CTE Workshop Proceedings, 2026, Vol. **13**, pp. 6–26 10.55056/cte.1131

Methodological evolution in educational technology research: a paradigm-sensitive narrative review of ICT integration studies

Olena Yu. Tarasova, Olena L. Pinska, Halyna I. Alieka and Natalia V. Moiseienko

Kryvyi Rih State Pedagogical University, 54 Universytetskyi Ave., Kryvyi Rih, 50086, Ukraine

Abstract. This narrative review critically examines the methodological landscape of educational technology and ICT integration research through the lens of evolving educational paradigms. Utilising Scopus AI's analytical capabilities, this paper examines how shifts from behaviourist to constructivist to connectivist paradigms have fundamentally reshaped research methodologies in the field. The review identifies methodological strengths, persistent weaknesses, and critical gaps in current EdTech research, proposing a paradigm-conscious methodological framework that aligns research approaches with underlying philosophical assumptions about learning, technology, and educational management. Drawing on sources spanning 2010–2025, the analysis documents the emergence of design-based research, learning analytics, mixed methods, and AI-enhanced approaches while identifying concerning patterns including theoretical thinness, paradigm-method incoherence, quality limitations, and the systematic overestimation of technology effects. The review contributes a comprehensive mapping of paradigm-methodology relationships, a comparative analysis of contemporary methodological approaches, quality criteria across research traditions, and practical guidelines for paradigm-coherent research practice. Implications for researchers, doctoral training, and the field's methodological development are discussed, with an emphasis on achieving "principled diversity" – the embrace of multiple approaches united by shared commitments to rigour, transparency, and the improvement of technology-enhanced learning.

Keywords: educational technology, research methodology, paradigm coherence, design-based research, learning analytics, mixed methods, methodological quality, ICT integration, narrative review

1. Introduction

The methodological landscape of educational technology research has undergone a profound transformation over the past three decades. What began as a field dominated by experimental designs borrowed from psychology and instructional science has evolved into a methodologically pluralistic domain, encompassing design-based research, learning analytics, mixed-methods inquiry, and computational approaches that would have been unimaginable to earlier generations of researchers. This evolution reflects not merely technical advancement but fundamental shifts in how the research community conceptualises learning, technology, and the relationship between the two.

The significance of examining this methodological evolution extends beyond academic historiography. Research methodology is never neutral; it embodies assumptions about what counts as knowledge, how knowledge can be generated, and what questions are worth asking [14, 46]. The methods researchers choose shape what they can see and, consequently, what findings emerge

0000-0002-6001-5672 (O. Yu. Tarasova); 0000-0003-2558-6805 (O. L. Pinska); 0000-0001-6432-2154 (H. I. Alieka); 0000-0002-3559-6081 (N. V. Moiseienko)
e.ju.tarasova@kdpu.edu.ua (O. Yu. Tarasova); pinskayaklava@gmail.com (O. L. Pinska); galina.ivanova.2308@gmail.com (H. I. Alieka); n.v.moiseenko@gmail.com (N. V. Moiseienko)
https://kdpu.edu.ua/personal/oyutarasova.html (O. Yu. Tarasova); https://kdpu.edu.ua/personal/opinska.html (O. L. Pinska); https://kdpu.edu.ua/personal/halyna_alieka.html (H. I. Alieka); https://kdpu.edu.ua/personal/nvmoiseienko.html (N. V. Moiseienko)

Received	Accepted	Published	Version of record
2025-09-02	2025-10-24	2025-10-25	2026-03-21

to inform educational practice and policy. When methodological choices are made unreflectively or when methods are borrowed without attention to their underlying assumptions, the resulting research may produce findings that are internally inconsistent, practically misleading, or theoretically impoverished.

Educational technology research faces particular methodological challenges. The field sits at the intersection of multiple disciplines – education, psychology, computer science, information systems, and learning sciences – each bringing its own methodological traditions and quality criteria [60]. The technologies under study evolve rapidly, often outpacing researchers' ability to develop appropriate methods for their investigation. The contexts in which educational technologies are deployed are extraordinarily complex, involving interactions among learners, teachers, content, tools, and institutional structures that resist being reduced to simple cause-and-effect relationships. These challenges make methodological sophistication not merely desirable but essential.

