Gmail **Amy Rae Fox <amyraefox@gmail.com>**

CogSci 2015 notification - #616

4 messages

cogsci2015@cogsci.ucmerced.edu <cogsci2015@cogsci.ucmerced.edu> Thu, Apr 2, 2015 at 2:15 AM
Reply-To: cogsci2015@cogsci.ucmerced.edu
To: amyraefox@gmail.com
Cc: cogsci2015@cogsci.ucmerced.edu

Dear Amy Fox :

We are sorry to inform you that your paper submission

616 - Visualizations of Student Time-Use

has not been accepted for presentation at CogSci 2015. We received 666 paper submissions this year, and each underwent careful peer review. While many submissions were found to be of high quality, time and space constraints allowed us to accept 187 (28%) for oral presentation and a further 288 (43%) for poster presentation. Comments from reviewers concerning your submission appear at the end of this message.

Because you are a member of the Cognitive Science Society, you still may have the option of presenting this work as a member abstract. Each member of the Cognitive Science Society is given the opportunity to present one poster at the conference as the first author of a member abstract. Thus, if you have not already submitted a member abstract as first author, you may present the work reported in this submission as a member abstract. Member abstracts will appear in the conference proceedings, and each includes the allocation of space at one of the conference's poster sessions in order to discuss the reported research with conference participants.

You may find information concerning the formatting requirements for member abstracts at:

http://cognitivesciencesociety.org/conference2015/submissions.html

In order to take advantage of this opportunity, simply submit your member abstract before May 1, 2015 at:

https://precisionconference.com/~cogsci15/

Please keep in mind that member abstracts cannot be longer than 150 words. If your submitted member abstract is longer than this limit, it will be rejected without further opportunities for revision. If your abstract is too long, it will not appear in the conference proceedings, and you will not be allocated space to present the work as a poster at the conference. Please make sure that your abstract does not exceed 150 words.

While there will be multiple poster sessions at the conference, requests for poster presentation on a specific day cannot be accommodated due to the complexities inherent in a conference of this size. By submitting your member abstract at this time, you are implicitly agreeing to have one of the abstract authors available to present your poster at any time during the conference: from July 23, 2015 to July 25, 2015. A detailed conference schedule, including information about when your poster is to be presented, will be made available well before the conference dates. Formatting requirements for posters will be communicated, soon.

Details about conference registration will be made available on or around May 1, 2015. They will appear at:

http://cognitivesciencesociety.org/conference2015/registration.html

At least one author of your poster must be registered for the conference by June 15, 2015. If none of the authors are pre-registered for the conference by this date, your member abstract will not appear in the conference proceedings and no space to present your poster will be allocated. If you would like to present this work as a member abstract poster, please make sure that at least one author is pre-registered by June 15, 2015.

Thank you very much for submitting your research results to CogSci 2015. We understand that it is difficult to get this news, but with limited space at the conference and so many strong submissions, the Program Committee is forced to make difficult decisions. Still, we hope you consider attending in Pasadena this Summer!

With Best Regards,

Program Committee

CogSci 2015
cogsci2015@cogsci.ucmerced.edu

---------- Submission 616, Review 4 ----------

Title: Visualizations of Student Time-Use

Reviewer: primary/meta-reviewer

Type of Submission

Cognitive Science
Psychology

The Review

The three main reviewers have done excellent jobs in providing very detailed reviews of this paper. I concur with their judgement that the paper is generally technically sound, well written, and should be of interest for some or at least a few of the broad Cognitive Science audience. I also strongly share concerns of especially reviewers 1 and 2 about possible limitations of the theoretical merit of the paper (e.g., due to the small number of participants). As reviewers 1 and 3 point out, this paper seems to do a good job describing first, exploratory work. I am looking forward to seeing more promising research follow up on it and to then seeing that follow-up work presented at Cognitive Science.

---------- Submission 616, Review 1 ----------

Title: Visualizations of Student Time-Use

Type of Submission

Psychology

The Review

The paper describes an experiment where participants have to visually represent their time usage regarding task, sequence, duration, timing, and frequency. Different representations are discussed in connection to existing literature.

