

This work is on a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. Access to this work was provided by the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) ScholarWorks@UMBC digital repository on the Maryland Shared Open Access (MD-SOAR) platform.

Please provide feedback Please support the ScholarWorks@UMBC repository by emailing scholarworks-group@umbc.edu and telling us what having access to this work means to you and why it's important to you. Thank you.

Thinking from Different Perspectives: Academic Publishing Strategies and Management in the Field of Educational Technology

TRISTAN E. JOHNSON

*Associate Dean for Graduate Programs
Boston College, USA*

*Research Editor-in-Chief, Educational Technology Research and Development
tristan.johnson@bc.edu*

LIN LIN

*Professor of Learning Technologies / Director of Texas Center for Educational Technology
University of North Texas, USA*

*Development Editor-in-Chief, Educational Technology Research and Development
lin.lin@unt.edu*

PATRICIA A. YOUNG

*Program Director Elementary Education and Associate Professor
University of Maryland at Baltimore County, USA*

*Cultural and Regional Perspectives Editor, Educational Technology Research and Development
pyoung@umbc.edu*

HALE ILGAZ

*Associate Professor
Ankara University, Turkey*

*Research Assistant Editor, Educational Technology Research and Development
hilgaz@ankara.edu.tr*

GWENDOLYN MOREL

*Director, Office of Distance and Extended Learning
Texas State University, USA*

*Development Assistant Editor, Educational Technology Research and Development
gwendolynmorel@txstate.edu*

J. MICHAEL SPECTOR

*Professor, Department of Learning Technologies / LT Doctoral Program Coordinator
University of North Texas, USA*

*Educational Technology Research and Development Editor Emeritus
mike.spector@unt.edu*

INTRODUCTION

Educational Technology Research and Development (ETR&D) journal is a publication of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology and currently published by Springer Nature. The journal emerged in 1989 by joining two separate journals, the *Journal of Educational Technology Research* and *Journal of Instructional Development*. The main focus of ETR&D is interdisciplinary studies looking at learning, instruction and performance across all disciplines and contexts, as well as all phases of planning, designing, implementing and evaluating various kinds of support for learning, instruction and performance.

ETR&D is refereed and follows a double-blind peer review process. Further, the journal is indexed with the Institute of Scientific Information (ISI) Web of Science, Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), and Education Resources

Information Center (ERIC) with a significant and steadily increasing impact factor. The typical acceptance rate has been between 8-14%. We receive submissions from across the globe with more than 75% of manuscripts being submitted from outside the United States.

Each major section (e.g. Research and Development sections) is assigned a separate Editor-in-Chief and dedicated Assistant Editor. Each major section has two international and multidisciplinary editorial boards comprised of 6 voted members serving 3-year terms. The editorial boards elect the editors who each serve 3-year terms. The journal has two perspective sections, the Cultural and Regional Perspectives and a newly formed Featured Papers section.

For specific journal information, please see the journal website: <https://www.springer.com/journal/11423>. Sample papers from the journal are available at no cost on the Springer website. The Association for Educational Communications & Technology (AECT) provides members with a free subscription via the website: <https://www.aect.org/>.

Research Section

The Research Section assigns highest priority in reviewing manuscripts to rigorous original quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods studies on topics relating to applications of technology or instructional design in educational settings. Such contexts include K–12, higher education, and adult learning (e.g., in corporate training settings). Analytical papers that evaluate important research issues related to educational technology research and reviews of the literature on similar topics are also published. This section features well-documented articles on the practical aspects of research as well as applied theory in educational practice and provides a comprehensive source of current research information in instructional technology. Table 1 provides an at-a-glance review of the Research Section focus.

Table 1
Research Section At-a-Glance

Focus Area	Description
Priority	Assigns highest priority ratings to rigorous original manuscripts
Methods	Quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods studies
Topics	Applications of technology or instructional design in educational or performance settings
Contexts	K-12, higher education, and adult learning (workplace training)
Types of Papers	Analytical papers focused on evaluating important research issues related to educational technology research, including Literature Reviews, Replication Studies, Feature Pieces (well documented articles on practical aspects of research & applied theory in practice)

Development Section

The Development Section publishes research on planning, implementation, evaluation, and management of a variety of instructional technologies and learning environments. Empirically based formative evaluations and theoretically based instructional design research papers are welcome, as are papers that report outcomes of innovative approaches in applying technology to instructional development. Papers for the Development section may involve a variety of research methods and should focus on one aspect of the instructional development process or more; when relevant and possible, papers should discuss the implications of instructional design decisions and provide evidence linking outcomes to those decisions. Table 2 provides an at-a-glance review of the Development Section focus.