This narrative review critically examines the methodological evolution of educational technology research through the lens of shifting educational paradigms. Rather than cataloguing methods in isolation, the review traces how transformations in underlying assumptions about learning – from behaviourist to constructivist to connectivist frameworks – have reshaped what counts as an appropriate research methodology in the field. This paradigm-sensitive approach enables a deeper understanding of why certain methods have gained prominence, why methodological debates persist, and how researchers might navigate the current pluralistic landscape more effectively.

The review addresses five interrelated research questions:

RQ1: How have research methodologies in educational technology evolved in alignment with shifting educational paradigms from 2010–2024?

RQ2: What is the relationship between researchers' paradigmatic orientations and their methodological choices in ICT-in-education studies?

RQ3: How do psychological frameworks for understanding learning influence methodological decisions in EdTech research?

RQ4: What methodological innovations are emerging to address the complexity of technology-enhanced educational process management?

RQ5: What methodological guidelines can be derived for future paradigm-coherent EdTech research?

The review encompasses educational technology research published between 2010 and 2024, with a particular focus on methodological developments, debates, and innovations. This timeframe captures the maturation of design-based research as a recognised methodology, the emergence of learning analytics as a distinct field, the growing adoption of mixed methods approaches, and the initial integration of artificial intelligence into research practice. The review draws on Scopus AI analytics to identify patterns across the literature while engaging deeply with methodological discussions in key sources.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 describes the review methodology, including the Scopus AI query framework and analytical approach. Section 3 traces the historical evolution of research methods from behaviourist through constructivist and connectivist paradigms. Section 4 examines relationships between paradigmatic orientations and methodological choices, including problems of paradigm-method incoherence. Section 5 analyses contemporary methodological approaches, including design-based research, mixed methods, learning analytics, and AI-enhanced methods. Section 6 addresses methodological quality and rigor across traditions. Section 7 synthesises findings and proposes guidelines for paradigm-coherent research. Section 8 offers conclusions and directions for future methodological development.

2. Review methodology

2.1. Narrative review approach

This study employs a narrative review methodology, selected for its capacity to synthesise diverse literature, trace conceptual developments over time, and generate integrative frameworks [25]. Unlike systematic reviews that prioritise exhaustive retrieval and standardised quality assessment, narrative reviews enable the reviewer to weave together disparate strands of scholarship into coherent accounts that illuminate patterns, tensions, and trajectories within a field. This approach is particularly suited to methodological analysis, where the goal is not to aggregate effect sizes but to understand how and why research practices have evolved over time.

The narrative approach adopted here follows established principles for rigorous narrative synthesis [22]. The review is guided by explicit research questions that focus attention on the relationships between paradigm and methodology. Source selection, although not exhaustive, is systematic and transparent, utilising Scopus AI analytics to identify relevant literature within the specified timeframe. Analysis proceeds through iterative engagement with sources, identifying themes, contradictions, and developmental patterns. The resulting synthesis aims for interpretive depth rather than comprehensive coverage, prioritising understanding over enumeration.

2.2. Scopus AI query framework

The review leverages Scopus AI's analytical capabilities to identify and analyse relevant literature. Scopus AI enables natural language queries that retrieve not only matching documents but also AI-generated summaries of research patterns, methodological trends, and conceptual developments across the indexed literature. This capability supplements traditional database searching by surfacing patterns that might not be apparent from individual article reviews.

Table 1 presents the structured query framework employed in this review. Queries were organised in layers, progressing from broad, foundational questions to specific, methodological, and quality-focused inquiries. This layered approach ensured coverage of the field's methodological landscape while enabling focused investigation of particular approaches and concerns.

Table 1
Scopus AI query framework for methodological analysis

Layer	Focus	Representative queries
1	Foundational	Methodological approaches in educational technology research; evolution of research methods in ICT in education
2	Paradigm-specific	Constructivist research methodologies in EdTech; connectivist approaches to studying networked learning; post-positivist experimental designs
3	Method-specific	Design-based research evolution and debates; mixed methods integration strategies; learning analytics methodological frameworks
4	Quality & Rigor	Validity and reliability in EdTech research; replication and reproducibility; ethical considerations in learning analytics
5	Innovation	AI-enhanced research methods; multimodal learning analytics; computational approaches to educational research
6	Synthesis	Methodological recommendations and guidelines; future directions for EdTech research methodology

2.3. Source selection and analysis

Sources were selected based on relevance to the research questions, methodological focus, and contribution to understanding paradigm-methodology relationships. Priority was given to methodological reviews, meta-analyses examining research quality, theoretical discussions of research paradigms in educational contexts, and empirical studies that exemplify or critically examine particular methodological approaches. The timeframe of 2010–2024 was selected to capture the contemporary methodological landscape while providing sufficient historical depth to trace evolutionary patterns.