Although, the paper is written clearly and is in general technically sound, I miss a clear hypothesis here; I don't consider the "three questions" not as such. Additionally, the outcomes are expectable; the authors themselves state that "the analysis … trends … consistent with existing literature". So, for me the question is where the additional knowledge gain is.
Although, the work at hand is necessary and valuable (for the CogSci audience), too many questions remain open (see detailed comments below), and so I consider this as a nice pre-study for further experiments.

Detailed comments:
* I am not sure what the point of "Representing time in time … preceded the event of breakfast." is. Time is in general sequential. Not trained people have severe problems when, e.g., considering branching time as, e.g., in logics dealing with branching time.
* "one needs to restore the intrinsic property of linearity …" I don't agree, first as this is induced as by the space restrictions of the experiment and second, I don't consider an arrow as artificial in this context. If you consider this as such, each representation is artificial.
* I assume you have a gender diversity problem with the participants of the experiment. You should explicate this as, e.g., in studies on map representations and route instruction, women and men tend to represent

space (and so externalizations of time) differently.
* The order of aspects (sequence, duration, …) in your instructions may play a role in the results. Furthermore, I consider frequency doesn't play a major role in organizing every day life. Therefore, one could assume that participants abstract away (or underrepresent) these in there externalizations due to space restrictions (I assume the space of an A4 piece of paper as somewhat arbitrary; why not A3; several A4 papers, …). This may also influence the result that students tried to generate a single integrated representation for all aspects.
* I also consider the given task as kind of abstract or artificial. What is the representation needed for? In my opinion, you ask for a "representation for the purpose of representation".
* I assume the fixation of the start of the day (12am) as biasing. This may force participants to artificially split their internal representation of a day to suffice this restriction.
* How did you measure an "effective representation"?
* "students may prefer … forward progression of time" … as time is! All aspects asked for are non-cyclic; even frequency is a linear aggregation over time.

---------- Submission 616, Review 2 ----------

Title: Visualizations of Student Time-Use

Type of Submission

Education
Psychology

The Review

(1) Originality and significance:

The paper reports an original study of time diagrams in which French undergraduates drew graphical representations of biographical events over time. A coding scheme was designed to investigate variations in the spatial organization of events, the form of graphical elements used, and the temporal properties represented in the drawings. Curvilinear graphs were produced more frequently than circular and textual representations of time. Instructions included request to represent cycles and processes, so the near absence of cyclical forms, event duration, and event frequency are notable results. The paper builds on diagram analysis work by Tversky, arguing that diagrams represent how people think about time. The significance of the paper is limited by the method and conclusions. This is an elicitation study which investigated variation of diagram elements among a small population. The results tells us something meaningful about variation in graphical visualizations of time. The paper is careful not to offer overly general conclusions, but could have included discussion of theoretical issues.

(2) Technical soundness:

The task and coding scheme appear to have been carefully designed. The study serves as an investigation of how to use space to represent time,with variable graphical forms and components, such as order of events, duration and frequency. The design of the codeing scheme seems ad hoc. Also the application of the scheme in three sets of ratings would be better if applied as a single hierarchical set of categories with one set of ratings and inter-rater reliability. The discussion of the results reflects thoughtful consideration of the theoretical motivations of the study.

(3) Theoretical merit:

The conclusion from this study reports the variations observed among the

visualizations with respect to coding scheme categories. The diagrammatic variations are interesting and the large variability in types of visual elements employed is unexpected from 25 participants. The paper notes limitations of this sort of study: few participants, all education majors.

A key limitation of this study is due to the small number of participants relative to the large number of coding scheme categories. Consequently the contribution cannot offer us an understanding the distribution of type of visualizations. Still I do think there are valuable results from this study.

The paper discusses possible influences on the types of diagrams from exposure to conventional calendars, and other planning tools. Another indication that the authors were careful in interpreting the results, is their consideration of alternative explanations for diagrams consisting only of a single timeline: the students may have valued information efficiency. But the discussion ended there. A stronger discussed could have linked the results to theories of time representation.

I think that in addition to reproducing results consistent with other investigations of diagrams, this study offers an interesting case study of a uniform population of non-technical students' visual conceptualizations of time.

