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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 ports of life</th>
<th>Current Allocation of Time (in 60 days)</th>
<th>Desired Allocation of Time (in 60 days)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td>440 (7-8 hrs./day)</td>
<td>7-8 hours per day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>600 (10 hrs./day)</td>
<td>Includes getting ready and travel time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>190 (3 hrs./day)</td>
<td>Includes meals, helping children with homework, spending time visiting your parents, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>100 (1.5 hrs./day)</td>
<td>Time with friends, spouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>30 (0.5 hrs/day)</td>
<td>Spiritual practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>20 (0.3 hrs./day)</td>
<td>Philanthropic, civic activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>60 (1 hr./day)</td>
<td>Exercise, reading, crafts, hobbies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,440 hrs. (24 hrs./day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work: Time and Priorities

Faculty

• Research (40%)
  • Research + Writing
  • Collaborative Projects
  • Grants
• Teaching (40%)
  • Courses
  • Advising
• Service (20%)

• Center (TCET)
• ETR&D journal
Calendar

Writing Time

On writing day:
3pm – 5pm
Planning, Tracking and Organization
Planning, Tracking and Organization
**Planning, Tracking and Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Books and BoK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Specter &amp; Lin (eds.), Parsons, Lin, &amp; Cocksham (2018, eds), Springer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Refereed Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Lin, Mills, &amp; Herenthaler (2016), CHBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Cai, Parsons, Lin, &amp; Specter (2018), TechTrends, YCET and AECT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Peer reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Cockerham, N., Schellen, &amp; Chang (2017), AECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Yang, Lin, &amp; Yang (AECT, 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Keynote, panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>AECT 2017 Panel on Socrates and Confucius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Lin, talkSTEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Regional Press</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Cockerham, Chang, &amp; Lin (2016), Linguistic &amp; Cultural Factors in Math Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Lin, Cockerham, Chang, &amp; Retrieved (2018), FWMSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Cockerham, Schellen, Chang, &amp; Lin (2016), CDI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As an Author
Choosing Journals

• Impact factor – five-year impact factor
• Acceptance/rejection rates
• Reputation within the discipline
• Review process
• Opportunities for follow-on and response articles
• Balance between high-impact and quantity publications
Submitting a Manuscript

• Fit for the journal: be familiar with and follow journal guidelines
• Often, it is okay to send an abstract to the editor and ask if it seems like a reasonable fit
• “Chicken” OR “egg” process (in general: completing the study -> identifying the journal <-> writing up the study following the journal guideline)
• Make the abstract, introduction and reference section perfect – follow author guidelines very carefully
• Carefully proofread prior to submission
• Respond to all reviewer recommendations
Manuscript: Writing

• Use simple sentences: one idea at a time (avoid a sentence that has several clauses such as.... which... that... because...

• Avoid using: always, very, never, clearly, and so forth (avoid using ‘etc.’)

• Pay attention to details, for instance, spelling, typos, and the APA style.
  • Different perspectives between an author and a reviewer

• Use the author guideline provided by the journal. When in doubt or when seeing contradictory statements (e.g., guideline not in concert with APA style), follow the guideline provided by the journal.

• Write to help people understand, not to show off your knowledge or sophistication.

• Write in simple English: it is worth spending time editing the paper. Many papers are rejected because they have too many grammar mistakes or are difficult to understand.

• Admit the limitations of all aspects of the research – there are always limitations
Manuscript: General Process

• Author: submit a manuscript to a journal (e.g., ETR&D)
• Editorial office: check for issues such as plagiarism, IRB, author identification, author guideline, and other (2-3 weeks)
• Editor:
  • Check for author identification, fit, relevance, significance, and potential for publication
  • Send the manuscript to a panel of reviewers based on the fit and expertise of the reviewers (1-2 weeks)
• Reviewers
  • Accept or decline the invitation to review (3 weeks)
  • Accept the invitation and review the manuscript (one month)
  • Make recommendations about the manuscript: typically major or minor revisions
• Editor: Make decision about the manuscript (1-2 weeks)
• Author: Revise the manuscript (if major or minor revisions) (1-3 months)
• Editor: Send back to the same reviewers if possible at all
• Average cycle: 3-4 rounds [6 months – 2 years]
Manuscript: Editor’s Role

• Rely on reviewers – reviewer quality and reliability are known after a few reviews
• Select a balanced review panel – e.g., one for the methodology, one for the content focus, etc.
• Rarely overturn a review panel’s recommendation
• Help authors interpret and prioritize reviewer recommendations
• Help authors find alternative publication venues
Manuscript: Editor’s Perspective

• Clear, concise writing; non-trivial topics; a coherent and focused paper
• Familiarity with the journal and the journal’s guidelines
• A literature review of the pertinent research on the topic
• Research standards: the research method is well-designed and the data are well-presented
• A genuine contribution to the knowledge base
• A paper likely to generate interest among readers and lead to follow-on submissions on related topics
Manuscript: Typical Review Outcomes