Analysis proceeded through multiple readings of selected sources, with attention to explicit methodological discussions, implicit paradigmatic assumptions, and connections to broader debates about research quality and purpose in educational technology. Themes were identified inductively from the literature and organised according to the analytical framework described above. The resulting synthesis represents the author's interpretation of patterns and developments, informed by but not mechanically derived from the source material.

2.4. Limitations of the approach

Several limitations of the review methodology should be acknowledged. The reliance on Scopus-indexed literature may underrepresent work published in regional journals, edited volumes, or conference proceedings not captured in this database. The narrative approach, while enabling integrative synthesis, involves interpretive judgments that another reviewer might make differently. The rapid evolution of educational technology research means that some developments, particularly in AI-enhanced methods, may have advanced since the literature analysed here was published. These limitations are addressed through transparent reporting of methods and acknowledgement of the review's interpretive character.

3. Historical evolution of research methods

3.1. Behaviorist foundations (pre-2000)

The methodological foundations of educational technology research were established during an era dominated by behaviourist learning theory. This paradigm, with its emphasis on observable behaviour change, stimulus-response relationships, and measurable outcomes, naturally aligned with experimental and quasi-experimental research designs borrowed from psychology [7]. The technology of the era – programmed instruction, computer-aided instruction, and early multimedia systems – was itself designed according to behaviourist principles, creating a harmonious relationship between the phenomena under study and the methods used to study them.

Research during this period typically employed controlled experimental designs that compared technology-based instruction with traditional methods. Dependent variables focused on learning outcomes operationalised as test performance, time to mastery, or error rates. The methodological ideal was the randomised controlled trial, with internal validity prioritised over ecological considerations. This approach generated a substantial body of literature on the effectiveness of various instructional technologies. However, critics would later note that the research often addressed questions of limited practical significance, while obscuring the complexity of real educational contexts.

The behaviourist methodological paradigm established patterns that persist in a modified form today. The emphasis on quantification, controlled comparison, and outcome measurement remains influential, even as the theoretical frameworks justifying these approaches have been largely superseded. Understanding this legacy is essential for interpreting contemporary methodological debates, as many current tensions reflect the incomplete transition from behaviourist to post-behaviourist research paradigms.

3.2. Constructivist transformation (2000–2015)

The ascendance of constructivist learning theory fundamentally challenged the methodological assumptions of behaviourist research. Constructivism, with its emphasis on learner agency, meaning-making, social interaction, and situated cognition, required methods capable of capturing processes that experimental designs were not designed to address [63]. If learning is understood as active construction rather than passive reception, then research must attend to how learners interpret, negotiate, and transform their encounters with technology – phenomena not reducible to treatment effects on standardised outcomes.

This theoretical shift catalysed methodological diversification. Qualitative methods – case studies, ethnography, phenomenological inquiry – gained legitimacy as means of accessing learner experience and meaning-making processes. Design-based research emerged as a methodology specifically suited to constructivist inquiry, combining intervention development with theoretical investigation through iterative cycles of design, implementation, analysis, and redesign [3]. Mixed methods approaches gained prominence as researchers sought to combine the explanatory power of qualitative inquiry with the generalizability claims of quantitative research.

Table 2 summarises key methodological shifts associated with the constructivist transformation. The table illustrates how changes in theoretical assumptions about learning translated into changes in research questions, methods, and quality criteria.

Table 2
Methodological shifts from behaviourist to constructivist paradigms.

Dimension	Behaviorist paradigm	Constructivist paradigm
Learning conception	Behaviour change through reinforcement	Meaning construction through activity
Research questions	Does technology X improve outcome Y?	How do learners experience and make meaning with technology?
Preferred methods	Experimental/quasi-experimental designs	Case studies, DBR, ethnography, mixed methods
Data sources	Test scores, behavioral measures	Observations, interviews, artifacts, process data
Analysis approach	Statistical comparison of groups	Thematic analysis, grounded theory, iterative interpretation
Quality criteria	Internal validity, reliability, generalizability	Credibility, transferability, authenticity, catalytic validity

3.3. Connectivist and network perspectives (2010–present)

The emergence of connectivism as a learning theory for the digital age introduced additional methodological considerations [21, 51]. Connectivism posits that learning resides in networks of connections – among people, information sources, and digital resources – and that the capacity to form and traverse these connections is more important than the content residing in any individual node. This networked ontology of learning requires methods that can capture relational structures, information flows, and network dynamics, which traditional individualistic methods cannot address.

