
The Evaluation of Scholarly Activity in Computer-Assisted Language Learning

BRYAN SMITH

Arizona State University

Department of English

P.O. Box 870302

Tempe, AZ 85287-0302

Email: david.bryan.smith@asu.edu

BARBARA A. LAFFORD

Arizona State University

School of International Letters and Cultures

P.O. Box 870202

Tempe, AZ 85287-0202

Email: barbara.lafford@asu.edu

The current study provides guidance for both junior computer-assisted language learning (CALL) researchers as they decide on the most appropriate forms and placement of scholarly activity and also for decision makers attempting to evaluate the scholarly activity of these CALL researchers in their quest for promotion and tenure. In this study, data from 35 online surveys from established CALL researchers were examined to determine their expert opinions on the quality of CALL-specific and general applied linguistics journals. These scholars were also asked to list the criteria they used to rank these journals and comment on the types of scholarly activity most beneficial to junior CALL scholars. Results suggest that the single most important element in the scholarly dossier of a CALL researcher is a series of refereed scholarly articles in highly ranked, peer-reviewed journals. A clear qualitative hierarchy of both CALL-specific and general applied linguistics journals emerged from the data. The data also show that scholars agree that the “best” journals for CALL research are those that reflect the highest quality of relevant articles and those that make a significant contribution to the field. Markedly less important to these CALL experts in determining journal quality are those more “objective” measures of quality such as acceptance rate, impact factor, and circulation.

IN THE SECTION OF HER 1991 ARTICLE dealing with professional rewards, Garrett summarized the frustration many computer-assisted language learning (CALL) practitioners experience regarding the evaluation of their work: “Teachers who devote the time and energy necessary to create technology-based materials for their teaching are understandably frustrated by the continuing reluctance of most departments, at least in research universities, to recognize their work with promotion and tenure” (p. 94). In addition, Garrett noted that chairs and promotion and tenure (P&T) committee members, who are not often involved in the development of CALL teaching materials, are not easily able to distinguish between the quality of the electronic delivery of

conventional foreign language teaching materials and those that employ pedagogical principles and practices that are innovative and theoretically grounded.

Garrett (1991) then made two proposals to help resolve this issue: (a) Work with the Modern Language Association (MLA) and faculty and department heads to create guidelines and a list of names of recognized (CALL) experts to act as referees for promotion and tenure decisions, and (b) incorporate the development of CALL materials into a research project, as “publication of papers on the research will make an unarguable contribution to the promotion bid, even when the materials development effort per se does not” (p. 95).

Although publishing venues for CALL-related research have grown substantially since the appearance of Garrett’s (1991) original article, the disconnect between the perceptions of decision makers and CALL practitioners about CALL

scholarly activity seems to persist today. For example, at the time of Garrett's original article there was already a growing body of work in CALL; however, teachers/researchers were often advised to publish in the more "conventional journals" rather than in those devoted to CALL because the latter were not considered research-oriented enough or selective enough to "count" (N. Garrett, personal communication, June 2, 2009). Among the major CALL-specific journals were the *CALICO Journal*, *ReCALL*, and *Computer Assisted Language Learning* (first published in 1983, 1989, and 1990, respectively).

In addition to these few journals that were dedicated to CALL, there were also several "mainstream" applied linguistics-related journals that were publishing CALL research at that time. Some of the more familiar of these included *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *Computers & Education*, *Computers in the Schools*, *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, *ELT Journal*, *Foreign Language Annals*, *French Review*, *Hispania*, *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *The Modern Language Journal*, *Simulation & Gaming*, *System*, and *TESOL Quarterly*, among others. Of course, like today, there were several regional publications as well, which served as outlets for CALL research. One of the earliest publications of this sort was *On-CALL* in Australia, which began publication in 1986. *On-CALL* merged with *CALL-EJ* in Japan (established in 1995) in 1999 to become today's *CALL-EJ Online*.

There were also various professional organization special interest group newsletters on CALL-related issues dating back to the early 1980s. However, the field of CALL scholarship made a quantum leap in 1997 with the publication of the first online journal dedicated exclusively to CALL scholarship, *Language Learning & Technology*.

Since Garrett's article, there have been a few attempts at a professional organization level to address the core issues previously presented. For example, a "Joint Policy Statement" published by EUROCALL, CALICO, and IALL attempts to establish a clearer understanding for various decision-making bodies in academe of the range of activities represented in the field of CALL as well as to provide some guidance about how these activities should be evaluated (EUROCALL, 1999). Similarly, the University of California Consortium for Language Learning & Teaching seeks to help define the nature of the types of research, teaching, professional activity, and service in which applied linguists are generally engaged (UCLLT, 2009). They echo previous calls (Magnan, 2007; MLA, 2006) for establishing a consensus on how to evaluate digital scholar-

ship, an area of particular interest to CALL scholars.

As our contribution to this Focus Issue on Garrett (1991) we have undertaken a study of how CALL activities are currently evaluated by CALL scholars and by promotion and tenure decision makers. This study not only addresses the more frustrating aspects of the professional rewards issues facing CALL scholars raised by Garrett, but it also adds to the work that has attempted to answer her call to create guidelines for P&T committees for evaluating CALL scholarly activity, which includes empirical research as well as the creation of theoretically grounded CALL pedagogical materials.

THE PROBLEM

Knowledge and expertise in the area of CALL is now accepted as a critical part of most programs of study in applied linguistics. As CALL is an interdisciplinary field by definition, applied linguists who are also CALL scholars may find academic homes in a myriad of different departments, each with its own scholarly tradition and dominant research paradigm. Although this interdisciplinarity is one of the strengths of the field of CALL, it often complicates a key aspect of a scholar's academic life, namely the evaluation of his/her scholarly activity and approach to research. For example, a CALL scholar—indeed applied linguists in general—may find themselves in a department within the Humanities, although their research may be more in line with the research traditions in the Behavioral or Social Sciences. This creates a potential mismatch between their scholarship and their department or college's expectations. This problem is compounded by the fact that there is little guidance for decision makers, including P&T committees, chairs, and deans, regarding the quality of the numerous publication venues that now publish CALL research. When asked to evaluate CALL research, these nonexpert decision makers have little choice but to rely on easily quantifiable "objective" aspects of scholarship (e.g., raw number of the CALL scholars' publications, the readership, acceptance rate, and impact factor¹ of the journals in which they publish) or rely on their own intuition about what makes a journal "good."

