

Cj.278.114/15-Ú

In Prague 25/5/2015

## **Directive No. 26**

### **The ethical code of the publishing house of the IIR**

#### *1. Introduction*

##### 1.1

The publishing house of the IIR publishes only scholarly books whose high quality is ensured by the two-round review procedure. The review procedure and assessment of manuscripts must therefore be thorough, impartial and fair.

##### 1.2

The ethical code describes rules of ethical behaviour for all who take part in the review procedure and assessment of manuscripts. Authors of manuscripts, the editorial board, the editorial staff and reviewers are obliged to follow the rules defined in this ethical code.

#### *2. Authors*

##### 2.1

Each manuscript submitted for a professional assessment must be an original work. A manuscript submitted to the IIR publishing house must not be published or accepted for publishing by another publishing house, whether in Czech or another language. However, manuscript may contain articles that were already published in scholarly journals, collections, monographies, etc. and unpublished master's thesis, doctoral and habilitation work of excellent quality. An author must not submit a manuscript that is subject to assessment in another publishing house or send the manuscript to another publishing house if the concerned manuscript is being assessed at the publishing house of the IIR.

##### 2.2

A manuscript must be free of plagiarism, falsifying, fabrications and severe omissions. An author is obliged to refer to the work of other authors if he/she uses the literal wording of a part of their text or paraphrases their ideas. Plagiarism in all its forms represents unethical publication behaviour, and it is unacceptable. If an author uses in his/her manuscript a text from another work by him/her in its original literal wording, then this text must be enclosed in quotation marks as a quotation. Nevertheless, an author should avoid excessive citation of his/her own works. If plagiarism or auto-plagiarism (repeated publishing of one's own work) should occur, the manuscript shall be rejected, and the author may be further prohibited from publishing in the publishing house of the IIR in the future.

## 2.3

An author is to publish the entire outcome of his/her research. He/she should avoid omissions of any data or literature that is relevant to his/her research question. All starting points, assumptions, theories, methods or procedures which were used in pursuing a research goal and for concluding interpretations must be explicitly stated in the text.

## 2.4

Persons who significantly participated on the research and in the creation of the manuscript must be listed as co-authors. Persons who partially participated in the creation of the manuscript (by gathering data, coding data or providing comments) should be mentioned in the book (in the introduction, an editorial note, an acknowledgment or a colophon).

## 2.5

Manuscripts aspiring to publication in the publishing house of the IIR are reviewed in a review procedure. Authors are to incorporate the feedback, reservations and recommendations of the reviewers into their manuscripts in time according to the agreed deadlines. If an author is not able to meet a deadline, he/she is to inform an assistant of the publishing house of the IIR and ask for its prolongation as soon as possible.

## 2.6

The Institute of the International Relations is the holder of the copyrights for all publications published in its publishing house.

# 3. *Editorial board*

## 3.1

Within the framework of the review procedure a manuscript is assessed by two reviewers, who are renowned professionals whose professional profiles correspond with the manuscript that is being assessed. Reviewers are approved by the editorial board on the basis of a suggestion by the author or the editorial staff. The professional profiles of the reviewers always correspond with the empirical, theoretical and/or methodological approach of the manuscript under assessment. The reviewers who assess the manuscript should come, if the conditions allow for it, from different institutions than the IIR, they should not come from the same institution, and at least one of them must be from a different institution than that of the author/authors.

## 3.2

The editorial board assesses the reviews of the professional reviewers only according to their academic quality without any ideological bias or personal preferences. The editorial board pursues theoretical and methodological plurality; however, it simultaneously expects that the manuscripts will be of an adequate academic quality, valuable and accessible to readers. Each member of the editorial board may ask the editorial staff for an original manuscript, its final version, etc.

# 4. *Editorial staff*

## 4.1

An assistant sends the obtained external reviews to the author for the purpose of alteration of the text according to the reviewers' recommendations and objections. After the final version of the manuscript

has been submitted to the editorial staff, the reviews are sent to a scientific board, and it is expected that at this point, the reviews have been taken into account by the author. The editorial staff is obliged to adequately explain to the author any decision concerning his/her manuscript.

## 5. Reviewers

### 5.1

Providing reviews for the publishing house of the IIR is beneficial for the author, the IIR and the academic community itself as well. The publishing house appreciates the time and energy which reviewers devote to writing a review for the publishing house. Reviewers must refuse to provide a review for a manuscript with which they have a real or potential conflict of interests (for instance, in case the reviewer is a supervisor or an opponent of the author's dissertation thesis, or the reviewer has already commented on a text of the manuscript in the past).

### 5.2

Reviewers are to assess manuscripts impartially, fairly and professionally. The reviewers must be honest with the author if they have doubts regarding the quality of the manuscript. It is expected that the reviewers adequately explain their recommendations and provide the author with an appropriate number of comments and, eventually, recommendations. The reviewers must write and submit their reviews in time according to the agreed deadline. If a reviewer is not able to follow an agreed deadline, he/she will inform the editorial staff about this as soon as possible, and they will decide whether the term shall be extended or whether another reviewer will be chosen.

## 6. Final provisions

### 6.1

The ethical code summarises and formalises the current practise of the publishing house of the IIR. In formalising the code we were inspired by the following sources:

Eden, Lorraine–Cantwell, John (2010): *Code of Ethics: Journal of International Business Studies*, 18. 9. 2010. On-line: <[http://www.palgrave-journals.com/jibs/jibs\\_ethics\\_code.html](http://www.palgrave-journals.com/jibs/jibs_ethics_code.html)>.

Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy ČR (2005): *Etický rámec výzkumu*. Prague: Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy. On-line: <<http://www.msmt.cz/files/pdf/ATIIIIVlastnimaterial.pdf>>.

Ústav mezinárodních vztahů (2010): *Etický kodex výzkumu v Ústavu mezinárodních vztahů*. Prague: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů.

### 6.2

The directive shall become mandatory on 1/6/2015.

Doc. Mgr. Ing. Petr Kratochvíl, Ph.D.

Director of the IIR