ETHIOPIAN SPORT ACADEMY

Research Policy and Guidelines

Prepared by:

Dr. Amensisa Kebede (Assistant Professor)
Dr. Tefera Tadesse (Associate Professor)
Dr. Sisay Mengestu (Associate Professor)
Instructor Yibeltal Mersha
Dr. Abera Ayenew (Assistant Professor)

Table of Contents   Page

Chapter One:
The Need for a Research Policy in Ethiopian Sports Sector

1.1.   Introduction

Governments play an active and crucial role in developing and supporting the sporting life of their nations. This is true both at the high-performance level for elite athletes and community sport level for people of all ages and abilities. Few governments, however, make intentional and active use of sport on a large scale as a tool for advancing their domestic and international development and peace objectives. The importance of sport and recreation is recognized worldwide reflected in policy, such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 1990). Accordingly, research in sport advances coaching practices, commercialization in sport, culture and society.

The study of sport, culture and society is no longer a young and naive area of academic study and research. Generation after generation, sport experts, sociologists and historians have raised classical sociological and historical questions in relation to sport's organization, its distribution and the part it has played in the allocation and exercise of power. The potential eclectic coverage of ideas together with a sound grasp of sport itself provide for a stimulating avenue not only to developing sport, but also for analyzing, demystifying it and ultimately attempting to contribute to produce elite athlete that change images of the nation, commercializing sport, social and political change and intervention in the world in which we live in.

Today, the importance of sport and recreation programs is recognized worldwide. Article 31 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child states that, children have the right to engage in play and recreation activities (United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 1990). In the same manner sport is considered by the UN as an ultimate tool for more than six of the millennium Development goals. Consequently, the sports industry is becoming increasingly global with respect to conventional and new media distribution fronts. Despite the tremendous growth, the sports industry has not been well represented on many academic fronts, including research in the top academic journals. This is particularly true in the area of research benefiting academicians in training centers, business schools and sports industry business professionals. There has been a lack of relevant business research concerning the sports industry. A wide gap

exists between the business research on sports performed by major universities and the needs of the industry. As the sports industry grows, the teams, facilities, and other assets significantly increase in value and the domestic and international issues facing the industry become more complex. Closing this gap becomes urgent and more important.

Sport can be a valuable tool to advance international assistance priorities. Many governments of developing nations consider integrating sport for development and peace into poverty reduction strategies and national development frameworks. Sport can be an effective tool for advancing many of the development objectives reflected in strategic documents. This requires that sector-wide approaches and policy frameworks agreed by developing country governments and donor partners opt for an inclusive approach to sport. In a study on the status of sports development in fourteen African nations, Krotee and Waters (1998) compared African countries with developed nations on seven factor components of the National Sports Development Index (NSDI): objectives, legislation, organization, implementation, physical resources, research and evaluation and human resources. They concluded that African nations lagged behind in the overall NSDI score and noted greater differences between African and developed nations in terms of implementing sports programs, building and maintaining physical resources (i.e. facilities and equipment), conceiving, generating, and disseminating research and evaluation for each of the domains of sport. It is not surprising that African nations have lagged, given the limited provision of resources for sports development in most nations, and the relative poverty of African countries.

Without an inclusive approach, national scale-up of effective sports programs may be difficult. In this sense, Ethiopia lacks such a strong research activity and policy. Apart from the individual and experts' efforts in the area, getting an institutional attempt in the work and support of the country's sport with scientific research outcomes is scarce. Also, research policy in the area of sport has been a neglected component in the development of the country's sport. Therefore, the development of a complete research policy is one of the key responsibilities of the Ethiopian Sports Academy research directorate.

Because contexts vary across countries and within countries largely based on differences in the policy objectives and target populations involved, there are no one-size-fits-all policies or approaches that governments can adopt with regard to sport policy. Each government must

undertake its own consultations and analysis to determine where sport can be used effectively to achieve governmental objectives and how best to do this. Governments can, however, build on the lessons learned from other governments already making use of sport in this way. Similarly, organizations are expected to design their own policy in a way of achieving their missions. Since the Ethiopian sports academy mainly works toward meeting the needs of youth athletes as elite successors and scientific support in sport training for different federations and sport events, the current research policy gives larger platform as well multiple strategies that initiate to achieve its goals and missions.

1.1.1. *The Aacademy*

Ethiopian Sport Academy is a center of excellence in sports established by Ethiopian Council of Ministers Regulation No 249/2011. The Academy constitutes two training campuses. The main campus, which constitutes a total of 24.4 hectares of land, is situated in Addis Ababa, Bole Sub City, and Woreda 03. Athlete Tirunesh Dibaba Sports Training Centre is the second training campus located in Assela town, 170 kms East of Addis Ababa. The Assela campus is founded in 2009 and is currently offering training to youth in Football and Athletics. The main campus, which was founded in 2013 is currently offering training in ten sports such as Football, Basketball, Volleyball, Athletics, Paralympics, Table Tennis, Swimming, World Taekwondo, Box and Cycling. The Academy has plans to include other sports events in its curricula.

1.1.2. *Rationale*

The Academy is envisaging to formulate Sport Research Policy (SRP), identify, define, evaluate and determine enabling policy environments and factors through studies. Bestowed by the Mandate provided by the law an analysis of the Academy internal environment has been conducted. To this end, objectives and duties of the Academy as provided by law and Strategic Plan of the Academy which define Vision, Mission, Strategic Goals and Objectives of the Academy have been analyzed. Results of analyses revealed that the Academy is involved in scientific research:

➢ To provide standardized trainings to its immediate internal targets (youth trainees), and sector targets (sports professionals).

➢ To conduct researches in different sports disciplines and issues.

- ➢ To develop the national occupational standards of sports and sports training curricula.
- ➢ To provide research consultancy services to the government and local organizations.
- ➢ To establish relations with both local and foreign sports training and research institutions.
- ➢ To widely disseminate research works and build the application of research outputs.

The Academy is, therefore required by law to be center of excellence in sports training and research, as provided in its vision statement, to satisfy not only the needs of its immediate targets in the development of elite athlete, but also the needs of the sector and cross-sector partners through local and international collaboration.

1.1.3. Research policy, current situations, sport sector analysis and need

Currently the country as a nation and more specifically the academy currently lacks an up-to-date research policy that encompasses the introduced Ethiopian Sport Science Journal (EJSS) online and print disseminations and standard researches works to be:-

- ➢ Demand driven and More problem solving
- ➢ Support Professionals and Athletes Training problems scientifically and progressively
- ➢ Use efficient use of skilled manpower, experts and economy
- ➢ Acceptable and locally and internationally widely indexed journal System
- ➢ Contribute for the quality of research in education and industry innovations
- ➢ Collaborative works and international agreements
- ➢ committed to promoting ethical practices in research,
- ➢ Diversifications in research areas

Accordingly, in order to meet and exceed the quality and standard requirements of trainees, and stakeholders, this Research policy analysis the following advantages that can be improved by scientific research:

- • Creating a competent, motivated, adaptable, and innovative sport professional, for the country, which can contribute to sport development
- • Facilitating demand-driven, high quality problem solving scientific researches and applicable for training relevance of all sectors and the stakeholders.
- • Undertake research on local, national, and international issues and problems.

- Create national and international links
- Offering research-led diversified programmes that are relevant to the country
- Prepare country representative athletes with the necessary theoretical and practical knowledge

The findings above have therefore implied that any research endeavors and thus the SRP should be an entity in the broader context of the macro (socio-political and economic) enabling policy environments of the nation. The recognition by the Federal Democratic Republic Ethiopia (FDRE) Constitution that the nations, nationalities and peoples of Ethiopia are Supreme Authority to determine their future with due respect of the socio- cultural diversity of the peoples of Ethiopia, provides fertile ground to exploit indigenous sports skills, knowledge, natural and cultural tendencies, and potentials of each and all communities of the nation.

Government's Vision to achieve a middle-class economy and beyond under a developmental democracy political–economy system through synergetic transformation of all developmental sectors of the country, including the sports sector, also calls for the modernization of the Sector. To enable the actors of the public wing of the sector such as sports associations and societies to assume leading role in diversifying and expanding sports events and to realize community-based sports organization, as provided in the FDRE Sports Policy, desires modern management and organizational system.

To develop sport as an alternative investment opportunity and to boost economic contribution of the sector calls for linking the academia and the private sector is vital. The growing number of sports infrastructures and the inclusion of sports different disciplines in the undergraduate and postgraduate programs of several universities call for interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research endeavors.

The findings above have implied the dual nature of the sports sector as having both social and economic sectorial features. It is therefore the belief of the Academy that as the first Academy specializing in different sports disciplines shall be required to assume its role as a leading and center of excellence in sports training, research and consultancy through inter–sector and cross–sector as well as international collaboration. Therefore, the formulation of the first ESARP which may possibly and gradually evolve as a national policy document is justified.

1.1.4. *Tasks and Responsibilities*

- Develop sports occupational standards and training curriculum and implement same upon accreditation by the ministry of education;

- Recruit, enroll and train trainees based on the demands of the regions, the Ethiopian Olympic Committee, the national sports federations and international best practices;

- Recruit, enroll and train children from regions and produce highly qualified and competitive young sport persons who are physically, mentally and socially fit for national and international competitions;

- Facilitate trainees to continue and become effective in their regular education besides the sport training program;

- Enable the trainees to participate, in various, in the country's socio-economic development and democratization process;

- Provide short term and continuing capacity building training according to the established occupational standards in coaching, sport management, sport medicine, sport rules and other sport related disciplines, and award certificates and diplomas for trainees who pass the assessment of competence;

- Conduct research in different sport disciplines;

- Provide consultancy and training services with and charge;

- Establish relations with the local and foreign sport training and research institutions and other organization having similar objective;

- Own property, enter into contracts, sue and be sued in its own name;

- Carry out such other related activities which are necessary for the attainment of its objectives.

1.1.5. *Research Gaps and Topics*

Currently, there is a dire need for research in Ethiopian sports sector to address the existing problems. In this regard, research needs to be practical and applicable immediately to the current problems. Accordingly, Experimental and Applied researches are more encouraged.

Hence, research shall endeavor and increase training in sports talent and development towards the elite level. Generally, research activities in sport, coaching sciences, exercise, talent identification, athlete development, Sport for development, Sport leadership and functioning,

training physiology, sport organizations, Sport economy and financing, sport and peace, nutrition, psychological variables and other related themes will be envisaged as desired.

1.1.6. *Guiding Principles for Policy Formulation*

The formulation of the SRP shall be based on the following principles.

- The Ethiopian Sports Academy is a governmental sports Academy. As a Government executing academic institution, the Academy is responsible to the Government and nations, nationalities and peoples of Ethiopia. Therefore, the Academy shall ensure that the overall organization and management of the research policy is community based.
- The Academy, through the research policy shall have responsibility to promote sport and to enhance sports contribution to the socio-political and Socio-Economic progress of the country. Towards this end, the Academy has envisaged that it shall be a center of excellence in sports trainings and research.
- We also believe that as the first Academy in Ethiopia, specializing in Sport training and research we shall aim to play a leading role in Olympic Sports and research through the collaboration of all partners, sector or cross sector, local or foreign towards producing and implementing practical and problem solving research outputs.

1.1.7. *Objectives of the Academy*

The Academy is entrusted to achieve the following objectives:

1. To produce physically and mentally competent and ethically sound young sport elites for national and international competitions;
2. To render capacity building training for professionals in different sport fields,
3. To conduct research and studies which contribute to the quality of different sport disciplines and disseminate the results thereof;
4. To serve as a center of excellence for different sport disciplines at the national level.

1.1.8. *Vision and Mission of the Academy*

To realize the objectives and duties given by law, the Academy has formulated the first strategic plan (2005 – 2008 E.C). The Strategic plan has defined Vision and Mission of the Academy.

Academy's Vision

To envisage the Academy by 2012 E.C as standardized and Africa's leading center of excellence of all-time blue-ribbon athletes and successful professionals in various sports in a long-standing pipeline.

Academy's Mission

Producing victorious athletes and capable professionals through the provision of research-based training to youngsters possessing exceptional talent so as to enable them to become competent & effective in both national and international contests.

1.1.9. Policy Objectives

General Objectives

Implement a sports research policy under coordinated direction through the participation of all internal, sectorial and cross-sect oral and foreign stakeholders to work out scientific methods:

- To produce elite athletes and build capacity of sports professionals through the provision of research-based trainings.
- To conduct research in different sports disciplines and disseminate the results thereof
- To ensure mass participation of sports.
- To boost sports investment opportunities and sport's mobilizing factor in activating other economic sectors to finally enhance the socio-economic contribution of the sector.

Specific objectives

- To ensure that research endeavors emanate from the mandate of the Academy.
- To install enabling system for research and implement strategy for a high-quality practical research.
- To ensure that research is community based.
- To peruse excellence in research, training and extension of service.
- To offer expertise in areas of national and continental sports issues.
- To ensure that research endeavors are innovative and problem solving.
- To install a strategy whereby trainings offered are research based

- To offer a range of opportunities for trainings and capacity building.

- To promote science and technology necessary for the sector through academic research Programs and services.

- To create an enabling environment that encourages local and foreign transfer, adaptations and dissemination of knowledge, skills and technology.

- To install a system whereby researchers & persons involved in the success of research Endeavors are rewarded according to their contributions.

- To ensure that the application of research follows national laws and Regulations.

- To ensure that researches meet international standards.

- To create a working system to mobilize and administer human, financial and material Resources to achieve the above objectives efficiently.

1.2. Strategies

To realize the guiding principles & to achieve the objectives under this Policy, seven major strategies are provided; each major strategy in turn is supported with detailed list of sub-strategies as provided below.

1.2.1. *Synergetic Vitalization of Enabling Policy Environments*

The SRP is not an in-house document. It is an entity of the broader socio-political & economic environment of the country. Therefore, a pre & post formulation & future revision of the Ethiopian Sport Academy Research Policy (ESARP) requires the following strategies:

- Register understanding of internal, macro, sector and cross-sector enabling policy environments as a prerequisite in the inception, formulation and implementation of the SRP.

- Contextual and synergetic linkage of the SRP with the enabling policy environments.

1.2.2. *Creating Enabling System for Research*

The implementation of any policy requires the establishment of an organizational structure & implementation tools such as rules & guidelines so that all pertinent actors in the implementation of the ESARP act under an established system. Therefore, the establishment of an enabling system shall be based on the following strategies:

- Establish enabling organizational structures for research management, organization and leadership, as well as to define duties, roles & responsibilities for the execution of research;

- Compile a survey study document on enabling policy environments as a prerequisite in the formulation and implementation of SRP;

- Compile explanatory document on the contents of the SRP for better understanding by researchers and stakeholders;

- Provide academic and research code of ethics based on national and international Standards;

- Define procedures for proposal research review, implementation, dissemination and impact evaluation of researches;

- Develop criteria for research performance, awards, grants and incentives;

- Develop system for research undertaking initiatives and procedures;

- Develop system for finance and resource generation, allocation, use and integration;

- Develop system for applied research and linking of sports training with research;

- Install necessary infrastructure such as sports science laboratories, information communication technology, libraries and data base documentation and dissemination of researches;

- Develop implementation strategy document and necessary guideline documents for a strategic implementation of the SRP.

1.2.3. *Prioritization of Research*

The Academy encourages individuals and institutions whether local or foreign, national or international to involve in research schemes of the Academy. Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research issues & themes are also believed equally significant. However, prioritization is also equally necessary to encourage quality and responsive research endeavors. To this end, the Academy shall pursue the following strategies:

1.2.3.1. *Prioritization of Research issues*

Prioritization of research issues shall be made in response of and to vitalize enabling policy environments to meet research needs of identified target groups at all levels of policy

environments. Therefore, the following research issues have been identified on which research themes shall be based:

- The development of national occupational standard and sports training curricula;

- The development of syllabus and training materials for Academy's regular training programs;

- The development of Academy's training capacity building syllabus, manuals, & teaching materials;

- Research necessary to determine and provide solution to physical, mental, social, psychological, sociological and educational status of Academy's trainees;

- The identification & development of Academy's capacity training courses on sports management, medicine, sport rules and other fields of sport sciences;

- Applied research necessary to discover, innovate, create, adapt & introduce new ideas, methods, technologies, formula, knowledge and skill;

- The identification of challenges, evaluation of training methodology & practices of the Academy, and recommendation of better scientific ideas;

- The identification of potential areas of sportsmanship, whether natural or cultural for recruiting Academy's trainees;

- The identification of indigenous knowledge and potential areas so as to develop centers of excellence of potential sports in potential localities;

- The identification of problems and provide solutions on sectoral sport management of the government and public wing of the sector;

- Development of system to vitalize sports potential to play its role in achieving the Vision and GTP of the country;

- System to identify expand and manage diverse sports investment opportunities;

- Research necessary to design and implement schemes of mass sports mobilization;

- The development & implementation of strategies to create financially independent sports public sector;

- Research necessary to design, establish, build, expand and manage sports infrastructure;

- The development & implementation of strategies & necessary guidelines.

1.2.3.2. Thematic Prioritization of Research

The Academy shall include research strategy for the identification of themes and thematic prioritization of research.

1.2.3.3. Prioritization of Academy's Sports Events

Research for the purpose of Academy's internal purpose of achieving the production of elite athletes shall also prioritize sports events included in the training curricula of the Academy.

1.2.3.4. External Proposals for Prioritization of Research Issues and Themes

Despite the Academy's prioritization list of research issues and themes, external proposals for prioritization of new research issues and themes shall also be considered.

1.2.3.5. Demand Driven Prioritization of Research & Consultancy

Demand driven consultancy and research service needs of organizations shall be entertained despite Academy's prioritization list of policy issues & themes.

1.2.7. Prioritization in Response to Changing Trends

Changing international trends and national enabling policy issues may influence prioritization strategy of the Academy.

1.2.4. Research Undertakings and Initiatives

Broad based participatory research undertakings are crucial to register qualitative and quantitative results. The Academy, therefore, recognizes that both individual and institutional initiatives are of equal significance. Involvement of staff and external stakeholders, local or

foreign is encouraged. Therefore, system development for research undertaking and initiatives shall require the following strategies:

- Identification of research issues and themes for the purpose of the Academy shall be initiated by the Academy, though not entirely reserved only for the Academy;
- Staff members of the Academy are required & encouraged to involve in research;
- Open calls for research for the purpose of the Academy shall be made to individuals and/ or institutions;
- Limited calls for research for the purpose of the academy shall be made to Universities, research and consultancy institution, colleges and academies;
- Commissioned call for research for the purpose of the Academy's research undertakings shall be made to universities, colleges and research and consultancy institutions and academies;
- The Academy shall respond to calls for research by other organizations, local foreign international;
- The Academy shall take initiatives to propose research undertakings for the purpose of other organizations;
- The academy shall undertake research initiatives both for Academy's or partners purpose through bilateral, tripartite and multilateral agreements;
- The Academy shall sponsor undergraduate and postgraduate students to evolve in researches;
- The Academy shall adopt and compile external research results for its purpose under national legal grounds and international agreements to which Ethiopia is a party;
- The Academy may consider research initiatives for the purpose of the Academy by individual researchers and research organizations;
- The Academy shall encourage team research undertakings;
- The Academy shall organize annual national and international sports research symposium, and participate in national and international research conferences and symposiums;
- The Academy shall encourage the undertaking of researches in vernacular languages.

1.2.5. *Partnership and Co-ordination of Research Endeavors*

Partnership between and among internal staff and departments, and between and among the Academy and external stakeholders promote interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary quality,

practical and problem-solving research outputs. Therefore, internal, inter- sector and intra – sectorial coordination of expertise, finance and resources shall be implemented through the following strategies:

Internal partnership

- Ensure that training and teaching learning process of the Academy is research oriented;
- Ensure that libraries, science laboratories, information technology laboratories, indoor and outdoor sports facilities fitness centers and classrooms are centers of education and applied research;
- Ensure interdisciplinary synergetic research management between and among academic training   Departments;
- Work out ways whereby the academic wings and supporting departments of   the Academy contribute in harmony to the success of Academy's objectives;
- Coordination of expertise and resources for an effective management of educational and research centers;
- Harmonization of sports training with regular education and supporting courses such as languages and psychology etc;
- Market research and the boosting of financial contribution of marketable infrastructures and services to research endeavors;
- Promotion and popularization of research;
- Mobilization of finance;

Sector Partnership and Coordination of Efforts

Sector partners include Government's sports structure at all levels & all sports federations, associations, etc.

- Establish system to coordinate research partnership and collaboration among offices of the government and public wing at all levels of sports administration structures;
- Work out ways to co-ordinate efforts, resources and finance for joint research undertakings;

- Support sports public wing (sport associations, clubs, etc) to establish research units in their own fields of specialty;

- Involve stakeholders of the sector and establish Sector's research forum for consultation on research.

Cross-Sector Partnership and Coordination

- Link research with the socio – political and economic environment to enhance sports significance to the socio-political & economic progress of the country;

- Establish a workable system for cross-sectorial partnership & collaboration to Coordinate interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research;

- Exploit the potentials of research capabilities of universities, colleges, academies, educational firms and research institutes and consultancy firms by engaging:

- University professors, researchers and consultants;

- Undergraduate and postgraduate students through sponsorship and internship schemes;

- Pertinent government offices;

- The private sector to evolve extensively to diversify and to enhance sports investment in volume & quality;

- The private sector to contribute towards research and innovation through financial contribution, contract and sponsored research;

- All partners to mutually share expertise, finance and resources with the Academy.

1.2.6. *Knowledge, Skill, Technology Transfer and Foreign Relations*

Foreign knowledge, skills, technology transfer, adaptation and dissemination shall be valuable in activating and vitalizing national knowledge, skills and capacity. To realize the aspiration of integrating and standardizing research and to cope up with the demanding international factors, the following strategies shall be applied:

- Identity areas of partnership and potential partners and establish partnership under the principle of mutualism;

- Ensure that all foreign partnership is implemented under Ethiopia's foreign policy and contemporary foreign relations position of the government;
- Involve partner government offices embassy and foreign delegations and continental and international organizations for the facilitation of foreign relations;
- Possible areas of partnership between the Academy & International sports organizations such as FIFA, IOC, international sports federations &Associations, international research centers like International Olympic Academy and other foreign partners;
- Vitalize all possible areas of partnership between the Academy and African partners;
- Diversify strategies of partnership and voluntary's visits, & internship;
- Workout ways for the acceptance of the Academy as a research cite for theoretical & applied research needs of foreign partners.

1.2.7. *Documentation, Dissemination and Promotion*

Information and knowledge flow, evaluation of work and response to feedback, revitalization of policy inputs and registration of required outputs requires enabling communication environment between and among the Academy and target groups and partners. The development and implementation of enabling environment shall be attained through the following strategies:

- Development of communication program and strategy;
- Establishment of communication center, and the gradual development of the center as national spots research and development center /institute;
- Identification and utilization of all available communication tools such as:
  - Print (research document, proceeding, journals, books, newsletters posters. Brochures, leaflets, etc,);
  - Electronics (Radio, television, Internet);
  - Face to face (meetings, conferences symposium, visits, etc).
- Establishment of necessary infrastructure for communication, education and training centers and facilities such as libraries, e-library, archive, database, laboratories etc;
  - Develop efficient system for availing & sharing research products with partners and target groups;

- Organize national and international research conferences, symposiums and workshops.
- national &international sports science conferences & symposiums;
- Launch Academy's reputable journal which is locally and internationally widely indexed online open access and print journals&use access of international journals to publish Academy's best researches;
- Compile professionals' and partners' list;
- Staff library with necessary educational and research products through production adaptation, purchase, donation, etc;
- Produce simplified and abridged research products and others in indigenous languages & English language for the use by Academy's youth trainees;

1.3. Consultancy and Community Services

- The RCCSD together with the responsible centers shall conduct need assessment to identify major community problems that may seek practical solutions.
- The office shall encourage researchers to carry out research that are geared to the solutions of common problems in sport sector.
- The types of consultancy services include research, training and any other related services of a professional nature.
- Academic staff members (a full-time coaches and research staff of the Academy) have the right to engage in consulting activities outside the Academy if services are delivered with prior and legal consent of the Academy.
- Academic staff members engaged in consultancy service shall be accountable for the activities they perform and financial matters they get from any organization for consultancy services they rendered
- The academy will provide consultancy services with/without payment.

1.4. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

Besides the regular supervision by their respective offices planned visits will be made by teams of officers of the RCCSD and selected staff from relevant the disciplines. Within each project and management system, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are essential for two main reasons

They provide information on how the project is functioning to report to supervisors and executives, but also to illustrate the lessons learned in a project often one function is stressed above the other, but both are equally important and need to be given the appropriate level of importance. M&E are key instruments to encourage ongoing learning for the improvement of development interventions. The benefits of conducting good M&E include improvement in management and performance in terms of effectiveness, efficiency and value for money, and an increase in accountability and transparency, the ultimate aim of monitoring and evaluation is to learn what has worked and what has not.

a. Research coordination office/research committee shall arrange periodical monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the project to know that the research is properly handled as planned in the research protocol.

b. The M&E shall be done in a form of field visit, quarterly progress and terminal report to ensure proper research conduct, as per the research protocol.

c. Will review and accredit the research and scientific analysis research based publications for its quality and copyright issues through its reviewers and editorial board structures.

d. Will Give ethical Clearance, monitor, evaluate and direct any research done by the academy to make it up to the standard.

1.5. Legalizing Research

Any research endeavor should not contravene national laws and international agreements to which Ethiopia is a party, Academic and authorship rights of individuals and organizations should be respected and balanced. In respect of the law, the following shall be accomplished:

▪ The application of the policy shall respect national and international laws to which Ethiopia is a party.

