Editorial: Volume 32 Issue 1

In this editorial we have provided updated bibliometric data to 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.

Table 1
2014/2015 AJET Publication Summary

	2014	2015
Issues published	6	6
Articles published	48	46
Editorials published	6	6
Article and editorial downloads (to 28/2/16)	88745	37402
Average downloads per article/editorial	1643	719

* Note 2015 downloads are comparable to 2014 data over same period.

As can be seen within Table 1, AJET published 46 articles and 6 editorials in 6 issues in 2015, a similar publication volume to 2014. Downloads of 2014 articles remained strong in 2015, with over 22,000 additional downloads since June 2015. Downloads of 2015 articles has also been strong with over 37,000 downloads so far.

Table 2
Top 2015 AJET Articles by Download

Article	Authors	Issue	Downloads
Learning styles and perceptions of student teachers of computer-supported collaborative learning strategy using wikis	Kai Ming Li	Vol 31, No 1	1904
The effects of face-to-face and computer-mediated peer review on EFL writers' comments and revisions	Mei-ching Ho	Vol 31, No 1	1810
Technology acceptance among pre-service teachers: Does gender matter?	Timothy Teo, Xitao Fan, Jianxia Du	Vol 31, No 3	1791
Video-based feedback on student assessment: scarily personal	Michael Henderson, Michael Phillips	Vol 31, No 1	1776
How do virtual world experiences bring about learning? A critical review of theories	Swee-Kin Loke	Vol 31, No 1	1344

Table 2 shows the five most downloaded articles published in 2015. Reader interest in articles which focus on learning online with peers appears noticeably strong, with the three articles by Li, Ho and Loke all touching on this topic.

Table 3

*Acceptance Rates for 2013/2014 AJET Submissions**

	2013 Submissions			2014 Submissions		
	Total Articles	% of total submissions	% of peer-reviewed submissions	Total Articles	% of total submissions	% of peer-reviewed submissions
Total submissions	469			438		
Declined at editorial review	370	79%		336	77%	
Sent for peer review	99	21%		102*	23%	
Declined following peer review	52	11%	53%	50*	11%	49%
Accepted following peer review	47	10%	47%	39*	9%	38%

* Note that some 2014 submissions are still in process because we are awaiting revised submissions from authors prior to second round review

Table 3 shows a comparison of the number of submissions and acceptance rates for articles submitted in 2013 and 2014. It is important to note that acceptance rates for 2015 submissions are not yet available because many 2015 submissions are still under review or back with the author for revisions. The number of submissions received remained high but with a slight reduction (7%) from 2013 to 2014. Interestingly the number of submission grew again (to 512) in 2015. The percentage of articles found suitable to send out for peer review (23% in 2014) and the percentage of articles accepted following peer review (38% in 2014) have remained relatively stable.

Table 4

Thomson Reuters JCR SSCI Impact Factor

	2013	2014
Thomson Reuters Web of Science Journal Citation Reports (JCR) Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) Two Year Impact Factor	0.875	0.648
JCR SSCI citations in specified year to AJET articles in the 2 previous years	140	94
JCR SSCI Five Year Impact Factor	1.198	1.006
JCR SSCI citations in specified year to AJET articles in the 5 previous years	381	338
JCR SSCI Two Year Impact factor ranking within Education & Educational Research Category	84th of 219	131st of 224

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. AJET's JCR Two Year Impact Factor for 2014 was down slightly on 2013, while the Five Year Impact Factor was also down but only marginally. 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. AJET's performance on the Google Scholar citation metrics further improved from its strong position in 2014, with its h5-index increasing from 30 to 33. Google Scholar's ranking of Educational Technology journals places AJET 8th internationally which is very encouraging.

Table 5
Google Scholar Citation Metrics

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

Finally, Table 6 shows AJET's five most cited articles of all time, based on citation statistics from Google Scholar. It is interesting that all five articles were published in 2010, which must have been an excellent year for high quality and high interest articles in AJET.

Table 6
AJET's most cited articles since 2010 (Google Scholar)

Article	Authors	Issue	Citations
Personalised and self regulated learning in the Web 2.0 era: International exemplars of innovative pedagogy using social software	C McLoughlin, MJW Lee	Vol 26, No 1, 2010	258
Smartphones give you wings: Pedagogical affordances of mobile Web 2.0	T Cochrane, R Bateman	Vol 26, No 1, 2010	170
Using wikis for collaborative learning: Assessing collaboration through contribution	T Judd, G Kennedy, S Cropper	Vol 26, No 3, 2010	134
Blended learning environments: Using social networking sites to enhance the first year experience	J McCarthy	Vol 26, No 6, 2010	111
The networked student model for construction of personal learning environments: Balancing teacher control and student autonomy	W Drexler	Vol 26, No 3, 2010	105

In this issue

The articles in this issue of AJET are, as usual, diverse in focus, methodology and context. Virtual worlds continue to be of interest, with Chow utilising a structural equation modelling to explore the variables that influence the sense of presence which has been claimed as a contributing factor in the efficacy of learning in a 3D virtual world. This perhaps helps to set the scene for the article by Vrellis, Avouris and Mikropoulos who explore virtual worlds in terms of Learning outcome, presence and satisfaction finding that presence was positively correlated to satisfaction but not to the learning outcome.

Social networking, such as through Facebook, also continues to be of interest with Kabilan exploring its functionality and efficacy as a site for e-portfolio development. In contrast Hope challenges the higher education sector to recognise that while social networking sites can offer valuable possibilities for education and learning they also "distract" (or free) students from the often mundane reality of study, whilst reinforcing "damaging, rigid definitions of work and study."

The higher education sector is also challenged by Devlin and McKay in their study on how students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds in Australian universities and be supported through digital technologies. They indicate that student success was facilitated by the use of a range of resources and media, facilitating interactive and connected learning, enabling personalised learning and assuring high academic standards. Although they do not directly refer to social networking sites, one does consider if Kabilan's utilitarian and Hope's critical approaches may offer further insight in supporting students from a low socioeconomic background.

Hong and Chiu's paper look beyond technology to explore students' perception of the role of ideas and how such perceptions related to their knowledge-building practices. Jang and Chang return to the concept of technological pedagogical and content knowledge (TPACK) to better understand the tension between student and instructor perceptions and conclude that such a framework, specifically a TPACK questionnaire, may usefully aid professional learning and improvement of technology enabled education provision. Mackness, Bell and Funes also take a broad view with their exploration of the rhizome as a metaphor for teaching and learning in a massive open online course (MOOC). They found that while many learners welcomed the anti-authoritarian, anti-hierarchical characteristics of this approach, lack of depth of engagement with the rhizome concept could lead to imbalances in power relations and increased vulnerability for some learners.

Welcome

In this issue we also formally welcome Eva Heinrich to the Lead Editorial team. Eva is an Associate Professor in the School of Engineering & Advanced Technology at Massey University, New Zealand. Her work has recently included the use of digital technologies in assessment and ePortfolios as well as the complexity of academic professional learning. Eva brings a wealth of research and editorial experience to AJET which has already strengthened AJET's editorial process.

Barney Dalgarno, Eva Heinrich & Michael Henderson
Lead Editors Australasian Journal of Education Technology