



Contents

Editorial	iii-vi
An investigation of the effectiveness of electronic classroom communication systems in large lecture classes	137-154
<i>Manjula D. Sharma, Joe Khachan, Ben Chan and John O'Byrne</i>	
Students' self analysis of contributions to online asynchronous discussions	155-172
<i>Elizabeth Murphy and Jamie Loveless</i>	
Scaffolding and integrated assessment in computer assisted learning (CAL) for children with learning disabilities	173-191
<i>Ivan L. Beale</i>	
Identifying the factors that influence computer use in the early childhood classroom	192-210
<i>Suzy Edwards</i>	
Developing and using multimedia effectively for undergraduate teacher education	211-221
<i>Dianne P. Chambers and Kaye Stacey</i>	
The search for learning community in learner paced distance education: Or "Having your cake and eating it, too!"	222-241
<i>Terry Anderson, David Annand and Norine Wark</i>	
Agency of the instructional designer: Moral coherence and transformative social practice	242-262
<i>Katy Campbell, Richard A. Schwier and Richard F. Kenny</i>	
Teaching IP networking fundamentals in resource constrained educational environments	263-282
<i>Grenville Armitage and Warren Harrop</i>	

the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education and the Australian Society for Educational Technology. Members of ASET, ASCILITE and ISPI (Vic) receive AJET as a part of their membership benefits.

For details on submission of manuscripts, subscriptions and access to the AJET online archives, please see <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/>

For review inquiries, contact the Editor, Associate Professor Catherine McLoughlin, School of Education (ACT), Australian Catholic University, PO Box 256, Dickson ACT 2602, Australia. Email: C.McLoughlin@signadou.acu.edu.au, Tel: +61 2 6209 1100 Fax +61 2 6209 1185. For production matters and subscriptions contact the Production Editor and Business Manager, Dr Roger Atkinson, 5/202 Coode Street, Como WA 6152, Australia. Email: rjatkinton@bigpond.com, Tel: +61 8 9367 1133.

AJET is managed by an Editorial Board nominated by ASCILITE and ASET. The 2005 Editorial Board comprises:

Catherine McLoughlin (Editor), Australian Catholic University
 Roger Atkinson (Production Editor)
 Trish Andrews, University of Queensland
 Carolyn Dowling, Australian Catholic University
 Mike Keppell, Hong Kong Institute of Education
 Lori Lockyer, University of Wollongong
 Mary Jane Mahony, University of Sydney
 Elizabeth Stacey, Deakin University

Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education http://www.ascilite.org.au/	Australian Society for Educational Technology http://www.aset.org.au/
--	---

Copyright in individual articles contained in AJET is vested in each of the authors in respect of his or her contributions. Copyright in AJET is vested in ASET (1985-86), AJET Publications (1987-1996), and ASET and ASCILITE (from 1997). Desktop publishing and HTML by Roger Atkinson. Printed and bound by Pilpel Print, Beaufort Street, Perth WA 6000, Australia.

Supporting Societies

Supporting societies obtain bulk supplies of printed copies of AJET at the same cost as applicable for ASCILITE and ASET members, and access to AJET online articles during the period of restricted access for each issue. Inquiries about supporting society status may be directed to the Production Editor.



**INTERNATIONAL
 SOCIETY FOR
 PERFORMANCE
 IMPROVEMENT**

ISPI Melbourne Chapter
<http://www.ispimelb.org.au/>

Editorial

AJET's review process: An outcomes summary

In order to deal effectively with rapid growth in the submission of articles to AJET during 2004-2004, we have made increasing use of 'editorial rejections'. These are rejections made by the Editor and Production Editor, in cases for which we feel there is little chance of acceptance being recommended by external reviewers. The advantages are that we reduce the time demands placed upon our reviewers, we concentrate their very valuable services upon articles with good chances of acceptance, and we can provide more rapid feedback to many of the authors, in some cases as fast as 'same day'. Table 1 shows the extent of our utilisation of "editorial rejection", and also shows that a kindred journal, *Higher Education Research and Development* [1] has developed this practice to a similar extent.

Table 1: Article review outcomes AJET 2003-2005 and HERD 2004

Year of receipt	Number received	Number accepted (d)	No. rejected editorially	No. reject ext review	No. pending	% accepted (f)
2003	61	13	34(e)	14(e)	0	21.3%
2004(a)	97	22	51	3	21	
2005(b)	23	3	5	0	15	
HERD 04(c)	84	7	47	10	20	

- Data in columns 3-6 is at 24 April 2005. We expect to resolve the 21 year 2004 receivals that are pending at 24 April by the end of May 2005.
- Data in columns 3-6 is at 24 April 2005. We estimate that at the end of 2005 there will be about 10 receivals in the pending category.
- Data for HERD was provided by HERDSA's President and published in HERDSA List, Thurs 31 March by Roger Landbeck, List Moderator. HERD uses the term "rejected at screening".
- The number of articles accepted from a particular year's receivals does not correspond to the number published in each year, owing to time taken for review and revisions, and fluctuations in the speed of these processes. For example, AJET published 24 articles in 2003, the majority being 2002 receivals.
- Some of the rejected articles may appear again as receivals in a subsequent year. The reasons for counting these instances as rejections are to enable a clearer cut off for each year's outcomes, and to align data collection with the editorial advice, used in a significant proportion of cases, 'Reject. Invite resubmission of a revised or expanded work for a new review process'.
- The acceptance rate cannot be calculated until after resolving all receivals in the pending category.