INCREASING DEMANDS ON RESEARCH

Although many schools strive for a more equitable balance among research, teaching, and service when evaluating faculty, in most cases

research enjoys a special position in the evaluation process, especially for junior faculty seeking tenure. Indeed, the evidence suggests that demands for publication have been expanding. These demands, which are driven by the nation's most prestigious research universities, are trickling down throughout all sectors of academe (MLA, 2006). Publishing in academic professional journals is clearly important; however, the aforementioned quantitative criteria used to establish a journal's quality and, by extension, gauge a scholar's credentials may not be applied evenly in every P&T case. In addition, these criteria and measures are not necessarily those that CALL experts would use when evaluating the scholarly work of other CALL researchers.

PRIOR RESEARCH ON THE QUALITY OF LINGUISTIC SCHOLARSHIP

VanPatten and Williams (2002) looked at P&T issues facing scholars in second language acquisition (SLA), including the challenge of evaluating the quality of SLA scholarship by nonexpert administrators and other decision makers. The authors sent out a survey to 72 tenured SLA specialists working in departments that focus on literary or cultural studies at major research universities in the United States and Canada. This survey asked about criteria used to review junior SLA faculty, the informants' opinions of major journals and presses, and current practices used by faculty to evaluate the scholarship of SLA junior faculty.

The data from the 45 returned surveys from SLA scholars found the following: (a) The field of SLA may be characterized as a "journal culture" instead of a book culture; it tends to expect refereed journal articles² from P&T candidates; (b) edited volumes are valued for tenure decisions; monographs are not expected at the junior scholar level; (c) co-authorship is encouraged; (d) the most highly rated journals are those that tend to accept mostly quantitative, cognitively based SLA research (e.g., *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *Language Learning*, *Second Language Research*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*);³ (e) the most highly rated presses for the publication of SLA edited volumes or monographs are European or university presses (e.g., Cambridge, Oxford, Blackwell, Benjamins) or are American presses with a cognitive slant (e.g., Erlbaum); (f) textbooks that are not basic language textbooks (e.g., an introductory textbook for graduate SLA courses) should be considered as scholarship in a tenure profile; (g) conference presentations should count

in one's tenure profile; (h) workloads of junior SLA scholars with language program direction responsibilities should be taken into consideration; reduced teaching loads and other types of support should be given to the candidate; decision makers should consult position papers by the American Association of University Supervisors and Coordinators on workloads of language program directors (LPDs); (i) home departments of junior SLA scholars need to find them good mentors, even if they need to look outside their institution; and (j) departments should ask for outside evaluators of a candidate's pretenure file (second or third year), while there is still time for the scholar to "retool" and make decisions about the kind of activities in which s/he should engage to support her/his tenure case.

Egbert (2007) expanded on studies like VanPatten and Williams (2002) and carried out an in-depth quality analysis of journals in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and Applied Linguistics. In this study, Egbert commented on the futility of using a single set of criteria for judging journal quality: "A single method, regardless of the number of components included, could not account for important differences among journals and in reasons for publishing in them" (p. 157).

Egbert first took issue with some of the frequently used "objective" indicators of journal quality, stating that they are often "based on subjective primary data, such as expert opinion" (p. 158). She pointed out various problems associated with the use of citation analysis (impact factor and citation counts), acceptance rates, time to publication, availability and accessibility and other descriptive measures (e.g., editorial policies, indexes in which the journals are listed [the Institute for Scientific Information's Social Sciences Citation Index and Journal Citation Reports], status of the editorial board) to judge journal quality. Nevertheless, Egbert provided this type of "objective" information on the top journals identified by the respondents in detailed tables.

The journal analysis Egbert (2007) carried out involved data from multiple data sources to develop a "holistic idea of journal quality" (p. 161). A survey of journal quality was sent to approximately 300 members of the TESOL Research Interest Section; information gleaned from the 31 returned surveys in this study and that from the Journal Citation Reports database form the basis of Egbert's analysis.

Survey respondents were asked to list the top 10 research journals (print or electronic) in the field of TESOL that were published in English and

addressed a broad base of issues. Participants were also asked to list the criteria they used to choose the journals on their lists. Respondents stated that the following indicators were used to create their selections: relevance to context (research or practice needs) or personal interest, the review process, the quality of the articles, the journal's relevance to TESOL, and the significance of the journal's contributions to the field. What is interesting about Egbert's list is the almost complete lack of mention of any of the more "objective" quantitative criteria mentioned earlier (e.g., acceptance rate, circulation/readership, time to publication, citation counts, impact factor, number of indexes in which the journal appears).

Magnan (2007) explored issues related to the evaluation of digital (online) scholarship. Echoing the MLA's (2002) Guidelines for Evaluating Work with Digital Media in the Modern Languages, she noted that the criteria for evaluating digital scholarship need to center on academic peer review that will gauge a manuscript's potential contribution to the profession at large. Magnan stated that "the rigor of the selection process is more important in determining the merit of a publication than its physical nature" (p. 153). Like VanPatten and Williams (2002) and Egbert (2007), Magnan noted that co-authorship is the norm in the field of SLA.⁴ However, she also suggested that the contribution of each author be made available to academic promotion committees and be included for readers in a clarifying footnote in co-authored pieces.

In her discussion of the criteria used by departments to judge scholarship, Magnan (2007) noted the common reliance on reviews of monographs and on circulation and acceptance rates of journals. She also stated that the impact of an author's digital scholarship could be gauged by the number of hits on a Web site or the number of times an article is downloaded. Magnan further noted that impact factor is also used by evaluation committees, despite the fact that editors and authors may easily manipulate this measure. This can be done by including frequently cited surveys and state-of-the-art articles and producing special issues early in the year so that they have a greater chance of being cited by other authors later in the same year.

Finally, Magnan (2007) pointed out several advantages of digital scholarship: (a) The greater academic reach of digital media due to the facility of access could make more of a contribution to the profession than print media; (b) the relatively shorter time to publication versus print format helps increase productivity of junior scholars during their probationary period; (c) the existence of digital databases (e.g., JSTOR) helps increase

access of current scholarship to junior scholars; and (d) digital formats potentially allow limitless space to provide ancillary materials (e.g., links to audio and video files, as well as instruments that allow for replication of studies) currently limited by space considerations in print media.

MEASURING THE QUALITY OF CALL RESEARCH

As there has been substantial recent work among SLA scholars (Egbert, 2007; Magnan, 2007), exploring the problems associated with the use of purely quantitative measures to gauge the quality of a linguistics journal (e.g., acceptance rates, circulation/readership, time to publication, and impact factor) or to evaluate a particular scholar's work (e.g., h-index score; Meho & Rodgers, 2008), we will not be treating that issue further.

