**Instructions for authors**

Published manuscript may comprise an empirical study using an acceptable research strategy, such as survey, case study, experiment, archival analysis, etc. It may contain a theoretical study aimed at advancing current theory or adapting theory to local conditions or it may arise from theoretical studies aimed at reviewing and/or synthesizing existing theory. Concepts and underlying principles should be emphasized, with enough background information to orient any reader who is not a specialist in the particular subject area. Moreover, please keep in mind, that review study will not be accepted in the conference proceedings. However, review study can be presented in the poster section of the conference.

The manuscript should be focused on at least one of the following topics:

* theory and methodology of pedagogy and education;
* theory and methodology of science;
* human resources and human relations management;
* knowledge management and knowledge engineering;
* systems engineering and information engineering - applications in education and/or science;
* quantitative methods for education and/or science.

**General information**

* All manuscripts are accepted only in English. If the authors are not native speakers, we strongly recommend using proofreading services. This would avoid negative comments from the reviewers´. Consequently, high level of language quality can avoid delays in the review process.
* A typical manuscript should be up to 7 pages in total (including tables, figures and footnotes). Extra fee of 20 EUR or 500 CZK per additional page is required. Moreover, manuscripts that significantly exceed these limits will be critically reviewed with respect to the length.
* A typical manuscript should consist of following sections: Title, Abstract, Keywords, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, Acknowledgements (if necessary), References, and Appendix (if necessary).
* The title of the article should have max to 80 characters including spaces.
* Abstract should be between 100 and 150 words in length.
* Paper should have 4 – 6 key words or phrases in alphabetical order, separated by commas.
* Introduction must provide a short review of the current state in the area of the manuscript objective. The author(s) should refer to significant sources, particularly scientific journals and conference proceedings listed in the Web of Science (WoS), Scopus or ERIH databases. We also appreciate references to the ERIE conference proceedings from the previous years and the ERIES Journal.
* The Introduction should have clear structure leading to the main problem statement (objective of the manuscript). Finish this section with a simple description how the manuscript is divided in sections.
* Materials and methods must contain method(s) used for research. Furthermore, the author(s) must describe materials or data used in research. More importantly, if the manuscript stems from the author(s) previous work(s), describe this point here shortly as well.
* Results should describe the author(s) main findings and achieved goals according to the described materials and methods in the previous section. Results should be clearly structured and must answer the main objective stated at the end of Introduction. There is no exact limit for the length of this section. The author(s) should present all relevant findings with regard to their research.
* Discussion is one of the most important parts of the manuscript. The author(s) must compare their findings with other relevant researches within the field. The author(s) must discuss the applicability, pros and cons of the achieved results and if a problem was stated or discovered, how this problem can be solved.
* Conclusion should summarize the manuscript and stress the important point(s) of it. Moreover, the author(s) may conclude with topic(s) for the future work. Conclusion should not exceed more than a half of a page.
* Please do not mention Acknowledgement(s) in the main document. All details required by any funding and grant-awarding agencies must be only mentioned in the metadata for your paper (available during the paper submitting to editorial management system).

**Style guidelines**

* Please use text font Times New Roman of the size 12, single spacing and justified.
* Text should be simple one-column text.
* Do not number chapters, for the chapter titles use bold text, size 13 and for the sub-section titles use bold text, size 12. If the author(s) need another level of sub-sections, then the author(s) should use bold text, italic, and size 12.
* Author(s) should use italics for emphasis. Do not number pages or use page headers and footers.

**Tables and figures**

* All tables and figures must be numbered continuously as they appeared in the text. All tables and figures must be referred in the text and titled as follows (do not write the square parenthesis): Table 1: [name of the table, year(s) captured in the data], (reference if necessary), and Figure 1: [name of the figure, year(s) captured in the data], (reference if necessary).
* Title should be Times New Roman font of size 11, as well as the text inside table(s) or figure(s).
* Author(s) should bear in mind that the conference proceedings is printed in size A5, monochrome print (no colours). Therefore, please use the colours only in greyscale. Please, ensure whether all your figures are readable according to such conditions.
* Please do not use in the manuscript expressions such as: “above” or “below”; when referring to used table(s) and figure(s). Table(s) and figure(s) can be moved higher or lower in the text during the final formatting by the Technical editor. Author(s) should always refer directly using caption of table(s) or figure(s).
* If the manuscript includes large table(s) or figure(s), then the author(s) can place them in the Appendix.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alternative | Costs | Benefits |
| Alternative 1 | 12 | 20 |
| Alternative 2 | 14 | 17 |
| Alternative 3 | 8 | 15 |

**Table 1: The name of the table, 2000-2012 (source: own calculation)**



**Figure 1: The name of the figure, 2000-2012 (source: Adair, 1988)**

**Equations**

* Equation(s) should be inserted in invisible tables for alignment, see example below. Each equation(s) need to be numbered, use bold numbers in thin parenthesis on the right side. All equations must be numbered continuously and referred in the text as well. Equation(s) are referred in text by its number in parentheses.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| http://erie.pef.czu.cz/Images/vzorec.jpg | (1) |

* We recommend using MS Word's integrated equation editor.