▪ Intellectual property rights of authors and researchers shall be respected.

- All research endeavors shall be assumed under binding agreements, contractual or otherwise to define ownership, transfer of rights and moral rights under the law.

1.5.1. *Proprietorship of Research Outputs and Research Resources*

Intellectual property refers to original creative works embodied in tangible and intangible products that have economic value which becomes the property of inventors & innovators.

Intellectual property, thus, needs societal recognition and legal protection. The proprietorship of research results fully funded by the academy shall be of the Academy.

Redeployment of project resources: Any office, field or instrument purchased by a research grant shall be the property of the Academy after the accomplishment of the project.

1.5.2. *Protection of Information*

No information or equipment affecting the sovereignty, security, public order environmental, health or other essential public interests classified in accordance with the applicable national laws, rules, regulations and national policies shall be restricted. In the event that such information or equipment which is known or believed to require such protection is identified will be brought immediately to the attention of the appropriate officials and designated authorities and shall consult concerning the need for and level of appropriate protection to be accorded to such information or equipment.

1.5.3. *The Unclassified Equipment or Information*

For the purpose of implementation research shall be in accordance with the national laws, rules, regulations and national policies.

1.5.4. *Rights, Publications and Confidentiality*

Confidential information of athletes, students or institutions, which the organizations receive from each researcher, may only be used for the research activities and may not without consent from the academy from whom confidential information is received be disclosed in any way to third party. Researchers shall not make any public announcement statement or publish or release any information in relation to any sponsored research activity without the prior written approval of the academy.

1.5.5. Joint Intellectual Property

The protection and allocation of intellectual property and findings created, furnished or published in the course of research supports from the academy shall be governed out in specific agreements with researchers.

- Any intellectual property rights arising from or support of the academy to the researchers and by the joint and collaborative efforts shall be jointly owned and subject to any other terms and conditions as may be agreed up on.

- Researchers shall acknowledge one another in any form of writing, publications or presentations based on research derived from the cooperative efforts of ESA.

1.6. Scope of Implementation

The research Policy shall be implemented by the Ethiopian Sports Academy, Addis Ababa campus and any future campuses and centers established under the Academy.

1.7. Office Responsible for the Implementation of the policy

The Research, Consultancy and Community Service Deputy Director Office of the Academy shall be responsible for the implementation of this Policy.

Chapter Two:
General Guidelines and Procedures of Research

2.1. Basic Standards in the Conduct of Research

ESA maintains the highest standards of integrity in its research activity Ethical standards are of paramount importance in the academy's research policy and strategy. To promote and disseminate ethical research practice, and to emphasize on integrity and rigor, ESA seeks to sustain a research culture in which the following general principles are understood *Honesty, Openness, Ethics and Leadership and Cooperation.*

Honesty:

Central to all research endeavors, regardless of discipline, is the need for researchers to be honest in respect of their own actions in research, and in their responses to the actions of other researchers. This applies to the whole range of research activities, including the generation and analysis of data, applying for research funds, to declare any conflicts of interest.

Openness

Whilst recognizing the need for researchers to protect their own research interests in the process of planning research work and obtaining results, the academy encourages researchers to be open. Commitment to openness in research prohibits secrecy, including limitations on publishing ability of results, unless pre-specified conditions like, violation to agreement that specify restricted publication/ circulation of outputs, data that might evoke individual and communal values, if the results threaten the academy security.

Ethics

Those researchers which involve human participants/subjects must be ethically sound. Such researchers shall be reviewed by the research ethical committee of the academy. Research misconduct is least likely to arise in an environment where good research practice (e.g. documentation of results, peer review, regular discussion and seminars) is encouraged and where

there is an   adequate supervision at all relevant level. Research misconduct includes the following, with no particular order, whether deliberate, reckless or negligent.

a. Unauthorized use of information which was acquired confidentiality
b. Fabrication, falsification or corruption of research idea
c. Distortion of research out comes, by distortion or omission of data that do not fit expected results
d. Dishonest misinterpretation of result
e. Publication of data known or dishonest to be false or misleading
f. Plagiarism or dishonest use of unacknowledged sources
g. Inappropriate attribution of authorship
h. Fraud or other misuse of research funds or research equipment
i. Inciting others to be involved in research misconduct

The above list is not exhaustive and other acts of misconduct specifically related to research activities may be dealt with under this procedure. The Academy takes seriously any allegation of research misconduct. Any member of the Academy who believes that an act of research misconduct has occurred or is occurring should, in a responsible and appropriate manner, notify the research, consultancy and community service director (office of Research and consultancy) as appropriate.

The office of research and consultancy should decide on appropriate course of action to deal with the misconduct. The following measures can be taken depending on the severity of misconduct

a. Removal from the research project
b. Letter of reprimand
c. Special monitoring of future work
d. Probation or suspension

Leadership and Cooperation

The culture and tone of procedures in any organization must be set by those in authority. Within the Academy it is the responsibility of management and staff to ensure that a climate of mutual

cooperation is created. This should allow research to be conducted in accordance with good research practice management and staff should create a research environment in which all members of research staff are encouraged to develop their skills and in which the exchange of ideas is fostered.

2.2. Procedures for Initiating and Conducting Research

The research process includes activities that pass through a series of steps in order to get approval and funding to go ahead with a proposed research project, this process includes pre-award, post- award and termination phases

The following issues will be considered, while developing initiating project proposals

   a. Research initiation shall be set based on the thematic and priority areas of the Academy

   b. All academic , medical and supportive staffs (Training and Education, competition and Gym assistants) only are eligible to apply for research grant in the Academy, unless and otherwise he/she has been reprimanded for specific period of time to be decided in laws due to community research misconduct.

   c. Every research project shall have a principal investigator (PI). The principal investigator(s) should be the person who is authorized to act for and to assume the obligations imposed by the policy requirements, and condition for a grant or grant application.

   d. In order to enhance knowledge use, the research team could engage with partners from relevant public or private sector organizations or NGO's

   e. The policy for preparing proposal assisted by external sources shall be in line with the formats of the funding agency if available. If the funding agency does not provide policy or format, ESA format for proposal writing shall be used.

   f. A research proposal of an academic staff for which internal or external funding is sought shall be reviewed by the research committee for screening in terms of their significance and priority, the comments shall be used as in put in the decision to approve or reject the research proposal.

g. Academic staff carrying out research without the need for financial support shall notify their department and the research director.

h. All proposals presented by researchers to be the submitted external funding bodies shall obtain the prior endorsement of the office of Research and consultancy following appropriate steps.

i. There shall be calls for research proposal every year. The submission of research proposals shall be due a month after the call is posted. Call for research proposals shall be announced by of the office of research and consultancy

j. Research proposals shall be submitted both electronically and in hard copy to the office of research and consultancy

k. The research proposals shall be evaluated based on policies for evaluation of research proposals (Appendix -2)

l. The research committee and reviewers technical team assigned by the research general director shall complete the review process in consideration ethical and technical matters of the proposal.

m. Final selection of proposals will be announced after proposals publicly defended and evaluated by the reviewers and research committee.

n. Proposals approved by the research committee shall be submitted to the office of Deputy Director for Research for further endorsement

2.3. Research Proposal Registration and Publicity

a. The proposals that have been approved shall be made public by the office of Research and consultancy.

b. There shall be assigning of project contract between researcher and the Academy using appropriate format (Appendix-3)

c. Collaborative research and research funded outside ESA shall be registered and agreement shall be signed between PI(s), donor and ESA indicating the role of each parties, benefit sharing, and equipment ownership and patenting issues based on the guiding principles as stated in Appendix(4).

d. The office of Research and consultancy office shall notify the approval of the project to the finance office and facilitate the Implementation of the project with all concerned units

e. All financial matters shall operate according to the budget breakdown indicated on the project document unless specific operational exceptions are authorized by the office of Deputy Director for Research.

2.4. Administration of Research

a. The overall administration of research in the Academy is vested in the office of Deputy Director for Research

b. The office Research and consultancy shall hold annual Research conference where results of research activities will be presented. Funds for such conferees will be budgeted through the office of Research and consultancy and approved by Academy management as appropriate.

c. The financial administration of research funds shall be governed by the existing financial policy and procedures of the Academy

d. A researcher whose project proposal is approved shall request the RCCSD for release and utilization of the allocated budget for his/her research

e. Execution of approved research projects funded by external agencies shall be administered based on the Academy's system. The Academy shall take 10% of the funds as overhead cost from externally funded mega research projects worthen more than 400,000 Birr. But the Academy may consider waiver of such overhead costs for those organizations that do not allow such kind of cost in their legislation. On the other hand, if the service uses the academy resources, extra service fee and cost of the used resources will be covered according to the academies service fee drawn or agreed up on.

f. The overhead cost will be used to cover administrative/management costs, to provide incentive for researchers, and to promote research capacity of the Academy

g. A researcher should settle the financial aspect of his / her research project based on the rules and regulation from MOFED and obtain a clearance letter from the

Academy's finance and office of Research and consultancy before obtaining any kind of leave.

h. The PI is responsible in managing project fund, adherence to reporting requirement and assurance of the demands of sponsor.

i. If, for any reason, a research project is discontinued and if the work is not properly carried out within the planned timetable, the researcher is required to return all fixed assets purchased to run the project and the unutilized money to the Academy

j. Equipment bought through the Academy research grants or external research project funds are the property of ESA

k. Researches will be funded or supported by the academy will be supported depending on the type of research. An experimental design research can be funded up to 65,000 Birr based on the inputs and interventions required for the test. Applied research designs will also be funded with a maximum of 45,000 Birr whereas other types of researches focusing on knowledge will be funded up to 25,000 Birr.

l. Execution of research consultancy services approved by consultancy projects and funded by external agencies shall be administered based on the Academy's system. The Academy shall take 10% of the fund as overhead cost from externally funded mega research consultancy projects worthen more than 400,000 Birr. However, the Academy may consider waiver of such overhead costs for those organizations that do not allow such kind of cost in their legislation. On the other hand, if the service uses the academy resources, extra service fee and cost of the used resources will be covered according to the academies service fee drawn or agreed up on.

2.5. Role and Responsibility of Different Actors

2.5.1 *The Role And Responsibility of Top Management of The Academy*

The culture and tone of procedures in any organization must be set by those in authority within the organization; it is the responsibility of the management and staff to ensure that a climate of mutual cooperation is created. This should allow research to be conducted in accordance with good research practice management and staff should create a research environment in which all

members of research staff are encouraged to develop their skills and in which the exchange of ideas is fostered.

2.5.2. *Roles and Responsibilities of Researchers*

A. Researchers will play an active role in the initiation, planning, development of proposal, searching of funds, implementation, and management of the research project.

B. The researchers are expected to produce research results that meet basic research standards to ensure their quality.

C. Researchers are accountable for proper utilization of the research fund. They are also expected to settle properly and in due time the account they have drown from the Academy and/or external funding sources.

D. Researchers should submit progress report and a final copy of the research reports funded by the Academy and/or any external organization.

E. Collaborate with other researchers in their field (both nationally & internationally)

F. Enhance the Academy status through the quality of research.

2.5.3 *Roles and Responsibilities of the Offices of Deputy Director for Research*

A. Define research direction and research priorities of the Academy.

B. Coordinate and administer the Academy's research, consultancy and community service activities.

C. Monitor supervise and control the proper utilization of funds allocated for research.

D. Ensure the proper implementation of the Academy research, consultancy and community service policies, strategies and guidelines.

E. Establish and maintain scientific relations with other governmental and nongovernmental organizations and research institutions within and outside the country.

F. Organize scientific meetings, workshops, seminars to evaluate the technical and scientific progress of research projects carried out in the academy.

G. Promote the dissemination of research results through the annual research conference of the Academy.

H. Maintain documentation and publication of research out puts.

I. Organizing Research Facilities and Equipment

2.6. Progress Report

A. Office of research and consultancy shall follow the progress of the research activity and ensure that work schedules, the production of targeted out puts and required actions are proceeding according to the plan.

B. Reports should be submitted according to the timelines and the standard formats set by the office of Research and consultancy. The reporting should be done based on the progress report submission format (Appendix- 5)

C. Recommendations for continued funding of projects or the acceptance of the terminal report depends on previous satisfactory receipts of progress and quarterly reports as judged by office of research and consultancy.

D. The PI shall submit copies of the final document (terminal report) to the office of research and consultancy.

E. The terminal report shall be reviewed and evaluated by the research review committee based on the policy for reviewing (Appendix -7)

F. The feedback from the research office/ director and research review committee on progress and terminal reports shall be communicated to the PI to accommodate comments and then submitted to the research office/director.

G. The terminal report shall be registered, and information shall be made public to staff and stake holders in the form of proceedings & symposium.

H. Research reports will mainly be in English. However, to facilitate knowledge transfer, reports can be translated into other local languages whenever appropriate.

2.7. Research Extension & Termination

2.7.1. Research Extension

The research projects shall have a period to accomplish the project. The researchers that have gone beyond the research period without justifiable reason will not have this work recognized as part of their research load. No extra funding or load extensions shall be given for a research project that has been extended without justifiable reason.

Project extension may be allowed when there is justifiable reason and it is approved by RCCSD. The researcher should apply in written one month prior to the requested extension to allow time for processing and approval.

2.7.2. *Research Termination*

A research undertaking can be terminated in the condition of either / both parties want to cancel. But this is done under the following conditions: The Academy can terminate the research when the research couldn't move based on the rules written dawn in the contractual agreement.

2.8. Output, Outcome and Impact Assessment of the Study Results

ESA will use the following two alternative approaches to monitor and evaluate the effects of its research. Tracking forwards; from completed research to see where and how it is communicated, and to what effect. For tracking forwards, the Academy will decide where to look for effects and use the under listed five categories to capture the multi dimension nature of its research output:

a. Knowledge production (e.g. Peer- reviewed papers);
b. Research capacity building (e.g. career development);
c. Policy or product development (e.g. input into official policies or protocols);
d. Sector benefits (e.g. impacts on specific client groups) and
e. Wider benefits in sport sector.

Tracking backwards: examining organizational management and professional practice to explore how research is sought out and used in these areas, and to what effect, for tracking backwards, the Academy may undertake interview with research users by deploying different mechanisms.

2.9. Research Audit

A research audit will be conducted by office of Deputy Director for Research once every year to assess how well the theme meets the Academy's research objectives.

The areas which the audit should focus on include:

a. The scope and extent of the research activity

b. The strengths and weakness of the research activity.

c. The effectiveness of the training provided

d. The focus and future direction of the research activity

e. Linkages/ relations to other clusters of the Academy and other research performance is drawn up.

2.10. Exit Mechanism of Projects

a. The findings of the research projects upon project completion shall be presented to the annual research conference.

b. Any publications from the research project shall be registered, submitted to the RCCSD and deposited in the Academy library.

c. The experience from the research project shall be documented and passed to the appropriate academic unit and serve as a training ground.

2.11. Engagement of Staff in Research

a. All research staffs should devote 75% and 25% of their workload in research and academics, respectively.

b. All academic staffs should devote 25% of their work time towards research and 75% of their work time towards training.

c. Find ways and means for the dissemination of the research findings through publication of journals, proceedings, books and periodicals, presentation of occasional papers and participation in and conducting of seminars, symposia and workshops.

2.12. Research Allowance and Load

a. Payment of subsistence allowance/per-diem to researchers shall be in line with the budget specified in the research grant and/or as agreed upon by the funding agency and the Academy.

b. Allowances for research supportive staff shall be based on the pay list specified in the approved proposal by funding agency and the Academy.

c. The allowances shall be based on the financial regulation of the government for research projects funded by the treasury.

d. Number of research project per academic staff/principal investigator for should not exceed 2 proposals at a time.

2.13. Motivational Schemes for Researchers

Staff in a team or individual bases involved in research without standing research performance and merit will be awarded during the annual research conference day or other venue as determined by the office of Deputy Director for Research in order to encourage academic staff involvement in research and to build a research culture in the Academy, the following activities will be promoted:

a. Devise better mechanism to recognize materially or financially by rewarding academic staff based on their outstanding performance in research. The application and nomination procedure for awards and evaluation criteria to nominate best researcher (s) award will be set by the office of Deputy Director for Research later.

b. If any staff has brought a research fund from outside via the name of ESA, he/she will get 10% of the total research fund as a benefit excluding his benefit portion from being a participant in the research undertaking. This is mainly applied based on the financial rules and regulations of the funding agency.

c. The award shall consider research outputs recorded in the previous budget year.

2.14. Payments

2.14.1. Payments shall refer to all costs approved for the implementation of researches granted by the Academy.

2.14.2. Costs for goods & services can be covered in kind through delivery of service and materials. Such costs may include costs for transport, facilities, equipment, stationary, etc.

2.14.3. Payments in cash for the implementation of research shall be paid to the lead Researcher in two phases each payable at the initial period of the commencement of each phase.

2.15. Awards

2.15.1. Awards shall mean to all professional awards awarded in cash and/or in kind to Lead Researchers Co-Researchers & Authors of educational materials granted by the Academy;

2.15.2. Awards shall be implemented under two categories;

2.15.3. Award for a Successful Completion of Research & Educational materials;

2.15.4. Awards for Researches with the Highest Impact;

2.15.5. All awards shall be applied per a Research and a training material preparation.

2.16. Academic Honorarium

- Research contributions shall determine among other factors all academic honors and privileges awarded to trainers and academic staff.

2.17. Incentives

2.17.1. Incentives shall pertain to all employs of the Academy contributing to the success of research

2.17.2. The following shall be beneficiaries of incentives

2.17.3. Reviewers of research proposals

2.17.4. Reviewers of research projects

2.17.5. RSC members

2.17.6. RATC members

2.17.7. Any other staff contributing as required by his/her duties

2.18. Profit Sharing

2.18.1. The Academy shall share profits gained through consultancy services and fare of PR with consultants & researches;

2.18.2. Profit sharing shall be implemented per single consultancy service and research;

2.18.3. A researcher shall share profits except award gained through the implementation of a researches grated by external sources to the Researcher in his own capacity and when the Research is endorsed by the Academy; and

2.18.4. Profit sharing from joint research schemes between the Academy & an organization shall be decided on agreed terms of both parties.

2.19. Cost for Consultancy Service

a. Consultancy contract preparations shall involve the determination of proper and accurate cost of the consultancy service to be rendered. Every academic staff, in consultation with offices of Deputy Director for Research and its offices, shall take full responsibility in the preparation of cost for the consultancy service.

b. The academic staff engaged in consultancy services shall manage project or consultancy budgets by themselves but shall present financial reports to the office of Research and consultancy.

c. The Academy and the academic staff member(s) engaged in the consultancy service is entitled to some percent of the total consultancy cost. The amount of consultancy fee to be shared among the academic staff and the Academy shall be determined by office of Deputy Director for Research in consultation with the two parties.

d. The amount of fee to be shared may vary based on whether the consultancy service is made with or without the Academy's time and facilities.

2.20. Monitoring and Evaluation of Research Undertakings

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is mainly designed to play a supportive role in the conduct of research. The implementation of M&E in ESA is to verify the status of research activities, of identify problems encountered in the process of implementing research project, to take immediate measures, and to present challenges to the respective management for those not solved during field follow up. The M&E is regularly done by the research committee. The research subcommittee led by research Directorate Director shall develop a check list for

monitoring and evaluating a project that suites a discipline in question. The research subcommittee shall undertake a periodical M&E in various forms such that:

i.   The research committee shall review quarterly, progress and terminal report and write a report whether the conduct of the research is in line with the project proposal and protocol of the project.

ii. The committee also shall check whether the research project is undertaken in the time frame as documented in the proposal.

iii. The committee shall monitor the management and utilization of financial and physical resources to the planned project

iv. The committee shall write a report and provide a feed back to the researcher.

v.   The researcher shall send a response letter to research committee stating the arrangements made to improve the research undertaking.

vi. The researcher failing to report as per the recommendations of the committee shall not be getting a financial support to continue the project.

vii. The Deputy research Director…..

2.21. Research Policy Implementation Strategies

In order to implement the above-mentioned research policy, the following strategies will be taking into account.

a. Respective academic staffs, in consultation with office of research and consultancy office shall be responsible for the respective follow ups and facilitation of research undertakings.

b. Short orientation/induction training shall be organized on the research policy for new academic staff members and are expected to emphasize the use of research activities for academic promotion and other incentives.

c. This research policy shall be widely shared among the staff of the Academy.

Chapter Three
3. Ethiopian Journal of Sport Science Journal
Journal Foundation and Introduction

3.1. Introduction

Ethiopian Sport Academy is a center of excellence in sports established by Proclamation No. 1263/14 The Academy constitutes two training campuses. The main campus, which constitutes a total of 24.4 hectares of land, is situated in Addis Ababa, Bole Sub City, Woreda 03. Athlete Tirunesh Dibaba Sports Training Centre is the second training campus located in Assela town, 170 kms East of Addis Ababa. The Assela campus is founded in 2009 and is currently offering training to youth in Football and Athletics. The main campus, which was founded in 2013 is currently offering training in nine sports such as Football, Basketball, Volleyball, Athletics, Table Tennis, Swimming, World Taekwondo, Box and Cycling. The Academy has plans to include other sports events in its curricula. Therefore, the academy has more than **45** coaches of different discipline and **450** supportive staffs.

These days, in different part of the world, senior coaches of different sport discipline conducting research and published their findings to the entire world to be used by other junior or beginner coaches while coaching their young athletes for the betterment of their sport training. In connection with this, our coaches of different sport, should also conduct research and disseminate their out puts to the rest of the country as well as sport professional to implement or use the current research findings for their sport training. To use the current research out puts, it needs different dissemination strategy. One of these dissemination strategies is journal.

In Ethiopia, for the last several years, our sport professionals, coaches and University lecturers, were suffering to publish their research findings in different journals of the country because of the relevancy of the sport profession with their journals which have been published by different universities of our country. Therefore, it is mandatory and very urgent to launch new specific journal in the field of sport profession to create a wonderful platform for sport professionals in general and young researchers in the academy in particular to publish their research findings.

3.2. **Name of the Journal**

The Ethiopian youth and sport academy launched a scientific journal with the following name and abbreviation:

"Ethiopian Journal of Sport Science" or EJSS.

3.3. **Scope of the Journal**

The Ethiopian Journal of Sport Sciences is a peer reviewed open access, inter and multidisciplinary journal published by Ethiopian youth and sport academy. The journal dedicated to expanding access to Ethiopian sport research, increasing intra-Academies or Universities scientific collaboration, and building academic research capacity in Ethiopia. The journal aims to provide a modern, highly-visible platform for publishing Ethiopian sport research and welcomes submissions from different scientific disciplines and publishes original research papers, systematic and scholarly review articles, and critical papers which will stimulate debate on research, policy, theory or philosophy of **sport** as related to **training** and **development** in **Ethiopia**, technical reports, and short communications, and which will meet the journal's high academic and ethical standards. Manuscripts of **sport training**, education, management, and research are encouraged. This journal will have five main sections. These are: **Technical report**, **Reviews and Analysis**, **Technical Notes and preliminary communications**, **Sport Sciences Issues**, and **Dataset Papers**. Moreover, the journal values critical scholarly debate on issues that have strategic significance for coaches, trainees, educators, practitioners, leaders and policy-makers of **sport profession in Ethiopia.**

The following are broad categories

: Sport youth training

: Sport Biomechanics

: Sport psychology

: Sport physiology

: Sport management

: Sport sociology

: Sport medicine

: Sport rehabilitation

: Sport for Development

: Sport Pedagogy

The study should define principles of broad applicability, be related to problems over a sizable geographic area, or be of potential interest to a representative number of scientists.

3.3.1. *Characteristics of a Strong Manuscript*

Before describing the characteristics of a good manuscript, we turn briefly to problems associated with a poor one. Bartol (cited in Eichorn & VandenBos, 1985) identified the following main problems:

- inadequate review of the literature,
- inappropriate citations,
- unclear introduction,
- ambiguous research questions,
- inadequately described sample,
- insufficient methodology,
- incompletely described measures,
- unclear statistical analysis
- inappropriate statistical techniques,
- poor conceptualization of discussion,
- discussion that goes beyond the data,
- poor writing style, and
- excessive length

3.4. Organizational Structure of the Journal

The Ethiopian Journal of Sport Sciences (EJSS) comprise of Editor-in-chief, Editorial Board members, and Advisory Board members.

3.4.1. *Journal Advisory Board*

The journal Advisory Board is consists of a group of prominent and well respected individuals in the journal's field and working in different part of the world in scientific activities like research. They act as ambassadors for journals and will provide advice on key policy issues and

strategic direction of the journal. The size of Advisory boards varies across disciplines but, the journal will have up to 10 Advisory Board from different discipline and different part of the world in the field of sport sciences.

3.4.1.1. *Qualification and Experience of Advisory Board*

The formation of the Editorial Board is done through incorporating global experts with excellent academic track record and expertise in the respective journal subject. There is no restriction in the number of the Editorial Board members. Advisory board members should have a Ph.D. degree in the relevant subject and must have good publication record and adequate exposure to scientific journal writing, editing, or managing.

3.4.1.2. *Terms of Service*

The terms of service for the appointed Advisory will be a minimum of three years and a maximum of five years. May appoint Editorial Board for a prescribed duration and add or revise constitution of the Board if required.

3.4.1.3. *Duties and Responsibilities of Advisory Board*

The following duties and responsibilities of the Advisory Board of the journal will be actively involved to achieve the Journal objectives. Therefore, they will have the following duties and responsibilities.

These are:

➢ Reviewing Editorial policies and guidelines periodically.

➢ Advise on journal policy and scope.

➢ Reviewing draft documents of manuals and instructions, drafted by Editorial Board, related to publication processes.

➢ Consulting the Ethiopian youth and sport Academy research Directorate director and the chief journal editor related to journal office administration and publication process.