• Rejection – this may come with a recommendation that the content be directed towards a different publication
• Major revisions required – usually comes with detailed recommendations for specific improvements
• Minor revisions required – usually means one is on a path to publication
• Acceptance – usually after several resubmissions; may come with copyright release forms
Manuscript: Reviewers’ Critiques

- Poorly written manuscript; grammar errors
- Failure to follow journal guidelines
- Problems with the design, methods, instruments, or analysis
- Missing important (and/or current) theoretical foundation, literature, alternatives, perspectives, prior research reviews (sometimes reflected in references)
- Exaggerated, unwarranted or vague claims; not backed by a current literature review
- Poorly organized paper, lack of coherence
- Weak discussions of limitations, implications or future research
- Lack of consistency among the multiple authors who contributed
Author: Responding to Reviewers (1)

• Review all of the comments and feedback, looking for commonalities and differences
• Develop a plan of action to improve the manuscript
• While working on responses to feedback and improving the manuscript, build a separate response to each comment or suggestion of each reviewer in a table (or in bullets) – arrange the table (bullets) by reviewers
• Submit the responses to the reviewers as recommended by the journal
Author: Responding to Reviewers (2)

• Wait and gather your thoughts
• Be grateful for the reviewers’ and editor’s time
• Choose battles wisely
• You can respectfully disagree, and provide you reasons
• The reviewer being wrong does not mean you are right – you can always write more clearly
• Do not pick one reviewer against another
• Restate the reviewer’s concerns to clarify your understanding
• Respond to the reviewer’s comments, and address the issues in the manuscript
• Be prepared to make major changes and cut texts
• Do not submit the same unaltered paper to another journal
Questions?
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Additional Info
ETR&D

- Sponsored by the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)
- Refereed – double-blind peer review process
- Indexed – ISI Web of Science / SSCI / ERIC
- Published by Springer
- Journal presentations at AERA (Spring) and AECT (Fall) meetings every year
- Acceptance rate between 8%-15% (approx. 12% but has recently dropped below 10%)
- International editorial board
ETR&D - Interdisciplinary

• Formed in 1989 from two existing journals – the Journal of Educational Technology Research and the Journal of Instructional Development

• Two major sections: Research (Tristan Johnson) and Development (Lin Lin)

• Additional sections:
  • Cultural and Regional Perspectives section (Patricia Young)
  • Featured Papers (J. Michael Spector)
  • Editorial Assistants (Gloria Natividad; Hale Ilgaz; Gwen Morel)

• Broad contributions from all around the world
ETR&D Editors

• Elected by the Editorial Board to serve three-year term – consecutive terms possible and desirable
• Research Editor manages the election of the Development Editor
• Development Editor manages the election of the Research Editor
Editorial Boards

• Six members for each major section
• Each serves three years
• Need not be AECT members
• Preferably from the review board of consulting editors
• Typically revert to the review board at the end of three years
• Vote on new board members every year and the editor every third year
ETR&D Reviewers

• Typically 3+ years past terminal degree
• Need not be AECT members
• Published in ETR&D or a similar journal
• Selected by the editor in consultation with the editorial board
• May be removed by the editor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>Publisher / Country</th>
<th>Publishing Schedule</th>
<th>H Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Journal of Educational Technology (BJET)</td>
<td>Blackwell Publishing Inc. / United Kingdom</td>
<td>Bi-monthly</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers and Education (CE)</td>
<td>Pergamon Press Ltd. / United Kingdom</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology: The Magazine for Managers of Change in Education (ETMAG)</td>
<td>Association for Educational Communication and Technology (AECT) / United States</td>
<td>Bi-monthly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology Research and Development (ETRD)</td>
<td>Association for Educational Communication and Technology (AECT) / United States</td>
<td>Bi-monthly</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Science (IS)</td>
<td>Kluwer Academic Publishers; / Netherlands</td>
<td>Bi-monthly</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Educational Computing Research (JECR)</td>
<td>Baywood Publishing Co., Inc. / United State</td>
<td>8 times / year</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Learning Sciences (JLS)</td>
<td>Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc. / United States</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Research on Technology in Education (JRTE)</td>
<td>Taylor &amp; Francis Ltd. / United States</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechTrends (TETR)</td>
<td>Association for Educational Communication and Technology (AECT) / United States</td>
<td>Bi-monthly</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>h5-index</td>
<td>h5-median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Computers &amp; Education</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>British Journal of Educational Technology</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The Internet and Higher Education</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Journal of Educational Technology &amp; Society</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>International Conference on Learning Analytics And Knowledge</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Educational Technology Research and Development</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>TechTrends</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Language Learning &amp; Technology</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Journal of Online Learning &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Distance Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Learning, Media and Technology</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Education and Information Technologies</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Interactive Learning Environments</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>International Conference on Technological Ecosystems for Enhancing Multiculturality</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Computer Assisted Language Learning</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Australasian Journal of Educational Technology</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Review Processes

• Double-blind review – both authors and reviewers remain anonymous
• Blind review – authors do not learn who reviewers are, but reviewers may know who the authors are.
• Non-blind review – used in some journals, magazines, and edited volumes
• Known after the fact – rare and usually with the permission of those involved or for furthering a productive dialogue