Rather than blindly relying on the etically based objective measures previously mentioned in evaluating the work of CALL scholars, it seems more reasonable to attempt to establish some guidelines for evaluating CALL scholarship that takes a more *emic* approach—that is, guidelines that draw on perspectives and distinctions that are meaningful to members of the "CALL culture." Who better to guide our notions of the most influential and highly regarded forms of scholarly activity and publishing venues in the field of CALL than senior CALL researchers from around the world? Indeed, it is these very scholars who are often asked to write external letters of evaluation for junior faculty seeking promotion and tenure.⁵ It is within the context of the potential conflict of etically versus emically based criteria to judge CALL scholarship that we have undertaken the following study.⁶

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was twofold. The primary goal was to provide guidance for CALL researchers as they decide where best to channel their scholarly energy. This includes determining what types of scholarly activities to focus on as well as determining the most appropriate publishing venues for their work. The second goal was to provide guidance for those decision makers attempting to evaluate the scholarly activity of CALL scholars.

The following research questions were posed:

1. What criteria do CALL scholars use to rate professional journals in their field?

2. Which professional journals do CALL experts view as the best venues for CALL scholarship?

3. What is the perception of the quality of online journals as potential CALL venues?

4. What types of scholarly activities are most beneficial for CALL scholars seeking promotion and tenure?

5. What advice do CALL researchers have for junior scholars in the field?

APPROACH, DESIGN, AND METHODOLOGY

Approach and Design

This study is based on data collected from various surveys sent to CALL scholars and journal editors in the fields of CALL, applied linguistics, and SLA. As there was no experiment involved and the authors wanted to collect data from various sources at a given moment in time, the research design was *ex post facto*.

Methodology and Procedures

This section describes and outlines the methodology and chronology of procedures carried out to collect the data for this study. First, the authors drafted two surveys. The first one, titled the CALL Expert Survey,⁷ was designed to produce a substantial list of senior CALL scholars who are well known in the field. To this end, the researchers each identified 20 tenured CALL scholars who are widely published in a variety of CALL venues.

These lists were reconciled and a final list of 23 CALL scholars was compiled in preparation for deployment of the main instrument: the CALL Journal Survey. The CALL Expert Survey asked the 23 potential respondents to provide the following information:

1. (a) the names and institutions (if known) of 10–20 (tenured) CALL researchers who are making/have made a significant contribution to the field of CALL, (b) a list of up to 10 CALL-related academic journals that publish CALL research and that make a valuable contribution to the field (these journals must have a CALL focus and be published in English), and (c) a list of up to 10 non-CALL-specific SLA/applied linguistics journals that make a valuable contribution to the field of SLA/applied linguistics and that are viable venues for CALL research.

The CALL Expert Survey yielded eight completed surveys with usable data (35% return). The nominations asked for in the three questions were compiled, yielding the following information to create the second instrument, the CALL

Journal Survey: 66 potential tenured CALL experts who would serve as our potential pool of participants for the CALL Journal Survey and a total of 39 viable venues for CALL-related work (5 CALL-specific journals, 14 Educational Technology-related journals, and 20 General Applied Linguistics/SLA journals).

Suggestions made by respondents who did not conform to the requirements of the three questions were omitted. Such omissions included nominations of researchers who are experts in a particular subfield of applied linguistics but not CALL, nominations of CALL journals that accept manuscripts by invitation only (e.g., *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*), those that are no longer in print⁸ or not published in English, nominations of “general” applied linguistics/SLA journals that we were not able to identify and confirm, or those that received only one nomination entry (a threshold was set at two nominations for inclusion in the CALL Journal Survey).

The CALL Journal Survey

The CALL Journal Survey was designed to elicit responses to questions relevant to the study’s research questions listed earlier. The following text introduced the CALL Journal Survey and spoke to the survey’s purpose: “We are conducting a research study to evaluate the perceived quality of academic journals related to computer-assisted language learning. The study will also explore how CALL-related scholarly activity is assessed during promotion & tenure decisions involving CALL researchers.”

In an effort to partially validate our survey instrument, we chose four established CALL experts and asked each to review a draft of the CALL Journal Survey for overall appropriateness, meaningfulness, and clarity of the individual questions. Two of these four responded, providing valuable feedback on the construction of the instrument. We then incorporated this feedback in our revised version of the CALL Journal Survey.

As previously mentioned, the authors used reasonably current existing work published on the issue of journal quality in the field of applied linguistics/SLA (Egbert, 2007; Magnan, 2007; Van Patten & Williams, 2002) to inform the selection of indicators of journal quality as well as possible perceptions of the respective value of various types of published scholarly activity used in this survey.

Survey Structure

The main survey was deployed and results were gathered via the Web site Survey Monkey

(www.surveymonkey.com). The survey instrument contained the following sections: (a) Introductory letter of invitation, (b) Demographic data about the respondents, (c) Questions about CALL Scholarship and specific CALL-related academic journals, and (d) Questions about Publishing and P&T relevant to CALL Scholarship. At the end of each question there was a section for “write-in” responses. The prompts for these write-in sections were worded as one of the following, depending on the nature of the main prompt: (a) Other criteria not listed above, or (b) Would you like to make any additional comments related to this question?

Participants

The CALL Journal Survey yielded 35 completed surveys of the 66 invitations (53% return). Respondents came from the following geographical regions: United States = 23, Europe = 5, Canada = 4, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan = 1 each. The average number of years working in the field of CALL among these respondents was just under 17.5 years. The self-described area of expertise of these respondents was as follows: CALL = 13, SLA = 5, Applied Linguistics = 4, Foreign Language Education = 4, Teacher Education = 2, and TESOL = 2. There were four “other” responses that identified areas related to distance learning, online learning, or literacy and technology. In an effort to help maintain a reasonable degree of anonymity for the respondents, data about academic title, geographic location, and area of expertise are not cross-referenced in Table 1.⁹

Data Analysis

Where possible, we decided to limit participants’ choices to prescribed, explicitly listed alternatives rather than ask for open-ended responses. As mentioned, however, for each question a textbox was provided to allow respondents to enter in an unlimited amount of additional information. Most of the responses were analyzed using agglomerative hierarchical clustering using Euclidean distance to show what legitimate groupings emerged from the data. Agglomerative hierarchical clustering is a bottom-up clustering method in which clusters have subclusters, which, in turn, have subclusters, and so on. Agglomerative hierarchical clustering starts with every single object (sample) in a single cluster. Then, in each successive iteration, it agglomerates (merges) the closest pair of clusters by satisfying some similarity criteria, until all of the data are in one cluster. In mathematics, the Euclidean distance is the distance between two points that one would measure with a ruler, which can be proven by repeated application of the Pythagorean theorem. When contrasting questions related to the perception of online journals (Questions 5 and 6), a Wilcoxon signed ranks test¹⁰ was used.