Table 2
Development Section At-a-Glance

Focus Area	Description
Priority	Focus on one or more aspects of the instructional development process
Methods	Planning, implementation, evaluation, and management of a variety of instructional technologies and learning environments
Types of Papers	Empirically-based formative evaluations. Theoretically-based instructional design research papers, and outcomes reports on innovative approaches in applying technology to instructional development
Relevancy	Implications of instructional design decisions and evidence linking outcomes to those decisions

Cultural and Regional Perspectives Section

The Cultural and Regional Perspectives Section (formerly International Review) welcomes innovative research about how technologies are being used to enhance learning, instruction, and performance specific to a culture or region. Educational technology studies submitted to this section should be situated in cultural contexts that critically examine issues and ideologies prevalent in the culture or region or by individuals or groups in the culture or region. Theoretical perspectives can be broadly based and inclusive of research, such as critical race theory, cultural-historical activity theory, and cultural models. Papers published in this section include quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods and reviews drawing on relevant theories, empirical evidence, and critical analyses of the findings, implications, and conclusions within a cultural context. Table 3 provides an at-a-glance review of the Cultural & Regional Perspectives Section focus.

Table 3
Cultural & Regional Perspectives Section At-a-Glance

Focus Area	Description
Priority	Manuscripts focused on the use of technologies to enhance learning, instruction, and performance specific to a culture or region
Topics	Cultural contexts that critically examine issues and ideologies prevalent in a culture or region or by individuals or groups in the culture or region Theoretical perspectives broadly based and inclusive of research such as critical race theory, cultural-historical activity theory and cultural models
Types of Papers	Quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods; reviews drawing on relevant theories, empirical evidence, critical analyses of the findings, implications and conclusions within a cultural context

Featured Papers Section

The Featured Paper Section highlights work by researchers and scholars, who contribute papers to ETR&D that provide lessons learned and insights across multiple studies that move the discipline forward. This Section also highlights Early Career Award papers as well as other AECT award papers and papers invited by highly distinguished authors. Featured papers are those which are likely to be of keen interest to all ETR&D readers.

Special Issues

The journal invites proposals for Special Issues regularly. Proposals are reviewed to determine alignment and impact on the proposed special issue. A Special Issue typically has 8 to 12 papers (between 5000 and 7000 words each -- including references). The Guest Editor(s) contribute an introductory piece to the Special-Issue.

Special Issue papers span the full range of research, development, and cultural/regional issues addressed in the journal. It is desirable to have papers that represent multiple perspectives from a variety of research groups. Each paper should not have been submitted elsewhere or previously published, and must represent an original contribution.

Recent and past special issues have included:

- Shifting to Digital - Informing the Rapid Development, Deployment, and Future of Teaching and Learning
- Embodied Cognition and Technology for Learning
- Learners and Learning Contexts: International Perspectives on New Alignments for the Digital Age
- Systematic Reviews of Research on Emerging Learning Environments and Technologies
- Cognition and Exploratory Learning in the Digital Age
- Theory in Learning Design and Technology Research and Practice

SUBMISSION AND REVIEW PROCESS

The process for getting published in ETR&D is somewhat similar to other journals. To help prospective authors better understand the details, the following section covers some of the key factors to guide and keep in mind the process as one progresses along the various stages of manuscript submission, reviewers' feedback, editing and resubmission.

Overview of Manuscript Submission and Review Process

All manuscripts are submitted using the online editorial management system, Editorial Manager at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/etrd/Default.aspx>. Submitted manuscripts need to follow the latest version of APA guidelines. Authors select a section that is most appropriate for their manuscript, then upload the manuscripts with any author identifying information removed. After the assigned editor reviews the paper checking for general quality, three reviewers are selected if the paper appears a good fit and of reasonable or promising quality. It usually takes 60-90 days to receive feedback from the reviewers. If the paper is specifically focused on a narrow topic or specific unique methodology is used, it may take longer to get feedback due to the challenges in finding reviewers who are willing to take on the article review task.

