

Guidelines for Research Articles for the Department of Economics

The following guidelines on the research articles have been prepared by Department of Economics, Ratna Rajyalaxmi Campus, Pradarshani Marga, Kathmandu, for its double-blind, peer-reviewed journal, *Economic Review of Nepal*, taking as a basis the guidelines of Humanities and Social Sciences Journal published by Ratna Rajyalaxmi Campus Research/Educational Development Project Management Committee (RMC). The research articles

- should be written in at least 3500 words or as prescribed by the standard of Editorial Board, Department of Economics, Ratna Rajyalaxmi Campus;
- should be typed in double-spaced lines, a Times New Roman 12-point font, with a 1-inch margin on all sides of the A4-size paper, by *indenting* the first line of a new paragraph by a half inch or one tab;
- should include the writer's *declaration* that the article has not been submitted or published elsewhere in any journals;
- should be sent in both *soft* copy and *print* versions for acceptance within a stipulated time without missing the deadline for its acceptance;
- should *strictly* follow the *American Psychological Association* (APA, 7th ed.) for in-text citations, references, reporting inferential statistics, statistical symbols, table formats, figure formats, and the five levels of headings;
- should be *original* and based on *current* issues, and the editors and the publisher have no responsibilities for the statements and opinions expressed by the contributors;
- should be screened for its originality test by using an *antiplagiarism* check software;
- should *contain* title, abstract, introduction, method, results, discussion, acknowledgments, references, and appendices (if necessary); and
- should include a *cover page* with the title of the article, author's name, designation, affiliation, and corresponding email address, without mentioning the author's name within the article. The *detailed formats* for research articles are given below:

Title

A title in fact summarizes the main ideas of your study, identifies the variables under your study, identifies their relationships, avoids using abbreviations, and also avoids using superfluous words, such as *a study of*, *an analysis of*, and *an investigation of*. Therefore, the title

- should be *brief*, *clear*, concise, and informative;

- should have a maximum length of *12 words*;
- should be typed with the first letter of each word in *uppercase* and the remaining letters in *lowercase*, except for proper nouns; and
- should be typed in the *center* alignment.

Abstract

An abstract comprehensively summarizes the contents of your article. A good abstract is accurate, nonevaluative, coherent and readable, and concise. Therefore, the abstract

- should be a *single paragraph* with no indentation of the first line;
- should have a maximum length of about *150–250 words*; and
- should include the *gaps* identified in the previous studies, the *objectives* to fill the gaps, major *methods*, main *findings*, and *implications* or applications, with *keywords* ranging from three to five.

Main Text

The main text—which includes the introduction, method, results, and discussion—should be organized under the following headings:

Introduction

The Introduction section *reviews* the relevant literatures in your topic areas (e.g., historical, theoretical, empirical, and policy reviews), then clearly *identifies* the knowledge gaps in these areas of research (If several studies have been already conducted on this subject area, for example, then this Introduction section says what is still lacking in these previous literatures, says how your current study differs from these earlier studies, and also says why this current study is still important and relevant.)—and also addresses the research problems or questions that previous researchers have raised but left unsolved for future studies (That is, the Introduction section shows the logical continuity between previous and your work.)—*sets objectives* to fill the gaps, *indicates* your study's significance (i.e., theoretical or practical implications and your study's importance from the perspective of plugging the gaps), *formulates* hypotheses based on the objectives, and finally *says* how your hypotheses and research design relate to one another. In brief, the Introduction section discusses the relevant related works of literatures, introduces the problem, identifies the research gap, explores the importance of the problem, sets objectives, formulates hypotheses, and finally relates the hypotheses to the research design.