RESULTS

This section presents data from the CALL Journal Survey. Discussion of the survey results based on the closed items is followed by an analysis of the open-ended responses that accompanied many of

TABLE 1
Participants by Academic Title, Geographic Location, and Area of Expertise

Academic Title					
Professor Emeritus	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Principal Lecturer	Senior Lecturer
1	12	16	1	1	3
Geographic Location					
United States	Europe	Canada	Australia	New Zealand	Japan
23	5	4	1	1	1
Area of Expertise					
Applied Linguistics	CALL	Foreign Language Education	SLA	Teacher Education	TESOL
4	13	4	5	2	2

Notes. For “Academic Title” one participant did not provide an answer. For “Area of Expertise” only the first self-report entry is listed. Most respondents listed more than one area of expertise. Under “Area of Expertise,” there were 4 “Other” responses.

TABLE 2
Criteria Used When Evaluating the Quality of Computer-Assisted Language Learning Journals

Grouping	Criteria	Mean	Sum
1	1. Quality of articles	2.83	102
	2. Significance of contribution to the field	2.52	91
2	3. Review process	2.26	81
	4. Originality	2.20	79
	5. Author quality	2.14	77
	6. International scope	2.14	75
	7. Range/breadth of topics	2.06	74
	8. Generally perceived prestige	2.06	74
3	9. Selectivity/acceptance rate	1.97	71
	10. Research orientation	1.89	68
	11. Availability/accessibility	1.83	66
	12. Theory/practice link	1.72	62
	13. Editorial board status	1.69	61
	14. Editor's status	1.63	59
4	15. Databases in which journal is indexed	1.46	52
	16. Citation analysis (frequency and impact factor)	1.40	50
	17. Time to publication	1.37	49
	18. Circulation/readership	1.37	49
	19. Reputation of the journal's publisher	1.26	45

Note. The mean score was used for statistical analysis; 3 = critical; 2 = very important; 1 = of some importance; 0 = not important.

these answers. In most cases, we present the data in two formats: mean and sum.

Where we had very good response rates, such as in Question 2, we used the mean as the point of comparison; that is, for Question 2, most or all respondents provided an answer or rating for each of the criteria suggested. In contrast, when we asked about rating specific journals, there were often cases for which a journal did not have many people rank it. Thus, comparing mean scores would be less meaningful. In those cases, the sum of scores was used to rank the data.

Quality of CALL Journals

Criteria for Journal Evaluation. To begin the survey (which included ranking of journals), respondents were asked to indicate which criteria they considered to be most important (as CALL experts) when evaluating a CALL journal. Table 2 shows that these criteria fall into one of four meaningful levels, with *quality of articles* and *significance of contribution to the field* being the most highly rated. Although these criteria are listed in descending order of mean and sum score from high to low, statistically we do not differentiate between Criteria 1 and 2 in Group 1, nor do we imply any meaningful difference between those criteria within each of the other groups; that is, although *review process* and *generally perceived prestige* have

mean scores of 2.26 and 2.06, respectively, we simply consider both of these criteria as members of the second most important group of evaluation criteria.

Interestingly, some of the widely used "objective" criteria discussed earlier in the introduction to this article, such as acceptance rate, time to publication, citation analysis (frequency and impact factor¹¹), and readership fall in the lower two groups and are, then, viewed as less important measures of journal quality by CALL scholars themselves. Egbert's (2007) study also found the same trend among TESOL research scholars; that is, the most highly rated criteria for judging journal quality were relevance to context, personal interest, review process, quality of articles, relevance to TESOL, and significance of contribution to the field, rather than acceptance rates, circulation rates, or citation frequency.

The open-ended "write-in" comments for Question 2 revealed important information in four major areas: Content and Scope, Production Value, Accessibility, and Timeliness of Feedback.

Regarding the content/scope of the journal, respondents noted that quality journals recognize the unusual diversity of topics important to CALL and make an effort to include work on nontrendy aspects of the field and locally relevant work. Other criteria used to judge the quality of a journal include the quality of its

TABLE 3
Rankings of CALL-Specific and Education Technology-Related Journals

Grouping	Journal Name	Sum	Mean
1	<i>Language Learning & Technology</i>	158	4.38
2	<i>CALICO Journal</i>	138	3.83
	<i>Computer Assisted Language Learning</i>	121	3.90
	<i>ReCALL</i>	116	3.62
3	<i>CALL-EJ Online</i>	79	2.92
	<i>Journal of Computer Assisted Learning</i>	66	3.32
	<i>Computers & Education</i>	66	3.16
	<i>Computers and Composition</i>	60	3.36
	<i>Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication</i>	59	3.67
	<i>British Journal of Educational Technology</i>	58	3.38
4	<i>Computers and the Humanities</i>	42	3.20
	<i>Journal of Research on Computing in Education</i>	40	3.29
	<i>Journal of Educational Computing Research</i>	34	3.11
	<i>Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia</i>	34	3.10
	<i>International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education</i>	32	3.17
	<i>Computers in Human Behavior</i>	31	3.14
	<i>Journal of Computer-based Instruction</i>	30	2.71
	<i>International Journal of Instructional Media</i>	27	3.04
	<i>Educational Technology Research and Development</i>	27	3.04

Note. The sum score used for statistical analysis. Statistical analysis of responses was based on agglomerative hierarchical clustering using Euclidean distance. CALL = Computer-assisted language learning.

editing and its professional look (production value). Accessibility is also an issue revealed in the survey. Respondents stated that they view journals more favorably if they can be accessed freely and online.

The timeliness of the feedback on submissions is an important factor in the evaluation of journal quality as well. A prolonged turn-around time can be deleterious to junior scholars, who are working to "beat the clock" and publish as much as possible during the 6-year tenure probationary period. One bad experience like this may negatively affect a scholar's view of that journal. However, a scholar's positive personal experience with a journal or its editors would also color his/her view of the publication. Indeed, such a perception is also likely to carry over into that scholar's professional life as a tenured/senior faculty and influence their future deliberations on P&T cases for which they would be serving as one of the decision makers.

Ranking of CALL Journals. Question 3 of the survey asked respondents to rate the quality of certain CALL journals on a Likert Scale (1–5):

3. The journals listed below have been identified as potential venues for CALL research. They have either a CALL-specific focus or address issues related to computer technology in education. Please respond to the following statement:

This journal publishes research of high quality and represents the best in the field of CALL.

1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree

Table 3 presents how respondents ranked CALL-specific and Education Technology-related journals that publish CALL research. The ranking and grouping into four categories in Table 3 is based on an analysis of the sum scores rather than the mean, as few respondents ranked every journal listed. Indeed, it seems that our CALL experts were much more familiar with some journals rather than others on the list. Thus, when interpreting Table 3, one must be aware that the ranking takes into account the rank from 1 to 5 as well as how many participants ranked a particular journal. We also provide the mean score for informational purposes only.