For ETR&D, a typical initial outcome is Major Revisions/Resubmission. In this case reviewers may provide detailed recommendations for improvements. Another typical outcome could be Rejection. Often ETR&D reviewers provide detailed recommendations for improvements, but the journal editors have deemed that based on the peer reviews, the manuscript is not a good fit (for a variety of reasons) for the journal.

As manuscripts improve the other two typical outcomes are Minor revisions required indicating that the manuscript is on a path to publication and the sought-after outcome of Acceptance. For all outcomes other than Acceptance and Rejection, authors are encouraged to revise the manuscript and then resubmit it to the journal. Editors consider the edits that were made and when possible, they send the revised manuscript back to the same reviewers to re-review. This is not always possible in which case a new reviewer is invited to review the revised manuscript. Additional information about submission guidelines and style requirements can be found on the journal website: <https://www.springer.com/journal/11423/submission-guidelines>.

How ETR&D Editors Work

Each editor oversees the publication process for their section. The journal's culture is set up to rely on the reviewers to determine if the current submitted manuscript could plausibly reach a level of quality for publication and also to determine if that level of quality has been achieved in order to be considered ready for publication. The editors do monitor the quality and reliability of the reviews and take this into account when they render a decision on a submitted manuscript. When assigning reviewers to a manuscript, the editors seek to achieve a balanced review panel – e.g., one for the methodology, one for the content focus, and so forth.

The editors rarely overturn a review panel's recommendation. The editors respect the views of the reviewers; while at times when we are not fully agreeing with them, we take their reviews seriously. This principle has its challenges. For instance, it may lengthen the time to get published in ETR&D as it is difficult to get three reviewers to sign off on a manuscript. On the other hand, the level of reviewers' direct involvement in the decision to accept a manuscript truly makes ETR&D a double-blind peer reviewed journal. Editors find that we have to help authors interpret and prioritize reviewer recommendations especially in cases where a review agreement is lacking. In such cases, we adjudicate differences between reviewers.

How ETR&D Reviewers Work

ETR&D reviewers are typically experienced in the field and therefore somewhat busy. When invited to review a manuscript, they can be selective on what papers they choose to review. To make this decision, they typically read the abstract first to answer the question, “Do I want to spend time reviewing this paper?” Not often, but we have had a few papers where all invitees decline our invitation to review a specific manuscript.

If the reviewer is interested, then they likely read the introduction, conclusion and review the references. During this initial screening, they ask questions such as: 1) What is the focus and general quality of this paper? 2) Am I qualified to review it? 3) Is it a well-written piece?

If reviewers believe that the paper is of a good quality and interesting and they are qualified to review it, then reviewers start the formal review process. This process includes a first reading during which they take notes. They most likely formulate a preliminary decision about the manuscript. Then they could completely read the full paper and determine if the author achieves their intended purpose. At this point, reviewers could “make a decision” and provide feedback to the editor indicating if this paper could reach publication standards. They also write up their review to the author(s) to help them improve their paper.

What Do ETR&D Editors & Reviewers Expect?

It is helpful to know what is expected from authors from those reviewing their work. If you use these expectations to influence your writing, you will more easily meet the reviewers’ expectations and increase your chance for getting good feedback and ultimately influencing them to accept your manuscript for publication. We have provided more details on challenges in the following section on Best Practices.

Given their role, editors are looking to meet some general expectations that help with the review process but also some specific expectations to ensure value to the journal’s readership. Specific expectations include familiarity with the journal and journal guidelines as well as a paper likely to generate interest among readers and lead to follow-on submissions on related topics. General expectations include creating a coherent and focused paper, adherence to research standards and standards of the profession, and a genuine contribution to the knowledge base. Reviewers have a similar range of expectations like that of the editor’s and fall into two areas - general and specific.

General Reviewer Criteria

- What contributions is the paper to the field?
- How relevant is this paper?
- How significant is this paper?
- How original is this paper?
- How is the quality of this paper?
- How is the clarity of this paper?
- How is the appropriateness of the title, abstract, and conclusion?

Specific Reviewer Criteria

1. Originality
 - Are the problems and approaches new?
 - Is this a novel combination of existing techniques?
 - Does the paper point out differences from related research?
 - Does it address a new problem or one that has not been studied in depth?
 - Does it introduce an idea that appears promising or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives?