➢ Holding periodic meetings for enhancement of office administration, journal sustainability, and quality issues.

➢ Assist the editor(s) in decision making over issues such as plagiarism claims and submissions where reviewers can't agree on a decision.

3.4.1.4. *Advisory Board Members*

1. Tefera Tadesse Jimma (Ph.D)

   - Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, IER, AAU,

   - Humboldt Senior Research Fellow

   - Institute of Medical Education, University Hospital, LMU Munich, Germany

2. Professor. Wolfgang Immanuel Schöllhorn,

     Professor Movement and Training Science

   - Director of Sport Institute at University of Mainz ,Germany

3. Prof. Dr.Victor Babu Koppula

   - Professor, Department of Philosophy, Andhra University, India and

   - Editor-in-Chief of:-
     - IJMER (International Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Educational Research) and
     - Sucharitha : A Journal of Philosophy and Religion

4. Associate Professor Feked Tuli
   - Associate Professor in Educational Research at Kotobe Education University
   - Vice President of Kotobe Education University

5. Associate Professor Wassie Anteneh Melkamu
   - Associate Professor on Agriculture (UN)

3.5. Journal Editorial Board

Editorial Board members and Editors are often a good bet for identifying topics that are of importance to the community which our journal serves. Scientific journals will require all members of the journal, specifically, Editors and Editorial Board members to obey by COPE of Conduct and best practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.

The composition of editorial Board members should be from all discipline based on the scope of the journal. The journal Editors and Editorial Board members will have the following structure and number. These are listed as follow;

- ➢ Editor Manager(1)
- ➢ Editor-in-Chief (1)
- ➢ Associate Editors(7)
- ➢ Journal Secretary(1)
- ➢ Technical Editors(1)
- ➢ Language Editors(1)
- ➢ Copy Typist(1)

Therefore, the editorial Board of the journal will have five members chosen for their expertise based on the scope of the journal and one copy typist.

3.5.1. *Qualification and Experience of Editorial Board Members*

The Journal Editorial Board basically consists of a group of prominent people in the Journal's sub-disciplinary field of study. All Editorial Board members should be appropriate and in line with the aims and scope of the Journal and represent each discipline of the Journal. Concerning to experiences of the editorial Board members, they should have many years of experience in research and also should have publications in his/her area of expertise and be committed to participating in the process of providing timely, high-quality reviews for the Journal. In general, the Editorial Board will be reviewed and evaluated occasionally by the Academy research Directorate. Editorial Board members may be asked to submit an updated version of their profile/resume.

3.5.2. *Appointment and Terms of Service of Each Editorial Board Member*

The **Editor –in-Chief** will be selected and assigned by the Academy research Directorate of Ethiopian Sport Academy. The **Associate Editors** will be identified potential candidates from

different discipline, based on the scope of the journal, and assigned by the Academy research Directorate. Then, the assigned Editorial members will be notified with an official letter signed by the Academy Research Directorate Director.

3.5.3. General Duties and Responsibilities of the Editorial Board

Editors are responsible for all the contents published in their journals, which means that they should strive to meet the needs of readers and authors, seek to constantly improve their journal, have well-defined editorial processes that ensure the quality of published material and promote freedom of expression.

➢ The editor should refrain from considering manuscripts when there is a conflict of interest because of competition, cooperation and other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies or institutions associated with the manuscript.

➢ Editors should ensure the integrity of academic records and publish corrections, clarifications, retractions or apologies whenever needed.

➢ Providing integrity and credibility of the research contributions,

➢ The editor should actively seek the opinions of authors, readers, reviewers and members of the editorial board of the possible ways of improving the journal.

➢ Establishing and maintaining quality of the journal by publishing quality papers in his/her journal

➢ Promotion of freedom of expression within the cultural, constitutional/legal framework,

➢ Providing corrigendum for any correction, clarification and apologies where required

➢ The editor's duty is to support initiatives that will reduce publication and academic misconduct and to introduce and educate researchers about the provisions of publication ethics. The policy of the journal, if necessary, should be modified taking into account new technical and scientific knowledge about peer review, journal editing and publishing, and the effects of policy on the behavior of the journal authors and reviewers.

➢ Meeting the needs of authors and readers,

➢ The editor needs to convince the owners and/or publishers of the journal of the need to ensure the necessary resources, including the occasional involvement of other professionals (e.g. designers, lawyers, etc.).

➢ Maintaining ethical standards of their journal,

- Editors should systematically assess the impact of their guidelines on authors and reviewers, and revise them if necessary, encouraging responsible behavior and discouraging misconduct.

The Editor should:

- promptly respond to the author (s) of the papers submitted for publication, and
- Assign a specific number to an article submitted for processing; and pay impartial consideration to all research papers submitted for publication.
- To ensure evaluation of the content of research papers impartially,
- Disregard the discriminating factors, e.g. gender, race, ethnicity, religious belief, cultural sentiments, political affiliation, seniority and/or institutional association of the author(s) while selecting articles for publication,
- To ensure impartiality of the review process by informing the reviewer (s) that s/he needs to disclose any conflicts of interest regarding the submitted research paper.

Good practices for their job would include to:

- Encourage new ideas and suggestions of authors, peer reviewers, members of editorial board and readers for improving quality of his/her journal,
- Apply the process of blind peer review in true letter and spirit,
- Promote innovative findings in respective field and publishing them on priority,
- Promote anti-plagiarism policy,
- Educate contributors (authors) about ethical practices in research, and
- Implement the journal's policy without institutional pressure and revise the policy from time to time.

CHAPTER FOUR
4. EDITORIAL POLICY AND GUIDELINES

4.1. Detailed Duties and Responsibilities of Each Editorial Board Member

The Editorial Board member duties and responsibilities are very important to make the journal better and to achieve its objective. Therefore, each Editorial Board members of the Journal duties and responsibilities are described in detail below.

4.1.1. Editorial Manager

The Editorial manager is also expected to be at least an assistance Professor with a minimum number of five articles published in reputable journal (out of which two as a Principal Author).He or She in collaboration with the Editor-in-Chief, is generally responsible for supervising and allocating the work to editors, reviewers, authors, and reporters can also serve as the chair of the Editorial Board. He/she develop, manage, and execute the editorial strategies within all editorial content to increase readership and generate leads. The Editorial manager also ensures that the entire editorial process is competed perfectly within the allocated time as per the standards and guidelines. The Editorial Manager is the primary copy editor for the journal and generally oversees the overall production process from edited manuscript through printed pages.

As a manager, the editorial manager is also responsible of recruiting/hiring and supervising all employees of the journal and also works as a public relation agent (to manage the flow of information between an organization and its public).

The Editorial manager will consult with the Editor-in-Chief and the General Director of Ethiopian Sport Academy Research Directorate on various improvement options for the Journal in case where the general research Director is not the Editorial Manager. Moreover, the manager will write articles, letters, blogs, newsletters, and media posts in conjunction with the other Board members.

4.1.2. Editor-in-Chief

Editor-in-chief is the most senior editor who has overall responsibility for the journal and can be served as the chair of the Editorial Board. The editor-in-Chief is expected to be at least an assistance Professor and published a minimum number of five articles in reputable journals (out

of which two as a Principal Author). He/she has also a responsibility for managing the production of all content for the publication.

The Editor-in-Chief shall develop procedures for manuscript submission, review and reviewer criteria, acceptance, managing day-to-day operations, and publication of the Journal. The editor-in-Chief shall have the following important skills:

➢ Proofreading skills involve the ability to identify errors in spelling, grammar, syntax, style and tone while reading written text.

➢ Copyediting skills involve revising written text to improve readability while also ensuring the information is accurate, consistent and free of omissions or repetitiveness.

➢ Editors-in-chief need strong communication skills to provide feedback to copywriters, journalists and editors in a positive manner that encourages growth and change when necessary.

➢ An editor-in-chief needs to have strong attention to detail to ensure consistency in the style and tone of their publications.

➢ As the highest-ranking position on the editorial staff, the editor-in-chief must motivate, encourage and provide instruction to the other members of the editorial members to lead the publication to success.

➢ An editor-in-chief has supervisory authority over their team and represents their team at social events and gatherings, so they need to have strong listening skills, empathy and the ability to build positive professional relationships.

➢ An editor-in-chief needs excellent organization and time-management skills to ensure they can prioritize tasks, plan and complete projects by their deadlines, remember important details and maximize their efficiency and productivity.

The Editor- in-Chief may have the following additional duties and responsibilities:

➢ Approve the publication's layout, design, and styles.

➢ Acting as a representative for the publication at events.

➢ Delegate Editorial roles to other members of the Editorial Board.

➢ Develops, in consultation with other Board members and the Advisory Board of EJSS, systems to enhance the advancement of the Journal.

➢ Handles, by presenting the matter to the Board through the Associate Editor and Editor Manager, the appeal procedure for manuscripts that are rejected.

➢ Making final decisions about which stories, articles and photographs to publish.

➢ Assigns an appropriate Associate Editor for specific papers and also notifies the author when a manuscript is accepted or not for publication.

➢ Developing and managing budgets for the editorial team together with Editorial Manager.

➢ Both the editor manager and editor in chief are expected to report the general managerial issue and editorial process and technical activities done quarterly.

➢ Any Dispute and Complaints unsolved or appealed will be managed by the editorial board, Research Committee, and Research and Consultancy Council respectively. All the roles of the Editorial Committee/Board, Research committee and Research and Consultancy Council in research structure Horizontal and Vertical relationship are explained at chapter seven.

4.1.3. Associate Editors

The Associate Editors are responsible for the scientific and intellectual content of the Journal in their fields. They are responsible for obtaining reviewers for manuscripts assigned to them and also they should have at least 50% representation of scholars from outside of the Academy. The Associate Editors review and evaluate the technical content of the manuscript and its suitability for publication in the Journal and recommend to the Editor-in-Chief the course of action that should be taken regarding a manuscript submitted to the Journal. The Associate Editor is also responsible for receiving manuscripts, replying to authors on the status of the manuscripts, following up on review and publication processes, following up publication production process, promoting and marketing the Journal. He/ she also prepares budget and submits it to the Editorial Board for approval. Associate Editors will be responsible for reviewing the submitted research articles;

4.1.4. Journal Secretary

The Journal Secretary, in close collaboration with the Editorial Manager, is responsible for providing efficient and responsive secretarial and administrative support to the Editorial Board. In general, the duties include effective handling of information using tact and discretion; managing files (document paper and electronic information); ensuring correspondence and calls on behalf of the Editorial Board members; preparing correspondence on his behalf, including drafting general replies and processing expenses claims. Moreover, the Journal Secretary will be responsible for prioritizing and responding to inquiries by letter, telephone and email, directing

them as appropriate; coordinate and manage meetings and conference calls, take minutes and ensuring arrangements are effectively managed; prepare summary information and annual reports; liaise between Human Resources in organizing the recruitment of new staff; establish efficient office systems including filing, handling and disposing of confidential information and ensure that the group web-pages and intranet site is up to date.

4.1.5. Language Editor

The Language Editor ensures that the document is structurally correct (spelling, punctuation, and grammar) and stylistically consistent. If there are language issues with the article the Technical or Associate Editor may recommend the Language Editing Service. Then, the language editor will take necessary action for the betterment of the journal.

4.1.6. Technical Editor

The Technical Editor compares the final version of the document with the marked-up version to make sure that all corrections have been made. He/she also reviews both content (for completeness, accuracy, and appropriate language) and form (for the organization, visual design, and usability) of the article.

4.1.7. Current list of Editorial Board Members

Editor-in-Chief

- **Amensisa Kebede Legesse (Ph.D)**

Editorial Manager

- **Sisay Mengistu Associate Professor Hawaassa University**

Associate Editors

- **Dr. Melkamu Dubesa**
- **Dr. Aemero Asmamaw**
- **Dr.Zerihun Ayenew**
- **Dr. Abera Desalegn**
- **Dr. Atakelit Hailu**
- **Dr. Telahun Bereded**
- **Ass. Prof. Besher Edo**
- **Ass. Prof. Abera Assefa**
- **Dr. Aschenaqi Tadesse**

4.1.8 Reporting Mechanism of the Editorial Board to the Academy

As stated above, the Editorial Board of the Journal are a group of individuals working as a team with the Editor-in-Chief with the ultimate objective of developing an outstanding journal and promoting new initiatives for improvement. The chair of the editorial Board will be assigned by the Academy General Director with the research deputy general director presenting three qualified nominees (From the Editor in Chief, Editorial Manager and the research Directorate Director). The Editorial Board of the Journal, chaired by Editor-in-Chief or Editorial Manager (Preferred to be Directorate Director of the research) will be accountable to the Research Deputy Director of Ethiopian Sport Academy. The Editor-in-Chief or Editorial Manager of the Journal will directly report to the Editorial Board. The Editorial Board of the Journal is expected to have a regular communication forum among members via teleconference and Skype. Depending on the availability of funding, the Editorial Board of the Journal shall make face to face meetings to discuss issues including: advice on journal policy and scope; to work with the Editor-in-Chief's about the on-going development of the Journal; to identify topics for special issue; to recommend a conference which would promote the Journal.

4.1.9. Editorial Board Meetings

Editorial Board meetings are useful opportunities to meet with the quorum or all of the Editorial Board members to brief them on issues, take questions and also gain ideas for policies and upcoming journal editions. The meetings can be done face to face, or via telephone or video conferencing. To ensure smooth functioning of the journal, the Editors are responsible for conducting the Editorial Board meetings on regular basis (at least twice a year). When Board meetings are not possible, the meeting can be arranged on an individual basis at conferences or other events. Board members' meeting is a key way of networking and building and strengthening the relationship with the Editorial Board members.

4.2. Editorial Policy and Working principles

The Editorial policy deals with the work ethics and principles of the Editorial Board that govern the work relationships between members of the Editorial Board, editors, and the author(s).

Confidentiality

The Editor must ensure confidentiality of the author(s) and reviewers during the process of double-blind peer review.

➢Information pertaining to an article and all communications with referees and corresponding authors as confidential and should not be disclosed by the Editor to anyone except the author(s), reviewer(s), and editorial board members,

➢ Upon reaching a decision about a research paper, only the Editor may disclose or announce title of the study and name of the author(s) that has been accepted for publication. Any other information may only be disclosed with the prior approval of the author(s), and

➢Confidentiality of the participants of the research should also be ensured by protecting personal information (e.g. identifiable personal details, images, and/or individual results). Editor should declare clear guidelines to the contributors (authors) regarding confidentiality of the individual participant.

➢Prior to publication, the content of the manuscript should be kept confidential, both the Editor and reviewer(s) will not share or use any part of the work.

4.2.1. Code of Conduct for Journal Editors

Editors mainly work with the Journal Editor-in-Chief. The Editor-in-Chief can include any Editorial Board member and delegates Activities for the Editorial Board. Code of conduct for journal editors is designed to provide a set of minimum standards which should be followed by the editors of scientific publications and journals.

Editors, Associate Editors, and Journal Staff

Editorial staff must not use information gained through working with manuscripts for private gain. Editors should publish regular disclosure statements about potential conflicts of interest related to the commitments of journal staff. Guest editors should follow these same procedures.

4.2.1.1. Ethical Guidelines to Editors of the Journal

1. An editor should give unbiased consideration to all manuscripts offered for publication, judging each on its merits without regard to race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s). An editor may, however, take into account relationships of a manuscript immediately under consideration to others previously or concurrently offered by the same author(s).

2. An editor should consider manuscripts submitted for publication with all reasonable speed and attention.

3. The sole responsibility for acceptance or rejection of a manuscript rests with the editor. Responsible and prudent exercise of this duty usually requires that the editor seek advice from two or more reviewers, chosen for their expertise and good judgment, as to the quality and

reliability of manuscripts submitted for publication. However, manuscripts may be rejected without review if considered inappropriate for the journal.

 4. The editor and members of the editorial team should not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than those from whom professional advice is sought. (However, an editor who solicits, or otherwise arranges beforehand, the submission of manuscripts may need to disclose to a prospective author the fact that a relevant manuscript by another author has been received or is in preparation.) After a decision has been made about a manuscript, the editor and members of the editorial team may disclose or publish manuscript titles and authors' names of papers that have been accepted for publication, but no more than that unless the author's permission has been obtained.

5. An editor should respect the intellectual independence of authors.

 6. Editorial responsibility and authority for any manuscript authored by an editor and submitted to the editor's journal should be delegated to some other qualified person, such as another editor of that journal or a member of its Editorial Advisory Board. Editorial consideration of the manuscript in any way or form by the author-editor would constitute a conflict of interest and is therefore improper.

7. Unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations disclosed in a submitted manuscript should not be used in an editor's own research except with the consent of the author. However, if such information indicates that some of the editor's own research is unlikely to be profitable, the editor could ethically discontinue the work. When a manuscript is so closely related to the current or past research of an editor as to create a conflict of interest, the editor should arrange for some other qualified person to take editorial responsibility for that manuscript. In some cases, it may be appropriate to tell an author about the editor's research and plans in that area.

8. If an editor is presented with convincing evidence that the main substance or conclusions of a report published in an editor's journal are erroneous, the editor should facilitate publication of an appropriate report or note pointing out the error and, if possible, correcting it. The report may be written by the person who discovered the error or by an original author of the research.

9. An author may request that the editor not use certain reviewers in consideration of a manuscript. However, the editor may decide to use one or more of these reviewers, if the editor feels their opinions are important in the fair consideration of a manuscript. This might be the

case, for example, when a manuscript seriously disagrees with the previous work of a potential reviewer.

10. An Editor should ideally send a PDF rather than Microsoft Word or other electronic file to reviewers and request that amendments, alterations or comments not be made to the electronic copy of the manuscript. It is important that all anonymous comments appear as such and with programs such as Word the computer and user is often shown in tagging comments or amendments.

4.2.1.2. Editor's Relations with Readers

Readers should be informed about who has funded research or other scientific engagement and whether funders had any role in the research and publication, and if so, what kind. In this sense, the editors should ensure that all published research papers are reviewed by qualified reviewers (including statistical reviews if necessary) and that non-reviewed parts of the journal are clearly marked. Editors should systematically adopt processes that promote accuracy, completeness and clarity of research reporting, including technical editing and the use of appropriate guidelines and regulations, especially when it comes to research in Sport medicine and related areas. Editorial boards should inform the readers about authorship and contributor ship, transparently listing contributions and discouraging misconduct, such as the appearance of authors who have significantly contributed to the work but are not listed as authors (ghost authors) or the authors who listed, but did not contribute to the work to an extent sufficient for authorship (guest authors). Editorial boards should also inform readers about the steps that have been taken so that the published works of people related to the journal issuance or of the members of the editorial board were objectively and impartially assessed.

4.2.1.3. Editorial Members Relations with Authors

Editor's decisions on acceptance or rejection of an article should be based on the importance of the article, originality and clarity, validity and relevance of the research for the area which the journal covers, regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, ethnicity, nationality or political beliefs of the author. Editors under the research standing committee must ensure or propose appropriate reviewers of submitted papers, i.e., individuals who are able to assess the article and are not in conflict of interest. In doing so, the editors should take into account the author's request for exemption of certain persons, if it is clearly explained and

applicable. A detailed description of the review process should be available to authors, and editors should be prepared to justify any deviation from it. Editors may not change decisions made on acceptance or rejection of articles, except in the case of serious problems associated with the submitted article. The journal should establish mechanisms for authors to complain on the decision of the editor.

The instructions for authors should contain clear information on what is expected from them by editors. These instructions should be updated regularly.

Editors should provide guidance on the criteria of authorship, as well as on the criteria for collaborators, following the standards to be applied within the scientific field (e.g. responsible research publication: international standards for authors, etc.). In addition to the authors or collaborators, the information about the potential conflict of interest should be clearly stated.

4.2.1.4. Editorial Board Members Relations with Reviewers

▪ Editors through the research committee's secretary should provide clear guidelines for reviewers, stating all that is expected from reviewers, including confidential material submitted for review. Before their consent, reviewers should declare their potential conflicts of interest. Privileged information or ideas obtained during the review process shall be kept confidential and should not be used for personal gain.

▪ Editors should ensure the protection of the identity of the reviewer, except in the case of open review, during which the reviewer selects whether his /her identity will be disclosed or not.

▪ Editors Chief usually the research committee's chairperson selects two or more persons who have appropriate professional competence for evaluating manuscripts, gives these clear guidelines for the implementation of the review process and is responsible for its objectivity and timeliness.

▪ Reviewers are encouraged to comment on various ethical issues related to the possibility of research misconduct raised by submissions (e.g. unethical research design, lack of patient consent to be research subjects, protection of research subjects, for example, Athletes, improper handling and presentation of research data, etc.).

▪ Reviewers are encouraged to comment on the originality of submissions and the caution related to redundant publication or plagiarism. Editorial reviewers can provide the tools for the

detection of related publications (e.g. links to cited literature and results of bibliographic search).

▪ Reviewer comments are sent to the authors in its entirety, unless they contain derogatory or offensive remarks.

▪ Editors in different ways acknowledge and reveal the contribution of reviewers and encourage academic and scientific institutions to respect of the activities of reviewers and to recognize reviews as an important part of academic achievement.

▪ Editors Chief or Secretary (usually the research Directorate or Expert in the academy) develops and maintains a database of reviewers that is regularly updated, adding new reviewers and removing those who systematically produce poor quality or late reviews. In this way, editors Chief monitor the work of reviewers and quality of review and take all steps to ensure high quality of the review process. Editors use different methods to identify new reviewers, for example, suggestions of authors or by searching bibliographic databases, with the aim that the reviewer corpus represents the community of the scientific field and journal well.

▪ Editors' council should take reasonable measures in the event of ethical complaints submitted in relation to the manuscript or article. These measures refer to contacting the author of the manuscript or article and stating complaints or claims with due diligence, and if there is no response to the complaint, they may include further recourse to competent institutions and academia, as well as publication of a correction, recall, expressing concern or other appropriate response. Every reported case of unethical behavior must be investigated, even if detected several years after the publication.

4.2.1.5. Relations of Editor with Editorial Board Members

▪ Editors should ensure that new members of the editorial board receive instructions about their expected work and report regularly new policies and changes to the existing members. The journal should have a policy of handling the work of editors to ensure impartial peer-review.

▪ At least once a year, members of the editorial board will be invited to the assessment of journal management, submission of comments and suggestions to improve the journal or the work of the editorial board and inform them of any changes in the journal policy as well as future challenges.

4.2.2. Quality Assurance

▪ Editors must take all reasonable steps to ensure the quality of published material, considering the fact that the journal and its parts have different goals and standards. Editors should have systems for the detection of false data (e.g. manipulated photographs or plagiarized text) at their disposal, which can be used regularly or in case of doubt. Journal style should be based on factors that improve quality reporting (e.g. adoption of structured abstracts, standard style of referencing-established in the international scientific community, the use of guidelines such as CONSORT, etc.), rather than on aesthetic or personal preferences.

4.2.3. Protection of Individual Data

▪ Editors are required to comply with the Act on Personal Data Protection in force Law. The confidentiality of information obtained during the research or professional interactions (e.g. between doctors and patients, researchers and respondents in the survey, etc.) always has to be protected. Therefore, it is almost always necessary to obtain a written consent for publishing by persons that could identify themselves or be identified by others (e.g. case studies or photos).

▪ Disclosure of personal information without the express consent may be permitted only when the public interest transcends any damage, if it is impossible to get approval and, if is not likely that a reasonable individual would oppose to its publication.

The policy of publication of personal data should be publicly disclosed and clearly explained to the authors. It should be noted that consent to participate in research and undergo treatment is not the same as consent to the disclosure of personal information, photos or quotations.

4.2.4. Encouraging Academic Integrity

▪ Editors should try to ensure that the research is conducted and published in accordance with the relevant international standards and guidelines (for example, the Declaration of Helsinki for clinical research, AERA and BERA guidelines for research in the field of education, etc.).

▪ Editors should seek guarantees that all research was approved by the appropriate bodies (e.g. Research ethics committee), where they exist. However, editors should consider that such approval does not guarantee the ethics of research. If editors have concerns or they need additional explanations, they should ask for evidence of ethical approval for the research and ask the authors questions about the ethical aspects of the research (such as, how the Athletes in the survey were asked for the consent and how it was obtained, or what methods to reduce

suffering were applied). It is necessary to ensure that the reports on clinical trials refer to compliance with the relevant international or national guidelines for the protection of research participants.

▪ It will be designed to appoint an ethical adviser for the journal, who the editors will contact in specific cases, and who would periodically review regulations, instructions and guidelines of the journal.

4.2.3. Procedures in Cases of Scientific Misconduct

In case the editors suspect scientific misconduct, or somebody has warned them about it, they have an obligation to act, regardless of the fact whether the work has been published or not. Editors cannot simply reject the manuscripts that raise concerns or doubts about the possible scientific misconduct. Ethics require the investigation of such cases, and it is recommended to follow the procedure, whenever possible and regardless of the complexity of the procedure and the effort. Editors should primarily seek answers from those whose behavior raises concerns. If they are not satisfied with the answer, they should refer the matter to the relevant employer, institution or competent body, with the aim to investigate the alleged scientific misconduct in depth.

4.2.4. Ensuring the protection of Academic Records

Erroneous, inaccurate or misleading statements must be corrected immediately, with due prominence. Editors should follow international guidelines for retraction, e.g. COPE guidelines. Editors should take steps to reduce the possibility of publishing a recurring publication and presentation of anonymous trials. It is also necessary to ensure the safe storage of published materials (e.g. storage in national and international repositories). It is very important to ensure that the articles are freely available to their authors.

