

Editorial: Volume 33 Issue 1

The bibliometric data in this editorial provide readers with information about the journal's publication, review and article access statistics, the articles attracting the most interest over the past year and the citation performance of the journal. The data has been summarised in a series of tables below along with explanatory notes and brief commentary.

Please note that the data on access statistics presented in this editorial are not backward compatible with data published previously in the first issues of past years. In November 2015 the journal management system used to host AJET was upgraded to a new version. This changed the method of collecting article statistics, which now importantly distinguish access by automated bots and human users. The data calculated with the new methods since the upgrade provide more accurate reader statistics, but are lower than figures reported previously. To our best knowledge all data reported within this editorial were recorded and retrieved by consistent methods.

As can be seen within Table 1, AJET has continued to publish 6 issues in 2016, offering a similar number of articles compared to the previous years (the variation is caused by special issues which tend to have fewer articles than regular issues). The number of downloads per article has risen considerably over the years. The 2016 figures are stronger than the 2015 values taken over the comparable period. This indicates that access to 2016 articles should easily surpass the figures for articles published in 2015 and that AJET is attracting strong interest from its readership.

Table 1
AJET Publication Summary

	2014	2015	2016
Issues published	6	6	6
Articles published	48	46	45
Editorials published	6	6	6
Article and editorial downloads (to 28/02/2017)			
Abstracts	13232	24955	20321*
Full articles	14779	24458	16319*

* 2016 downloads are considerably higher than the 2015 values taken over the comparable period.

Table 2 shows the most downloaded articles per issue published in 2016. Readers will appreciate that the download numbers only provide indications of popularity and cannot be compared across issues that closely after publication. Time will tell which articles will attract sustained attention.

Table 2
Top 2016 AJET Articles per Issue by Full Article Downloads to 28/02/2017

Issue	Article	Authors	Downloads
Vol 32, No 1	The rhizome: A problematic metaphor for teaching and learning in a MOOC	Jenny Mackness, Frances Bell, Mariana Funes	2047
Vol 32, No 2	e-Portfolios enhancing students' self-directed learning: A systematic review of influencing factors	Jorrick Beckers, Diana Dolmans, Jeroen Van Merriënboer	525
Vol 32, No 3	Open access journals in educational technology: Results of a survey of experienced users	Ross A. Perkins, Patrick R. Lowenthal	620
Vol 32, No 4	An empirical study towards understanding user acceptance of bring your own device (BYOD) in higher education	Gary Cheng, Yuanyuan Guan, Juliana Chau	513
Vol 32, No 5	Enhancing Graduate Students' Reflection in E-portfolios Using the TPACK Framework	Yu-Hui Ching, Dazhi Yang, YoungKyun Baek, Sally Baldwin	184
Vol 32, No 6	What if learning analytics were based on learning science?	Zahia Marzouk, Mladen Rakovic, Amna Liaqat, Jovita Vytasek, Donya Samadi, Jason Stewart-Alonso, Ilana Ram, Sonya Woloshen, Philip H Winne, John C Nesbit	407

Table 3 shows a comparison of the number of submissions and acceptance rates for articles submitted in 2014, 2015 and 2016. The number of submissions for 2016 was strong and surpassed the 2014/15 numbers. The percentage of submissions deemed of sufficient quality to be passed on for full peer review has remained stable over the 2015/16 period. As seen from the rise in articles sent for review, the demand for reviewers is high and increasing.

Table 3
AJET Submission and Review Statistics based on submissions per year

AJET Submissions and Reviews	2014	2015	2016
Total submissions	434	413	450
Declined at editorial screening (percentage of total submissions)	334 (77%)	275 (67%)	295 (66%)
Peer reviewed (percentage of total submissions)	100 (23%)	138 (33%)	155 (35%)
Declined at peer review (percentage of peer reviewed)	56 (56%)	76 (55%)	79*
Accepted (percentage of peer reviewed)	44 (44%)	62 (45%)	26*
Declined (either at editorial screening or following peer review, percentage of total submissions)	390 (90%)	351 (85%)	374*
Accepted (percentage of total submissions)	44 (10%)	62 (15%)	26*

* These are preliminary figures as 50 articles submitted in 2016 are still under review

Table 4 shows a summary of citation statistics from the Thomson Reuters Web of Science, Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) Journal Citation Reports (JCR), while Table 5 shows a summary of Google Scholar citation statistics. Readers interested in a detailed discussion of these statistics and how they are calculated are referred to the editorial within issue 30(3) of AJET. After a dip in 2014 AJET's JCR Two Year Impact

Factor has bounced back in 2015. The Five Year Impact Factor also shows an upward trend in 2015. The Two Year Impact Factor tends to fluctuate notably from year to year as highly cited papers come into or move out of the data window, whereas the longer time window for the Five Year Impact Factor has a smoothing effect on the data. The total citations, as shown in the JCR SSCI, show a strong increase in 2015. Notably the impact factor excluding self-cites has improved.