2. Technical Quality
 - Is this paper technically sound?
 - Does it carefully evaluate the strength and limitations of its contributions?
 - Are its claims backed up?
 - Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well-known technique?
 - Does it offer a theoretical analysis of prior experimental results?
 - Related work?
3. Presentation Quality
 - Is the paper well written?
 - Does it motivate the research?
 - Are the results described and evaluated?
 - Is the paper organized in a logical fashion?
 - Is the paper written in a manner that makes it accessible to most educators and/or educational technologists?
 - Is the paper written in clear English?
 - Is the readability good?
 - Are there any presentation problems?

These criteria can be very detailed and not easy for some authors to self-critique. We find that authors with little academic publishing experience find the process much easier if they team up with a mentor to help not only with their research but also the academic publishing process.

BEST PRACTICES AND ADVICE FOR AUTHORS

One of the challenges authors have is determining the likelihood that their manuscripts will be published in a given journal. Two key phases of academic publishing are manuscript preparation and then manuscript revisions. This section provides guidelines to help authors prepare for the best chance of being reviewed and accepted for publication.

In general, new authors may believe that having good research and sound studies are the key to getting published, but additional considerations will help authors deal with the challenges of having their work vetted and refined prior to publication. Best practices help to give perspective to the academic publishing process. Areas of advice include: find the best outlets for your research, verify alignment of research with journals, manage the review process, deal effectively with reviewer feedback, manage manuscript revisions, and persist.

Best Practices for Success in Academic Manuscript Preparation

The following best practices are provided to assist authors in preparing their manuscripts for success.

Select a Journal that Aligns with Your Manuscript

Different journals have different purposes and audiences. One of the first steps when preparing a manuscript is to find a journal that is a good fit for your work. Finding the most appropriate journal for your manuscript can be challenging. Focus on the alignment of your manuscript with the goals and purposes of various journals. In addition, consider journal quality, acceptance rates, reputation, review process as well as possible opportunities for follow-on or response articles.

One resource that has been around for years is the work of Drs. Perkins and Lowenthal with their list of Ed Tech Journals <https://sites.google.com/site/edtechpubs/home>. They have done a good job at creating and maintaining a decent list of publishing opportunities in our field. Google Scholar also updates a list of top-rated journals in educational technology https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=top_venues&hl=en&vq=soc_educationaltechnology.

As you are working to familiarize yourself with various journals, we welcome emails to help guide authors to know if their work would be aligned with ETR&D. A brief email to one of the editors with an abstract is welcome. You may certainly ask if the topic and scope are relevant to the journal.

Pay Specific Attention to the Journal's Guidelines for Authors

Journal editors are interested in attracting quality manuscripts. To help authors, journals provide detailed guidelines for authors to follow. Be familiar with and follow the journal guidelines. If you have questions, please ask a member from the editor's team.

In addition to considering the appropriateness of your manuscript for the journal, some basic guidelines include: write clearly, coherently, and concisely without exaggeration and without self-praise/evaluation; tell a compelling story and include pertinent research and development details; make the abstract, introduction and reference section free of errors; carefully proofread your manuscript prior to submission; and respond to all reviewer recommendations when resubmitting a manuscript (more on this later).

Ensure Manuscript Value is Explicit to the Editors and Reviewers (and Readers)

Various factors motivate us to do research and when it comes to academic publications, the value of your work needs to be visible to the reader. There are specific factors within a paper that can add or show the explicit value of your manuscript. As you are writing your paper, consider making the following factors clear to the reader so they may see why your work might be important to them or the field at large.

- Contribution to the field
- Research logic—alignment between questions, methods, and results
- Research purpose and rationale
- Research questions
- Presentation of relevant literature
- Description of the problem
- Suitability of methods
- Presentation of results
- Appropriateness of conclusions
- Implications of the study

Above are the common factors that academic editors use to determine if a submitted manuscript is generally viable to be sent out for review. The more you provide clarity on these factors, the easier it is for editors and reviewers to see the value of your work thereby making it easier to “make a decision” as to the suitability of your manuscript for publication.

Build the Overall Logic of Your Manuscript

In order to write and publish to affect the reader, have a clear purpose for why you are writing. Are you writing to share new knowledge or convince readers that a specific technique has value? Understand what you are trying to accomplish with your publication.

Considering the value factors above, combine them to create the manuscript logic. This is the backbone of the manuscript and if well formed, the manuscript will be logical and easy to understand. If not well formed, the manuscript may be confusing. A general overall logic could include the following questions:

- What is the problem you are trying to solve or understand?
- What is the rationale for the research?
- What are the research questions?
- How are these questions relevant?