4.2.5. Intellectual Property

When it comes to issues of intellectual property editors need to be careful and cooperate with the EYSA research directorate for considering potential violations of the laws and conventions of intellectual property. In doing so, the application of tools to detect plagiarism in received manuscripts (e.g. software that detects the texts that are similar) can be helpful, either as part of the regular editorial process or when suspicions are raised. Editors need to support the authors

whose copyright has been infringed, or who were victims of plagiarism. In cooperation with the publisher editors should defend the rights of authors and prosecute offenders.

4.2.6. Stimulating Discussion

Editors should encourage and be willing to consider persuasive criticism of an article, and the author of the criticized material should be given a chance to respond. By no means should the publication of research reporting negative results be excluded, and the research that questions the results already published research should be considered.

4.2.7. Complaints

Editors should immediately respond to complaints and ensure the procedure where dissatisfied applicants can forward their complaints.

4.2.8. Fair play and Impartiality

The criteria for the selection of research papers must be impartial and the Editor should select academically and scientifically sound articles,

4.3. Editing and Formatting Guidelines

• The Editor should prepare clear guidelines about preparing and formatting of a paper and print these guidelines in each issue of the journal,

• The guidelines should cover information related to 'content' and 'format' of a research paper,

• Preferred manual style is. APA declared as a policy decision.

4.4. Disclosure

• The Editor must not use any unpublished information/data from the submitted research paper without the permission of the author(s), and

• Any information received after the peer review process must be kept confidential and not used for personal gains.

4.5. Publication Decisions

• The Editor should only shortlist research papers which have relevance to the scope of the journal clearly stated in the Journal, using his /her judgment, but without any personal bias.

• After completion of the reviewing process, the submission of revised manuscript, and assessing the quality and validity, the Editor has a right to accept or reject a research paper.

• The Editor's decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based purely on merit, academic standards and professional demands of the journal.

• The Editor must justify the reason (s) of rejecting a research paper to author(s). This may include:

■ Failure to fit in the scope of the journal (may be communicated after preliminary review)

■ Insufficient depth of content

■ Major errors related to design, analysis, write up and format

■ Any misconduct or conflicting factors (e.g. plagiarism, copyright infringement, legal issues, fake data, authorship issues)

• The Editor is required to timely communicate the editorial decision to the author(s),

• The Editors should not reverse decisions in favor or against author(s) on their own.

Publication Recommendation

To further differentiate the roles of gatekeeper and consultant (and to make the Action Editor's job easier when quite discrepant recommendations are received) we ask that you communicate your publication recommendation only on the standardized evaluation form, which is not shared with authors. **Please do not include an explicit recommendation about acceptance, revision, or rejection in your narrative evaluation that will be shared with the authors**.

In making your publication recommendation, please consider these guidelines developed by the APA Publication and ESA Research Committee:

To merit publication each manuscript must make an original, valid, and significant contribution to an area of sport appropriate for the journal to which it is submitted. That is:

(1) A manuscript cannot have been published, in whole or in part, in another journal or readily available work.

(2) A manuscript must be accurate, and the conclusions and generalizations must follow from the data.

(3) A manuscript must be more than free of major fault—it must be an important contribution to the literature.

(4) A manuscript must be appropriate for the journal. For a manuscript not meeting all those criteria, you will usually recommend rejection, with detailed reasons for your recommendation. (emphasis in the original)

As you consider these policies in formulating your publication recommendation to the Action Editor, it may be helpful to think in terms of the answers to three sequential questions:

1. Is the topic of the manuscript appropriate for *EJSS*?

2.If the Editor believes that a manuscript is clearly outside the scope of the journal, it is rejected without peer review. However, you may receive a manuscript to review because the Editor has some question about its appropriateness for *EJSS*. It is helpful for the Editor to have your opinion on this question. The standardized rating form contains an item assessing fit. You might also decide to address this question in your narrative. A statement describing the topics appropriate for publication in *EJSS* is included outside the cover of each issue.

3.Does the manuscript make a significant scientific contribution? A key determination is thus: Is the manuscript important? This is a difficult question to answer at times but perhaps these alternative versions of the importance question can help:

▪ Does it add significantly to the literature in the field? Will it stimulate more research/theory in the area?

▪ Will it be cited frequently?

▪ Does it offer a new/creative approach that has the promise of serving the field well?

There are many manuscripts that represent sound work, using common methods and designs, but these alone are not appropriate criteria for acceptance.

The *manuscript should add significantly to the field*. This is not a simple decision, but this is perhaps the central issue involved in the publication recommendation. What this means is that many well-done studies may not be accepted because they do not surpass the importance criterion. Given the state of our knowledge, as that of ever increasing, this bar is ever changing. What was new and creative three years ago may now be standard. So, the key assessment is "Will the manuscript move the field forward significantly?"

The *EJSS* Manuscript Evaluation Form contains items for you to rate the scientific contribution of this study.

4. Can the flaws in this manuscript be remedied in a revision? Separate from the determination of overall importance is the issue of "Can the manuscript be improved?" All research is inevitably flawed, and that despite an investigator's best efforts, flaws will remain in every published study. Although the initial version of a manuscript may contain many problems and would require extensive reworking, *EJSS* Action Editors are encouraged to invite a revision if (a) the manuscript has the potential to make a significant contribution to the literature and then

(b) There is a reasonable chance that all the serious issues could be successfully addressed. So, if a manuscript is not potentially important certainly, if there is a "fatal flaw" in the study, it cannot be accepted.

The crucial point is that your recommendation to reject the manuscript or invite a revision should hinge primarily on your judgment about

(a) Importance and only then on

(b) Whether it is possible to address all the major flaws you have found in a revision. It can be more kind to the author to recommend rejecting a manuscript the first time around rather than to invite revisions that have little chance of correcting the identified flaw(s).

CHAPTER FIVE
5. Author's Guide

5.1. Ethical Guidelines for the Author(s)

The following ethical guidelines are obligatory for all author(s) violation of which may result in application of penalties by the editor, including but not limited to the suspension or revocation of publishing privileges. Code of conduct for authors is designed to provide a set of minimum standards which should be followed by the editors of EJSSJ.

5.2. Reporting Standards

❖ Authors reporting on original research are required to present their work in the correct manner in accordance with the patterns of scientific and academic communication and in the context of previous research and offer an objective discussion of its significance and importance.

❖ The authors are also required to describe the methods and present the results in a clear and unambiguous manner.

❖ The paper should contain enough details and references to permit the others to check the work.

❖ Fraudulent or intentionally presented false claims represent unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

❖ When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his published work, his or her commitment is to notify the editor or publisher without delay and cooperate with the editor to cancel or correct the work. If an editor finds from a third party that a published article contains a significant error, the author's obligation is to withdraw or correct the work without delay or provide evidence to the editor about the validity of the original work.

❖ Overviews and professional articles must also be precise and objective and the works that include the views of the editorial board should be clearly indicated.

❖ An author should recognize that journal space is a precious resource created at considerable cost. An author therefore has an obligation to use it wisely and economically.

❖ It is the author(s)' responsibility to ensure that the research report and data contain adequate detail and references to the sources of information in order to allow others to reproduce the results.

❖ Fragmentation of research reports should be avoided. A scientist who has done extensive work on a system or group of related systems should organize publication so that each report gives a well-rounded account of a particular aspect of the general study. Fragmentation consumes journal space excessively and unduly complicates literature searches. The convenience of readers is served if reports on related studies are published in the same journal, or in a small number of journals.

❖ An author's central obligation is to present an accurate account of the research performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance.

5.3. Access to Information and Storage of Material

❖ If any question arises about the accuracy or validity of the research work during the review process, the author(s) should provide raw data to the Editor. Authors may be asked to provide basic information related to the work for the purpose of editorial reviews and they should be willing to allow public access to such information, if possible, and keep such information for a reasonable time after its publication.

❖ A primary research report should contain enough detail and reference to public sources of information to permit the author's peers to repeat the work. When requested, the authors should make a reasonable effort to provide samples of unusual materials to other researchers, with appropriate material transfer agreements to restrict the field of use of the materials so as to protect the legitimate interests of the authors.

5.4. Ethical Requirements

❖ **Formal and documented ethical approval from appropriate research ethics committees** are required for all studies using people, medical records and anonymized human data. Fully informed consent should always be sought where possible from all participants, otherwise an ethics committee should decide if the work is acceptable.

❖ **Privacy of Participants**

• Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, should not be used or reported in the author's work without explicit permission from the investigator with whom the information originated. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, should be treated similarly.

• Authors should cite sources that have strongly influenced the content of research and manuscript. Information obtained privately, for example, in a conversation, correspondence or discussion with third parties may not be used or transferred without the express, written permission of the source. The information obtained during the performance of confidential services, such as the peer review of project applications for funding may not be used without the express written permission of the author of the work that has been the subject of such services. Authors must respect the privacy of the participant of research and must not use any information obtained from them without their informed consent.

• Authors should ensure that only information that improves understanding is shared.

• Authors must ensure that in instances where the identity of the participant needs to be revealed in the study, explicit and informed consent of the concerned party is obtained.

• In the case of the demise of a participant, consent must be obtained from the family of the deceased.

❖ An experimental or theoretical study may sometimes justify criticism, even severe criticism, of the work of another scientist. When appropriate, such criticism may be offered in published papers. However, in no case is personal criticism ever considered to be appropriate.

❖ **Images**

• The author(s) should ensure that images included in an account of research performed or in the data collection as part of the research are free from manipulation,

• The author(s) must provide an accurate description of how the images were generated and produced.

❖ Specific permission for facial photographs of Athletes or study participants is required. A letter of consent must accompany the photographs in which a possibility of identification exists. It is not enough to cover the eyes to mask identity.

❖ **Contributors are required to follow the procedures in force in their countries which govern** the ethics of work done with human subjects. The Code of Ethics of the World Medical Association (Helsinki Declaration) represents a minimal requirement. When experimental done for human subjects, describe their characteristics.

❖ For human participants in a research survey, secure the consent for data and other material verbatim quotations from interviews, etc to be used.

❖ **Laboratory and clinical research** should be driven by protocol; pilot studies should have a written rationale. Protocols must be carefully agreed by all contributors, including if appropriate the participants. Any unusual hazards inherent in the procedures, equipment, chemicals, or techniques used in an investigation should be clearly identified in a manuscript reporting.

5.5. Originality Plagiarism and Acknowledgment

❖ **Acknowledgment of Sources**

• An author should identify the source of all information quoted or offered, except that which is common knowledge.

• A paper must always contain proper acknowledgment of the work of others, including clear indications of the sources of all information quoted or offered, except what is common knowledge.

• The author(s) must also acknowledge the contributions of people, organizations and institutes who assisted the process of research, including those who provided technical help, writing assistance or financial funding (in the acknowledgement).

• It is duty of the author(s) to conduct a literature review and properly cite the original publications that describe closely related work.

❖ **An author should cite those publications that have been influential in determining** the nature of the reported work and that will guide the reader quickly to the earlier work that is essential for understanding the present investigation. This requires sufficient references to contextualize the work within its research context.

❖ Citation of work may be omitted if the author feels that it is not influential to the outcome or analysis of the reported work. Except in a review, citation of work that will not be referred to in the reported research should be minimized. An author is obligated to perform a literature search to find, and then cite, the original publications that describe closely related work. For critical materials used in the work, proper citation to sources should also be made when these were supplied by a non-author.

❖ It is the author(s)' responsibility to ascertain that s/he has submitted an entirely original work, giving due credit, by virtue of proper citations, to the works and/or words of others where they have been used.

❖ Authors should try to write a completely original work, and if they have used the work and/or words of others, they must precisely cite or quote them. Plagiarism in all its forms is considered unethical publishing behavior which is not acceptable.

❖ **Plagiarism** can appear in many forms, from "imposing" other people's work as the author's own, copying or paraphrasing relevant parts of the works of others (without citing the original author) to contributing the results of other people's research to themselves.

❖ Material quoted verbatim from the author(s)' previously published work or other sources must be placed in quotation marks.

❖ Authors are obliged to obtain permission from the copyright holders to publish illustrations, photographs, tables and other materials protected by copyright laws. Copyright-protected material may be reproduced only with proper permission and acknowledgement.

❖ As per ESA policy, in case the manuscript has a similarity index of more than 19%, it will either be rejected or left at the discretion of the Editorial Board for the purposes of a conditional acceptance.

5.6. Multiple or Simultaneous Publication

❖ It is improper for an author to submit manuscripts describing essentially the same research to more than one journal of primary publication, unless it is a resubmission of a manuscript rejected for or withdrawn from publication.

❖ It is generally permissible to submit a manuscript for a full paper expanding on a previously published brief preliminary account (a "communication", "conference report" or "letter") of the

same work. However, at the time of submission, it should be made aware with earlier communication, and the preliminary communication should be cited in the manuscript.

❖ Authors should not submit a manuscript that describes the same research in more than one journal or primary publication at the same time except if a re-submission of a rejected or withdrawn manuscript is.

❖ Authors should not submit a previously published paper.

❖ Simultaneous submission of the same manuscript to more than one journal is considered unethical behavior in publishing and is not acceptable. Publishing of certain types of articles (e.g. translations) in more than one journal is sometimes justified, assuming fulfillment of certain conditions.

❖ Authors may re-publish previously conducted research that has been substantially altered or corrected using more meticulous analysis or by adding more data.

❖ The authors and EJSS editors must agree to the secondary publication, which must cite the primary references and reflect the same data and interpretation of the primary document.

5.7. Authorship

Authorship Credit

• Authorship of the work may only be credited to those who have made a noteworthy contribution in conceptualization, design, conducting, data analysis and writing up of the manuscript.

• It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to include the name(s) of only those co-authors who have made significant contributions to the work.

• The corresponding author should ensure that all co- authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

• Other contributions should be indicated in a footnote or an "Acknowledgments" section. An administrative relationship to the investigation does not of itself qualify a person for co-authorship (but occasionally it may be appropriate to acknowledge major administrative assistance).

• Deceased persons who meet the criterion for inclusion as co-authors should be so included, with a footnote reporting date of death.

• No fictitious name should be listed as an author or co-author. The author who submits a manuscript for publication accepts the responsibility (as corresponding author) of having included as co-authors all persons appropriate and non in appropriate.

• The submitting author should have sent each living co-author a draft copy of the manuscript and have obtained the co-author's assent to co-authorship of it.

5.8. Communication with Editors and Reviewers

Authors are expected to respond professionally and timely to editorial and reviewer comments. If an author decides to withdraw the manuscript that was already submitted to the review process or is not ready to accept the reviewers' suggestions, he or she should immediately notify the editor.

5.9. Disclosure of Data and Conflict of Interest

❖ The authors should in their work disclose any financial or other significant conflict of interest that could influence the results or interpretation of their work.

❖ The manuscripts must be clearly state all the organizations who have given support to the research and all sources of funding and their possible role in conducting research and processing and publication of its results. If the funding source is not clearly stated, it is considered that the financial costs of research and preparation of the work are covered by the author himself or herself.

• **Examples** of possible conflicts of interest that should be disclosed include employment, consultancy, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, application and registration of patents and grants or other funding sources. Potential conflicts of interest should be published at the earliest possible stage.

• Potential conflict of interest, e.g., a consulting or financial interest in a company, that might be affected by publication of the results contained in a manuscript. The authors should ensure that no contractual relations or proprietary considerations exist that would affect the publication of information in a submitted manuscript.

❖ All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed alongside a brief overview of the role played, if any by the responses during various stages of the research.

5.10. Manuscript Acceptance and Rejection

❖ The review period can last between 1-3 months or longer and during this period the author(s) reserve the right to contact the Editor Board to ask about status of the review.

❖ Once the review process has been completed, the author will be informed about the status of the manuscript which could either be an acceptance, rejection or revisions. In the case of rejection, the author(s) reserves the right to publish the article elsewhere.

❖ In case of revisions, the author(s) must provide an exposition of all corrections made in the manuscript and the revised manuscript should, then, go through the process of affirmation of revisions and be accepted or rejected accordingly.

❖ In case of dissatisfaction over the decision of rejection, the author can appeal the decision by contacting the Editor.

5.11. Declaration

❖ Authors are required to provide an undertaking / declaration stating that the manuscript under consideration contains solely their original work that is not under consideration for publishing in any other journal in any form.

❖ Authors may have to sign an agreement allowing the journal to reserve the right to circulate the article and all other derivative works such as translations.

❖ Authors may submit a manuscript previously published in abstracted form, for e.g. in the proceedings of an annual meeting, or in a periodical with limited circulation and availability such as reports by the Government agencies or a University.

❖ A manuscript that is co-authored must be accompanied by an undertaking explicitly stating that each author has contributed substantially towards the preparation of the manuscript in order to claim right to authorship.

❖ It is the responsibility of the corresponding author that s/he has ensured that all those who have substantially contributed in the manuscripts have been included in the author list and they have agreed to the order of authorship.

5.12. Manuscript Submission

Any submission follows the manuscript guiding formats of EJSS. EJSSJ follows the writing formats used in most scientific journals. The <u>Publications Handbook & Style Manual</u> is the official guide EJSS acknowledge for preparing and editing papers.

Creating the Manuscript File

Because Microsoft Word files are required for editing of the text, it is preferred that authors submit the manuscript as a Word file. The figures may be submitted as PDF, EPS, TIF, or JPEG files.

Word Limits

Papers should be a maximum of 7000 words, including abstract, headings, tables, and figures, where each table or figure (including table titles and figure captions) is equivalent to 300 words (600 for large tables and figures that take up an entire page). The suggested word limit for Technical Notes and Preliminary Communications is 4000 to 5000 words, including tables and figures (each of which count for 300 words) and excluding references. Word limits do not apply to introductory papers to special sections.

Accepted manuscripts are prepared for typesetting using Microsoft Word. Therefore, authors are strongly encouraged to use this software during manuscript composition. Rich-format text, PDF and TeX files are not acceptable. The file must be double-spaced and line numbered. The file should contain the following elements:

Title and Byline

❖ A short (12 words or less, not counting conjunctions, prepositions, or articles) title that accurately identifies and describes the manuscript content.

❖ The title should represent the article's content and facilitate retrieval in indexes developed by secondary literature services. The terms in the title should be limited to those words that give significant information about the article's content. It is best to start the title with key words—not with words such as "Effect of" or "Influence of." Many readers peruse titles in a journal's table of contents to decide whether to read a given paper. A good title briefly identifies the subject, indicates the purpose of the study, and introduces key terms or concepts.

❖ Keep titles free of nonstandard abbreviations, chemical formulas, or proprietary names, and avoid unusual or outdated terminology. Use common names.

❖ Series titles are used infrequently. Articles in a series are not discouraged as such, but the editors need to be assured that all papers in the series are available for review and that the reader will be able to obtain earlier and later material in that series.

❖ Titles may be descriptive (e.g., Variables A and B under C Conditions), declarative (A Relates to B in C Manner), or even a question (Does A Do X?).

Author–paper Documentation (addresses / affiliations, email address of the corresponding author, etc.).

Titles are often used in information-retrieval systems. Avoid abbreviations and formulae where possible.

The author–paper documentation appears on the first cover page of the published article. The purpose is to give addresses for all authors and an email address for the corresponding author (author documentation), **Title**, **the date the paper was received for review**, **the date the paper was accepted**, and **any necessary institutional identification** such as a **grant support, dissertation requirement, or a journal article number** (the paper documentation) and **surname, with professional titles**.

Word count List the total number of words used in the paper - which includes the abstract, footnotes, references, and tables. This number should not exceed 7,000 words.

• **Author names and affiliations.** Where the family name may be ambiguous (e.g., a double name), please indicate this clearly. Present the authors' affiliation addresses (where the actual work was done) below the names. Indicate all affiliations with a lower-case superscript letter immediately after the author's name and in front of the appropriate address. Provide the full postal address of each affiliation, including the country name, and, if available, the e-mail address of each author.

• **Corresponding author.** Clearly indicate who will handle correspondence at all stages of refereeing and publication, also post-publication. Ensure that telephone and fax numbers (with country and area code) are provided in addition to the e-mail address and the complete postal address.

• **Present/permanent address**. If an author has moved since the work described in the article was done, or was visiting at the time, a "Present address" (or "Permanent address") may be indicated as a footnote to that author's name. The address at which the author actually did the work must be retained as the main, affiliation address. Superscript Arabic numerals are used for such footnotes.

In the manuscript, put this paragraph after the byline or on the cover page only.

Alternatively, any necessary institutional identification can be placed in the Acknowledgments section. If all authors are at one address, do not repeat the names in the documentation. Otherwise, group together all authors at a single address in the order they appear in the byline. **Give only initials and surname, without professional titles. The titles remain at the cover page or acknowledgments section.**

Following complete addresses for all authors, give any sponsoring institutional information, with brief addresses; and lastly "*Corresponding author" (immediately followed by that person's email address in parentheses). Headquarters will provide the received and accepted dates for accepted papers.

Example:

Amensisa k. Legesse, and Tefera Tadesse*

2.13. Authorship

❖ We encourage the use of full names in by lines (e.g., Amensisa k. Legesse, A. Kebede Legesse or Amensisa Kebede Legesse instead of A. K. Legesse OR Amensisa Kebede L.).

❖ The first person listed in the title is, by definition, the corresponding author deals with proofs and, after publication, with reprint requests.

❖ An asterisk (*) follows the name of the corresponding author in the byline, matched to the words "*Corresponding author" at the end of the author–paper documentation paragraph. Following standard American rules of punctuation, the asterisk comes after any comma (e.g., Frances L. Dudeck, Sayeed S. El-Marhawi,* M. Agnes Santello, and Vernon S. Foell). The authors of the paper decide the sequence of author names; the order should be agreed upon by all authors involved.

5.14. Parts of a Manuscript

Abstract

❖ A journal abstract has two typical uses. Printed at the head of a scientific paper, an abstract helps readers decide whether to delve into the paper; abstracts are also published via abstracting and indexing services. Because the abstract will be seen and read by many more people than will read the paper, everything that is important in the paper must be reflected in the abstract.

❖ Include an informative, self-explanatory abstract. The abstract should be a single paragraph. It should be specific, telling why and how the study was made, what the results were, and why they were important. The abstract should read like a "mini-manuscript" with 1 to 2 sentences each for a justification/rationale, objective(s), methods, results, and conclusion. Present the most significant results and use quantitative terms where possible.

❖ The abstract should call attention to new techniques, observations, or data. Be specific.

❖ Use an **informative abstract** (also called a substantive abstract) presents the paper in miniature, complete within itself. It moves from an introductory statement of the rationale and objectives or hypotheses, through materials and methods, to the results and conclusions. (A descriptive abstract is more like a table of contents for the paper and is rarely used in scientific publications except, perhaps, for review or opinion papers.) A number of books and articles offer useful advice on preparing abstracts (e.g., O'Connor and Woodford, 1976; O'Connor, 1979; Day, 1988), and

❖ An internet search for "informative abstract" is likely to have recent course materials on scientific writing among the results. Because an informative abstract has to stand alone, do not deflect the reader with phrases such as "will be discussed" or "will be explained." For the same reason, do not include reference, figure, or table citations. Equations also are inappropriate in an abstract unless they are the central finding of the study. Limit your use of abbreviations and define the ones you do use.

Write the abstract as a single paragraph, with a limit of 350 words (~1500 characters) for manuscript and 600 words for full-length papers.

Introduction (including Objectives and literature Review)

Use the introduction to review published literature and issues related to your topic. A thorough introduction helps the reader recognize what your research contributes to the current knowledge in your subject area. Begin your article by clearly identifying its subject and state the hypothesis or definition of the problem designed to solve. Give a brief reference to previous concepts and research. Limit literature references to essential information, and do not rely on old references when newer are available. Keep the introduction short, but include:

(i) A brief statement of the problem that justifies doing the work, or the hypothesis it is based on;

(ii)The findings of others that will be further developed or challenged; and

(iii) An explanation of the general approach

Text

After the **Introduction (Objectives and literature)** the main text of the manuscript typically includes Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, and a conclusion. The Results and Discussion sections may be combined into one section. The author(s) can:

(i) Include a separate conclusions section, which will appear as a subheading under the Discussion

(ii) Provide the conclusions (with no heading) at the end of the Discussion section. In either case, the conclusions should be no longer than 300 words or 600 words for full length paper. Within the 300 words, the conclusions and implications of the work should be provided. In some instances, no conclusions may have been drawn from the study. In this case, the implications of the study should be provided. In other words, if the author(s) decides to forego the inclusion of a conclusion subheading within the Discussion section, then the final paragraph of the Discussion section should provide the conclusions (if any) and the implications of the study.

(iii)   Method and Discussion

Use the Discussion section to interpret your results. Give particular attention to the problem, question, or hypothesis presented in the introduction. A good discussion typically covers most or all of the following steps:

1.sample variables are free of confounding influences (e.g., education is controlled for), recruitment and sampling techniques are appropriate,

2. measures are reliable and valid for assessing the variables of interest, and

3. the statistical procedures are appropriate and sufficiently sophisticated to

4. Examine the data and are carried out appropriately.

5. Relate the results to the original objectives.

6. Explain the principles, relationships, and generalizations if supported by the results.

7. Address any exceptions or lack of correlation that qualify the findings, or difficulties that point to areas for further investigation.

8. Explain how the results relate to previous findings, whether in support, or contradiction, a.

9. Present conclusions supported by a summary of the evidence. The Discussion section should focus on the meaning of your findings, not recapitulate them. Scientific speculation is encouraged, but it should be reasonable, firmly founded in observation, and subject to tests. It must also be identified as such. Where results differ from previous results for unexplained reasons, possible explanations should not be labored. Controversial issues should be discussed clearly and fairly.

