief and is subject to review by the Editorial Board.

1. Authors' responsibilities and authorship

Originality and plagiarism

By submitting a text for peer review in *Naše společnost/Czech Society* the authors declare that they have written the text themselves or with the contribution of persons whose contribution is clearly specified in the text. By submitting a text the authors further declare that their work does not infringe any copyright or violate any proprietary or other rights. If any violation of rights is discovered, the Editor-in-Chief and the publisher are obliged to take all measures against unfair practices, copyright infringement and plagiarism, and to publish corrections, clarifications, or apologies when needed.

Authorship of the paper

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made a significant contribution should be listed as co-authors.



Editorial office - Naše společnost/ Czech Society
Public Opinion Research Centre
Institute of Sociology
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
Jilská 1
110 00 Prague 1, Czech Republic
tel/fax: +420 286 840 129

e-mail: redakce.ns@soc.cas.cz, <http://cvvm.soc.cas.cz/casopis/o-casopisu>

Multiple or concurrent publication

The authors declare that their paper has not been submitted for review to another journal or previously published unless an agreement with the Editor-in-Chief stipulates otherwise.

Acknowledgement of sources

The authors declare that any and all sources used have been properly cited in accordance with copyright and research ethics. If the authors have used the work and/or words of others, they shall ensure that this is appropriately cited or quoted. The authors shall cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the work reported.

Conflict of interest disclosure

The authors shall disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantial interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretations reported in their manuscript.

Copyright to accepted manuscripts

By signing the mandatory *license agreement*, the authors grant and assign to the publisher (SOÚ AV ČR, v.v.i.) the copyright to the article, which is protected by Act no. 121/2000 Coll., on Copyright and Rights Related to Copyright and on Amendments to Certain Acts (the Copyright Act) in the Czech Republic.

Participation in the review process

The authors are obliged to participate in the peer review process and to correct mistakes.

2. Reviewers' responsibilities and peer review

Naše společnost/Czech Society is a peer-reviewed academic journal. The peer review process is considered key to ensuring the quality of the journal and maintaining a high standard for published works. It is set to be as objective, quick, and practical as possible.

Qualification

To review a paper, the Editor-in-Chief in cooperation with the editorial team shall select experts on the topic of the paper. A reviewer who feels unqualified to review the manuscript received should inform the Editor-in-Chief promptly and decline the review request.



Integrity of blind review

The Editor-in-Chief shall be responsible for preserving the authors' and the reviewers' anonymity through a double-blind review process.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

The Editor-in-Chief shall make sure that the reviewers are not in close working, institutional or personal relations with the authors. A reviewer should decline the review request if in conflict of interest. Should a reviewer discover any copyright infringement or have any suspicion of plagiarism, they are obliged to notify the Editor-in-Chief.

Standards of objectivity

Each reviewer shall complete a report stating whether they recommend that the paper be accepted, revised or rejected. In the attached reviewer report, they shall substantiate their recommendation and suggest any modifications to the text. The reviewer should give his/her statement clearly and objectively, avoiding personal criticism and subjectivity. All comments and suggestions from the reviewers should be followed by supporting arguments.

Confidentiality

The reviewers are obliged to keep all received manuscripts in strict confidentiality and must not use them to their personal advantage.

Promptness

Any selected reviewer who knows that a prompt review will be impossible should notify the Editor-in-Chief and withdraw from the review process.

3. Editorial responsibilities

Publication decisions

The Editor-in-Chief shall have the responsibility and authority to reject a paper before peer review if he/she deems that it does not meet the basic requirements of a scientific text, including any form of plagiarism, or it clearly lies outside the research fields of public opinion research, sociology, political science, demography, media studies, economics, historiography or related social sciences, or it addresses a subject so narrow (geographically or in terms of research focus) that publication in



Editorial office - Naše společnost/ Czech Society
Public Opinion Research Centre
Institute of Sociology
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
Jilská 1
110 00 Prague 1, Czech Republic
tel/fax: +420 286 840 129

e-mail: redakce.ns@soc.cas.cz, <http://cvvm.soc.cas.cz/casopis/o-casopisu>

a specialist journal is justified instead. The Editor-in-Chief has the right to recommend changes to the language, form or content of the manuscript prior to peer review.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

All submitted manuscripts will be considered for publication free of charge. The Editor-in-Chief should have no conflict of interest with respect to the authors whose article he/she intends to reject. In such cases the responsibility and authority shall be transferred to a substitute editor. The peer review process is organized purely with respect to the intellectual content of the paper without any regard to the author's gender, social class, sexual orientation, religious denomination, ethnicity, citizenship or political opinion.