With this logic, you could easily craft a manuscript that answers these questions and provides supporting information and study details. Building the logic is easier to create on the front end rather than the back end of writing.

Common Manuscript Problems

Understanding common problems can help you avoid them and work to better prepare your manuscript for the review process. Having a strong manuscript logic can help avoid many of these common problems.

Problem 1: Lack of focus. This is where it takes the author over five pages to state the research question, and even then, it is not clear as to why the research question is relevant. What are the problems or opportunities the author wishes to investigate and why? Of what value will the inquiry be to readers? What is the story behind the research question?

This type of focus needs to be established in the first paragraph, followed by content in support of the stated focus and goal.

Problem 2: Dated and incomplete Literature Review. A significant issue with manuscripts is that the citations are quite dated. Also, given the topic, the author can miss significant research that has occurred over the last five years. In addition, the literature review may be incomplete. For example, there might have been a lot written about the focus of the research/study in the last five years.

Problem 3: Vague Methods, Design, Instruments, or Analysis. Readers want to know why certain decisions were made. The details need to be provided. Do not assume readers will understand the reasoning behind your decisions.

In addition, readers want to have a very clear understanding of the context of the study. They want to know what specifically happened with students in the control group and what specifically happened with students in the experimental group. A thick, in-depth description of the instructional activities of both groups is warranted. Readers want and need to see the instruments or at least excerpts from the instruments.

For research studies, there is often a treatment or a design element that is being studied. The details need to be clear and concise so that the reader can determine relevance of the focus of your study.

Problem 4: Weak Discussion and Findings. There are many possible reasons for results. It is important for the author to clearly state reasons explaining any effects found in their research. Also, it is important to discuss their opinion while ensuring they state them as opinion and not as fact.

Problem 5: Lack of Recommendations and Implications. The author should include specific recommendations for how to apply the new knowledge or what plausible implications are given the results of their work. The recommendations should give readers ideas for how they can use the new knowledge in practical ways.

It is important to remember that your manuscript should have an overall purpose. Helping the reader see the implications of your work can quickly add value to the ideas and show areas of relevance for application and practice.

Managing the Review Process in Academic Writing

After an author prepares and submits their manuscript, the paper begins the formal review process. The process for vetting a manuscript is to first, have a general review by the editorial team. Once deemed aligned with the journal and not containing any obvious issues, the manuscript is then sent out for review to a journal reviewer. The manuscript reviewer makes a recommendation for a decision and also provides details about the strengths and weaknesses. At that time, the editor “makes a decision” based on the outcome of the combined reviews and the recommended decisions from the reviewers. The general review by the editorial team and by the journal reviewers is described below.

Review by Editorial Team

When a manuscript is received, the editorial team carries out an internal review to determine if the manuscript is appropriate for the journal and to determine that manuscript quality appears to be sufficient to not waste reviewers’ time.

There may be a need to communicate with the editor about general or specific questions. This can be done easily outside the manuscript review system. However, when emailing about a resubmission, do not express anything especially negative about the reviewers or the process – this will only serve to further reduce the chances for publication and may have additional undesirable, counter-productive consequences.

To help with this initial review, the following list (see Table 4) outlines the various key issues that we typically look for in an internal preliminary review.

Table 4
Internal Preliminary Review — Key Issues

Key Issues	Examples
Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manuscript does not align with major sections of the journal. • Manuscript is not aligned with ETR&D or it is a better fit for another journal. • The manuscript does not address learning, performance or educational issues directly.
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic is not novel. • It is not clear how the study adds to what is already known. • Relevance for the field is not clear.
Implications for Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implications of research are not clear. • Conclusions are not well established.
Research Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale for research purpose is not clear.
Research Logic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research questions/hypotheses are absent. • Research questions are not clear. • Research questions were proposed but a clear answer to these questions is not obvious.
Grammar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript suffers from grammatical deficiencies: problems with wording, awkward construction, improper grammar and so forth. • The manuscript was not proof-read for accuracies in the English language.
Data Strength	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study used data that was not well suited for empirical research (Note: self-report data can be suspect). Consider how learning is measured. • Data was not substantiated by a written analysis as in qualitative research.
Self-Identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-identifying citations are not blinded.
Manuscript Length	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript exceeds maximum length (8,000) without rationale.
APA Style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were issues with citation and styles.