(Iv) Tables: - usually show numerical value or textual information and are almost always characterized by a row-column structure. Any type of illustration other than a table is referred to as a figure. Compose tables using the word processor's table feature (i.e., the table should have defined cells—do not create tables by using the space bar and/or tab key). Tables should not duplicate matter that is presented in figures. Use the following symbols for foot notes in the order shown: †, ‡, §, ¶, #, ††, ‡‡, etc. The symbols *, **, and *** are always used to indicate statistical significance at the 0.05, 0.01, and 0.001 probability levels, respectively, and are not used for other footnotes. As with figure captions, spell out abbreviations on first mention.

Number

- Number tables sequentially (i.e. If you have more than one table in your writing) e.g. Table 1, Table 2

- Each table must be referred to in the text, using a capital T, for example: ...as shown in Table 1

Title

- Place directly above the table itself and below the table number.

- Brief clear and explanatory, in italics and with major words **capitalized** with no full stop.

Note

5. Place directly below the table, the word "Note" in italics with a full stop, for example: *Note.*

6. Explain abbreviations, symbols etc

7. Acknowledge the source of the table

8. Include a copyright statement at the end of the note.

Ruling (Lines)

- Limit the use of lines to those that are necessary

- Appropriately positioned white space can be an effective substitute.

Spacing: - Tables may be submitted either single or double spaced. Consider readability **(V) Figure** captions and tables should be placed in the main text close to where they are first called out. (Figures may also be submitted separately as high-resolution image files in the following acceptable formats: EPS, TIF, PDF, or JPEG)

Caption:

When you use a figure that has been adapted or copied directly from another source, you need to reference that original source. This reference appears as a caption underneath the figure (image):

- don't include a title on top - the caption is your title

- concise explanation of the figure; i.e. a brief but descriptive phrase

- include copyright information

- format your caption - use italics and a capital F for Figure and sequential numbering (if you have more than one Figure)

General rules:

- Number all figures with Arabic numerals in the order in which they are first mentioned in text, regardless of whether a more detailed discussion of the figure occurs later in the paper. For example, Figure 1...Figure 2...etc.

- Refer to the figure in your writing - no italics, but with capital F, for example "In Figure 1..."

Figure.1

Reproduced from Common Running Problems in Sport: their assessment, management and prevention (Larkins, 1990)

Insert the figure captions in the file following the figure as well as after the references list. Spell out abbreviations on first mention in figure captions, even if they have already been defined in the text. (The reader should be able to understand the figure content without referring back to the text).

VI. Acknowledgments (optional).

Brief acknowledgment of grant funding can be included in the documentation paragraph, but extensive support information and personal thanks belong in the acknowledgments section at the end of the paper.

VII. Appendices

If there is more than one appendix, they should be identified as A, B, etc. Formulae and equations in appendices should be given separate numbering: Eq. (A.1), Eq. (A.2), etc.; in a subsequent appendix, Eq. (B.1) and so on. Similarly, for tables and figures: Table A.1; Fig. A.1, etc. Vitae submit a short (maximum 100 words) biography of each author.

Supplemental Material paragraph, if applicable.

Supplemental material may be included in the online version of articles. The material must be submitted along with the original manuscript and will undergo peer review. Authors are encouraged to submit materials that contribute to the content and quality of the article or to use supplemental material as a means to shorten the text of manuscripts.

2.15. References

Author

An author can be a person, committee, organization, or other party responsible for the work. Avoid the use of "anonymous." Only when no author can be determined for a document should "anonymous" be used.

For Web pages, it is most common to use the name of the organization as the author.

The Webmaster or contact person for the site is not usually considered the author. Similarly, use the organization and location as the publisher of the site.

Date

Three dates are important:

(1) The date when the publication was placed on the internet or was copyrighted,

(2) The latest date of any update or revision, and

(3) The date when the person doing the citing accessed the publication.

Title

 Book and journal titles are usually clearly stated on a Website. For other Web pages, look for

(i)   The most prominent (usually the largest) words on the screen,

(ii)   Wording followed by a copyright or registered-trade mark symbol,

(iii)   The title bar of the Web browser (generally in the top left corner).

Publisher

In electronic terms, a publisher is defined as the person or organization that produces or sponsors the site. Look at the bottom of a home page, at the top or on a side bar of the first screen, at the end of a document, or for the organization named after a copyright statement.

Examples:

- University of Gondor. 2012.
- University of Wisconsin automated weather observation network.
- University of Wisconsin Extension. http://www.soils. wisc.edu/wimnext/awon/awon.html (accessed 18 Jan. 2012). SAS Institute. 2004.
- User's guide: Statistics. SAS Inst., Cary, NC. last name first, followed
- The author's name is listed by initials (Smith, J.R.). For works by more than one author, only the first author's name is inverted (Smith, J.R., M. Jones, and C. Rosen).
- Titles Use sentence-style capitalization for titles and subtitles of articles, book chapters, bulletins, and books, capitalizing the first letter of the first word as well as proper nouns and adjectives.
- Do not number the references list
- Arrange the list alphabetically by the surnames of the first authors and then by the second and third authors.
- Single-authored articles should precede multiple-authored articles for which the individual is first author.
- Two or more articles by the same author(s) are listed chronologically; two or more in the same year are indicated by a, b, c, etc.
- Only literature that is available through libraries or other readily accessible public media can be cited. Material that does not meet this standard should be cited as personal communication or unpublished data.

Examples:

Journal article

- Smith, D.T., D.L. Johnson, and J.K. Thomas. 2001. Phosphorus losses in irrigation runoff. J. Environ. Qual. 30:2569–2580.

Book

- Lindsay, W.L. 1979. *Chemical equilibria in soils.* John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Chapter in a book (Book Section)

- Nelson, D.W., and L.E. Sommers. 1982. Total carbon, organic carbon, and organic matter. In: *A.L. Page et al., editors, Methods of soil analysis*. Part 2. 2nd ed. Agron. Monogr. 9. ASA and SSSA, Madison, WI. p. 539–579

Official Sources

- Spelling: Merriam-Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary

- Chemical names: PubChem (https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih. gov/)

• Journal abbreviations: Chemical Abstracts Service Source Index (CASSI; American Chemical Society, http://cassi.cas.org/)

• In the reference list itself, give the names of all authors if fewer than six authors.

• If the paper has more than six authors, the sixth and following author names may be abbreviated to "et al."

• Do not use a dash to indicate names repeated from the prior entry. Do not use "ibid." or "op cit."

Citation Style

The author–year notation system is required; do not use numbered notation. For within-text citations of papers with two authors, name both authors. With three or more authors, include the last name of the first author plus "et al."

For two or more articles using the same within-text citation, add a distinguishing lowercase letter (a, b, c, etc.) to the year in both the text and references list. Separate citations with a semicolon. For citations of multiple works by the same authors, the author names do not need to be repeated.

Examples: (Murphy, 2001; Murphy and Smith, 2001; Murphy et al., 2001) (Murphy, 2001; Murphy and Wong, 2001a, 2001b; Murphy et al., 2001) (Murphy, 2001; Murphy et al., 2001, 2002; Murphy and Davis, 2002)

Citing Quotations

Direct quotations from a book or very long chapter (above 40 words) require a page number in the text citation, to spare the reader a tedious hunt for the original wording in context. When practical, the exact page number is preferred for any quotation.

Citing Unpublished Sources

Only literature available through libraries or other readily accessible public media may be cited. All other material, such as personal communications (information from someone other than the authors) and unpublished data (information from one or more author named in the byline), is cited in the text as parenthetical matter. Give both the source and the date for the information.

Examples: (R.D. Jackson, personal communication, 1997) (unpublished data, 1998) [when all authors are responsible for the data] (Faribault, unpublished data, 1998) [when only the author Faribault is responsible for the data] Placing "unpublished data" or "personal communication" between the name and year clearly distinguishes these citations from those keyed to the reference list. The terms in review and in press are not synonymous. Material that is in press has been accepted for publication but has not yet appeared in print. This material may be listed in reference sections

because the reader will eventually be able to locate it. Material submitted for publication but not yet accepted may be included in the reference list of your paper during the review process, but upon your paper's acceptance these entries must be converted to citations of unpublished data or personal communication. If the change from review status to in press status occurs before or by the proof stage, the citation can be restored and completed.

Reviewers and editors are not expected to verify the accuracy of the literature citations. Authors should check the alphabetical reference list against the citations in the body of the manuscript as one of the last steps before submitting the manuscript for publication.

Miscellaneous Dissertations and theses

- Maraqa, M.A. 1995. Transport of dissolved volatile organic compounds in the unsaturated zone. Ph.D. diss., Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Software and software documentation.
- Abacus Concepts. (1991). Super ANOVA user's guide. Release 1.11. Abacus Concepts, Berkeley,
- CA. Minitab. (1998). MINITAB 12. Minitab, State College, PA.
- SAS Institute. 1994. The SAS system for Windows. Release 6.10. SAS Inst., Cary, NC. 'Encyclopedia article.
- Encyclopedia of plant physiology. Vol. 12A. Springer, Berlin. p. 135–167.

Map.

Cite a map separately only if it is a stand-alone publication. If there is no author for a map, do not use "Anonymous." In such cases, the name of the map stands in for the author. Author. Year. Map title [map type, e.g., demographic map]. Map number (if included). Publisher, Publisher location. Notes (e.g., scale).

Electronic Sources

- Treat electronic sources as you would the same kind of material in print. Start with the author, date, article or Web page title, and further information essential to the online reference. Because of the potentially ephemeral nature of electronic publications, if a publication exists in both print and electronic versions, cite the print version only. Some electronic sources are the equivalent of personal communications or unpublished data (e.g., email, an online interview or chat session, or information posted on an individual's home page). Cite these in the text only; include the full URL address and the date.

- For original content from online sources, other than formally published documents such as journal articles and books, include as much of the following as can be determined: Author of the content, title or description of the page, the owner of the site if it can be determined, and the

URL. Also provide the date you accessed the material. Citations to a home page should be cited in text.

• **Conflicts of Interest Statement.** Authors should include a statement just before the References section that explains any conflicts of interest. If there are none, authors should explicitly state that there are no conflicts of interest. Conflicts of interest are anything that would interfere with, or a reasonable person could perceive to interfere with, the fully transparent and objective presentation of the paper. Potential conflicts could concern intellectual property, relationships with other entities, or financial gain but are not limited to these issues.

• A Templet of the Journal page for the manuscript is available at the end of this chapter.

5.15. Consent and Permissions

The submitting author should have sent each living coauthor a draft copy of the manuscript and have obtained the coauthors' assent to co authorship of it. Authors are responsible for obtaining all permissions for use of figures from other publishers and should supply these releases at the time the accepted manuscript is forwarded for production. Authors are also responsible for obtaining permission from individuals whose images are included in photographs.

5.16. Revised Manuscripts

At submission of a revised manuscript, the author should submit a marked version and a clean version of the manuscript. The marked version should clearly identify the differences between the original submission and the revised submission. The preferred method of indicating the changes is to use the Track Changes function in Word.

Errata

Errata may be used by the authors of a paper to correct errors and omissions that affect the integrity of the version of record that are identified after publication. All additions and corrections are subject to editorial approval and must be approved by all coauthors before sub-mission; corrections of minor errors or omissions will not be published. Send all errata requests to the journal's managing editor.

5.17. Plagiarism Screening

Papers submitted to *EJSS* are screened for plagiarism prior to being sent for review. If there appears to be major repetition from other sources, the Editor will evaluate the duplication and take appropriate action as warranted.

5.18. Language Editing

Particularly if English is not your first language, you may wish to have your paper edited for language. This is not a mandatory step but may help to ensure that the scientific content of your paper is fully understood by journal editors and reviewers. After you submit to an EJSS, if there are language issues with your paper, the Technical or Associate Editor may recommend the English Language Editing Service. Language editing does not guarantee that your manuscript will be accepted for publication.

5.19. JOURNAL TEMPLET

- ## Training Related and Supportive Factors for the Occurrence of Acute Injuries for Junior Athletes at Ethiopian Athletics Training Centres (16
- ## Bold Blue Colour, 1.15.Space, All Times Roman)

First Author[1], Second Author[2] (14 Bold)

1(Department, College/ University Name, Country Name) (10 Italic)
2(Department, College/ University Name, Country Name) (10 Italic Bold)

Abstract ((11, 1.5.Space , Bold))

Runners sustain injuries at an alarming rate. According to various epidemiologic studies (Rochcongar P, Pernes J, Carre F, et al. 1995; Walter SD, Hart LE, McIntosh JM, et al, 1989), between 27% and 70% of recreational and competitive distance runners can expect to be injured during any 1-year period.

The general purpose of the study was to investigate and describe the causes, consequences and potential preventive measures or strategies that are effective enough to reduce acute injuries in coaching practices of the five Ethiopian national Athletics Training Center s(Tirunesh Dibaba ,Maychew, Bekoji, Hagerselam, Debrebirhan and Ethiopian Sport Academy) of running Athletes. This twelve-month retrospective questionnaire study comprised Ethiopian athletics training centers' running athletes Short distance (n=65), Middle distance (n=75), and. **(10 , 1.5.Space)**

Background of the Study (12 Bold)

It is still an on-going debate among sport medicine professionals and coaches whether athletic injuries are an inevitable part of athletics, or whether they may be predicted or even prevented by utilization of advanced coaching strategies and technologically safe equipment. To fully elaborate on the issues of different types of injuries among elite athletes, it is necessary to consider multiple factors, both the external and internal causes and consequences of injury (Slobounov, 2008).

In relation to this several studies have investigated the risk factors for sports injuries in long-distance running .Those factors include age, anthropometrics, anatomical factors, training years, injury history, menstrual status, physical fitness, and psychological factors (Bahr, & Holme 2003; Taimela, Kujala, &Österman, 1990; van Mechelen, Hlobil, &Kemper, 1992;Murphy, Connolly, &Beynnon, 2003). The amount of exposure, sudden increased training or running distance (Collado, Sainani, &Fredericson, 2011; Taunton et al, 2002; Tenforde, Sayres, McCurdy, Walter, &Hart, 1990) or running volume (Lysholm, &

Wiklander, 1987): Training errors without enough resting and recovery time and fatigue as well as equipment, such as shoes, skies and poles can also be risk factors for an injury. Further, training surface has been found to be associated with injury risk (Wen ,2007). A hard training surface increases the risk for stress fractures (Knobloch , &Yoon Vogt ,2008). **(11, 1.5.Space)**

Table.**25** **((11, 1.5. Space, Bold))**

Number of Acute Injuries

ANOVA **(11, 1 Space, Bold)**

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.344	2	1.672	1.560	.213
Within Groups	215.416	201	1.072		
Total	218.760	203			

$P \leq .05$

References **(11, 1.5.Space, Bold)**

Aaltonen S, Karjalainen H, Heinonen A, Parkkari J, Kujala UM. (2007). Prevention of injuries:

Alonso JM, Junge A, Renstrom P, Engebretsen L, Mountjoy M, Dvorak J. (2009). Sports injuries surveillance during the (2007) IAAF World Athletics Championships. Clin J Sport Med 19 (1), 26-32.

Arnason A, Sigurdsson SB, Gudmundsson A, Holme I, Engebretsen L, Bahr R. (2004). Risk factors for injuries in football. Am J Sports Med 32 (Suppl 1), S5-S16.

Bahr R, Andersen SO, Loken S, Fossan B, Hansen T, Holme I. (2004). Low back pain among endurance athletes with and without specific back loading A cross-sectional survey of cross-country skiers, rowers, orienteers, and nonathletic controls. Spine 29 (4), 449-454.

Basler RS, Hunzeker CM, Garcia MA.(2004). Athletic skin injuries: Combating pressure and friction. Phys Sports med 32 (5), 33-40**. (10,** 1.Space, Bold for authors only

Chapter SIX
6. Reviewers Responsibilities and Guidelines

▪ Reviewers should preview a manuscript that they have been asked to review to see if they have conflicts of interest that could complicate their review. Reviewers must disclose to editors any conflicts of interest that could bias their opinions of the manuscript and should recues themselves from reviewing specific manuscripts if the potential for bias exists. Reviewers must not use knowledge of the work they are reviewing before its publication to further their own interests.

▪ It is the responsibility of all reviewers to deal with requests from editors and associate editors to review papers and make those reviews in a timely manner, with care, consideration, and above all objectivity, exercising confidentiality at every stage. It is appreciated by authors when reviewers explain and support their judgments so that comments may be fully understood. There are checklists for reviewers that will help with the process, and training is available upon request. Reviewers should not retain copies of any article that they review.

6.1. Ethical obligations of Reviewers of Manuscripts

1. In as much as the reviewing of manuscripts is an essential step in the publication process, and therefore in the operation of the scientific method, every scientist has an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.

2. A chosen reviewer who feels inadequately qualified to judge the research reported in a manuscript should return it promptly to the editor.

3. A reviewer (or referee) of a manuscript should judge objectively the quality of the manuscript, of its experimental and theoretical work, of its interpretations and its exposition, with due regard to the maintenance of high scientific and literary standards. A reviewer should respect the intellectual independence of the authors.

4. A reviewer should be sensitive to the appearance of a conflict of interest when the manuscript under review is closely related to the reviewer's work in progress or published. If in doubt, the reviewer should return the manuscript promptly without review, advising the editor of the conflict of interest or bias. Alternatively, the reviewer may wish to furnish a signed review

stating the reviewer's interest in the work, with the understanding that it may, at the editor's discretion, be transmitted to the author.

5. A reviewer should not evaluate a manuscript authored or co-authored by a person with whom the reviewer has a personal or professional connection if the relationship would bias judgment of the manuscript.

6. A reviewer should treat a manuscript sent for review as a confidential document. It should neither be shown to nor discussed with others except, in special cases, to persons from whom specific advice may be sought; in that event, the identities of those consulted should be disclosed to the editor.

7. Reviewers should explain and support their judgments adequately so that editors and authors may understand the basis of their comments. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. Unsupported assertions by reviewers (or by authors in rebuttal) are of little value and should be avoided.

8. A reviewer should be alert to the failure of authors to cite relevant work by other scientists, bearing in mind that complaints that the reviewer's own research was insufficiently cited may seem self-serving. A reviewer should call to the editor's attention any substantial and significant similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper or any manuscript submitted concurrently to another journal.

9. A reviewer should act promptly, submitting a report in a timely manner. Should a reviewer receive a manuscript at a time when circumstances preclude prompt attention to it, the unreview manuscript should be returned immediately to the editor. Alternatively, the reviewer might notify the editor of probable delays and propose a revised review date.

10. Reviewers should not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, except with the consent of the author. If this information indicates that some of the reviewer's work is unlikely to be profitable, the reviewer, however, could ethically discontinue the work. In some cases, it may be appropriate for the reviewer to write the author, with copy to the editor, about the reviewer's research and plans in that area.

11. The review of a submitted manuscript may sometimes justify criticism, even severe criticism, from a reviewer. When appropriate, such criticism may be offered in published papers. However, in no case is personal criticism of the author ever considered to be appropriate.

12. Ideally a reviewer should not make their comments on the appropriateness of publication of a manuscript on the electronic copy of the work as this can have the details of the reviewer and institution embedded into the computers' programming. All comments and proposed alterations to the text should be made on a hard copy of the manuscript for the Journal Editor to review.

6.2. Summary of issues to Include in a Review

Key issues to remember:

1. Is the manuscript important?

2. Is the manuscript fixable? How could it be altered?

3. What are the key points and what are the more particular points and are these differentiated?

4. In general, good reviews do not exceed 3 pages single spaced (there are always exceptions).

5. Keep in mind that you too are an author and ask yourself what would a good review look like if this were your manuscript?

▪ Editorial committee with the research Committees must then take these recommendations and make an editorial decision of acceptance status. While this decision is often in agreement with the majority of the recommendations of the reviewers, this is not a requirement. The Action Editor has an independent say as to the disposition of the manuscript.

▪ If the Action Editor decides that a manuscript is not appropriate for publication, then this message will be delivered to the authors along with clear justification of the reasoning for the decision.

▪ If the Action Editor decides that the manuscript is appropriate for resubmission and reconsideration, then it is his or her task to make it very clear what exactly is needed in the revision. This will certainly use many of the points raised by the reviewers as well as any separate ones deemed appropriate by the Action Editor. However, it is important that the Action Editor also makes it clear what reviewer points do not need to be addressed in the revision. It is important that the Action Editor be as clear as possible about what is and what is not required in a revision. This helps the authors craft a revision.

Addendum: Possible issues to consider in a review

Below are a set of issues to consider in a manuscript. They should not be used as an outline to construct your review but as issues to consider in your evaluation. Although the guidelines below generally follow the order of the components in a manuscript (i.e., introduction, method, results), after the opening paragraphs your narrative evaluation need not follow the same order, nor is it necessary for your evaluation to comment on each section of the manuscript.

In fact, Action Editors generally find reviews more helpful when all the most serious concerns are collated together into a single series of points early in the review, followed by a clearly separated section of less serious concerns.

Introduction

The basic task of this section of the manuscript is to make a persuasive case for the importance of this study. Consider a typically well-informed, regular reader of *EJSS*, but one who is not an expert in this specific research domain.

- Would such a reader be convinced by this introduction that the study addresses an important research problem, and that the research questions are well-justified?
- Does the study advance scientific inquiry in counseling psychology and constitute an original and substantive contribution to the field?
- Do the authors provide justification for the study based upon a review and incorporation of relevant literature, both qualitative and quantitative?
- Does the author articulate the goals of the study and the contribution of the study in extending or addressing gaps in the literature?
- Are research questions stated clearly and derived logically either from theory, conceptual framework, thorough literature review, anecdotal evidence, and/or clinical experience (or some combination thereof)?
- In some cases, more exploratory studies may not have a clearly defined framework. For example, some qualitative studies would support having the participant observer enter into a community to determine community need. If no conceptual framework is given, has the author given a clear justification?
-

In quantitative Designs,

- Are research questions/hypotheses well grounded in theory and previous research? If hypotheses are proposed, is each one phrased as a falsifiable statement, and is each one logically derived from the theory and previous research presented?

- If research questions are posed, is this choice justified in your view, or do you believe the state of knowledge in this research area warrants a specific hypothesis instead of a general research question?

- Have the authors clarified the critical assumptions that underlie the logic of their design, or are there important assumptions left implicit that should be directly addressed?

- Have authors justified convincingly why this quantitative approach is the most appropriate methodology for their study?

For qualitative Designs

- Are the research questions logically derived from previous research, theory, and/or experiential evidence?

- Do the authors locate their research questions and methods in an appropriate research paradigm (Ponterotto, 2005)?

- Are the authors clear about whether their study is confirmatory/verification oriented or discovery oriented?

- If the former, do the authors anchor their research questions in established theory? If the latter, are the authors careful not to let theoretical postulates overly focus the research questions and limit discovery?

- Have authors justified convincingly why the chosen qualitative design is the most appropriate methodology for their study?

[Note: There is a misunderstanding among some that qualitative researchers neglect, avoid, or dismiss theory. Qualitative researchers must, of course, master theory and research in their topical area, but some qualitative paradigms (e.g., more constructivist) address and integrate theory more in the discussion to maintain the "discovery" focus of the research questions, whereas other paradigms (e.g., more post positivist) anchor their research questions (and interview protocols) in theory.]

- Have the authors justified convincingly why this qualitative approach is the most appropriate methodology for their study?

Method

One basic task of this section is to provide enough information so that future researchers could replicate this work. If you were required to replicate this study with only the method section as a resource, would you be able to do so with enough fidelity? Has the population of interest been defined and described in enough detail? Are participants adequately described? Is the sample adequate for answering the questions posed?

In experimental Studies

- Have appropriate manipulation checks and experimental controls been included in the design?
- Has the procedure for assigning subjects to conditions introduced possible confounds?

In quantitative Designs

- Have the sampling methods, demographic characteristics, and attrition of the sample been described in enough detail so that readers can reach an informed conclusion about what generalizations are possible?
- Have the proportions of ethnic/racial minority members of the sample been adequately described? When a sample of convenience is used, are the generalizations proposed by the authors reasonable?
- How have the purposes of the study been described to participants, and how might these procedures influence the results?
- Did considerations of statistical power contribute to an a priori determination of adequate sample size? In your view, does this sample afford enough statistical power and can meaningful generalizations be drawn to the population of interest?
- Have all variables been appropriately operationalized, and the measures used to assess them adequately described?
- Are the measures appropriate for the participants in this sample?
- Have appropriate psychometric characteristics (e.g., scoring, dimensionality, reliability, and validity) been reported for all measures and subscales used? (For example, has retest reliability been reported for all measures of constructs the researchers have conceptualized as traits? Has predictive validity been reported for any measure used as a screening tool?)
- Are the reports of psychometric properties that are cited from other studies relevant for the sample used in this study? [An error still frequently seen in manuscripts submitted to *EYSAJ* is

that reliability and validity are ascribed to a measure without reference to the sample from which estimates were derived. See Wilkinson, L. and the Task Force on Statistical Inference APA Board of Scientific Affairs (1999)].

- How is reliability for the study sample addressed? For example, are reliability coefficients for the current sample reported? If measures were developed for this study, is enough information provided about the psychometric integrity of these measures? If rating scales are used, have the raters been adequately trained and has the reliability of the rating scheme been sufficiently documented (e.g., Kappa or Intraclass Correlation Coefficients)?

- As you consider the methodology in total, and keeping in mind that no research design can be free of flaws, does the design adequately control threats to internal and external validity?

For qualitative studies,

- Has the paradigm underpinning the research been clearly articulated; or, if not specified, do the research question, research design (method), data gathering, and analysis reflect a congruent paradigmatic approach?

- Have variants of the method or analysis approach been cited?

- Has the research method or design been clearly identified and justified as appropriate for the research purpose?

- Has the researcher's stance in relation to the participants, community, and phenomenon been articulated?