Table 3 presents a clear ranking preference for the journal *Language Learning & Technology* (the sole occupant of Category 1), followed by the *CALICO Journal*, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, and *ReCALL* in Category 2. The journals found in Categories 3 and 4 are mostly those that publish works dealing with the use of computers in the fields of education, human behavior, and the humanities.

The open-ended "write-in" comments for Question 3 revealed much important information. Several respondents were quick to point out our

omission of journals like *ALSIC* and *System*. Non-English-language journals like *ALSIC* were omitted from this part of the survey because the survey required that they be published in English. Of course, this is a limitation of sorts. The journal *System* is unique. According to the description of this journal from the main Elsevier Web site, *System* is “devoted to the applications of educational technology and applied linguistics to problems of foreign language teaching and learning” (Elsevier, 2009). However, many articles that appear in *System* are not related to CALL or Educational Technology but rather concern “mainstream” applied linguistics. For this reason we included *System* in our list of “mainstream” applied linguistics/SLA journals later in the survey.

Some respondents to the survey criticized articles in CALL-specific journals for not consistently standing up to close critical scrutiny, which could lead to a decrease in their perceived quality. Others noted that the poor quality of the writing, editing, and production in some CALL journals can also diminish their value. In addition, many CALL journals were criticized for not reflecting or stimulating enough real theoretical progress in the field.

In reference to the follow-up question on ranking (rank the top three CALL journals), one participant made the following comment: “I think ranking is meaningless—it all relates to specific articles and their immediate relevance to what I am working on at the moment, and whether my interest at the moment is in theory or practice.”¹²

Quality of CALL-Specific and Applied Linguistics/SLA Journals for CALL Research

It is clear that many mainstream journals also publish CALL-related research as long as it fits within their mission and appeals to their target audience. For this reason, Question 8 included all journals that were nominated by at least two experts in the CALL Expert Survey. This list included CALL-specific, Educational Technology, mainstream Applied Linguistics/SLA, and relevant non-English-language journals.

8. In my department publishing in the following venues would benefit a junior faculty member (and CALL researcher) seeking promotion and/or tenure.

Table 4 presents the CALL scholars’ rankings of the journals in response to Question 8. Again, because we used the sum of the rankings provided in the responses, one must be aware that the rank-

ing takes into account the rank from 1 to 5 as well as how many participants ranked a particular journal, similar to Table 3.

To get a more complete picture of journal rankings, the top 14 journals from Table 4 (ranked by sum) were then ranked by their mean scores to create Table 5. Table 5 also provides the journals’ rank by sum and sum scores for comparison with the rank by mean and mean scores. Based on these data we suggest that all of the journals listed in Table 5 are highly beneficial publishing venues for CALL scholars.

The open-ended comments made by CALL scholars indicated their perception that general applied linguistics/SLA journals are more highly regarded than CALL-specific journals; however, they note a recent trend among departments to more fairly weight the higher quality specialty (CALL) journals. Some survey respondents strongly suggested that CALL researchers successfully lobby to get the better CALL-related journals on institutionally approved applied linguistics/SLA “lists” for determining the quality of journals in which CALL scholars publish.

Promotion and Tenure of CALL Scholars

This section addresses survey questions specifically related to P&T: the attitudes of CALL scholars and their departments’ views of online journals, the relative importance of various types of published creative activity, preferred publication venues of seasoned CALL scholars, and advice to junior CALL scholars.

Attitudes Toward Online Journals. Questions 5 and 6 address the attitudes of CALL experts toward the quality of journals published exclusively online and the perceptions by CALL scholars of their departments’ views of journals in that same format.

5. I believe that journals that are published EXCLUSIVELY online are less rigorous/scholarly than those that are published in hard copy.

(1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

6. In my department (unit) when it comes to decisions on tenure for junior faculty members (who are also CALL researchers) those journals that are published exclusively online are perceived as being less rigorous and/or scholarly than those published in hard copy.

(1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

TABLE 4
Potential Benefit of CALL-Specific and Applied Linguistics/SLA Journals for Promotion and Tenure
(Ranked by Sum)

Rank	Journal Name	Sum
1	<i>Language Learning & Technology</i>	143.0
2	<i>CALL</i>	133.0
2	<i>The Modern Language Journal</i>	133.0
4	<i>TESOL Quarterly</i>	130.0
5	<i>CALICO Journal</i>	128.0
6	<i>Language Learning</i>	125.0
6	<i>System</i>	125.0
8	<i>Applied Linguistics</i>	123.0
8	<i>Canadian Modern Language Review</i>	123.0
10	<i>Language Testing</i>	122.0
11	<i>Foreign Language Annals</i>	119.0
12	<i>Studies in Second Language Acquisition</i>	116.0
13	<i>ReCALL</i>	103.0
14	<i>International Review of Applied Linguistics</i>	101.0
15	<i>Journal of Applied Linguistics</i>	93.0
16	<i>Journal of Second Language Writing</i>	87.0
17	<i>AAT Journals</i>	86.0
18	<i>Reading Research Quarterly</i>	85.0
19	<i>Computers & Education</i>	80.0
20	<i>Computers & Composition</i>	79.0
21	<i>Language Assessment Quarterly</i>	78.0
21	<i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i>	78.0
23	<i>Journal of Computer-Assisted Learning</i>	77.0
23	<i>British Journal of Educational Technology</i>	77.0
25	<i>Speech Communication</i>	72.0
26	<i>Educational Technology Research & Development</i>	68.0
26	<i>Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication</i>	68.0
26	<i>JALT Journal</i>	68.0
29	<i>CALL-EJ Online</i>	67.0
30	<i>International Journal of Artificial Intelligence</i>	61.0
31	<i>International Journal of Instructional Media</i>	60.0
31	<i>Computers in Human Behavior</i>	60.0
33	<i>Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia</i>	57.0
34	<i>RELC Journal</i>	54.0
35	<i>Journal of Educational Computing Research</i>	53.0
36	<i>Journal of Research on Technology in Education;</i> <i>a.k.a. Journal of Research on Computing in Education</i>	49.0

Note. CALL = Computer-assisted language learning; SLA = Second language acquisition.

A Wilcoxon signed ranks test was performed to compare the views of CALL experts with their perceptions of how their own department views online publications. Table 6 shows that there was a significant difference between the two perceptions ($z = -3.665$, $p = .0001$, $r = .67$). CALL experts felt that their home department viewed online journals as being less rigorous than those published in hard copy.