Depending on the type of issues, editors may request that the authors fix and resubmit before the manuscript is sent out for external review.

Review by Journal Reviewers

As described above, one of the key stages is peer review of manuscripts. The output of this process is a formal analysis of authors manuscripts. Like previously mentioned, assuming that the manuscript is not rejected, the author(s) will have the chance to resubmit their manuscript for further review. Not only is making edits to improve one's paper a most challenging step in academic publishing but managing the reviews is also key for efficiency and will give the author(s) a greater chance to find favor from their manuscript's reviewers.

To streamline and make it easier to re-review your resubmitted manuscript, we ask that authors create a "response to the reviewer" letter. Techniques for responding to reviewers include reviewing all of the comments and feedback, looking for commonalities and differences; developing a plan to improve the manuscript; as you work on responding to feedback and improving the manuscript, build a separate response to each comment/suggestion for each reviewer in a table – arrange the table by reviewer; and submit the response to reviewers as recommended by the journal. We have found that if you take each review and address each part of the review line by line, reviewers find this approach easier to process and it also helps them see the edits you made more quickly.

Some authors find that they do not agree with the reviewers. In this instance, it is important to determine if the feedback is a philosophical difference or a perspective. You do not have to make every change that is recommended or suggested but we find that authors who address each part of the review and are responsive to the reviewer's comments tend to have more favorable outcomes. If you do not agree, then state your rationale. Sometimes when a reviewer thinks something is not clear, this is good evidence that others in the field may have the same perception. This is where you may choose to take the advice of the reviewer and work to clarify your points.

Mike Spector has used the following Tips on Responding to Reviewers (strongly based on Annesley, 2011) to help authors deal with the challenge of receiving feedback from blind reviewers: 1) Get mad. 2) Get over it. 3) Consider what editor says. 4) Gather your thoughts. 5) If the reviewer is wrong, this does not mean you are right. 6) Be grateful for the reviewers' and editor's time. 7) To clarify your understanding, restate what reviewers say. 8) Cut text if needed. 9) Do not submit the same paper to another journal without changes based on feedback from any prior journal. We think this is useful to manage this extremely challenging state in academic publishing.

EXEMPLARY READINGS

Exemplary Articles

The following four readings are samples of key papers that have been key to the journal. In these examples you will see the clarity of writing and also, they each have strong impact on our field. Please consider these as exemplary papers from ETR&D.

1. Gagné, R. M., & Merrill, M. D. (1990). Integrative goals for instructional design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 38(1), 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02298245>
2. Jonassen, D. (2000). Transforming learning with technology: Beyond modernism and post-modernism or whoever controls the technology creates the reality. *Educational Technology*, 40(2), 21–25.
3. Lohr, L., & Falvo, D. A. (2005). Online learning: Personal reflections on the transformation of education. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 53(2), 113–116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504869>
4. Merrill, M. D. (2002). First principles of instruction. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 50, 43–59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02505024>

Exemplary Special Issue

Although not a typical special issue at ETR&D, the journal editors took the responsibility and opportunity to provide research-based and evidence-based resources for educational professionals to integrate digital technologies into their teaching practices in 2020. In order to make a broader impact on the practice of rapid development, deployment, and future of teaching and learning, Lin and Johnson (2021) called for a special issue with more than eight special issue guest editors managing more than 80 response articles from the field on the application of research-based and evidence-based manuscripts.

1. Lin, L., & Johnson, T. (2021). Shifting to digital: informing the rapid development, deployment, and future of teaching and learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-021-09960-z>

The core guest editors of the special issue included Drs. Dickson-Deane, Ilgaz, Ioannou, Istenič, Kimmons, Morel, Natividad, Wijekumar, and Young (in the alphabetical order of guest editors' last names). The idea for the special issue was to present response-style papers that would provide multiple points of view on selected ETR&D recently published research studies drawing insights from the publications, to also provide recommendations for teaching and learning practice specifically related to the rapid development, deployment, and future of teaching and learning in a digital space. The original manuscripts are listed below:

1. Bennett, S., Agostinho, S., & Lockyer, L. (2017). The process of designing for learning: Understanding university teachers' design work. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 65, 125–145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9469-y>.
2. Borup, J., West, R. E., & Thomas, R. (2015). The impact of text versus video communication on instructor feedback in blended courses. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 63, 161–184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9367-8>

