

## Editorial 26(2)

In IIER Editorial 25(4), our "25 year overview", we provided some demographic information about the authors of IIER articles. Looking over the current issue, IIER 26(2), the trend lines described in Editorial 25(4) remain clearly established. On gender, 17 of the 27 authors in 26(2) are women. On number of articles published per year, with 11 in 26(2) and 10 in 26(2), IIER is trending towards about 40-42 articles for volume 26, compared with 31 articles in volume 25 and 20 articles in volume 24. On diversity in countries of origin, volume 26 is also on trend, with 11 articles from Australia and New Zealand, and 10 articles from "rest of world" (Editorial 25(4) explains this classification, namely "country of origin is determined by the institutional affiliation of the article's first author, at the time the research was conducted").

We could add another two "trend lines" to those outlined in Editorial 25(4). These are *diversity of contexts*, and *diversity of topics*. Of course, diversity of contexts is linked to diversity in countries of origin, and diversity of contexts follows simply from IIER being a "generalist" journal that considers any topic within educational research. The current issue is a good example of the diversity theme.

Starting with the article by Aura, Venville and Marais, the country context is Kenya, and the topic concerns deaf children in residential primary schools. Then with Eboiyehi, Fayomi and Eboiyehi, the country context is Nigeria and the topic concerns gender inequality, investigated by a questionnaire and interviews administered in three Nigerian universities. In the article by Ercan, Bilen and Ural the country context is Turkey, and the topic is computer assisted learning in secondary school science, specifically the curriculum unit 'Earth, Sun and Moon'.

Kervin and Mantei take us into the preschool sector in New South Wales, with their article exploring how 4-5 year olds develop their sense of community, using the children's digital storytelling activities to gain insights. In the article by Knutson Miller and Gonzalez, the concept of a country context is less relevant, as the topic is internships (or practicums) that engaged Californian initial teacher education students with 3-13 year old children in China. The research by Lange, Costley and Han is from South Korea and is concerned with informal cooperative learning in small groups of undergraduate students participating in an English conversation class. Australia is the country context for the study by Lovett, who explores the topic of intergenerational mobility amongst working class students, from a cultural-evolutionary perspective, in article that cannot be assigned exclusively to one sector of education.

In the article by Maakrun and Maher, the concept of a country context is again less relevant, as they report upon the experiences of initial teacher education students from New South Wales engaged in a service learning activity with children in Kenya. Main, O'Rourke, Morris and Dunjey conducted their research in a Western Australian primary school, examining the benefits that students with disability can gain from classroom use of handheld digital gaming consoles.

The article by McCarthy takes us into a South Australian university context, investigating the efficacy of a flipped classroom model for teaching first year students three-dimensional animation. The final article, by Naylor, Chakravarti and Baik is also from an Australian university context, reporting upon the motivations and experiences of PhD candidates conducting research in oncology, and using focus group interviews as the main method of investigation.

The purpose for the paragraphs above is not to provide the reader with a precis of IIER 26(2), as the authors of the articles do that with good abstracts. The purpose above is akin to the purposes underlying a reflective journal entry. Having made some very brief notes about two aspects of diversity and how it is displayed well in this issue of IIER starts us on thinking about why diversity should be valued for IIER. One outcome is that we consider whether the topic and context in a submission has been accorded good recognition in previous volumes of IIER. Data can be obtained in an objective manner from *Google* searches specifying domain 'iier.org.au', or *Google Scholar* searches specifying journal 'issues in educational research', using appropriate keywords. IIER's editorial staff may decline a submission if its topic, method of investigation, context, sector and perspectives have been well represented in recent volumes of IIER. Advice of that type is accompanied, as best we can within the limits of time available and expertise, with advice on alternative journals and suggestions on improvements that may enhance prospects for acceptance by another journal.

To conclude, we would like to remind authors about the need for good attention to some matters arising from our work on recent volumes (not referring to any particular article in IIER 26!) that will help facilitate editorial and review processes:

- Researchers need to include details of ethical procedures followed in their research. Usually this is one or two sentences about institutional research ethics committee approvals.
- Please include URLs or DOIs in citations of references wherever possible. Copy editing of reference lists, to correct significant errors in titles, authors and journal details can be time consuming, and we believe that external reviewers should have their access to citations facilitated, for example to check upon details in method that are available only from a cited reference.

We commend IIER 26(2) to you.

**Anne Power**

Editor IIER

**Clare McBeath**

Publisher IIER

**Roger Atkinson**

Associate Editor and IIER Website Manager