Table 4
Thomson Reuters JCR SSCI Impact Factor

	2013	2014	2015
Thomson Reuters Web of Science Journal Citation Reports (JCR) Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) Two Year Impact Factor	0.875	0.648	0.798
JCR SSCI total citations in the year	513	537	705
Impact factor without Journal self cites	0.680	0.517	0.706
JCR SSCI Five Year Impact Factor	1.198	1.006	1.171
JCR SSCI Two Year Impact factor ranking within Education & Educational Research Category	84 th of 219	131 st of 224	135 st of 231

AJET's performance on the Google Scholar citation metrics has been fairly stable over the last years, with an h5-index of 31 in 2016. The h5-median improved to 47 in 2016. Google Scholar's ranking of Educational Technology journals places AJET 9th internationally in 2016.

Table 5
Google Scholar Citation Metrics

	June 2014	June 2015	June 2016
Google Scholar h5-index	30	33	31
Google Scholar h5-median	57	43	47
Google Scholar h5-index ranking within Educational Technology category	8 th	8 th	9 th

Finally, Table 6 shows AJET's five most cited articles over the last five years, based on the Google Scholar h5-index.

Table 6
AJET's most cited articles over the last five years based the Google Scholar h5-index

Article	Authors	Issue	Citations
Students' perceptions of using Facebook as an interactive learning resource at university.	C Irwin, L Ball, B Desbrow, M Leveritt	Vol 28, No 7, 2012	151
Can Web 2.0 technology assist college students in learning English writing? Integrating Facebook and peer assessment with blended learning.	RC Shih	Vol 27, No 5, 2011	146
Analysis of the technology acceptance model in examining students' behavioural intention to use an eportfolio system.	RH Shroff, CC Deneen, EMW Ng	Vol 27, No 4, 2011	132
Schools going mobile: A study of the adoption of mobile handheld technologies in Western Australian independent schools.	M Pegrum, G Oakley, R Faulkner	Vol 29, No 1, 2013	91
Challenging mobile learning discourse through research: Student perceptions of Blackboard Mobile Learn and iPads.	S Kinash, J Brand, T Mathew	Vol 28, No 4, 2012	88

In this issue

Outside the publication of special issues, AJET does not arrange articles for publication based on topics. We do not delay publication of papers while waiting for a collection of papers with similar themes. As a consequence, each issue is characterised by a variety of contributions with diverse foci and methods. While our first issue for 2017 makes no exception, the articles do reflect three themes that often dominate the field of educational technology: students, teachers and systems. These three components are often hard to disentangle, which has sometimes resulted in research over-claiming the impact of one to the exclusion of the other, such as the significance of a system implementation (e.g., flipped classroom model or a MOOC) rather than look to the complex interplay of learning / teaching and learners / teachers.

Many of the articles bring to bear new designs in the use of systems to facilitate students taking an active role in their learning. Three such articles focus on peer learning. Ghadirian and Ayub analyse the behaviour of peer moderators in asynchronous online discussions. They categorize different types of e-moderators and link these categories to online behaviour patterns and academic performance, which in turn suggest design issues for us to consider. McKenzie and Roodenburg investigate what happens if students take an active role in authoring quiz questions. They report on the use of the PeerWise software and provide a comparison to teacher authored questions, looking at student perceptions and acceptance. In contrast with the two previous papers Trust applies a cultural historical activity theory to investigate how teachers seek and share knowledge in peer-to-peer professional development networks and points to the influences of technical and social aspects.

Often in educational technology we can lose ourselves in considering cutting edge technologies, but frequently, the day-to-day experience of students and educators in higher education are less state-of-the-art if not digitally mundane. Zanjani, Edwards, Nykvist and Geva remind us of this fact, underlining the continued importance of Learning Management Systems (LMS) as central platforms for technology-supported learning. In their study they look, in particular, into the affects of LMS design on learner engagement. However, despite the continued dominance of LMS in higher education, many educators are turning to social media, particularly social networking sites. This trend is picked up by Balakrishnan, Teoh, Poursafie and Liew who investigate learner perspectives on the use of social media in learning with a particular emphasis on a comparison between Australian and Malaysian students. A different form of social media is that of virtual worlds, such as Second Life. Matthew and Butler's paper offers a new insight into the authentic learning potential of such systems, but in an unexpected way. In their study they re-purpose the virtual world to create machinima videos that are coupled with simulated documentation to generate scenarios for students to engage with.

In contrast with the above papers which focus on the re-use of current technologies, Yang, Fu, Hwang and Yang base their study on the development of an interactive mathematics learning system to be used by first year engineering and science students. A key ingredient in this design was the application of an instant diagnostic and guiding strategy that arguably resulted in improved student performance and confidence.

When considering the role of student and teachers, the field of educational technology has a long history of trying to understand the adoption and use of digital technologies and related educational designs. In this issue Zhang, Yin, Luo, and Yan build on the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and explore the factors that influence learners in the adoption of MOOCs in China. In contrast Batane and Ngwako apply the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) as evaluative framework to understand the continued challenge of integrating technology into teaching even when pre-service teachers demonstrate high levels of competency with learning technologies. In a different approach Tuapawa applies a phenomenological approach to understand the challenges faced by students when engaging in blended learning designs. Yang and Tsai also borrow on phenomenological traditions to better understand the experiences and patterns of engagement of in-service teachers in online education.

Eva Heinrich, Chwee Beng Lee & Michael Henderson
Lead Editors Australasian Journal of Education Technology