Computer-assisted language learning researchers' perceptions of online journals were generally very positive. One respondent stated, "If there is a rigorous, anonymous, peer-review process, there is no reason that the medium (electronic vs. print) would determine the quality

of the articles." Others noted that the online medium allows greater access to CALL publications, with the result that there are more citations of articles in online journals. Thus, the use of the criterion "citation rates" to judge scholarship in CALL and other disciplines will have to take into consideration how the instant availability and possible subsequent frequent citation of online works may cause this factor to be inflated as a result of practical expediency instead of reflecting the underlying quality of a work, which this criterion was originally meant to acknowledge. Another CALL scholar expressed the desire to see wiki-like collaborative articles, as in the hard sciences.

TABLE 5
Top 14 CALL-Specific and Applied Linguistics/SLA Journals Ranked by Mean and Sum Scores

Rank by Mean	Mean	Journal Name	Rank by Sum	Sum
1	4.74	<i>The Modern Language Journal</i>	3	133
2	4.68	<i>Language Testing</i>	10	122
3	4.62	<i>Language Learning</i>	6	125
3	4.62	<i>Studies in Second Language Acquisition</i>	12	116
5	4.60	<i>Language Learning & Technology</i> ^a	1	143
6	4.57	<i>Computer Assisted Language Learning</i> ^a	2	133
7	4.54	<i>Applied Linguistics</i>	8	123
8	4.50	<i>TESOL Quarterly</i>	4	130
8	4.50	<i>ReCALL</i> ^a	14	103
10	4.41	<i>Canadian Modern Language Review</i>	9	123
11	4.32	<i>System</i>	7	125
12	4.27	<i>CALICO Journal</i> ^a	5	128
13	4.22	<i>International Review of Applied Linguistics</i>	14	101
14	4.11	<i>Foreign Language Annals</i>	11	119

Note. We arbitrarily chose the sum "cutoff" of 100 or higher for inclusion in Table 5. In this way, we can be more confident that the journals in this table represent those with which our CALL experts are most familiar. CALL = Computer-assisted language learning; SLA = Second language acquisition. ^aCALL-specific journals.

TABLE 6
CALL Expert Versus Home Department's View of Online Publications

Variable	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	Effect-Size <i>r</i>
CALL Expert (Q5)	30	1.55	0.932	-3.665	.0001	.67
Home Department (Q6)	30	2.62	1.22			

However, survey respondents acknowledged that university administrators at some institutions may have a somewhat negative view of online scholarship, whereas those at other universities may not. One CALL scholar suggested that it is the junior faculty members' responsibility to educate senior colleagues by providing a short narrative on the electronic journals in which they publish. In any case, external reviewers for P&T cases will often be the arbiters of (online or print) journal quality. One survey respondent suggested that citation index figures and a journal's impact factor will become more important than the medium in which the article appears (online or print).

Relative Importance of Forms of Published Creative Activity. Question 7 asked CALL scholars to provide their opinions about their department's view of the relative importance of various types of publication for junior CALL scholars:

7. In my department (unit) the following forms of (published) creative activity are important in evaluating a junior faculty member's (CALL specialist) credentials for promotion & tenure.

TABLE 7
Relative Importance of Various Forms of Published Creative Activity

Grouping	Criteria	Mean
1	Refereed journal articles	4.74
2	Professional title books	4.03
	Book chapters in edited collections	3.94
3	Textbooks	3.07
4	Conference proceedings ^a	2.58
	Software creation	2.48
	Book reviews	2.22
	Non-refereed journal articles	2.13
	Software reviews	2.06

^aNo distinction was made between refereed and non-refereed proceedings, clearly a limitation of this question.

Table 7 presents how CALL experts ranked various forms of published creative activity with respect to the utility of each for a junior faculty member's promotion and tenure application. There are few surprises in this table. The criterion *refereed journal articles* was clearly ranked as the

TABLE 8
Journals Preferred by CALL Scholars for Publishing
Their Own Research

Rank	Journal Name	No. of Mentions
1	<i>Language Learning & Technology</i>	29
2	<i>CALICO</i>	15
3	<i>ReCALL</i>	12
4	<i>CALL</i>	11
5	<i>The Modern Language Journal</i>	7
6	<i>System</i>	6
7	<i>Language Learning</i>	5
8	<i>Applied Linguistics</i>	4
8	<i>TESOL Quarterly</i>	4
10	<i>Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication</i>	3

Note. Threshold for inclusion was set at two mentions. CALL = Computer-assisted language learning.

most important form of published creative activity, followed by *professional title books* (e.g., edited volumes or monographs) and *chapters in edited collections*. *Textbook* authorship was ranked a distant third, with the last group consisting of *conference proceedings*, *software creation*, *book reviews*, *non-refereed articles*, and *software reviews*.

Overall, the questionnaire data and comments show that publishing refereed journal articles, professional title books (e.g., edited volumes or monographs), and chapters in edited collections are the most valuable types of published creative activity in which junior scholars should engage. The other types of scholarly activity are likely to have a weaker impact on one's promotion and tenure case.¹³ However, one survey respondent did lament the fact that there are no written rules in his/her department about how various types of contributions would be evaluated or ranked.

CALL Scholars' Preferred Publication Venues for Their Own Research. To provide a more complete picture of the respondents' evaluations of journals that publish CALL research, we asked CALL experts where they try to place their own research. The responses in Table 8 were generally consistent with the responses to Questions 3 and 8, as previously indicated.

9a. In which journals do you try to publish your own CALL research? Why?

The data in Table 8 show that the CALL scholars preferred to place their own work in CALL-specific journals, followed by journals that were highly ranked in Tables 4 and 5.

Advice for Junior CALL Scholars

The respondents were then asked about advice they would give to junior faculty members regarding where to submit their research:

9b. If a junior faculty member (and CALL researcher) at your institution asked you where to submit his/her CALL research, what advice would you give him/her? Why?

Two types of comments were given regarding advice to junior CALL faculty regarding publication venues, including general "good advice" for succeeding in academe and specific strategies for success as a CALL publishing scholar.

General Good Advice for Succeeding in Academe. Respondents to the CALL survey offered advice to junior researchers for succeeding as a scholar in the field. Two major themes emerged from the open-ended comments: the importance of seeking out mentors among senior faculty in the field and publication tips.

Survey respondents suggested that junior scholars look for models in their field to emulate and from whom to seek advice, both within their institution and at other research universities. For instance, they can carefully track the publication records of the most recently tenured applied linguists across their college, seek out information and feedback on their research from more senior CALL faculty, and ask senior researchers in the field which journals are quick/slow to get reviews back.