- Is there evidence of reflexivity on the part of the researcher?

- Have paradigm-appropriate debriefers, auditors, participant feedback)?

For qualitative studies

- Are the procedures involved in the qualitative method described thoroughly?

- Have the procedures been described in enough detail so that the readers can judge that the investigation was carried out in a trustworthy manner (Morrow, 2005)?

- For example:

(a) Is the sampling/selection process thoroughly described; was sampling purposeful; are selection criteria described, and are they informed directly by the research questions; are decisions about sample size—e.g., redundancy, saturation—articulated; are recruitment strategies described adequately?

(b) Are issues of entry into the field and the use of gatekeepers described?

(c) Are data management aspects such as recording, transcription, and compilation of the data corpus spelled out?

(d) Are data collection strategies described in detail?

- Has the author specified who was involved in data collection?
- Are monitoring processes described (e.g., checking of interviews, analytic memos, site visits, discussion, observation)?

For qualitative Studies

- Is the investigator's interviewing stance (e.g., structured, semi structured, unstructured) and approach described?
- Are interview questions included, either in the text or an appendix?
- Are the training and supervision of interviewers described?
- Are other forms of data described adequately (e.g., observations, focus groups, documentary evidence, field notes, participant follow-ups)?
- Are data analysis steps described in detail sufficient for understanding how results were generated and so that the analysis could be replicated?
- Have the researchers provided for ways to check the adequacy of the analysis (e.g., audits, peer reviewers, triangulation of data, and involvement of participants)?
- Have the authors specified how participants were involved in the interpretation of the data (for example, if participant checks are used, does the researcher indicate how disagreements (different perspectives on interpretation) are resolved?
- Are authors' interpretive statements congruent with the results obtained, and with supporting quotes?
- Are data analysis software packages used for data analysis identified, and are reasons given for their selection? Are standards of trustworthiness (rigor) clearly articulated, either in a separate section or imbedded in the text (Morrow, 2005)?
- Has the investigator identified particular ethical considerations in regard to the study, including steps taken to reduce potential risks to participants, especially with regard to issues of confidentiality and researcher/participant roles that are unique to qualitative research (Haverkamp, 2005)?

Results, Statistical Analyses, Figures, and Tables

- Do the results follow closely from the goals described previously, that is, have the researchers studied the questions set forth in the introduction?

- Do the results provide answers to the research questions that have been posed?

Quantitative manuscripts submitted to *EYSAJ* should conform to guidelines for reporting statistical analyses published in 1999 by the APA Task Force on Statistical Inference. (*American Psychologist, 54*, 594-604). Reviewers not familiar with these guidelines should consult this resource.

For quantitative studies, have the data been screened for coding errors and outliers? Is the treatment of missing data appropriate? Are the quantitative methods used the most appropriate choices for testing the hypotheses or research questions? Are they appropriately matched to the nature of the data (e.g. random vs. fixed effects, longitudinal vs. cross-sectional)? Have the authors demonstrated that requirements and underlying assumptions of each statistical test have been fulfilled by the data (for example, assumptions of independence, and normality – both univariate and multivariate)?

For quantitative Studies

- Reports of statistical significance should be coupled with an appropriate estimate of effect size. (See Vacha-Haase & Thompson, 2004). Effect size estimates should be reported for each statistical test of each hypothesis or research question. Reports of point estimates should be accompanied by appropriate confidence intervals. Have appropriate corrections for the inflation in Type I error been used in reporting results of multiple statistical tests?

- Is each figure and table clear, accurately labeled, and essential, or could the material be presented more efficiently in text? Is the material in each table or figure self-explanatory? Does the text unnecessarily duplicate material that readers can glean more efficiently from the table?

For qualitative studies

- Is the Results section consistent with the defining paradigm and approach, producing results consistent with what was anticipated in the Introduction?

- Do the results seem logical and clear to the reader given the detailed description of the procedures and given the detail and organization of the Results?

- Do the category labels fit with the examples, and have adequate definitions of categories been provided? Can the reader say, "Yes, I can see how these themes were generated"? Are the results

characterized by "thick description" (i.e., rich, complex descriptions set in the context of participant's lives) and saturation of categories?

- Are the results concise, fluid, and interesting rather than laborious to read and digest? Has the researcher provided a sufficient number of examples so that the results come to life? Are participant voices (quotes) presented in sufficient detail, and are they logically connected and placed thematically? Where appropriate, are results presented in an appropriate figure or table consistent with the paradigm and design?

Discussion

- Does the Discussion provide an integration of the findings, referencing literature and theory presented in the Introduction, rather than merely restating the Results?
- Are the results discussed in the context of the available qualitative and quantitative literature?
- Have the authors noted the unique contributions of this study to theory and method?
- Is an integrative summary provided noting how the present study and its operating paradigm have advanced the science given previous research on the topic?
- Have the authors noted all the important limitations of the study?
- Have the authors developed conclusions and recommendations that are justified by the data and results, appropriately limiting and clearly identifying as speculative those inferences or conclusions that go beyond the data?

Specifically, for quantitative studies Discussions

- Is the discussion confined to interpretation of findings directly relevant to the hypotheses or research questions posed in the introduction, or do sections stray from this focus?
- Are the interpretations justified by the findings?
- Is language implying causal relationships – if it is used at all, used appropriately?
- Is each hypothesis or research question thoroughly addressed in terms of the results of this study?
- Are these results compared sufficiently with the results of other studies? For example, how do the effect size intervals obtained in this study compare to those reported in previous research? Practical significance of the effects should be discussed together with statistical significance.
- When results of this study differ from previous research, are plausible explanations offered?
- Have alternative explanations for results of this study been presented?

Specifically, for qualitative studies, if a constructivist study, does the Discussion now examine theory, conceptual models, and further research studies that were not included in the Introduction to maintain the "discovery attitude"?

In a constructivist or critical study,

▪ Is there a statement as to how the researcher herself/himself was impacted or changed by participation in the study?

▪ Has the author been clear in the results and discussion about the proper uses of qualitative findings (e.g., that findings are not generalizable); has the author avoided using generalized statements about people who have experienced the phenomenon (thus implying generalizability)?

▪ Has the author distinguished between limits due to qualitative methods (e.g., smaller sample sizes, researcher subjectivity, etc., which are legitimate components of a study) and limitations of the study?

Abstract

Before completing your evaluation, please review the abstract once more.

▪ Does the abstract provide a balanced description of the most important findings?

▪ In quantitative studies, is an account of hypotheses that were and were not supported provided?

▪ Does any portion of the abstract overstate the strength of effects or the magnitude of support for a specific hypothesis?

▪ For qualitative studies, is the approach or paradigm guiding the research mentioned?

▪ Have the findings been accurately summarized? Finally, is the abstract as informative as possible?

▪ Do you have suggestions for portions that could be deleted and replaced, within the space limitations, to increase the information value of the abstract?

▪ Is the abstract followed by up to five keywords to guide the indexing process?

6.3. PUBLISHING ETHICS FOR EDITORS AND REVIEWERS

The policies and guidelines provided here are in place to protect the quality and integrity of forms of scholarly practice and research, as well as the reputations of the publications produced by EJSS.

A. CONFIDENTIALITY

The whole peer-review process should be treated as confidential and sensitive. Any suspicion that publishing ethics have been violated should be treated in the same way.

B. RESPONSIBILITIES

Journal editors, associate editors, editorial board members, and reviewers are central to the publishing process. They serve the research community in the publication and dissemination of scholarly research.

The main responsibilities of editors, associate editors, editorial board members, and reviewers are:

☐ To handle all submissions fairly and in a timely manner, acknowledging submissions and communicating decisions made after peer review, including any help or advice that can be provided by the reviewers or the editors themselves

☐ To ensure that all submitted manuscripts are treated confidentially. Details should not be disclosed to others without the prior consent of the author. In addition, the identity and details of all reviewers should be treated confidentially

☐ To act objectively, making decisions about papers based entirely on their relevance, importance, and quality

☐ To make known any conflict of interests that might occur

☐ To take account of authors' wishes regarding reviewer choices

☐ To ensure that, should any suspicions of scientific or publishing misconduct occur, they are treated reasonably, sensibly, and confidentially and to ensure that any author appeals are dealt with fairly and quickly

☐ To comply with data protection regulations as appropriate

C. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

If a guest editor, associate editor, or reviewer believes that his/her relationship to an author, if known, or the subject matter of an article, may constitute a conflict of interest for any reason, this must be disclosed to the journal editor.

• A reviewer should not, for the purpose of his/her own research, use unpublished material disclosed in a submitted manuscript, without the approval of the Editor.

• The data included in the research paper is confidential and the reviewer shall not be allowed to use if for his/her personal study,

• A reviewer must declare any potentially conflicting interests (e.g. personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious). In such situation, s/he will be required to follow the EYSA Research policies.

• A reviewer should be honest enough to declare conflicts of interest, if, the research paper under review is the same as to his/her presently conducted study.

• If the reviewer feels unqualified to separate his/her bias, s/he should immediately return the manuscript to the Editor without review and justify to him/her about the situation.

D. DUPLICATION SUBMISSION OR PLAGIARISM

▪ If a reviewer suspects for any reason that an author may have submitted the paper in the same or similar form to another publication or suspects that plagiarism or duplicate publication has occurred, then this should be discreetly brought to the attention of the journal editor.

▪ Reviewers must take great care to maintain confidentiality in all cases because accusations, whether suspicions are proven or disproven, can have a serious and damaging effect on the career and reputation of the individual(s) concerned.

▪ Any communication with the editor must be balanced, carefully argued, and suitably qualified such that reviewers do not leave themselves, the journal editor, or the publisher open to accusations of libel, which may occur whether or not the case is proven.

▪ Once suspicions have been communicated to the journal editor, they will be investigated with the same discretion by the editor. All procedures will be carried out in a sensitive and confidential manner.

E. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

▪ If you are employed by an organization or institution that receives public funding, it is conceivable that correspondence carried out in connection with your editing of the journal could be subject to a claim for disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act or similar legislation.

▪ A claim is most likely to arise in relation to dispute over authorship, priority, or allegations of plagiarism or where an author disagrees with the decision reached on an article. In our experience, disputes reach the stage where legal action is threatened only where concerns are not addressed in a timely manner or there is evidence of editorial misconduct (for example, by failure to follow

proper procedures or through statements that could be deemed libelous or slanderous). It is, in our opinion, extremely unlikely that a Freedom of Information claim will arise, but it is important to make editors and reviewers aware of the possibility.

Ethical Considerations

- • If the reviewer suspects that the research paper is almost the same as someone else's work, s/he will ethically inform the Editor and provide its citation as a reference.

- • If the reviewer suspects that results in the research paper to be untrue/unrealistic/fake, s/he will share it with the Editor,

- • If there has been an indication of violating ethical norms in the treatment of human beings (e.g. children, female, poor people, disabled, elderly, etc), then this should be identified to the Editor,

- • If the research paper is based on any previous research study or is replica of an earlier work, or the work is plagiarized for e.g. the author has not acknowledged/referenced others' work appropriately, then this should be brought in the Editor's knowledge.

F. COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION ETHICS (COPE)

EJSS supports the ethical principles set out by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). A number of useful resources, such as guidelines, discussion papers, and the COPE Code of Conduct are available on the COPE website. EJSS International recommends the COPE Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.

COPE provides an excellent set of flow charts to aid editors and reviewers when instances of suspected violation of publishing ethics occur. Advice includes what to do when

☐ Suspected duplicate/redundant submission occurs

☐ Suspected plagiarism occurs

☐ Suspected fabrication of data occurs

☐ Changes in authorship occur

☐ A reviewer suspects undisclosed conflict of interests

☐ A reader suspects undisclosed conflict of interests

☐ An ethical problem with a manuscript arises

☐ An editor suspects that a reviewer has appropriated an author's ideas or data

Suitability and Promptness

The Reviewers should:

• Inform the Editor, if they do not have the subject expertise required to carry out the review and s/he should inform the Editor immediately after receiving a request.

• Be responsible to act promptly and submit review report on time.

• Immediately inform the Editor of any possible delays and suggest another date of submission for a review report, and

• Not unnecessarily delay the review process, either by prolonged delay in submission of their review or by requesting unnecessary additional data/information from the Editor or author(s).

Standards of Objectivity

• The reviews should be objectively carried out with a consideration of high academic, scholarly and scientific standards.

• All judgments should be meticulously established and maintained in order to ensure the full comprehension of the reviewer's comments by the editors and the author(s).

• Both reviewers and author(s) in rebuttal should avoid unsupported assertions,

• The reviewer may justifiably criticize a manuscript, but it would be inappropriate to resort to personal criticism on the author(s), and

• The reviewers should ensure that their decision is purely based on the quality of the research paper and not influenced, either positively or negatively, by any personal, financial, or other conflicting considerations or by intellectual bias.

Originality

For evaluating originality, the reviewers should consider the following elements:

■ Does the research paper add to existing knowledge?

■ Are the research questions and/or hypotheses in line with the objective of the research work?

Structure

If the layout and format of the paper is not according to the prescribed version, the reviewers should discuss it with the Editor or should include this observation in their review report. On the other

hand, if the research paper is exceptionally well written, the reviewer may overlook the formatting issues. At other times, the reviewers may suggest restructuring the paper before publication. The following elements should be carefully evaluated:

If there is serious problem of language or expression and the reviewer gets the impression that the research paper does not fulfill linguistic requirements and readers would face difficulties reading and comprehending the paper. The reviewer should record this deficiency in his/her report and suggest the editor to make its proper editing.

■ Whether the data presented in the paper is original or reproduced from previously conducted or published work. The papers which reflect originality should be given preference for publication.

■ The clarity of illustrations including photographs, models, charts, images and figures is essential to note. If there is duplication, then it should be reported in the review report. Similarly, descriptions provided in the "Results" section should correspond with the data presented in

Review Report

• The reviewer must explicitly write his/her observations in the section of 'comments' because author(s) will only have access to the comments reviewers have made,

• For writing a review report, the reviewers are requested to complete a prescribed form (s).

It is helpful for both the Editor and author(s) if the reviewer writes a brief summary in the first section of the review report. This summary should comprise the reviewer's final decision and inferences drawn from a full review.

• Any personal comments on author(s) should be avoided and final remarks should be written in a courteous and positive manner,

• Indicating any deficiencies is important. For the understanding of the Editor and author(s), the reviewers should highlight these deficiencies in some detail with specificity. This should help justify the comments made by the reviewer,

• When a reviewer decides regarding the research paper, it should be clearly indicated as 'Reject', 'Accept without revision', or 'Need Revision' and either of the decisions should have justification.

• Both the track comments and the summary comments with results should be filled and sent to the editor in a month time.

• The reviewers should indicate the revisions clearly and comprehensively, and show willingness to confirm the revisions submitted by the author(s), if Editor wishes so, and

• The final decision about publishing a research paper (either accept or reject) will solely rest with the Editor and it is not a reviewer's job to take part in this decision. The editor will surely consider reviewer's comments and have a right to send the paper for another opinion or send it back to the author(s) for revision before making the final decision.

Narrative Evaluation

In the sections below, guidelines are provided that will hopefully be helpful in preparing your narrative evaluation. Please note that our intention is not to be prescriptive. We acknowledge that there are many ways to approach the task of reviewing a manuscript, and we recognize that individual reviewers may disagree, perhaps strongly, with some of the points below. Our intention is not to impose rigid conformity, but rather to provide general suggestions for those who are relatively new to the task of reviewing for this journal.

General Style

The narrative should be phrased as a communication between you and the Action Editor about the manuscript. Please refer to the authors of the manuscript sparingly and, when doing so, use the third person. Critical feedback tends to be easier to accept when a review refers to some aspect of "the manuscript" and avoids phrasing in the second person. Consider the difference in the two examples below. Which would you rather receive as an author?

(a) The manuscript could be improved considerably by updating the review of literature. . .The sample needs to be described in more detail so that readers can make a determination about its generalizability. . .A planned hierarchical multiple regression should be performed instead of using a stepwise approach.

(b) You need to update your literature review. . .You haven't described the sample in adequate detail for readers to make a determination about generalizability. . .Your choice of a stepwise hierarchical regression was inappropriate, instead, use a planned hierarchical regression.

Many reviewers use phrasing comparable to example (a) above when making suggestions for revisions. They refer to the authors only in connection with positive features of the work, for example, "The authors used an innovative analogue design to explore this important research area."

Organization

Many reviewers begin their narrative with a paragraph summarizing the study. This practice serves two useful functions.

First, it provides a brief statement of your essential understanding of the study and its findings, thereby, authors are reassured that you have read the manuscript in detail. (The positive effect on authors is not unlike the effective use of an accurate paraphrase in a counseling session.)

Second, this paragraph serves to remind you about the study weeks later when you receive copies of the editorial decision letter and other reviews.

Next, many reviewers add a paragraph or two commenting generally on the manuscript. Commendable features can be mentioned in this section. The strengths of the manuscript should be described in some detail. It is important for authors to know what you think they have done well, together with your comments about what should be changed. This paragraph might also be the best place to point out problems with APA style that crop up throughout the manuscript, for example, biased use of language.

For both the Action Editors and the authors**, clear separation of major and minor points is crucial**. A more effective review will emerge when you are able to separate the forest from the trees. What are the most salient points regarding the manuscript that you wish to share? Making these clear and listing and explaining them is very helpful. Please help the authors and Action Editor step-back to see the forest, or larger issues, and help differentiate them from the smaller, more specific issues. Sometimes a simple organizational structure of listing and explaining the major points first and then having a separate section detailing the minor ones is the most helpful.

It is also very helpful if you number each substantive point or request for revision in your narrative. These numbers facilitate the Action Editor's reference to your review in the editorial decision letter.

Focus. What follows is a fairly thorough listing of questions and issues you should think about in reviewing the manuscript. Again, the key issue is not to go through the manuscript looking at each question but to look at the larger issues and does the study address them. A review that goes through the following issues point by point is not especially helpful as there is no determination of what is important and what is not. So as much as possible, it is important to provide structure of what is important and what is less important with respect to the comments and evaluations

provided. It is also helpful to differentiate one's opinions and preferences for how something should be done from clear statements about what exactly need to be attended to in any revision.

Length Certainly it is important that reviews provide enough information that the Action Editors and authors have enough to understand the evaluation. This is almost always more than a single spaced page in length. Most reviews provide much more than minimal evaluative comments. However, it is not uncommon for reviews to go on for several pages. In my experience as an Action Editor and an author, reviews that are longer than 3 pages single spaced are not especially helpful. Generally, such a level of detail means that the larger and smaller issues are not being distinguished. So, a good guideline is to keep the review between 1 and 3 pages single spaced but not limited to. This should result in enough detail to explain the points made and not too much minutia so as to lose the key issues.

6.4. Ethical Obligations of Scientists publishing outside the Scientific literature

1. A scientist publishing in the popular literature has the same basic obligation to be accurate in reporting observations and unbiased in interpreting them as when publishing in a scientific journal.

2. In as much as laymen may not understand scientific terminology, the scientist may find it necessary to use common words of lesser precision to increase public comprehension. In view of the importance of scientists' communicating with the general public, some loss of accuracy in that sense can be condoned. The scientist should, however, strive to keep public writing, remarks, and interviews as accurate as possible consistent with effective communication.

3. A scientist should not proclaim a discovery to the public unless the experimental, statistical, or theoretical support for it is of strength enough to warrant publication in the scientific literature. An account of the experimental work and results that support a public pronouncement should be submitted as quickly as possible for publication in EJSS.

Chapter Seven:
7. Evaluation Guidelines and Promotion Directives of Research works and Researchers

The evaluation procedure is based on the work of Research Committee members, Editorial forums, reviewers and Research and Consultancy Council.

7.1. Evaluation Procedure of Project or Research Works

7.1.1. Research Committee

Standing/Research/ committees are established by the Academy management Board, and their tasks are as follows:

❖ The research Directorate Director is the chair of the Committee.

❖ Ensuring that the project/ Research proposal evaluation procedure is implemented according to the rules and deadlines prescribed by the Board and agreed Document.

❖ Grouping the project/ Research proposals that have met the administrative verification into Reviewers panel groups

❖ Determining the members of the evaluation Reviewers panel that will evaluate short project proposals in each group

❖ overseeing the work of evaluation reviewers panels (responsibility for carrying out tasks within deadlines and according to the rules of the Foundation, reviewing recommendations for funding and results of the evaluation after peer review)

❖ Overseeing the work of editorial Forum

❖ Giving funding recommendations to the Research and Consultancy Council.

General feature of review panel

I. Research Committees are categorized in sub groups according to scientific fields: Sport sciences, technically related sciences, Sport medicine and health, Sport social sciences and humanities.

II. The number of research committee members is determined by the Research and Consultancy Council, but it shall not be less than 7 or more than 11.

III. The identity of Research committees' members is made publicly available and published on the Research Journal and Website.

IV. The members of research committees have a mandate of two years, with the possibility of one re-election.

V. Members of research committee which evaluate project proposals; cannot involve for the open evaluation panels.

VI. Each sub group of research committee has a coordinator nominated by the research director and approved by the research and consultancy Deputy General Director. The coordinator is responsible for managing the work of the committee, convening meetings, organization of work within the committee, adherence to deadlines, communication with office, coordination of work with coordinators of other research committees and ensuring respect of the rules of the organization. In case s/he is prohibited, the coordinator can give his authority to another member of the research committee.

VII. Research committees make decisions at meetings, usually by consensus. If it is impossible to reach a consensus, decisions are brought by majority of votes. It is necessary that the meeting of the standing committee attend at least five members. Research Committee meetings are also attended by the Research office which takes minutes. If necessary, meetings of Research committees may be attended by other persons authorized by the Research and Consultancy Council or Management Board.

VIII. Certain decisions can Research Committee's coordinators bring on their own based on the ESA journal and research Guidelines and/or in consultation with the coordinator of another Research committee (e.g. transfer of project proposals to another scientific field).

IX. Research Committees can be editors and Reviewers of the research Journal.

X. Research Committees do not receive regular compensation for their work.

XI. Research Committees evaluation as a Technical Evaluation reviewers Panel for Mega Researches or Project for blind review of its two members and the committees' decisions should not be more than 30% and for small Researches 50%.

7.1.2. Reviewers Evaluation panels

Evaluation panels are appointed by Research Committees through approval of the Research and Consultancy Council and Management Board, but in case of the manuscript review process it will be assigned by the editor in chief. Thus, the reviewers' panel is restricted to the proposal and research or project undertakings evaluation. Hence their tasks are as follows:

- Small project/Research proposals evaluation up to 50% Evaluations with review format evaluation form and Open defense presentation forms.

- Mega project/Research proposals evaluation 70% Evaluations with review format evaluation form and Open defense presentation forms.
- Each reviewers work will be overseen by the technical sub research Committee and Research Committee.
- They will give their evaluation from their own at least two members review evaluation report sum average.
- Directing project proposals to further peer review or proposing not to direct project proposals to peer review (with explanation)
- Evaluation and assessment of the justification of financial plans, ethical issues and, if necessary, other additional criteria established by the **Research and Consultancy Committees and Management Board**
- Ranking of project proposals and issuing funding recommendations.

   General Features about the Review Panel: -

(i)   Evaluation panels are not permanent; they are appointed for a certain Call deadline for processing project /Research proposals. The number of evaluation panels is not limited and depends on the number of received project/ Research proposals and their scientific field.

(ii) The number of evaluation reviewers' panel members is determined by Research Committees, but it cannot be less than 3.

(iii) The identity of panel evaluation members is not available to public for the duration of the evaluation procedure. After the evaluation procedure completion, a list of all evaluation panel members may be published on the Journal/website of the Organization.

(iv) Each evaluation panel has a coordinator. The panel members elected a coordinator among themselves. The coordinator organizes the work of the evaluation panel ensures the adherence to deadlines, communicates with the Research Committee and the Office of the Research Directorates and ensures the respect of the rules of the Academy.

(v)   Evaluation panels do not receive compensation for their work but can be treated by the Academy and Governmental rules established for similar duties.

(vi) However, any allowed payment related services will be administered according to the directives of the stated directives mentioned at 7.5 which is based on the Ministry of Education similar Directives.

7.1.3. Reviewers

1) Reviewers can be from the panels or outside and must be independent. They are nominated by the research Committee from the list of approved lists of editors and reviewers of the academy already selected by the call of the office and approved by the Management Board.

2) Reviewers should be from the academy, Research institutions or Higher Institution as experts of Minimum of Assistant Professors or equivalents who will evaluate the full project proposals directed to peer review from evaluation panels.

3) The reviewers evaluate project proposals according to pre-established criteria form in the Evaluation. (Appendix ….)

4) Within one Call, one reviewer is mainly responsible for the evaluation of one up to two mega project /Research proposals or up to four short project /Research proposals.

5) Further Reviewers from the panels or outside are suggested by evaluation panels.

6) The identity of reviewers is not publicly available but is known only to the Office of the Foundation.

7) Evaluation panels do not receive compensation for their work but can be treated by the Academy and Governmental rules established for similar duties.

8) At least two Reviewers from the panel or outside close to the scientific Project or Research will evaluate 10 up to 20% of the panel evaluation (50-70%) Accordingly.

9) The research Directorate will propose the reviewers who have better publication and academics in the area and other criteria's to the Research Committee. The Committee will consider all other criteria related issues and approve it for the research and Consultancy Council.

7.1.4. Reviewers and Editors Selection Criteria

I. Members of evaluation panel and reviewers will be selected so that the best match between their areas of expertise and topics of the project proposal are looked for.

II. The criteria for their selection may vary depending on the type of program and the type of evaluation, and special attention should be paid to the selection of panels and reviewers for evaluating interdisciplinary project proposals.