(4) Breadth of interest for the broad Cognitive Science audience.

This research would interest some cognitive scientists working areas of event and time representation, and information visualization.

(5) Clarity of writing:

The paper is well organized and well written. The Figures serves as helpful examples for understanding the variety of results.

A more descriptive term than "primary mechanism" would help explain the motivation and expected results for the coding categories listed in Table 3.

---------- Submission 616, Review 3 ----------

Title: Visualizations of Student Time-Use

Type of Submission

Psychology

The Review

This paper presents the results of an exploratory study examining how students will draw representations of their use of time. The study is an investigation of how students will use elements of form and symbols to depict different aspects of time such as duration, frequency, and so on. Therefore, the study seems focused on the use of diagrams to depict time. The writing was clear and mostly free of errors.

They study will likely be of interest to researchers studying use of diagrams to explore and aid cognition. The study seems to be an initial foray into the domain of diagrams depicting time, and so it is largely exploring the issues of developing a coding scheme and what types of symbolic representations are used to convey time information. The study is observational in nature with no manipulation being made.

There are some interesting if not unexpected results regarding the relationship between reading direction and depiction of time as well as

they use of symbols (e.g., arrows) in diagrams of time. The discussion highlights a couple of results, but it does not explore alternative interpretations of the results. For example, it is highlighted that all participants created a single representation even though multiple representations were allowed. However, all participants were given only a single sheet of paper, and this procedural detail might have implied a single representation. It is also not stated whether participants were run individually or in a group. If in a group, could participants observe the diagrams that other participants were creating? If so, then this procedure could partially explain the agreements amongst participants.

Also, it was noted that no participant created a pie chart or other form of graph. I wonder how the materials present might have affected participants' use of more complex representations. For example, I would find it a bit challenging to draw a pie chart by hand.

In summary, this study is exploratory and may be of interest to researchers in the field of diagrams, but it offers few results that clearly speak to cognitive processes of broader interest. It seems more like an initial step toward more promising research along these lines.

Amy Rae Fox <amyraefox@gmail.com> Thu, Apr 2, 2015 at 2:25 AM
To: Erica de Vries <erica.devries@upmf-grenoble.fr>
Cc: Neil Schwartz <neil8860@gmail.com>

Dear Dr. de Vries,

Please see below -- I just received the decision on the paper for the CogSci conference. Although I am not surprised that it was not accepted, on the basis of it's limited contribution, I thought the reviewer comments were quite positive! I was excited to see that the primary criticisms were on the scope of the study and # of participants, and not on the writing, reasoning or methods. It seems that all three reviewers correctly identified the work as "exploratory and preliminary" ;-)

I know that I found this to be a worthwhile and educational process. Thank you for dedicating your time!
Amy
[Quoted text hidden]
--

****
Amy R Fox
Consultant
Making Information Beautiful
+ 01 919 886 4455
****
visit my website at **www.alwaysbeenamy.com**

Neil Schwartz <neil8860@gmail.com> Thu, Apr 2, 2015 at 4:40 AM
To: Amy Rae Fox <amyraefox@gmail.com>, Erica de Vries <erica.devries@upmf-grenoble.fr>

Great effort, Amy.

The key to this business is twofold:

1. Tenacity-- the proportion of rejections to acceptances should always be viewed as a batting average; at least the way I see it. You always just keep moving forward with your work.

2. Depersonalization-- never let rejections or acceptances seep into your sense of self-- in either direction.

Best,
NHS
[Quoted text hidden]

Erica de Vries <erica.devries@upmf-grenoble.fr> Thu, Apr 2, 2015 at 7:33 PM
To: Amy Rae Fox <amyraefox@gmail.com>
Cc: Neil Schwartz <neil8860@gmail.com>

Dear Amy,

I think these reviews are actually very very encouraging. It means you did a very good job in presenting an exploratory study, which it was ! I never imagined there would be so many submissions. Just think of the process, 3 reviews plus the synthesis for each of the 666 submissions, devilish indeed !

It was fun writing, you might want to look out for another opportunity to present your work.

Best regards,
Dr. de Vries

[Quoted text hidden]