Publication tips for younger scholars included looking for the "best fit" of their manuscript with a journal. For instance, scholars should be familiar with the type of theoretical approaches and methodological protocols that are most frequently found in different journals and choose their prospective publication venue accordingly. Respondents also suggested that scholars aim for an appropriate top-tier journal first and then, if the manuscript is rejected, they can consider submitting their work to second-tier (midlevel) publications. One very important suggestion was that junior scholars keep submissions in the mail; once researchers establish a publication rhythm, it is easier to keep up the momentum of the research cycle.

Specific Strategies for Success as a CALL Researcher. The survey respondents had several suggestions for junior CALL scholars regarding strategies for publication success in the field. The CALL researchers pointed out that even the better

CALL-related journals are not yet widely known by researchers in other fields (e.g., SLA, theoretical linguistics, sociolinguistics, literature) who might serve on departmental P&T committees. As a result, they suggested that junior scholars publish their first work in mainstream journals in SLA and Applied Linguistics (e.g., *The Modern Language Journal*, *Applied Linguistics*, *SSLA*, *TESOL Quarterly*, and *Language Learning*, or other journals that enjoy the highest international reputations), as publications in these journals are more likely to be recognized as quality work by P&T committees. However, the respondents noted that in order to have their work accepted in those journals, CALL scholars generally need to broaden the research frame. By publishing first in mainstream journals, the respondents felt that young CALL researchers can establish themselves in the field and attract the attention of established SLA scholars who might be able to serve as outside evaluators for their P&T case. Some survey respondents also suggested publishing initially in any or all of the key CALL journals, even though the quality might not be equal to the mainstream SLA journals.

Other suggestions included avoiding projects that take too long to complete during the tenure probationary period, educating senior faculty about these two kinds of journals, avoiding publishing only in online journals, and making sure that the theoretical underpinnings of the scholar's work always be evident regardless of the venue.

CONCLUSIONS

When interpreting the data and conclusions outlined in this study, one should keep in mind the data source. Our data are made up of direct input from many of the most published and respected CALL scholars active in academe today. This is important to restate here because, as VanPatten and Williams (2002) pointed out, scholars seeking promotion and tenure must demonstrate a level of scholarly achievement appropriate to the rank at which tenure is sought in comparison with peers from the wider community of scholars active in the same discipline. Although VanPatten and Williams were specifically addressing SLA scholars, this approach to evaluation also seems to be appropriate for a subdiscipline such as CALL. Indeed, except for a few programs, CALL scholars are typically an "area specialty of one" in their departments. In such cases, it is not sufficient for decision makers to look only to so-called peer or aspirational peer institutions when evaluating the body of scholarship produced by an individual.

Instead, departments, colleges, and universities should draw on input from the wider community of active CALL scholars.

Our sample of this community of CALL scholars is clearly of the opinion that the best journals for CALL research reflect the highest quality articles and that these journals make a highly significant contribution to the field. Markedly less important to CALL scholars in determining CALL journal quality are those more "objective" measures of acceptance rate, impact factor, circulation, and so forth. There was wide consensus among CALL experts that *Language Learning & Technology* stands out as our field's top journal. The next tier (listed in no particular order) consists of *CALICO Journal*, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, and *ReCALL*. Our results also show that CALL scholars feel that their home departments view professional journals that are published exclusively online are less rigorous and/or scholarly than those published in hard copy, whereas CALL scholars do not. This is especially troubling, given that two of the field's top four journals now fall into this category (*Language Learning & Technology* and *CALICO Journal*).

The CALL experts in this study identified publishing scholarly articles in refereed journals as the most important form of published creative activity for junior faculty. Publishing professional title books (e.g., edited volumes or monographs) and book chapters in edited collections follow journal articles in terms of importance for promotion and tenure. The fact that the importance of a book is lower than scholarly articles (and about equal in importance to publishing chapters in edited collections) clearly suggests that the subfield of CALL is an "article culture" rather than a "book culture." This issue is especially salient for those CALL researchers whose home department is in the humanities (see VanPatten & Williams, 2002, for discussion of this issue in terms of SLA scholarship). It seems, then, that junior CALL faculty should channel their scholarly energy toward publishing primarily scholarly articles in appropriate, highly ranked refereed journals. Chapters in edited collections are also highly valued in our field, as are professional title books. It should be noted, however, that focusing exclusively on a book project for tenure is perhaps risky, especially as publishing a book is not viewed as the standard for tenure for CALL scholars regardless of the department in which they happen to be housed.

Finally, when we include all of those nominated applied linguistics/SLA journals in our evaluation of top journals for CALL researchers, we

find 4 CALL-specific journals among the top 14. Not surprisingly, the very top of this list is occupied by mainstream applied linguistics journals (e.g., *The Modern Language Journal*, *Language Testing*, *Language Learning*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*). This suggests that junior faculty should shoot for a mix of the top mainstream and CALL-specific journals when building their P&T dossier. This preferred pattern of publication is reinforced by the responses in Question 9 that asked established CALL scholars where they attempt to place their own CALL research. Nine of the top 10 journals (see Table 8) were also among those top 14 journals discussed above (see Table 5). *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, which appears in Table 8 but not in Table 5, was also named as one of the most targeted journals for CALL researchers. This is not surprising given its very high mean rank for quality, shown in Table 3.

To conclude, we have attempted to provide several specific points about the nature of publishing in CALL. Ultimately, however, it is up to individual CALL scholars to educate their department heads about these points as well as how the various CALL-related and CALL-friendly journals are viewed by the wider community of scholars active in this discipline. The intention of this article is to assist CALL scholars in this endeavor. It may be prudent for CALL scholars in a given college or department to work with the administration in developing an "approved list of journals" that would help clarify one's case for promotion and tenure. Articles in journals not on the list would require the researcher to provide a bit more context when presenting these as part of their dossier. Given the nature of the field of CALL, we assume that most scholars will have a mix of articles that may or may not appear on that list.

Limitations

Although our small sample size ($n = 35$) is certainly a limitation of this study, all participants were CALL experts nominated by highly visible active CALL scholars. Another clear limitation is apparent when one considers where these scholars reside. Although invitations went out to about an equal number of CALL scholars working in the United States and those working outside of the United States, over 65% of respondents came from the United States, thus making these findings most relevant for an American audience. Finally, rankings and recommendations that stem from this research are based largely on subjective ratings and comments. We have done our best to

synthesize and contextualize comments made by participants. We have also tried to select statistical analysis techniques that do not overstep what the data present. We hope these results are useful to the field as a guide on which others can build.