Confidentiality

In order to achieve the highest level of objectivity and copyright protection in the review process, the editors must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript or its author to anyone other than the corresponding author and the reviewers (including potential ones).

Description of the peer review process

Manuscripts submitted for publication are presented for review to at least two reviewers. In view of the content of the reviews, the Editor-in-Chief shall notify the author whether he/she accepts the paper, accepts it with revisions, or rejects it. If the manuscript requires revisions or has been rejected, the author shall be informed of the primary reasons for this. Upon revision, the Editor-in-Chief shall first decide whether a paper has been revised adequately. If this condition is not met, he/she may return the paper for further revision. Where it can be proven that the author has eliminated any and all major problems identified in the peer review, the Editor-in-Chief may accept the paper without any further ado.

Papers which were rejected by both reviewers shall not be published. Papers which were rejected by one of the reviewers (while accepted with or without revisions by the other one) shall be reviewed in the second round by a third reviewer, or by one of the two original reviewers if justified (e.g. by a lack of specialists for a narrow topic). After the second round of review, the Editor-in-Chief shall propose acceptance, revision or rejection depending on the content of the reviews. The third round of peer review is not allowed, unless an exception is justified.



Editorial office - Naše společnost/ Czech Society
Public Opinion Research Centre
Institute of Sociology
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
Jilská 1
110 00 Prague 1, Czech Republic
tel/fax: +420 286 840 129

e-mail: redakce.ns@soc.cas.cz, <http://cvvm.soc.cas.cz/casopis/o-casopisu>

In the event that an author does not find any recommendations made by the reviewers to be justified, he/she can explain his/her position in a letter to the Editor-in-Chief; subsequent reviewers shall familiarize themselves with the content of such a letter, as shall the Editorial Board during the final discussion of the paper. All final acceptance or rejection decisions shall be made by the Editor-in-Chief. If an author does not agree with the decision of the Editor-in-Chief, the author may explain his/her reasons in an appeal which the Editor-in-Chief shall present to the Editorial Board.

The final acceptance or rejection decision shall be submitted for approval to the Editorial Board. Members of the Editorial Board have the right to consult manuscripts submitted to the editorial staff, including those rejected before review by the Editor-in-Chief. Unpublished manuscripts must not be used for any purpose by the Editors, and must be kept strictly confidential.

Length of the review process

The review process typically takes six weeks from the date on which a version of the manuscript deemed acceptable for review is received at the journal's official email address. The journal shall make every effort to ensure that the six-week limit is adhered to, but takes no responsibility for delays caused by the reviewers.

4. Editorial office and Editorial Board

Editorial work is ensured by the Public Opinion Research Center (CVVM), Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. Publication is ensured by CVVM in cooperation with the Press and Publications Department. In order to meet high standards of scientific research and ensure high quality of the published material, the Editorial Board shall be comprised of social science experts. The Editorial Board shall have at least seven members, the majority of whom shall not be internal employees. The Editorial Board shall formulate and approve the concept and the strategy of the journal and discuss and approve the content of each issue.

5. Publication ethics issues

Conflict of interest

The Editor-in-Chief and the publisher should preclude any business interests from compromising the journal's intellectual and ethical standards. They shall have the responsibility to maintain the integrity of its academic record and ensure the quality of the material published.



Editorial office - Naše společnost/ Czech Society
Public Opinion Research Centre
Institute of Sociology
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
Jilská 1
110 00 Prague 1, Czech Republic
tel/fax: +420 286 840 129

e-mail: redakce.ns@soc.cas.cz, <http://cvvm.soc.cas.cz/casopis/o-casopisu>

Fundamental errors in published works

Whenever it is recognized that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence. If, after an appropriate investigation, an item proves to be fraudulent, it should be retracted. Such a retraction should be clearly identifiable to readers and indexing systems. The editors should always be open to publishing corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.