Method

The Method section describes how your study was conducted. In the Method section, use simple past or present perfect tenses. This section generally includes (i) theoretical/conceptual framework, (ii) the major *demographic* (participant) characteristics for humans-related studies (both number and percentage for discrete variables like sex and race, but mean and standard deviation for continuous variables like income and savings) and the description of *locations* (study areas), (iii) the types of *sampling* methods, (iv) the target *population*, (v) the intended *sample* size and achieved sample size, including the method to determine the intended sample size, (vi) *techniques used to collect data* (in case of secondary data, a detailed explanation of how the data were accessed and what approaches were used to extract the data; That is, *ethical statement*: a clearer description of the process of obtaining permission to use and to download the data from the concerned authority if the data are not available freely), (vii) research *design*, (viii) econometric (regression) *models* with *a priori* and *a posteriori* expectations of signs of the regression coefficients if these models are used in your study, (ix) conceptual and operational definitions of the *study variables*, including their categories (such as independent, moderating, intervening or mediating, and dependent variables) used in the study, (x) statistical and econometric *tools to analyse* the data, (xi) the *tools to process* the data (e.g., EViews 12, SPSS 28, STATA 17, R-4.3.0 for Windows, Excel Microsoft 365, etc.) and the *style* (e.g., APA 7th ed.) to write your study, (xii) all methods of the data *diagnoses*, and (xiii) the details of the *reliability* and *validity* of questionnaires or scales in case of a survey or questionnaire design.

Results

In the Results or *Findings* section, you describe the data and report the results of descriptive and inferential techniques, following the order of your study objectives. Generally, the Results section consists of the following components:

- Also report statistical *nonsignificant findings* (a small effect size) even if *a priori* expectations of signs of regression coefficients and past practices demand statistically significant findings (a large effect size)—with possible reasons for obtaining these nonsignificant findings. Hence, do not hide uncomfortable findings by omission or by *cherry-picking*.
- Do not review most commonly used statistical procedures.
- At minimum, report all tested *hypotheses*, all *point* estimates, and all *interval* estimates. Use a *single* level of *significance* (e.g., $\alpha = .05$) and a single confidence

level (e.g., 95%) throughout your article. Also include the value of the test statistic, the degree of freedom, and the exact *only one* *p*-value.

- Also report estimation *problems* (e.g., regression *diagnosis* problems) and the problems with statistical *assumptions* that might affect the validity of your findings.
- Also include *transformation* and *exclusion* decisions that came from the data diagnosis.

Discussion

In the Discussion section here, you interpret (comment on, evaluate, or examine) the statistical results, in contrast to the Results section where you reported the statistical results: In fact, the Results section is a place to *report* your findings, but the Discussion section to *evaluate* your findings. The Discussion section generally includes (i) a very brief restatement of *objectives*, (ii) a summary of major *findings*, (iii) a brief restatement of *hypotheses*, (iv) *linking* findings to hypotheses, (v) the *conclusion* based on the findings and hypotheses (i.e., the conclusion in fact referring to commenting on or evaluating your findings based on your opinions and past experiences through the use of cautious, present-tense verbs, such as *seem*, *appear*, *may*, *could*, *would*, *tend to*, *is likely*, *turns out*, *suggest*, and *indicate*), (vi) *comparisons*—similarities and differences—of your conclusion with the conclusions of previous researchers and with economic theories (together with reasons), (vii) some *questions* or some *problems* that you raise and leave unresolved for the future researchers, (viii) the area for the *future research* and some *suggestions* to solve these unresolved problems, (ix) major *limitations* (e.g., sources of potential biases from the measurement of variables, inadequate sample size, sampling errors, nonsampling errors, and generalizable capacity of your findings to the target population; in case of secondary data, the secondary analysis of a survey data has several biases that—if not possible to eliminate or to reduce—should be clearly mentioned in your article as limitations) and *strengths*—the internal validity (the degree of accuracy) and the external validity (the degree of generalizable capacity across the target population)—of your findings, and (x) ending the discussion with the *significance* (i.e., uses, importance, or practical and theoretical implications) of your findings. In short, begin the discussion with a clear support or nonsupport of your hypotheses and end the discussion with the significance of your findings (i.e., the study's uniqueness, novelty, or new contributions to the exiting literatures).

Acknowledgments

Acknowledgments should be short and specific, providing information about various supports (e.g., funding, supervision, field assistance) received for the research.

References

Reference should be presented according to the APA 7th edition style with DOI or URL sources.

Appendices (if necessary)

References

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed., pp. 27–38, 41–51).

American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed., pp. 29–46, 50–60).

Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Educational research* (4th ed., pp. 330–336, 409–420). Sage.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2017). *Educational research* (10th ed., pp. 291–302). Pearson.

Sanders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2016). *Research methods for business students* (7th ed., pp. 636–643). Pearson.