However, is the practice of 'editorial rejection' or 'screening' used extensively in the publishing of scholarly research journals? How is it justified? Here are some illustrative quotations from journal editorials or guidelines for authors, identifying some of the issues:

Some editors tend to send most manuscripts out to reviewers, allowing the review board to have input on received manuscripts; others are more selective in what they send out, trying to respect their reviewers' time by sending only manuscripts that have a reasonable chance of acceptance. (Niederhauser, Wetzel & Lindstrom, 2004)

Before you send the paper out to referees, perform a first pass - a quick scan of the paper. ...you have the authority to return a paper to the authors without referee reports (preempt-reject) if you notice a serious problem with the paper. In such cases, clearly outline the problem and, if possible, provide some guidance to the authors about how the paper could be improved or what might be a more appropriate outlet. This does not happen very often, but it does happen. I would recommend preempt-reject in cases where the authors have failed to follow a substantial portion of the instructions to authors or where the paper is not suitable for ITE. (ITE, 2003)

... if a paper has little chance of seeing final publication, most journals will reject it out of hand, without sending it out for review. At the *New England Journal of Medicine*, most papers that make it through the first hurdle get at least two reviews from some of the 17,000 reviewers in the Journal's database... (Darves, undated)

The quotations underline some important issues: conserving reviewers' time, providing good formative feedback to the authors of rejected papers, and maintaining a watching brief on the editorial policies of other journals (you may be aware that the *New England Journal of Medicine* is regarded by many as the quintessential prestigious journal).



ASCILITE 2005 December 4-7

Balance, Fidelity, Mobility

Maintaining the Momentum?

Brisbane, Queensland

<https://olt.qut.edu.au/udf/ascilite2005/>



Sydney, 19-21 May 2005

<http://incsub.org/blogtalk/>

The provision of good formative feedback to the authors of rejected papers can be quite time consuming. However, we justify such work being done by the Editors as it constitutes a long term investment, a cultivating of potential authors, or a 'generalist' time input relating to persons, in contrast to the work of our reviewers, who are making more immediate investments of 'specialist' time into improving a particular article. Nevertheless, the question of the opposite approach, Editorial approval of 'obvious' acceptances and external reviewer feedback for papers with 'little chance', is a possibility, if only fleetingly considered. Take these examples of 'Editor only' approval cited in *Wikipedia* under the heading "Famous papers which were not peer-reviewed" [2]:

Although peer review is one of the cornerstones of the modern scientific methodology, some famous papers have been published without review. These include:

1. Publication of Watson and Crick's 1951 paper on the structure of DNA in *Nature*. This paper was not sent out for peer review. John Maddox stated that "the Watson and Crick paper was not peer-reviewed by *Nature*... the paper could not have been refereed: its correctness is self-evident. No referee working in the field ... could have kept his mouth shut once he saw the structure"...
2. The 1905 issue of *Annalen der Physik*, in which Einstein published five extraordinary papers including special relativity and the photoelectric effect. The journal's editor in chief, Max Planck, recognized the virtue of publishing such outlandish ideas and had the papers published; none of Einstein's papers were sent to reviewers. The decision to publish was made exclusively by either the editor in chief, or the co-editor Wilhelm Wien — both certainly 'peers' beyond doubt (who were later to win the Nobel prize in physics)...

However, as AJET's Editors are unlikely to have to deal editorially with comparably "famous papers", we'll not get into 'Editor only' approval.



AusWeb 2005

2-6 July

<http://ausweb.scu.edu.au/>

Idle Moment No. 11

At last! An opportunity to cite the House of Commons! The House's Science and Technology Committee has published a remarkable report, *Scientific Publications: Free for all?* This 118 page report embraces much of the open access agenda espoused by AJET and many other journals. Whilst it is concerned mainly with STM journals (scientific, technical and medical), it is very relevant for us because a major part of its discussions concerns the 'usual suspects', named in 'Figure 2: Global Market Shares of STM Publishers, 2003' (p.13), who happen to own most of the prestigious journals for educational research. The report's core recommendation is that "...all UK higher education institutions establish institutional repositories on which their published output can be stored and from which it can be read, free of charge, online." *Read, free of charge, online*, an ideal that we have sustained for AJET for nearly a decade!

Roger Atkinson and Catherine McLoughlin
AJET Production Editor and AJET Editor

Endnotes

1. HERD. <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/07294360.asp>
2. Wikipedia. [viewed 24 Apr 2005] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peer_review

References

- Darves, B. (undated). Submitting academic papers for publication in medical journals. *New England Journal of Medicine*. [viewed 24 Apr 2005] http://www.nejmjobs.org/resource_center/Medical_Journals.asp
- House of Commons (2004). *Scientific Publications: Free for all?* House of Commons Science and Technology Committee. Tenth Report of Session 2003-04 (HC 3991) <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmsctech/399/399.pdf>
- ITE (2003). Instructions to Associate Editors. INFORMS (Institute for Operations Research and the Management Sciences) Transactions on Education. [viewed 24 Apr 2005] <http://ite.pubs.informs.org/info/assocEditors.php>
- Niederhauser, D.S., Wetzel, K. & Lindstrom, D. L. (2004). From manuscript to article: Publishing educational technology research. *Contemporary Issues in Technology & Teacher Education*, 4(2). <http://www.citejournal.org/vol4/iss2/editorial/article1.cfm>



ALT-C 2005
Exploring the frontiers of e-learning

<http://www.alt.ac.uk/altc2005/>

12th International Conference of the Association for Learning Technology
University of Manchester, England, 6-8 September 2005