Future Research

Certainly, a follow-up study is warranted in 5 year's time, given the rapid growth of our field as well as new and shifting focuses of existing publishing venues. Future studies might attempt to gain a larger sample of CALL experts from across a wider range of countries and contexts from around the world. We recommend a larger scale collaborative effort among several scholars from across the CALL spectrum. Although this would allow access to many more CALL experts and would certainly provide a more representative sample of the field as a whole, such an approach would have a downside: Enhancing the representation of the many voices of CALL would come at the cost of decreased relevance to any particular professional context. Such a situation might work against the goal of this article. Perhaps several context-specific studies are a more viable and helpful option to help guide CALL junior researchers in their scholarly pursuits.

Another avenue of research that would enhance the ability of nonspecialists to judge CALL scholarship would be to revisit the "objective" quantitative constructs often used to judge publications (e.g., citation analysis [impact factor and citation counts], acceptance rates, time to publication, availability and accessibility), understand their limitations, and revise these criteria to include some measures that capture the essence of the qualitative criteria used to judge the quality of scholarship cited by the CALL scholars in this study and in future studies that look at this issue.

As the last contribution to this Focus Issue, we have attempted to answer Garrett's (1991) call for guidelines regarding the evaluation of CALL research to inform those entrusted with making critical P&T decisions regarding the professional future of CALL scholars. In addition, we have carried out an empirical study to gather together the collective wisdom of several CALL experts regarding the relative value placed on CALL scholarly activity when junior faculty come up for promotion and tenure and their suggestions to CALL researchers pertaining to which activities will help them reap the greatest professional rewards for their efforts. We hope that this information is considered carefully by faculty and administrators, as those junior

CALL scholars shape their careers and, by implication, the field of computer-assisted language learning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge the following individuals for their kind input on this article: Bob Fischer, Graham Davies, Kazunori Nozawa, Nina Garrett, Trent Lalonde, many of those at our CALICO 2008 presentation, and three anonymous *MLJ* reviewers. We hope we have accurately addressed their comments. Any errors remain our own.

NOTES

¹Impact factor is a measure of the frequency with which the “average article” in a journal has been cited in a particular year or period. The annual *Journal Citation Reports*[®] impact factor is a ratio between citations and recent citable items published. Thus, the impact factor of a journal is calculated by dividing the number of current year citations to the source items published in that journal during the previous 2 years.

²The survey respondents indicated that seven to eight refereed journal articles could be expected of a successful promotion and tenure candidate; however, this number could vary depending on the presence of other publications in the candidate’s file (e.g., book chapters and edited volumes).

³This finding may result from the particular theoretical biases of the scholars surveyed.

⁴See also Anderson and Lord (2008) for a more detailed discussion of the issue of co-authorship in the field of linguistics.

⁵This is true of most major academic institutions in the United States.

⁶As one reviewer pointed out, it is possible that the more qualitative (*emic*) criteria of the CALL scholars in this study are highly correlated with quantitative (*etic*) criteria used by those outside the field when judging scholarship, so that a high “impact factor” might correlate strongly with a “rigorous referee process.” In the end, it could be that both of these types of criteria simply take different paths in getting at the same latent/underlying defining feature, such as “exclusivity of the journal.” Whether such a positive correlation exists is an empirical question, one that could be addressed in the future.

⁷Both the CALL Expert Survey and the CALL Journal Survey are available upon request.

⁸Journals whose name has changed were included in the analysis. The former and current name is indicated where appropriate.

⁹A separate survey was sent to the editors (one per journal) of the 39 journals identified by CALL researchers to gather information on the more traditional indicators of journal quality (e.g., acceptance rate,

readership, publisher, audience, time to publication, and impact factor) used in prior research (Egbert, 2007; Magnan, 2007; VanPatten & Williams, 2002). The results of this survey, although related to this article, essentially address a separate set of questions about publishing in CALL and are not reported here.

¹⁰Because of the nature of this study, we decided to employ nonparametric measures of analysis where possible.

¹¹*Frequency* refers to the number of times a particular journal is cited by other journals indexed in the same databases. *Impact factor* is the ratio of number of citations of recent articles in the target journal by other journals indexed in the same database to the number of total articles published in the target journal for the same period of time.

¹²Comment by informant #201.

¹³It is unfortunate that the type of publications least valued for promotion and tenure consist of works that would be naturally tied to the activities and expertise of CALL practitioners and applied linguists in LPD positions (e.g., textbooks, software creation, book reviews, software reviews). The creation and critical evaluation of theoretically and empirically grounded pedagogical tools requires a high level of expertise in the field of SLA, applied linguistics, and CALL; as a result, quality works in this category of activities should be valued more in the P & T process. See Katz and Watzinger-Tharp (2005) for a discussion of the role of LPDs and applied linguists in foreign language departments.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, L. L., & Lord, G. (2008). Coauthoring: What every department should know. *ADFL Bulletin*, 39(2 & 3), 49–55.
- Egbert, J. (2007). Quality analysis of journals in TESOL and applied linguistics. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 157–171.
- Elsevier (2009). *System-Elsevier*. Retrieved July 13, 2009, from http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws_home/335/description#description
- EUROCALL (European Association for Computer-Assisted Language Learning). (1999). *EuroCALL Research Policy Statement: Joint policy statement arising from a seminar on CALL*. Retrieved July 13, 2009, from http://www.eurocall-languages.org/research/research_policy.html
- Garrett, N. (1991). Technology in the service of language learning: Trends and issues. *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 74–101.
- Katz, S., & Watzinger-Tharp, J. (2005). Toward an understanding of the role of applied linguists in foreign language departments. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 490–502.
- Magnan, S. (2007). Commentary: The promise of digital scholarship is SLA research and language pedagogy. *Language Learning and Technology*, 11(3), 152–155.

- Meho, L. I., & Rodgers, Y. (2008). Citation counting, citation ranking, and h-index of human-computer interaction research: A comparison of Scopus and Web of Science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 59, 1711-1726.
- MLA (Modern Language Association). (2002). *Guidelines for evaluating work with digital media in the modern languages*. Retrieved on July 13, 2009, from http://www.mla.org/resources/documents/rep_it/guidelines_evaluation_digital
- MLA (Modern Language Association). (2006). *Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion*. Retrieved on July 13, 2009, from http://www.mla.org/pdf/task_force_tenure_promo.pdf
- UCLLT (University of California Consortium for Language Learning & Teaching). (2009). *Considerations for evaluation of applied linguistics in language, literature, and culture departments in the UC system* (White paper). Retrieved on July 13, 2009, from <http://ucclt.ucdavis.edu/white-papers/evaluation-white-paper5.15.pdf>
- VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (2002). *Research criteria for tenure in second language acquisition: Results from a survey of the field*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Illinois at Chicago.