**References**

* References have to be alphabetically ordered and each reference has to be mentioned in the text as a continuous quotation and vice versa.
* The author(s) should check their references according to misspelled names, and years.
* **When the cited items have DOIs (Digital Object Identifier), author(s) must add DOI persistent links to the regular references. The persistent links should be active.**
* The author(s) may retrieve articles’ DOIs at: [**http://www.crossref.org/guestquery/**](http://www.crossref.org/guestquery/)
* The Harvard referencing convention is required as follows:
* Referencing in the text:
	+ In case of only one author: “Shopova (2014) states that digital literacy must be considered as a situated practice.“
	+ Direct quote from a book or journal article with one author: “Regarding the digital literacy Shopova (2014: 30) states that ´digital literacy must be considered as a situated practice´.” or “Regarding the digital literacy ´ digital literacy must be considered as a situated practice´ (Shopova, 2014: 30).”
	+ Direct quote from a book or journal article with two authors: “Fischer and Lipovská (2014: 48) states that ´Humanities and Social sciences spend less than 14.5 hours studying during the workweek´.” or “Regarding the study workload ´Humanities and Social sciences spend less than 14.5 hours studying during the workweek´ (Fischer and Lipovská, 2014: 48).”
	+ Direct quote from a book or journal article with three authors: “Flégl, Vostrá Vydrová and Tichá (2014: 73) conclude that with regard to a university level, ‘all PhD students are dissatisfied with their research results’.” or “‘PhD students are dissatisfied with their research results’ with regard to a university level (Flégl, Vostrá Vydrová and Tichá, 2014: 73).”
	+ Direct quote from a book or journal article with more than three authors: “Stasiak-Betlejewska et al (2014: 47) point out that ‘well-equipped laboratories can be a source of both students’ and teachers’ skills development’.”
* Creating a reference list:
	+ Book with one author: “Krejci, I. (2000) *How to write good references: Few steps for excellence*, Prague: ERIES Publishing.”
	+ Book with two authors: “Krejci, I. and Flégl, M. (2005) *Avoiding doubts in reference styles*, Prague: ERIE Publishing.”
	+ Book with three or more authors: “Houška, M., Krejci, I. and Flégl, M. (1997) *To become a master in your research: motivation is the essential*, Brno: University Press.”
	+ Book – second or later edition: “Krejci, I. (2000) *How to write good references: Few steps for excellence*, 2nd edition, Prague: ERIES.”
	+ Book by same authors in the same year: “Krejci, I. and Flégl, M. (2005a) *Avoiding doubts in references styles*, Prague: ERIE Publishing.” and “Krejci, I. and Flégl, M. (2005b) Handle your references correctly, Brno: ERIES Press.”
	+ Book with an editor: “Houška, M. (ed.) (2015) *Quality discussion must be the basis of your research: Three important steps*, Prague: ERIES Publishing.”
	+ Books with an anonymous or unknown author: “*The structure of your manuscript* (2005) Olomouc: K&F Publishing.”
	+ Journal article: “Rauchová, T. and Houška, M. (2013) ‘Efficiency of Knowledge Transfer Through Knowledge Texts: Statistical Analysis’, *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 46-60. http://dx.doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2013.060105”
* In case of any doubts see the full description of the Harvard referencing convention at <http://www.ex.ac.uk/dll/studyskills/harvard_referencing.htm>

**Ethics guidelines**

* The ERIE conference is committed to the highest ethics standards. All authors, reviewers, and editors are required to follow the ERIE conference ethical principles. Please see the responsibilities for editors, author(s) and reviewers in the menu “Ethics Guidelines”. In case of any doubts do not hesitate to contact the organization committee of the ERIE conference (erie@pef.czu.cz).
* Any report of possible ethics conflicts is a major issue for the ERIE conference. All ethics conflicts reported by reviewer(s), editor(s) or reader(s) will be immediately investigated by the Editors of the ERIE conference. If misconduct has been committed the accepted manuscript will be withdrawn. In addition, the author(s) may be excluded from having any future manuscript reviewed by the ERIE conference.

**Submission**

* Please ensure that the manuscript is carefully formatted according to the instructions described above. Special attention is paid to the exact application of the Harvard referencing convention to both continuous citations and list of references.
* Manuscript must be closely scrutinized for typographical and grammatical errors. If English is not author’s first language then the paper should be proof-read by a native English-speaking person, preferably one with experience of writing for academic use. Spelling should follow the Oxford English Dictionary.
* Manuscripts are submitted via the editorial system in the DOC or DOCX format.

**Review procedure**

* The submitted manuscript is submitted to a double-blind peer review process before publication. Please ensure that the author(s) names do not appear in the submitted manuscript.
* Reviewer’s overall recommendation can be as follows:
	+ Accept the paper. The paper is forwarded to the Programme Committee to be accepted for publication in the conference proceedings, no changes are required.
	+ Accept the paper with a minor revision. The paper is returned to the author to do some small corrections, rather technical than in contents.
	+ Accept the paper with a major revision. The paper is returned to the author to improve the quality of the paper significantly.
	+ Reject the paper. If both reviewers select this option, the paper will not be published in the conference proceedings.
* Reviewers’ suggestion(s) and comment(s) as well as other comment(s) by a supervising Programme Committee Member will be available in the conference submission system. The corresponding author will be informed by e-mail as soon as the review process finishes. If a revision is required, the author(s) should submit a revised version of the manuscript through the submission system again. If a reviewer requires evaluating the revised version of the paper, it is reviewer´s right to reject the manuscript in the second or further round of the evaluation.
* The revised version of the manuscript should be accompanied by another file, where the author(s) replies to all reviewers’ comments and describes all changes in the paper (see the template of the Replies to reviewers' in the Download section). It is author’s right to refuse some reviewers’ comment(s); in this case, author(s) has to clarify his/her viewpoint(s) in this accompanying file, too.