III. The main criterion for selection of panel members and reviewers are appropriate competencies for assessing project proposals (determined on the basis of current scientific

research and achievements) and competence in the area of program within which the Call was announced and independence (absence of conflict of interest)

IV. Scientific competence is crucial in selecting reviewers. However, in the selection of evaluation panel it is not necessary that a person is an expert in every single subject, but that the members of the panel as a group have the necessary competencies for evaluating the assigned proposals.

V. Reviewer must have equal or greater competence in relation to the applicant whose project proposal he evaluates.

VI. Peer review will be made

VII. Not more than one person can involve on both Standing Committees and Evaluation panels but cannot role twice as a reviewer in those two committees.

VIII. The main criteria for selection of reviewers who will conduct the evaluation are:

➢ PhD degree/Assistant Professor or other proven equivalent professional competence related to the topic of the project proposal

➢ Appropriate competencies for assessing project proposals (estimated on the basis of current scientific research and achievements) - reviewers should be experts in the topics of the topic.

➢ Competence in the area of the program within which the Call was released

➢ Independence (absence of conflict of interest)

➢ Excellent knowledge of English and Amharic language

Accordingly, the Following table will be used for evaluation summary

NO	Criteria	points	
1	Academic Rank	25	5 points gaps
2	Specialization and Subject matter experience	10	
3	Number of reputable Articles	25	
4	Other Related Publications	10	
5	Cooperation and Commitment of the Reviewers with the Academy	15	
6	Geography, Institution Variety, Gender and other issues mentioned in 7.4 in consideration by the office and Committee	15	

7.1.5. Evaluation Criteria

Project/Research proposal evaluation criteria within a certain Call are determined by the Research and Consultancy Council with the approval of the Management Board. The evaluation criteria shall be adjusted individually to each Call-in order to reflect the purpose and goals of the program.

1. All criteria shall be applied in the evaluation must be made available to applicants simultaneously with the Call release.

2. General criteria for evaluating project proposals are scientific quality, relevance and research feasibility, applicant and Scientific quality, research environment and relevance:.

   ▪ Scientific foundation of the research/project proposal and quality of the research plan

   ▪ The importance of the proposed topic in relation to the whole area of research

   ▪ Potential of the project proposals to improve research area

   ▪ Competitiveness of the project proposal in relation to the existing research on the same subject

   ▪ Suitability and competitiveness of the proposed methodology (as compared to the best in the area)

Project or Research Proposal Feasibility:

☐ Clarity and realism of the objectives and good planning of activities that leads to the achievement of objectives

☐ Realism and feasibility of the research (with respect to the planned time, objectives, intended results and resources available)

☐ Identifying risks and finding adequate solutions

☐ Assessment of the planned capacity for the execution of the project (financial support, number and competence of team members, institutional support) applicant and research environment quality.

☐ Scientific competence of the applicant (estimated based on previous accomplishments, Publications, Academic Status and Interdisciplinary fields team appropriateness to the topic)

☐ Applicant's competence for project management

☐ Previous research contributions of the applicant and team members in the proposed area and the Academy

☐ Institutional Support (providing adequate infrastructure and other conditions necessary for the implementation of the project)

(i) The Academy will not fund research that is contrary to fundamental ethical principles, research ethics and the code of ethics of scientific research. Therefore, the members of the evaluation panel are required to consider whether the proposal involves any ethical issues and

whether they are properly addressed (in accordance with legal provisions and international regulations). Members of the evaluation panel are required to establish the existence of ethical dilemmas, and all other matters that may pose potential risk (e.g. safety issues, hazards, possible misuse of the results in relation to humans, animals or the environment).

7.1.6 Evaluation Procedure and Project Proposals Selection

The project proposals' application and evaluation procedure are done blindly. The aim is to avoid the biasness, and later, the administration and implementation of the evaluation procedure which is to be carried out of only electronically at all stages. The Academy will not accept or receive only printed versions of project proposals and reviews. The evaluation procedure conducted by the Research Committees consists of the following steps:

7.1.6.1 Call for Proposals

1. Grants are awarded solely on the basis of public calls (tenders) that are published on the Academy website and Newspaper for mega projects.
2. Call content is determined by the Regulations on the conditions and procedure for allocation of resources to achieve the aims of the Academy.

7.1.6.2. Receiving Project Proposals

A. Proposals will be accepted only after the call release, on Academy's' official forms and in the manner prescribed in the Call. When submitting project proposals, applicants are required to adhere to all Academy's general acts and additional guidelines published along with each call.

B. When submitting Research/project proposals, applicants select scientific field which their project proposal belongs to. In the case of interdisciplinary project proposals, the applicant should number (1-6) all fields that his project proposal covers.

C. Research/Project proposals should be submitted only in printed and signed envelops with the necessary documents. An electronic version of the Research/project proposals can be asked that contain all required signatures and authentications.

D. Project proposals will be accepted only until the deadline (date and time) specified in the Call. After the deadline, the applicants cannot submit, amend or modify project proposals. Academy's Office may, in certain cases, seek amendments or clarifications from applicants.

7.1.6.3. Administrative Verification

I. <mark>All Technical Evaluations will be done under Research and Consultancy Directorates' Committees and councils as mentioned procedures in this document. The research and consultancy Administrative verification of all received Research/project proposals begins after the Call deadline and is implemented by the Academy's Office.</mark>

II. Administrative verification entails the review the application documentation while filling out the appropriate protocol for administrative verification. Protocols for administrative verification are available to all applicants simultaneously with the release of the Call.

III. Proposals that did not meet the administrative verification will not be directed to further evaluation procedure, and the applicants will be informed.

IV. If, during the evaluation procedure it is subsequently determined that the project proposal for any reason does not satisfy the conditions of the Call or other rules prescribed by the general acts of the academy, it is possible to decide on the exclusion of the project proposal from evaluation procedure at any time. The decision to exclude the project proposal from further evaluation procedure is made by the Board of management with the recommendation of the research /Standing Committee.

V. Any Ethical Clearance and Related documents shall be approved if necessary, during the evaluation and Project Implementation for the Standing Committee or Evaluation panels.

7.1.6.4. Project Proposal Grouping

1. All project proposals that met the administrative verification are directed to further evaluation procedure in order to be grouped according to areas within which they were submitted by the applicants.

2. Basic information on all project proposals within a certain scientific field the Academy's Office shall forward to the appropriate Standing Committee.

3. Interdisciplinary project proposals shall be directed to a scientific field which the applicant numbered with 1 or 2. It is the task of the Standing Committee to ensure proper processing of interdisciplinary project proposals. Any confidential information's shall be kept by the chair usually the research Director.

4. All proposals reported in the same scientific field the Standing Committee group into evaluation panel and determine the members of each panel. When grouping project

proposals, Standing Committees should consider the scientific fields within which the project proposals were submitted.

5. In certain cases, Standing Committees or evaluation panels can transfer project proposal to the scientific field that the applicant did not choose for his project proposal. Such a decision must be explained in writing. The decision to transfer the project proposal to another scientific field and another evaluation panel is brought by the Chair of the Standing Committee with the approval of the coordinator of the Standing Committee to which the proposal is transferred.

7.1.6.5. First Evaluation Step –Project Proposal Evaluation

I. In the first step, the standing Committee will evaluate to the maximum of 30% for the Mega project from his qualified members 10%, Directed External Examiners 10% and as a committee technical look of 10% (Which shall be a double-blind review). Then the evaluation panels evaluate project proposals assigned to them, and then make a decision on directing project proposals to peer review.

II. The Project proposal evaluation is carried out electronically and printed, according to predefined criteria and for project proposals evaluation forms determined by the Board. Project proposals evaluation forms are made available to applicants simultaneously with the Call release.

III. Decision to direct project proposals to the second step of evaluation shall be made at the meeting. If members of evaluation panel determine that the project proposal should be directed to the second round of evaluation (peer evaluation), they propose by reviewers and the project proposal is immediately sent to further procedure, and the applicant is notified.

IV. If evaluation panel members do not recommend sending the project proposal to the second evaluation step, they are required to explain in writing the reason why the proposal is not sent to further procedure. The decision on not sending the project proposals to further evaluation is made by the Board, and a notification on this, with panel explanation is sent to the applicant.

V. For applicants whose project proposals did not meet the basic quality criteria during project/Research proposal evaluation, members of the evaluation panel may suggest a restriction on the ability to submit project proposal to the next Call. The final decision on

the limitation of application is made by the Standing Committees approval and Management Board.

7.1.6.6. Second Evaluation Step– Peer Review

a) For each project proposal directed peer review it is necessary to provide two reviews. Reviews are sent to applicants upon completion of the entire evaluation procedure.

b) Peer evaluation involves assessment of the full project proposal. If the reviewer, upon having examined the project proposal, estimates that he does not have the expertise to evaluate the project proposal, S/he should inform the Academy as soon as possible and, if possible, recommend another expert who could evaluate this proposal.

c) Reviewers base their evaluation solely on documents that they received, and they implement it in accordance with the procedures of the Academy.

d) Full project proposal evaluation is carried out according to predetermined criteria through evaluating forms determined by the Standing Committee and the Board. Full project proposal evaluation forms are made available to applicants simultaneously with the Call release.

e) Reviewers have no possibility of communicating and exchanging information.

f) Affirmative Points can be included for small and Short project or research proposals for funding case (For regions, Staff members, regions, events etc accordingly)

g) All reviewers double blind evaluation holds up to 30% including the Evaluation panel from the written document.

h) Reviewers can be from the panel or outside with the Qualification and Signed Evaluation points for the form (Each 10%).

i) The panel stile should decide whether the paper /Project should proceed for further Evaluation with justifiable score and explanation. This will be approved by the standing Committee and The Management Board. Finally, it will be given to the applicant.

7.1.6.7. Evaluation Panels – Final Evaluation

1. **Upon peer review completion the evaluation panel members read all reviews, assess** project proposals' financial plans, and discuss ethical issues and, if necessary, additional criteria determine by the Board for particular Calls.

2. When evaluating financial plan, evaluation panel members must assess whether all of the items that the applicant proposes are purposeful, absolutely necessary and justified by the actual needs of the project and whether the financial amount are appropriate for each item according to the project proposal work plan.

3. The Evaluation Panel will call for the Proposal Presentation for final Evaluation with predetermined forms. The Forms are not mandatory, but the panel can prepare their own.

4. Following the evaluation, the evaluation panels to determine whether the project proposal complies with the determined criteria and decide whether to recommend it for funding. Project proposals that the panel determines that have met the criteria and receive a recommendation for funding must be ranked. In case of disagreement on total score each member will give out of 40% and All total 100% score will be calculated.

7.1.6.8. Research and Consultancy Standing Committees – Recommendation for Funding

A. Upon receiving evaluation results and recommendation of evaluation panels, Standing Committees make recommendations for funding.

B. Panel coordinators (or other members), that will explain the recommendations for funding, can attend the meeting of the Standing Committee.

C. When making recommendations for funding, Standing Committees should take into account the implementation of the evaluation procedure, results, the availability of financial resources & the balance of the development of scientific fields & branches within a scientific area.

D. Research Committees cannot change the order of projects in the rankings, which are determined by the evaluation panels, but may require additional explanation from the panels.

E. If Research Committees, in their recommendations, differ from the ranking established by the panel for evaluation, the difference must be explained in writing.

F. The Evaluation for mega projects can be from Technical and Funding Evaluation. For this mega Project all approved for feasibility of the projects will be evaluated technically 70% and the Budget request 30%. The final 30 % of Budget will be calculated by the committee after considering the Evaluation panel out of 70%.

G. Research Committees are required to notify the Board if there is a suspicion that the evaluation procedure is not conducted in accordance with the rules of the Foundation.

H. Presentation Assessment hold (20%) and the Reviewers Form at Presentation hold (20%)

7.1.6.9. Decision on Funding

1. Based on the technical evaluation results and approval of Research Committees and Research and Consultancy council; the management Board will decide on projects or research proposal funding budgeted up to 400,000 birr. The same procedure will be followed for projects and research works lead by the complete guide of the research and consultancy office.

2. In case of a bid for **a call of** Proposals and conduction research and project works above 400,000 birr funding, Committee will approve for financial legal requirements before directing it to the finance office. All requirements for firms ……..

7.1.6.10. Project Implementation Follow up and Phases release of funding

❖ The research Committee may assign and consult for the proper implementation of the project.

❖ Further funding release decides by the standing committee and when some suspicious activities happened with the consultation of the Evaluation panel and approved by the management Board.

7.2. Researchers Academic Promotions

Article 1. Principles Governing Promotions

The length of service with a given rank, effectiveness in training, publications, participation in the affairs of the Ethiopian Sport Academy (ESA), and community services and engagement given to the public at various capacities shall remain to be the basic criteria upon which the principles of academic promotion is based. The components of the requirement that have to be met to fulfill each of these criteria and the manner in which these are assessed are set forth in this Directive. With respect to academic rank determination, an academic staff with a second degree is equivalent to Assistant Researcher or Lecturer position; while a PhD holder or a DVM/MD with a specialization/second degree is equivalent to a researcher or an Assistant Professor.

Promotion of an existing academic staff, or determination of an academic rank for a transfer, or newly recruitment applicant, shall be initiated by the applicant, and to be reviewed at different stages by the Research Committee, Research and consultancy Council, Academic Council and to be decided at the Management Board or Board of the Academy. The criteria for promotion of existing academic staff will be based on the fulfillment of 1) effective training, 2) publication and patent, 3) community service and engagement, and 4) participation in ESA affairs; whereas the determination of an academic rank for a transfer, or newly recruited academic staff shall be based on review and equivalence of the credentials. The weighted average value for the above four criteria shall not be less than 75%. The minimum number of years of services of an Academic Staff shall be assessed based on the criteria referred for a given rank, and as clearly referred to in Article 5.

Article 2. Requirement for Academic Promotion

The requirement for academic promotion is based on fulfilling four mandatory criteria. The minimum requirement and percent value shall be as follows.

Table 1. **Minimum Requirement for Academic Promotion**

No	Criteria for promotion	Promotion to Researcher/Assistant Professor	Promotion to Senior Researcher /Associate Professor/	Promotion to Professor
		Maximum	**Maximum**	**Maximum**
1	Effective Training	40	35	30
2	Publication and Patent	35	40	45
3	Professional Community Service	15	15	15
4	Participation in ESA Affairs	10	10	10
	Total	100	100	100

For each promotion criteria, the candidate must attain a minimum of 75%; while the total average value shall not be less than 80%.

2.1 Effective Training

Effective training for an academic staff shall be determined by evaluations of peers, trainees, Deputy General Director, Research D/Director, Teaching and Training D/Director and at the end of the year as the case may be. The contribution and weighing criteria of effective academic staff shall be as follows:

   a) Evaluation by Trainees ------------------------20%

   b) Deputy General Director--------------------25%

   c) Research D/Director-----------------------25%

d) Teaching and Training D/Director--------15%

e) Evaluation by peers-----------------------------15%

In exceptional cases where an academic staff is not handling courses due to other assignments given by the ESA, the weighted evaluation of trainees may be waived and the rest criteria evaluation can be taken out of 100%.

2.2 Publication and Patent

Publications to be considered for promotion and the weighing criteria for national and international publications are presented as follows.

2.2.1 Peer-reviewed International Publications

Peer-reviewed publication which are not published by national journals are acceptable for promotion if the reputability is determined by considering factors such as peer review, originality, scientific quality, technical editing quality, editorial quality and regularity of the journals, and indexed in at least one of the following databases:

    a. Scopus

    b. Web of Science

    c. PubMed

The publication points to be awarded for each publication type and its maximum point to be considered for promotion using these peer reviewed journals that are indexed by Scopus or

Web of Sciences or PubMed is shown below in Table 2

Table 2. Publication points to be awarded for each publication

Publication type	Publication points	Maximum points to be earned (%) from each publication
Full-length Journal Article	1	100
Book	3	50
Text Book	1	50
Book chapter	1	25
Review Article in Annual Review Journals	1	50
Review Article in other journals	0.5	20
Conference Proceedings	0.5	25
Short/brief Communications, Technical Notes or Case report/Case Comment	0.5	10
Letter to the editor	0.25	5
Patent	0.50	25
Prototype	0.5	25
Technology Package	1	50
Work of Art	1	100

2.2.2   Publications in National Journals and Proceedings

National academic publications shall be considered for promotion if the publication is accredited or to be accredited by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education with weighing criteria as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. **Publication Points to be earned from National Academic Publications**

Publication type	Publication			Maximum points to be earned (%) from each publication
	Accredited and with impact factor of Site Score	Accredited with no impact factor or Site Score	Not accredited	
Full-length Journal Article	1	0.75	0.25	100 (15 for not accredited)
Conference Proceedings	0.5	0.375	0.125	10
Short/brief Communications, Technical Notes or Case report/Case Comment	0.5	0.375	0.125	10
Letter to the editor	0.25	0.187	0.062	5

Other academic publishing not referred under Table 3, namely book, book chapter, textbook, patent, prototype, technology packages, and work of arts, shall be treated as follows in Table 4.

Table 4. Other National Research and Patent related Academic Contributions

Type	Criteria for considering to promotion	Publication point	Maximum points to be earned (%) from each publication
Book	Published by peer-reviewed publishers and indexed by the indexing databases indicated under Article 2 and with an ISBN; if not it shall be evaluated and approved by three external professionals	3	50
Book chapter	Published by peer-reviewed publishers and indexed by the indexing databases indicated under Article 2, and with an ISBN	1	25
Textbook	The textbook to be used for one year before applying for promotion, AND it be evaluated and approved by three external professionals	1	50
Patent	Licensed by an authorized body, and is used for one year before applying for promotion	0.5	25
Prototype	Tested, registered, and/or licensed by an authorized body	0.5	25
Technology Package	Tested, registered, and/or licensed by an authorized body	1	50
Work of Art	Tested, registered, and/or licensed by an authorized body	1	100

Remarks

1. Except for promotions earned from Work of Arts, publication points accrued from journal articles shall not be less than 50% of the total publications required. The remaining 50% can be fulfilled from other types of publications and achievements based on the ratio for Maximum points to be earned (%) from each publication shown in Table 2.

2. Publications arising from Thesis/Dissertation may be used for promotion provided that the publication contains significantly (minimum of 50%) new data or new evidence or new method not included in the Thesis or Dissertation indicated hereof.

3. The publication point for a solo author and co-authors/joint authorship international journal article is awarded as shown below in Table 5.

Table 5.

Share of Publication Points for Solo and Joint Authorship in International Publications

No. of Authors	Share of each co-author		
	First Author	Co-authors	Corresponding Author*
1	1.00		1.00
2	0.800	0.750	0.775
3	0.700	0.650	0.675
4	0.600	0.550	0.575
	0.500	0.450	0.475

*If the corresponding author is also the first author, the publication points will only be the share allocated to the first author.

The publication point for a solo author and co-authors/joint authorship in national publications is awarded as shown below in Table 6.

Table 6.

Share of Publication Points in National Publications for Solo and Joint Authorship

No.of Authors	Share of each co-author	Accredited			Non-accredited		
		First author	Co-authors	Corresponding Author*	First Author	Co-authors	Corresponding Author*
1	0.75			0.75	0.25		0.25
2	0.600	0.570		0.575	0.15	0.120	0.125
3	0.525	0.475		0.500	0.131	0.10	0.106
4	0.450	0.400		0.425	0.112	0.062	0.087
	0.375	0.365		0.370	0.093	0.043	0.068

*If the corresponding author is also the first author, the publication points will only be the share allocated to the first author. If national publications have an impact factor, the share of each coauthor will remain the same as indicated in international publication.

Remarks:

For other publication types, the publication point share for solo, co-authors and corresponding authors shall be calculated based on their weighing criteria and its equivalence to be determined as specified for journal articles. For other national research related academic contributions, indicated under Table 4, the share of each contributors will be the same as the value indicated for accredited publications.

2.3 Participation in the Affairs of the ESA

The requirement for promotion using participation in ESA affairs shall be fulfilled by holding a post of academic administration at the department head, research directorate, teaching and training directorate, trainees affair directorate, registrar, and participating in research or standing or ad-hoc committees, and taking assignments when called upon by the department, office of research, teaching and training directorate or the respective ESA administration.

The specific weighing criteria for participation in ESA affairs are indicated below.

1. Academic Administration (full-time service)	
a) Research Directorate or Equivalent Positions	55
b) Trainees affair directorate or equivalent positions	50
c) Registrar or equivalent Positions	45
d) Department heads or Equivalent	40
2. Work in standing Committees (fulltime)	
• Three or more committees	25
• Two Committees	16
• One Committee	8
3. Ad-hoc and Other Committee	15%
• Three or more committees	15
• Two committees	10
• One committee	5

Remarks

1. As the Director General is working in a full-time administration position and exempted from handling courses, the weighing value for participation in ESA affairs shall be considered as 100%

2. The weighing value for an academic staff assigned in a government organization and with a home-base in university shall be calculated based on the equivalent position referred above.

3. The above specified weighing value for administration, full-time or ad-hoc committee positions shall automatically be considered if and only if service year is successfully accomplished.

4. Participation in administration, full-time or ad-hoc committee positions shall be considered only based on credentials or confirmation letter or certificate stating that the member has successfully carried out the given position or assignment. Otherwise, no weighing value shall be allocated if the expected task is not accomplished as per the requirement.

5. An academic staff who did not get the opportunity to serve in the ESA academic administration, the rest academic promotion weighing values shall automatically be converted to 100%

6. The above 15% weighing value shall not be counted for an academic staff who declined to accept such committee assignments

2.4 Community Service and Engagement

The current understanding of community service/engagement delivery does not leave the issues to the good will of the academic staff but empowers the academic unit to play a specific role matching its niche of specialization in confronting a specific problem and finding an appropriate solution through the participation of the community and relevant stakeholders thus ensuring and sustaining the relevance of the academic unit. The following may constitute public service and professional activities:

a. Participation in unpaid local, regional and national professional committees whenever called upon to do so;

b. Taking part positions in professional associations, journals, or participating in journal editing, reviewing and related tasks

c. Active involvement in the enhancement of one's profession, for instance, by helping organize and playing an active role in relevant professional associations;

d. Conducting series of press, radio and/or television programs to elucidate to the public some basic problems of health, education, law, science and technology, etc.; and other professional services to the community;

e. Engaging with industries in line with her/his field of specialization and for the mutual benefit of the ESA, industry or community.

2.4.1 Requirements for Promotion with Community Service/ Engagement

The weighing value for participation in community service and engagement shall be calculated as follows.

Participation in professional community service and engagement	15%
• three or more professional community services/engagements	15
• two more professional community services/engagements	10
• one more professional community services/engagements	5

Remarks.

1. Consultancy services shall not be considered as community service or engagement; thus, no weighing value shall be allocated and hence it shall not be considered as a promotion criterion.

2. The weighing value of community service and engagement for a Director General and Deputy General Director shall be waived and the rest criteria for evaluation may be taken out of 100%.

3. The weighing value for an academic staff assigned in a government organization and with a home-base in university shall be waived and the rest criteria for evaluation may be taken out of 100%,

4. The above specified weighing value for community service and engagement of academic staffs shall automatically be considered if and only if contribution is successfully accomplished, and based on credentials or confirmation letter or certificate stating that the academic staff has successfully carried out the given community service or engagement. Otherwise, no weighing value shall be allocated if the expected task is not accomplished as per the requirement.

5. Academic staff shall earn 7.5% for each evidence produced for Community

6. Service/Engagement.

Article 3. Minimum Points for Promotion

Apart from the fulfillment of the individual criterion specified above, a candidate for the ranks of Researcher/assistant professor, Senior Researcher/associate professor and professor shall earn a minimum of 80% of the maximum possible total points.

Article 4. Specific Requirement for Promotion for Each Academic Rank

4.1 Researcher/Assistant Professor

1. A candidate with the qualification of a Master's Degree or its equivalent and a minimum of four years of effective research and training as a researcher and Instructor.
2. At least, three publication points since last promotion of which a minimum of 75% of the publication points are gained from one's area of specialization; and
3. Active participation in the affairs of the ESA; and
4. Rendering public, professional and community service/engagement

4.2 Senior Researcher/ Associate Professor

1. Four years of effective research and training as a Researcher or Assistant Professor; and the degree of doctor of philosophy (Ph.D.), or its equivalent; and

2. At least four-point five (4.5) publication points since last promotion of which a minimum of 75% of the publication points are gained from one's area of specialization; and

3. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this Article, publications or works not employed for the last promotion may be considered for subsequent promotion provided they do not exceed one-fourth of the required number of publication points for the promotion sought.

4. Active participation in the affairs of ESA or working in government organization and with a home-base in ESA; and

5. Rendering public, professional and community service/engagement

4.3 Professor

1. Four years of effective research and training as a Senior Researcher or Associate Professor; and

2. The degree of doctor of philosophy (Ph.D.), or its equivalent (specialty and sub-specialty) and

3. At least seven and half (7.5) publication points since last promotion of which a minimum of 75% of the publication points are gained from one's area of specialization; and

4. Active participation in the affairs of the ESA or working in government organization and with a home-base in ESA; and

5. Rendering public, professional and community service/engagement; and

6. A candidate for promotion to the rank of professorship shall submit a solo full-length journal article, or at least three full-length journal articles in which s/he is a first or corresponding author.

7. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this Article, publications or works not employed for the last promotion may be considered for subsequent promotion provided they do not exceed one-fourth of the required number of publication points for the promotion sought.

8. The publications and CV of the applicant shall be sent to two external and two internal assessors who are renowned professors in the field chosen by the Research and Consultancy standing

committee for academic promotion. The assessors will use the form provided in Annex-I to fill their evaluations.

9. At least two external research grants (where applicable) won out of which s/he is a PI for one of them for promotion to the rank of professor.