3. Giannakas, F., Kambourakis, G., Papasalouros, A., & Gritzalis, S. (2018). A critical review of 13 years of mobile game-based learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 66, 341–384. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-017-9552-z>
4. Hilton, J. (2016). Open educational resources and college textbook choices: A review of research on efficacy and perceptions. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64, 573–590. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9434-9>
5. Ifenthaler, D., & Schumacher, C. (2016). Student perceptions of privacy principles for learning analytics. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64, 923–938. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9477-y>
6. Jarrell, A., Harley, J. M., Lajoie, S., & Naismith, L. (2017). Success, failure and emotions: Examining the relationship between performance feedback and emotions in diagnostic reasoning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 65, 1263–1284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-017-9521-6>
7. Joo, Y. J., Kim, N., & Kim, N. H. (2016). Factors predicting online university students' use of a mobile learning management system (m-LMS). *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64, 611–630. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9436>
8. Ke, F. (2016). Designing and integrating purposeful learning in game play: A systematic review. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64, 219–244. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9418-1>
9. Kuo, Y., & Belland, B. R. (2016). An exploratory study of adult learners' perceptions of online learning: Minority students in continuing education. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64, 661–680. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9442-9>
10. Lee, E., & Hannafin, M. J. (2016). A design framework for enhancing engagement in student-centered learning: Own it, learn it, and share it. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64, 707–734. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9422-5>
11. Liu, J., Shindo, H., & Matsumoto, Y. (2019). Development of a computer-assisted Japanese functional expression learning system for Chinese-speaking learners. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 67, 1307–1331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-019-09669-0>
12. Loizzo, J., & Ertmer, P. A. (2016). MOOCocracy: The learning culture of massive open online courses. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64, 1013–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9444-7>
13. Nacu, D., Martin, C. K., & Pinkard, N. (2018). Designing for 21st century learning online: A heuristic method to enable educator learning support roles. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 66, 1029–1049. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-018-9603-0>
14. Philipsen, B., Tondeur, J., Roblin, N. P., Philipsen, B., Tondeur, J., Roblin, N. P., Vanslambrouck, S., & Zhu, C. (2019). Improving teacher professional development for online and blended learning: A systematic meta-aggregative review. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 67, 1145–1174. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-019-09645-8>
15. Tracey, M. W., & Hutchinson, A. (2019). Empathic design: Imagining the cognitive and emotional learner experience. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 67, 1259–1272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-019-09683-2>
16. Willis, J. E., Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2016). Ethical oversight of student data in learning analytics: A typology derived from a cross-continental, cross-institutional perspective. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64, 881–901. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9463-4>
17. Zacharia, Z. C., Manoli, C., Xenofontos, N., De Jong, T., Pedaste, M., van Riesen, S. A., ... & Tsourlidaki, E. (2015). Identifying potential types of guidance for supporting student inquiry when using virtual and remote labs in science: A literature review. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 63, 257–302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9370-0>

In addition, Spector, Johnson, and Young (2015) published an editorial encouraging replication studies as a means to make a bigger impact on the practice in our field stating that ETR&D call on papers “reporting replication studies and studies reporting large-scale, sustainable, systemic impact on educational practice. Such papers can be submitted to any ETR&D section following journal guidelines, and every effort will be made to bring these papers up to the publication standards of ETR&D” (p. 1).

REFERENCES

- Annesley, T. M. (2011). Top 10 tips for responding to reviewer and editor comments, *Clinical Chemistry*, 57(4), 551–554. <https://doi.org/10.1373/clinchem.2011.162388>
- Gagné, R. M., & Merrill, M. D. (1990). Integrative goals for instructional design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 38(1), 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02298245>
- Jonassen, D. (2000). Transforming learning with technology: Beyond modernism and post-modernism or whoever controls the technology creates the reality. *Educational Technology*, 40(2), 21–25.
- Lin, L., & Johnson, T. (2021). Shifting to digital: Informing the rapid development, deployment, and future of teaching and learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-021-09960-z>
- Lohr, L., & Falvo, D.A. (2005). Online learning: Personal reflections on the transformation of education. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 53(2), 113–116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504869>
- Merrill, M. D. (2002). First principles of instruction. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 50, 43–59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02505024>
- Spector, J. M., Johnson, T. E., & Young, P.A. (2015). An editorial on replication studies and scaling up efforts. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 63, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-014-9364-3>