

## **Editorial: Volume 31 Issue 6**

It has been my pleasure to serve as joint lead editor of AJET over the past three years. I would like to use my final editorial contribution to recognise the work of the AJET team, and share some personal reflections.

Over its history AJET has built a reputation for quality and relevance to the Australasian and international educational technology communities. From 2012, ascilite set out to act on the recommendations of the review of AJET. This saw a significant overhaul of all aspects of the journal's operation, particularly with the introduction of an editorial team consisting of lead and associate editors. There is a very high workload associated with running an international journal, and AJET would not be successful without this team of dedicated volunteers with considerable collective expertise in the field. Our only paid staff at AJET are our excellent copy-editors, who are supported by funding from ascilite. The establishment of the AJET management committee, consisting of the lead editors and representatives from the ascilite executive, has also been critical to promoting a good relationship with the professional body while also maintaining editorial independence. Acknowledgement must also go to our editorial board members, many of whom provide valuable support and advice on request and on their own initiative. And thanks also to the editors of this year's special issue, who have done a stellar job in attracting and managing a valuable set of papers. The smooth running behind-the-scenes of AJET is a testament to everyone involved and it has been a privilege to work with such a professional and dedicated team.

AJET also relies on the commitment and contributions of our peer reviewers. Thank you to you all. We are very fortunate to have so many in our community willing to freely give their time to assess and critique the work of others. All high-quality journals these days are under the pressure of very high levels of submissions. At AJET we receive 7-10 new manuscripts each week. This is many, many more than we are able to publish and includes a sizable proportion of manuscripts which are unsuitable or underdeveloped. In response, we introduced a two-stage screening process, whereby a lead editor reviews every incoming manuscript and determines whether it is of sufficiently high quality to be considered for peer review. The authors of every manuscript declined on initial editorial review receive feedback about the reasons for this decision. It is our intention that this be a developmental process to help potential authors learn more about AJET's standards, while ensuring peer review is reserved for manuscripts that are suitable.

We have many good reasons to be proud of AJET as the scholarly publication of ascilite. It is founded on truly open values. All of the articles we publish are made openly available to anyone who has Internet access. There are no hidden charges that we pass on to our authors or readers. We have an open-minded editorial approach which is not driven by ideology, but values high-quality research and scholarship from across the range of methodological and theoretical approaches. We strive to disseminate rigorous studies and critical thinking that will advance knowledge in the field of educational technology. There are many challenges in contemporary academic publishing, including the vagaries of impact factors and metrics, the underlying costs of running any journal, and questions about the impact of publications on policy and practice. AJET is in an excellent position to respond to these challenges, but will need the continued support of the ascilite community to do so.

On a personal note, the experience that I have gained as an AJET lead editor has been invaluable. In the past three years I have reviewed more than 1000 manuscript submissions, through which I have developed a new appreciation of the breadth and depth of educational technology research and scholarship. I have had the great fortune to meet many of our authors, speak at events about research and publishing, and develop my own thinking and practice. Through these experiences I have developed a profound awareness of the critical role that peer-review and assessment have in developing our

knowledge base. There is so much more to learn about educational technology and we will need many perspectives to advance our understanding. Building on past research and incorporating approaches from other fields will provide us opportunities to make those advances, and we need to be willing to do so in a considered and rigorous way. I look forward to continuing to support AJET's role in this future as a member of the editorial board and peer reviewer.

## **In this issue**

A mark of the international reputation of AJET as a quality journal is the range of countries from which papers are submitted. In this issue three articles hail from Taiwan, one from Hong Kong, and another that considers the cross-border transition of students from mainland China to Hong Kong, as well as papers from Canada, Australia, and Indonesia. In these papers the authors have tackled research questions using a range of research methods including mixed methods, grounded theory, and Q-methodology. The first two papers focus on student perspectives on educational technology implementation in higher education. The field of educational technology research has been taken to task on a number of occasions for reporting on students' perceptions without theoretical framing and/or weak research design. In this case L. Chen, T-L. Chen and N-S. Chen utilize a Q-methodology to investigate the potential of cooperative learning in a flipped classroom context. The second paper by Hsieh, Lee and W-F. Chen adopt a mixed methods approach to investigate the value and implications for student developed eportfolios, from the perspectives of students as well as university educators and industry employers.

The third paper is by Montgomery, Hayward, Dunn, Carbonaro and Amrhein who tackle a familiar challenge of blended learning through a multi-year mixed methods study. It is interesting to note that they focus of students' approach to educational technology in terms of 'intentionality'. The fourth paper is by Ding and Stapleton who adopt a grounded theory approach to continue a long tradition of interrogating the potential of social media, particularly instant messaging, as a means of peer support. The fifth paper by Yu and Su takes a different approach to the potential of contribution-based pedagogies, namely the use of a system to enable student constructed tests. The sixth paper by Ansyari adopts a design-based research method to investigate the impact of a professional learning programme on lecturers' technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPCK).

The final two papers focus on the context of pre-service teachers. Wong applies a mixed method approach, including structural equation modelling, to identify the factors that may impact on the behavioral intention of pre-service students to use technology in their future teaching. In contrast Ng and Nicholas adopt a qualitative methodology including participant interviews and the analysis of their digital storytelling artefacts as a means to investigate resiliency during the pre-service teachers' practicum.

Sue Bennett

Co-Lead Editor, Australasian Journal of Educational Technology