

---

## Editorial

---

### Lorna Uden

Faculty of Computing and Digital Technologies,  
School of Computing,  
Staffordshire University,  
Mellor Building, College Road,  
Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 2DE, UK  
Email: L.uden@staffs.ac.uk

---

Welcome to V15N3 of *IJLT*. This issue has four papers. The first paper is ‘Designing a virtual patient as an interprofessional enactment: lessons learnt from the process’ by Song-ee Ahn and Samuel Edelbring. This study is based on observations of the design process of a virtual patient (VP), which aimed to facilitate interprofessional learning. The article follows a design team that used virtual interactive case system (VIC) software. The study is grounded in actor network theory (ANT) and its idea of enactments, the results illustrate how the different knowledge in the healthcare practices and pedagogical intentions were embedded into the case description and how the different patient enactments as well as pedagogical intentions were negotiated with VIC. By following the design process of this VP, this study aimed to trace how different practices and the knowledge within these practices were enacted as a VP and to understand the design team’s difficulties and challenges. Drawing upon actor-network theory (ANT), the study demonstrates how technology and various practices in healthcare and education were enrolled to build the VP and the different translations that took place during the process. They discuss the results by reflecting on the intertwined relationship among the different enactments of a patient in the different professional practices, the enactment of pedagogical intentions and the role of technology in the design process.

These authors identified three lessons from this case, concerning assembling, coinciding and clashing with the patient enactment. The first lesson concerns the knowledge required to design a VP for interprofessional learning. The results demonstrate that there could be no VP without knowledge of the various healthcare professions and practices, such as rounds, logistics, etc. The second lesson involves the collision between the patient enactment and the pedagogical intentions. This third lesson is that the technology involved should be understood as a partner that one negotiates with rather than as an empty tool. Understanding its logic and what is (im)possible with the technology is crucial for the design process. These authors conclude that building a VP for interprofessional learning requires not only knowledge of the practices but also an understanding of what kinds of actions and associations are allowed and negotiable with the chosen technology.

The second paper is ‘Strengthening anger management in the classroom: Contributions from B-learning training’ by Edgar Guillermo Pulido Guerrero and Ana Dolores Vargas Sánchez. This paper investigates how cognitive-behavioural techniques intended to control anger affected aggressive behaviours in students between

the ages of 8 and 14 in a B-learning experience. It analyses the contributions of a B-learning training experience to the reduction of school conflicts in classrooms by encouraging cognitive-behavioural anger management techniques. Using a mixed concurrent nested dominant approach, research took place from 2015 to 2017 with 43 Colombian children between the ages of 8 and 14. Data was collected using a pre-test/post-test, checklists, observation logs, and a focus group.

According to these authors, the findings show satisfactory performance in the execution of the indicated techniques; these results were verified by Wilcoxon's Z test, showing a significant increase in the measurement of Internal Wrath Control with both self-applied and hetero-applied instruments ( $-2,841$  with sign.  $0.004$  in the hetero-applied instrument and  $-1,699$  with sign.  $0.089$  in the STAXI-NA). Finally, an analysis of the qualitative results provides suggestions for improving the technical and pedagogical aspects. More studies are needed to verify the claim. It is a shame that the authors failed to follow good paper writing criteria and missed the conclusion.

The third paper is 'Augmented reality in history education: an immersive storytelling of American colonisation period in the Philippines' by Manuel B. Garcia. In this paper, the author presents an educational mobile augmented reality application for history education based from the curriculum outline of the Department of Education on Social Studies. The main goal of this study was to 'bring history to life' by co-designing a mobile application powered by augmented reality, with history teachers and grade six students, that can provide an immersive storytelling experience on the American colonisation period in the Philippines.

The author argues that the findings of the study confirmed that mobile augmented reality is a promising educational tool for a technology-aided history education as evaluated by co-designers of the study. The historic augmented reality application, HARA, provided an immersive storytelling experience on the American colonisation period in the Philippines by portraying historical events such as The Battle of Manila bay, mock battle of Manila, and first shot in Philippine-American war using animated 3D scenes. Instead of teachers narrating a story using excerpts from history books and students trying to imagine these historical events, HARA delivers a consistent and visual storytelling platform for simulation and dramatisation which revolutionise how history is experienced in the classroom. More empirical studies are needed to verify the results.

The fourth paper is 'Harnessing collaborative pedagogies to promote writing skills in a Web 2.0 environment' by Tami Seifert. This study investigates the potential of Google Docs as a Web 2.0 collaborative tool. This paper reports and describes the use of Google Docs in a master's degree program as an online tool for collaborative co-construction of knowledge and self-assessment. Participants included eighty graduate teachers from two classes studying for two consecutive years in a master's degree program entitled 'Technology in Education' at the Kibbutzim College of Education in Israel. The study employed a mixed method approach, which combines quantitative and qualitative research methods. The tools used were a questionnaire, focus group discussions, collaborative Google Docs and students' comments, class discussions and instructor assessments of the collaborative process.

The author argues that results indicated positive experiences when using Google Docs for online collaboration in the co-construction of knowledge. This collaborative tool facilitated the instructor's close monitoring of the students' progress, enabling the instructor to provide feedback and effectively assist the writing process. The results provide useful information for the design of appropriate activities to facilitate graduate teachers' collaboration. Further empirical studies are needed to verify the results. The implications for practice and learning should appear before the conclusion.