Where Do we Go from Here ...

Camille Dickson-Deane¹

Accepted: 6 October 2020 / Published online: 22 October 2020
© Association for Educational Communications & Technology 2020

The recent editorial by Kimmons (2020) reporting on educational technology trends highlighting areas of disconnect between research and practice is valuable and most importantly timely given the recent global events of the COVID-19 pandemic. It is pertinent that readers pursue their own reflection having been challenged, assumingly, by his statements and findings. Instead my comments focus on individualistic stances, which are influenced by belief systems and norms which make new views towards value and success both bound with indifferent difficulties.

The value of this editorial should not be defined only by its findings, but also consider that the ability of the field's participants and stakeholders to take the easy road to research is prevalent in our scholarship. Disregarding research because it is replicated sans context or devaluing its findings because it is not easily measured against 'a course grade' is this field's Achilles heel. Part of the challenge in using research today as Kimmons rightfully states, is that there is a lack of impact towards praxeology and by association, to those who practice, and do not subscribe to the most renowned methods of research in the academy. Practitioners are like the "learning and performance" emergency medical technicians (EMTs) or paramedics (given a medical analogy) [who all hold] a mixture of experiences and outcomes that create **unique** know-hows. We ignore their expertise and ask them to adhere to the expectations of the academy to be acknowledged, without us [the academy] understanding how practitioners share their knowledge and expertise. The value of the 5000+ word article to a practitioner or even a policymaker is worthless, if it is not in a form which is readily consumable, and yet there are very few of us that seek to address this need (Bishop et al. 2020). Furthermore, the intersectionality that exists in any one research agenda is reported by a constrained positionality perspective, leaving us void of rich experiences to teach, design and ultimately learn (Laurillard 2013). To elaborate, research articles readily present one view of a research context with the

understanding that generalization should confound use and relevance of findings – but they are not...they are presented as best practices and principled guides for implementation. Thus, the realisation is now that the multiple occurrences of force majeure, world crisis's and financial and economic reforms are forcing the field to address these and other issues that matter to the future.

The focus on the U.S. trends, is noted by Kimmons (2020) as a limited population to judge the field. Ignoring other geographically-situated definitions, experiences and values, have given birth to a parochial and somewhat insular understanding of the field. Kimmons (2020) also noted an absence in the findings of the tools that we in the field actively use (i.e., Blackboard, Moodle, BrightSpace, Canvas, etc.). A finding that given enough fuel will open research agendas to critique the design and implementation of these same tools. Instead of demanding improvements to these tools, we promote alternatives, a true contradiction of sorts as learning from poor design should not result in discarded solutions but improved iterations. Another area that requires more attention is an analysis of how learning influences performance in our immediate society. We do learn to perform, yet we focus only on the learning that occurs in the education sector, leaving other sectors a brief remark as to their own value within what we determined as "our" realm. Our ontological selves (as a field) no longer requires but demands more of us, by the need to acknowledge other geographies and languages, to expand the opportunity for us to seek the unknown-unknowns, to create bridges to other sectors, as, we become calm in the discomfort of new paths, being ready to support, achieve, and...

Understanding where we have gone wrong is the one thing we know, but actually actioning it in our behaviours, scholarship, curriculum and most importantly our [learning] designs is what we need to do (de Alvarez and Dickson-Deane 2018; Laurillard 2013; Romero-Hall et al. 2021). As we continue to march to our own beating drums, the new generation has used the voice that we trained them to have, as a weapon against our own dogma. Here, when we say one thing and yet, still do another - the cycle does not stop...we are at a point where accountability is much more the focus of our future than the action of our past.

✉ Camille Dickson-Deane
Camille.Dickson-Deane@uts.edu.au

¹ University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia

References

- Bishop, M. J., Boling, E., Elen, J., & Svihla, V. (Eds.). (2020). *Handbook of research in educational communications and technology: learning design* (5th ed.). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-36119-8>
- de Alvarez, M. S., & Dickson-Deane, C. (2018). Avoiding educational technology pitfalls for inclusion and equity. *TechTrends*, 62(4), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-018-0270-0>.
- Kimmons, R. (2020). *Current Trends (and Missing Links) in Educational Technology Research and Practice*. TechTrends. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-020-00549-6>
- Laurillard, D. (2013). *Teaching as a design science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203125083>.
- Romero-Hall, E., Correia, A. P., Branch, R. M. (Rob), Cevik, Y. D., Dickson-Deane, C., Chen, B., Liu, J. C., Tang, H., Vasconcelos, L., Pallitt, N., & Thankachan, B. (2020). *Futurama: learning design and technology research methods*. In *Research Methods in Learning Design and Technology* (pp. 206–226). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429260919-14>

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.