Article 5. Accelerated Promotions

1. Keeping all criteria and procedures in the regular promotion, a staff member who demonstrates extraordinary accomplishments in his area of specialization since last promotion may qualify for accelerated promotion if the following conditions are fulfilled.

2. every one hundred percent point achieved over and above the required points for publication in a given academic rank shall be considered equivalent to a year of effective teaching, provided, however, that a staff member should at least serve three-fourth of the number of years of the required term of service for his rank; and (Service year and double of the required publication point)

3. the candidate shall score 90% weighted average on academic performance evaluation; and

4. for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor, the candidate shall be a corresponding author of at least two articles;

5. for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate shall be a principal author of at least three articles she/he has presented and secured at least one external research project;

6. for promotion to the rank of Professor, the candidate shall be a corresponding author of at least four articles and has secured at least two external research/project grants one of which is from international sources.

Article 6. Other Provisions

1. Any of leave of absence such as study leave, sabbatical leave and research leave shall not be considered as service year for promotion. Breaches of duties and other approved disciplinary measures shall be considered on the completion of them.

Article 7. Effective date of the Directive

1. This directive shall enter into force as of January, 2023

7.3. Payments Related to Research Works

I. Researchers Works Related to Training and Consultancy

1. Payments for Laboratory or Workshop Guideline and Manuals up to 80 pages is Birr 5,500.00 (Five Thousand Five hundred) will be payed,

2. Payments for Laboratory or Workshop Guideline and Manuals 80-120 pages is Birr 6,500.00 (Six Thousand Five hundred) Birr per each document will be payed,

3. Payments for Laboratory or Workshop Guideline and Manuals above 120 pages is Birr 8,000.00 (Eight Thousand) Birr per each document will be payed,

4. Payments for Preparation of Training and Coaching Modules up to 80 pages is Birr 6,000.00 (Six Thousand) Birr per each document will be payed after the Module is reviewed and accepted by the reviewers' process; ownership will be to the Academy.

5. Payments for Preparation of Training and Coaching Modules up to 80-120 pages is Birr 9,000.00 (Nine Thousand) Birr per each document will be payed after the Module is reviewed and accepted by the reviewers' process; ownership will be to the Academy.

6. Payments for Preparation of Training and Coaching Modules above 120 pages is Birr 12,000.00 (Twelve Thousand) Birr per each document will be payed after the Module is reviewed and accepted by the reviewers' process; ownership will be to the Academy

II. Researchers Work Related to Researches

1. The fee for evaluators of the thematic (Grand) research theory proposals conducted by researchers will be 2,100.00 Birr (Two Thousand One Hundred Birr) per paper/document.

2. Internal presenters of research conference paper will be paid 3,000.00 Birr (Three Thousand Birr) per paper.

3. External presenters of research conference paper will be paid 3,500.00 Birr (Three Thousand Five Hundred Birr) per paper.

4. Internal Chairpersons of the research conference will be paid 3,000.00 Birr (Three Thousand Birr) per Session (one session will have three article presentation).

5. External Chairpersons of the research conference will be paid 4,500.00 Birr (Four Thousand Five Hundred Birr) per Session (one session will have three article presentation).

6. Key note speakers at the conference will be paid 6,000.00 Birr (Six Thousand Birr) per conference. The key note address requires research-based preparation to convey a relevant and leading message to the profession/topic.

7. In case of international conference key note speaker and researcher invited from outside Ethiopia institutions will be paid 10,000.00 Birr (Ten Thousand Birr) per conference.

8. The academy will pay 3,500.00 Birr (Three Thousand Five Hundred Birr) per month to the experts who serve as editors in the research journals.

9. 2,000.00 Birr (Two Thousand Birr) per month will be paid to those who serve as co-editors in the research journals of the Academy.

10. For Ethical Clearance members 2,000.00 Birr (Two Thousand Birr) will be paid monthly per individual.

III. Organization and Administrative Related Research Services

1. For Organizers, Coordinators and Reporters of a workshop and Symposiums will be payed 4,000 (Four Thousand) Birr per each workshop and Symposium.

2. For Trainers of a capacity building and Consultancy services of the academy or sector industry staffs will be payed 4000 (Four Thousand) birr per the Training module.

All the these Directives and Guidelines shall enter into force as of January, 2023

Anbesaw Enyew

Director General of Ethiopian Sport Academy

References

Elliott, R., Fischer, C. T., & Rennie, D. L. (1999). Evolving guidelines for publication of qualitative research studies in psychology and related fields. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38,* 215-299.

Haverkamp, B. E. (2005). Ethical perspectives on qualitative research in applied psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 146-155.

Maher, B. A. (1978). A reader's, writer's and reviewer's guide to assessing research reports in clinical psychology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46*, 835-838.

Mallinckrodt, B. (2006). Editorial. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 126-131.

Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 250-260.

Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 126-136.

Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.) Reviewing Scientific Works in Psychology. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Vacha-Haase, T., & Thompson, B. (2004). How to estimate and interpret various effect sizes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51,* 473-481.

Wilkinson, L. and the Task Force on Statistical Inference APA Board of Scientific Affairs (1999). Statistical methods in psychology journals. *American Psychologist, 54*, 594-604

Annex-I. External Assessor Assessment form for Professorship

Assessment of academic activities of Dr._____for the purpose of Promotion from the rank of Associate Professor to Full Professor.

1. Impressions based on the CV: _____

    _____

    _____

2. Please rate the publications issues indicated in the table below based on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Poor, 2 = Satisfactory, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, and 5 = Excellent:

Title	Methodology	The originality of the paper	Contribution to Scientific Knowledge	Overall Rating (on a scale of 5)	Indexed in	
					Scopus	WEB of Science
Average						

3. Overall evaluation (rating) of publications:

    _____

    _____

    _____

4. Overall recommendation for promotion: Accepted   Rejected:

5. Justifications for rejecting the promotion application

    _____

    _____

    _____

Name:_____   Signature:_____   Date:_____

Appendix 2

<div align="center">

Ethiopian Sport Academy

Ethiopian Journal of Sport Science

Evaluation of Manuscripts
</div>

The evaluation of a manuscript for publication in X journal follows a rigorous process. To do so, a five-point rating scale is used for scoring each of the quality indicators. In general, a rating of 3 or above is considered acceptable, while ratings of 1 or 2 do not achieve minimal standards for passing.

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING A MANUSCRIPT FOR PUBLICATION

Below is the guideline for scoring and interpreting results and the corresponding proposed action when this instrument used in evaluating manuscript for publication.

Title of the research:

_____

Manuscript Code _____   Researcher Code_____

Name:_____   Date: _____

I. Rating: For each category, please indicate your evaluation by marking an "X" in the appropriate box (PR–Poor (1), FR – Fair (2), GD – GOOD (3), VG – Very Good (4) Excellent (5). Please include comments

No	Evaluation Category	PR 1	FR 2	GD 3	VG 4	Ex 5
1	The submission adds to the body of knowledge in the field and will provoke thought among Journal readers. Meet the mission of the journal or its audience Comments:_____ _____					
2	The abstract is well organized? Comments:_____ _____					
3	The introduction builds a logical case and provides context for the problem statement. Comments:_____ _____					
4	The problem/idea proposed is clear and concise. Comments:_____ _____					
5	The author addresses the relevant literature in the field adequately. Comments:_____ _____					
6	The discussion is sufficiently developed and relevant. _____ _____					

7	The research methods are appropriate for the study and are clearly described. Comments:_____ _____					
8	The design is appropriate for the research purpose or question. If a mixed-methods approach is used, the rationale is provided for the relationship between and sequencing of quantitative and qualitative aspects of the study. Comments:_____ _____					
9	The study Has undergone ethics review? _____ _____					
10	There Are gender or age issues that are addressed well Or the Is a justified inclusion or exclusion of particular study groups.					
11	Sample size Is provided, along with the assumptions on which it is based. The sample size Is adequate. _____ _____					
12	Correct statistical procedures are used and are appropriate for the study's research paradigm. Comments:_____ _____					
13	Overall, the author's communication of their analysis is clear and evidences a general, overarching understanding of the issues involved in this question. Comments:_____ _____ _____ _____					
14	The findings/ideas are presented concisely and adequately (tables, figures, etc.). Comments:_____ _____					
15	Results & discussion are accurately stated based on the data. Thoughtful, detailed and comprehensive discussion is presented. Key findings are specifically related to previous research. Comments:_____ _____					
16	The author provides an insightful analysis of the data in the article, answering all or nearly all of the research questions framed by the author/s. The analysis is clear and relevant for the purpose intended.					

	Comments:_____ _____ _____ _____					
17	The author's conclusions and/or recommendations are justified by the perspectives and evidences presented and are linked to theintroduction and/or review of literature. Comments:_____ _____					
18	The manuscript is written clearly, following English grammar rules, and APA style accurate spelling use. Comments:_____ _____					
19	The originality of the flow, concepts and conclusions are well done. _____ _____					
20	Does the study enhance the institution's research infrastructure/support systems or the sector at overall level? _____ _____					

Total ____/100

II. Recommendation: Please select ONE category; include your comments explaining your selection

Overall Evaluation	Marks Obtained	Reviewer Rating	Proposed Action
Definitely Accepted For Publication	≥ 85	Excellent	Accepted
Publication AfterMINOR Revisions	$71 \geq x < 85$	**V. Good**	Accepted with Mainor modification
Requires Substantial Revisions Before It Can Be Considered	$50 \geq x < 71$	Good	Accepted with major modification
Probably Accepted For	$40 \geq x < 50$	Fair	Proceed to the next stage
Not Acceptable For Publication/Plagiarism /Already Published	< 40	Poor	Rejected

Name of the Evaluator: _____

Signature: _____   **Date:** _____

Appendix 3
Standard Format for the Preparation of Research Proposals

1. Title of the study

2. background of the study

3. Statement of the problem

4. Objectives (general and /or specific)

5. Research questions and/ Hypothesis

6. Significance of the study/ expected out comes

7. Scope of the study

8. Literature review (optional)

9. Materials and methods.

   - Description of study area

   - Study design

   - Study population

   - Sample size and sampling technique

   - Data collection instruments

   - Strategies of ensuring data quality

   - Materials and pprocedures

   - Method of data analysis

   - Ethical consideration

10. Work plan

11. Budget source (internal/external)

12. Budget requirement (detailed budget break down)

Budget Breakdown

No	Budget Title/Activates	No/Amount as necessary	No of days(as necessary)	Budget	Remark
1.	Facilities / Services				
1.1	Lab facilities				
1.1.1					
1.1.2					
1.2	Sport facilities				
1.2.1					
1.2.2					
1.3	Other facilities				
1.3.1					
1.3.2					
2.	Material inputs				
2.1	Lab. Equipment & tools				
2.1.1					
2.1.2					
2.2	Lab				
2.2.1					
2.2.2					
2.3	Sports equip & toots				
2.3.1					
2.3.2					
2.4	Stationery				

N<u>o</u>	Budget Title/Activates	No/Amount as necessary	No of days(as necessary)	Budget	Remark
2.4.1					
2.4.2					
3	Professional Regiments				
3.1	Data collection				
3.2	Data analysis				
3.3	Type setting				
3.4	(others specify)				
4	Transport				
4.1	Hometown				
4.2	Field				
5	Per diem				
5.1	Hometown				
5.2	Field				
6	Communication				
7	Any other				

13. Work plan for research activities (in detail)

No	Activity	Duration	remark

References (APA referencing style)

Declaration of oath

I, the project owner (and co-Authors) hereby declare that in applying for the project, I /we have full knowledge of the Provisions of Ethiopian Youth Sports Academy's Research Police & Research Guidelines. I (we) therefore vow to respect the provisions & shall not contravene the provisions & international accepted academic ethical norms throughout the implementation of the project, and shall take full responsibility for failures to respect the Academy's intentions, and accept any decisions of the Academy in response of any misconduct & shall be liable under pertinent provisions Ethical.

Principal Researcher / Project owner

Name--------------------------   Sig ------------------------

Co-authors

Name-------------------------------------   Sig-------------------------

Appendix 4

Proposal Evaluation Form to Be Filled by Each Review Team Member

Proposals are funded when they meet the set criteria. The criteria are listed below with its weight. Proposals with higher overall score are considered for funding. And the proposals that have scored below 50% many not be funded. The review committee shall be involved to review a project and the average of the evaluators will serve to decide on the funding of the projects. The research and ethical committee shall provide weights to the projects by considering the presentation and the incorporation of the comments given during presentation.

Title of the project _____

1. Relevance and degree of research priority in relation to ESA list of research priority and themes that demonstrates responsiveness to the sport sector (30%)

    Highly appropriate (25-30)

    Moderately appropriate (15-24)

    Inappropriate < 15)

    Score _____

2. Scientific quality and contents of the project (25%)

a. Justification, hypothesis, gaps and objectives. Is the objective and gap clearly stated, is the priority clear, and objective achievable, is the proposal well-reasoned out (6)

    Highly appropriate (5-6)

    Moderately appropriate (3-4)

    Inappropriate < 3)

    Score _____

b. Methodology (design, method, statistical analysis) it should be proper, well designed and related to all objectives (10)

    Highly appropriate (9-10)

    Moderately appropriate (5-8)

    Inappropriate < 5)

    Score _____

c. Expected output, indicates the anticipated out puts by running this project. Which research questions could be answered by doing this and what output is expected at the end of the project for dissemination and the beneficiaries from the project? The expected outcome should spell out and tally with the objectives that has been set (4)

> Highly appropriate (4)
>
> Moderately appropriate (2-3)
>
> Inappropriate <2)
>
> Score _____

d. In formation/knowledge dissemination strategy (5)

> Highly appropriate (4-5)
>
> Moderately appropriate (2.5-3)
>
> Inappropriate <2.5)
>
> Score _____

3. Technical feasibility (level of experience, availability of resources, time and budget and applicants are scientifically and technically capable and realistic in budgeting) (20%)

> Highly appropriate (16-20)
>
> Moderately appropriate (10-15)
>
> Inappropriate <9
>
> Score _____

4. Degree of collaboration, multi-disciplinary (15%)

> Highly appropriate – involved more than 2 disciplines (11-15)
>
> Moderately appropriate – involved (7.5-10)
>
> Inappropriate – not involved (<7.5)
>
> Score _____

5. Attainable with in specified period (10%)

> Highly appropriate (8-10)
>
> Moderately appropriate (4-7)
>
> Inappropriate <3
>
> Score _____ Total score _____

If the total score is 50 and above if you believe the project is worth funding with appropriate modifications, please give your comments to make improvement in the space provided.

a. Introduction and objectives _____

_____

_____

_____

b. Methodology _____

_____

_____

c. Expected out come _____

_____

_____

d. Work plan implementation budget _____

_____

_____

e. Additional comments _____

_____

_____

Reviewer's name   Signature   Date

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Assignment (Research Award Declaration This Declaration shall be signed by the Deputy Director of the office Research or his /her representative)

I (name),------------------(Authority),--------------declare that the Research Proposal filed by project Owner, (Name) & (Co – Authors) have been approved after careful review of the proposal under the established guidelines & procedures, and hereby announce a total of ------------------- have been allocated for the implementation of the proposal and I therefore declare the commencement of the project

----

Signature

Appendix 5
Ethiopian Sports Academy (ESA) (20%)
Part 2: Proposal Presentation Assessment   Name _____Date _____
Title _____ **Code** _____

	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Pragmatic Envisioning Skills	Has a well-founded and clearly stated hypothesis or overall project goal	Has a well-founded hypothesis/goal. Could be stated earlier or more clearly in the document	Has a hypothesis/ Goal Motivation not very clear and/or statement is not clear.	Some attempt at hypothesis/goal statement. Not clearly stated and/or lacks the motivation	No defined hypothesis or goal is stated in the proposal
Comments:					
Critical evaluation of literature (advanced knowledge	Demonstrates critical evaluation the current state of literature Multiple research groups properly cited; clear description of the works that motivate the reasoning for the proposed work.	Demonstrates critical evaluation the current state of literature Multiple research groups properly cited. Most works are clearly described; works motivate the reasoning for the proposed work.	Describes prior work. Properly cites multiple research groups. However, connection to current work is not always clear	Describes prior work. Some key Results are missing or results from only a few groups are mentioned. Connection to current work is not clear	Lacks a good description of prior work. Key results are missing, or results from only a few groups are mentioned. Connection to current work is not clear
Comments:					

Applied research principles	Preliminary results well described and interpreted show capability and proof-of- concept and support goal. Methods for future experiments clearly described; alternative approaches to ensure success described. Includes a timeline for overall project.	Preliminary results well described and interpreted Show capability and proof-of-concept. Includes timeline for project. Future experiments are sketched out and good in concept.	Includes some Description of preliminary results, timeline, and future experiments. Methods could be clearer.	Includes a timeline and description of future experiments. Few initial results presented details are missing from Methods.	Timeline initial results and/or descriptions of future experiments are missing. Descriptions of methods are hard to follow
Comments:					
Oral presentation skills	Is clear and precise in oral presentations. Is comfortable answering audience questions	Is clear and precise in oral presentations	Presents in understandable manner.	Lacks confidence/ somewhat hard to follow	Presentation very hard to follow or understand.
Comments:					

Initials: _____   **Committee initials:**_____

Appendix 6

ESA REVIEWER'S FORM

<mark>PART ONE</mark> ASSESSMENT OF ESA RESEARCH GRANT APPLICATION

CONFIDENTIAL		
1.1 Reviewer		
Surname:	First name(s):	
Committee:	Venue:	Date
Project title:		
Project ID:	Proposal or protocol	Version: Date:

This form is designed to

1. Inform prospective applicants of how applications are reviewed and provide a framework for critical and objective assessment of the proposal

2. Provide comments as feedback to the applicant with a clear indication of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal as appropriate

3. Provide a clear recommendation to ESA on whether or not to fund the proposed research project or proceed with the implementation of the protocol.

4. Make recommendations / suggestions which will guide the investigator in the development or improvement of the research protocol where the proposed research has enough merit to justify funding Further to carrying out best practice of independent peer review, it is especially to be noted that for research involving human subjects the ESA Ethics Review Committee (ERC) requires that all research proposals and research protocols undergo extensive scientific and technical review before being submitted to the ESA.

Appendix 7
Research Contract Agreement for ESA Sponsored Projects (To Be Signed By The Researchers and Representative For Research)

1. Title of the research project _____

2. Summary of research project _____

3. Principal investigator's name_____

4. Amount of award _____

5. Effective date

    This agreement shall be effective as of-------------

6. The undersigned agrees to accept responsibility for the scientific and technical conduct of the research project, the provision of progress report and the presentation of research reports at an annual research conference organized by the Academy.

7. The researcher shall have also responsibility to disseminate the output of the research

▪ To scientific community by publishing in peer reviewed and reputable national or international journals as well as

▪ To relevant development oriented/extension institutions through manuals, easily understandable local language texts if appropriate.

Name of PI	Signature	Date
--------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------

Approval
Head of research office   Signature   Date

_____

Authorization
Deputy Director for Research   Signature   Date

-------------------------   ---------------------------   ----------   ---------

Appendix 8
Guiding Principles to Make Contract Agreement With Other Partner Institutions

The contract agreement with partner institutions shall be developed by ESA and partner institution guided by the following principle:

a. The project shall be under the thematic and priority areas of ESA and devote in meeting the research strategic issues of ESA and research policy of ESA.

b. The implementation of project shall be monitored and evaluated in both the Academy and partner institution system.

c. The project shall commit to submit progress, annual and terminal reports to the Academy and also present the findings in the annual research conferences of the Academy.

d. The project shall commit to submit the publication, proceeding and other outputs aroused from the research project for respective library and research coordination office /RCCSD.

e. The financial administration shall be based on the project document agreed between ESA and partner institution.

f. Based on the above principles the Academy representative and the partner institution shall sign memorandum of understanding (MOU)

Appendix 9

Progress (Quarter/Annual) Reporting Format

1. Title of the project

   _____

2. Project management

   a. Name of PI

      _____

   b. Research team member(s) in the Academy

      _____

   c. Other partner/collaborating organizations (outside ESA) with addresses of contact person(s) and their role in the project.

3. Project duration and period

   a. Duration _____ (in months/year)

   b. Period from _____ to _____

4. Reporting period

   ┌───┐
   │   │
   │   │
   │   │
   │   │
   └───┘

5. Funding

a. Source of funding

   ┌───┐
   │   │
   │   │
   │   │
   │   │
   └───┘

6. Objective of the project

   a. General objectives

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

    b.   Specific objectives

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

7. Work plan used for the current reporting period (state briefly the work plan for the project until the current reporting is made)

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

8. Achievements/progress: indicate also which objectives have been addressed: project output description (give the highlights of the work done during the reporting period)

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

9. Problems encountered (state any major problems encountered while conducting the research): describe the advances and/or problems encountered towards the completion of the plan of work for this reporting period.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

10. Measures to be taken

```




```

11. Work plan (description of the work plan for the next funding including the research timetable)

```




```

12. Financial expenditure (detailed expenditure for the upcoming research period)

```




```

13. Additional remarks

```




```

Appendix 10

Terminal Report Format

A research report should include the following headings:

    a. Researchers name and address

    b. Abstract

    c. Acknowledgment

    d. Table of contents

    e. List of figures and tables

    f. List of symbols

    g. Introduction /background

    h. Objectives

    i. Literature review (optional)

    j. Methodology: experimental design

    k. Results and discussion

    l. Conclusions and recommendations

    m. References

    n. Appendices

Report formats

    a. All headings should be left justified

    b. Line spacing should be single spaced and font size should be 12

    c. Left margin should be 1.5 Inch and 1 Inch on all other sides

\

Appendix 11

Review Form for Terminal Report (To Be Filled By The Reviewers)

1. General comments (comments on: sufficiency of knowledge/information generated and conclusion drawn)

2. Comments on the content and organization of the report (this refers to the report format, editorial quality, lay out, length, adherence to fonts, line spacing, margin etc)

3. Comment on the abstract: Does the abstract adequately summarize the report?

4. Comments on the introduction and objective section: Does the introduction sufficiently detailed for this form of research? Are the objectives clear and do they reflect what has been achieved in the research?

5. Comments on the methods section: Is the research method sufficiently described and are the experimental details well described and can they be repeated?

6. Comments on the results section. Are the results well presented?

```
                                                                            
```

7. Comments on the discussion section: Is the discussion of the results accurate and exhaustive?

```
                                                                            
```

8. Comments on conclusions & recommendations: Are the conclusions and recommendations relevant and consistent eat with the analysis, are the conclusions and recommendations match with the research objectives

```
                                                                            
```

9. Comments on the references: Are the references relevant, exhaustive and up to date

```
                                                                            
```

10. Any additional comments

```
                                                                            
```

11. The reviewer should show his/her comment in the following rates as justified from the comments at each section.

   a. Accept without modification

b. Accept with minor modification as per the comments

c. Accept with major modification as per the comments

d. Reject the report to be done again as per the comments

12. The justifiable reasons for section forwarded by the reviewer

Appendix 12

Research Extension Request Form

Date: _____

I, the principal investigator of the project would like to extend the duration of the research project

1. Title of the research

2. Project management/organization/co-ordination

Principal investigator (s)
Research team member(s)

3. Project duration

Current date from------------to------------- Requested new date from-------------to-------------

4. Funding

Source of funding
Amount
Consumed fund

5. Achievements/progress

6. Reason for extension (state briefly why you intend to extend your research to the coming recurrent budget)

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

7. Problems in countered (state any major problems encountered while conducting the research)

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

8. Work plan (description of the work plan for the next year, including the research timetable)

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

9. Detailed budget

Type of expenditure	Description	Total cost	Remark, if any

I, hereby certify that the information field in the above is complete, accurate and correct that any future change will be reported immediately to the academy. I understand that academy is authorised to check at any time the accuracy of the information given in this form. I understand that the academy may also request more information, if necessary.

_____   _____

Name of principal investigator   signature & date

Approval

_____   _____

Deputy Director for Research   signature & date

Appendix 13 (Optional by the Management Committee Approval)

Alternative Evaluation Criteria for Proposals (Maximum points of 100) (Not In Line of The Evaluation Sheet)

1. Applicant Background **(Maximum 10 Points)**

   a. Currently implementing a development, or a program aimed at enhancing Sport of the subject area.

   b. Clear program activities and objectives that are in line with proposed research, and present opportunity for application of findings

   c. Recent experience and capacity relevant to the specific research activity being proposed

2. Contribution to SCALE program goals (Maximum 20 Points)

   a. Research adds to the topic knowledge base, locally, nationally, or regionally

   b. Research will result in learning relevant to multiple implementers in multiple countries

   c. Research contributes to an enhanced understanding of interventions at the intersection of the topic

3. Research Plan Description (Maximum 35 Points)

   a. Shows a clear link between the described gap in the body of knowledge in the area community, and the objectives of the proposed project or activity

   b. Directly relates to the target subject area described above

   c. Describes the activities to be implemented, how and by whom, and the proposed timelines for each major objective/deliverable/milestone

   d. Identifies substantive, active roles for any partners, including clear role and need for SCALE-funded research consultant or institution

e. Clearly demonstrates the applicant's capacity, interest, and availability to serve as a research partner. This may include logistical support (drivers, vehicles), social connections (introductory visits to communities and/or partner organizations), and staff time (e.g. to collect, analyze and/or ground truth data).

4. Activity assessment process and documentation (Maximum 10 Points)

   a. Includes a clear and feasible study plan

   b. Describes the process that will be used to ensure the proposed research activity's technical quality

   c. Provides a knowledge end-product that can be shared with multiple implementers globally, including through the sport Organization Network

5. Cost proposal (Maximum 20 Points)

   a. Degree to which costs are allocable, reasonable and allowable

   b. Clear and concise budget narrative