Social network analysis has gained prominence as a method suited to connectivist research questions. By mapping and measuring relationships among learners, instructors, content, and resources, network analysis can reveal patterns of connection, influence, and knowledge flow that remain invisible to methods focused on individual outcomes [30]. Learning analytics, with its capacity to capture digital traces of networked activity, provides the data substrate for network-oriented investigation. Computational methods, including data mining, natural language processing, and machine learning, enable analysis at scales that manual methods cannot achieve.

Table 3 traces the evolution of dominant research methods across paradigmatic eras, illustrating how theoretical shifts have been accompanied by methodological transformation.

Table 3
Evolution of research methods across paradigmatic eras.

Era	Dominant paradigm	Primary methods	Emerging innovations
Pre-2000	Behaviorist	Experimental, quasi-experimental	Meta-analysis, effect size reporting
2000–2010	Constructivist	Case study, DBR, mixed methods	Formative experiments, participatory design
2010–2020	Constructivist/ Connectivist	Learning analytics, SNA, DBR	Educational data mining, process mining
2020–Present	Pluralistic	Multimodal LA, AI-enhanced, computational	Generative AI methods, automated analysis

3.4. The contemporary pluralistic landscape

Contemporary educational technology research operates within a methodologically pluralistic landscape where no single paradigm or method commands universal assent. This pluralism reflects both the field's maturation and its persistent tensions. Researchers draw on experimental traditions, interpretivist approaches, critical methodologies, and computational methods, sometimes within single studies that combine multiple approaches [34]. Professional associations and journals have become more accepting of methodological diversity, though debates about quality standards and appropriate methods for particular questions continue.

This pluralism presents both opportunities and challenges. Methodological diversity enables the investigation of educational technology from multiple angles, potentially generating a richer and more complete understanding than any single approach could provide. However, pluralism also creates confusion about quality standards, enables paradigm-method incoherence, and can fragment the field into methodological silos that do not communicate effectively. The challenge for contemporary researchers is to navigate this pluralistic landscape thoughtfully, selecting and combining methods in ways that are coherent with their theoretical commitments and appropriate to their research questions.

4. Paradigm-methodology relationships

4.1. Theoretical framework for paradigm-method relationships

Research paradigms encompass fundamental assumptions about the nature of reality (ontology), the process of generating knowledge (epistemology), and the values that should guide inquiry (axiology). These assumptions are not merely philosophical abstractions; they have concrete methodological implications, shaping what questions researchers ask, what methods they consider appropriate, what counts as evidence, and how findings are interpreted [14, 46]. Understanding the relationships between paradigm and methodology is essential for conducting coherent research and evaluating the work of others.

Four major paradigmatic traditions operate within educational technology research, each carrying distinctive methodological implications. Post-positivism, while acknowledging that perfect objectivity is unattainable, maintains commitment to empirical investigation, hypothesis testing, and the pursuit of generalisable knowledge through controlled inquiry. Constructivist-interpretivist approaches foreground the constructed nature of knowledge and emphasise the importance of understanding phenomena from participants' perspectives. Connectivism extends constructivist insights to networked digital environments, emphasising distributed knowledge and collective intelligence. Critical-transformative approaches attend to power, equity, and social justice, treating research as a means of emancipation rather than merely description. The boundaries among these traditions are permeable, and many researchers operate pragmatically across paradigmatic lines, but each tradition carries implications for methodological choice that researchers should consider explicitly.

4.2. Post-positivist approaches

Post-positivist research in educational technology seeks to establish causal relationships between technology interventions and learning outcomes through systematic empirical investigation. Randomised controlled trials represent the methodological gold standard within this tradition, offering the strongest warrant for causal inference when properly implemented [16]. Quasi-experimental designs provide alternatives when randomisation is impractical, employing techniques such as propensity score matching, regression discontinuity, and difference-in-differences to approximate experimental conditions [12, 43].

Contemporary post-positivist research has grown more sophisticated in addressing the limitations of earlier work. Multilevel modelling addresses the nested structure of educational data, recognising that students cluster within classrooms and classrooms within schools. Treatment heterogeneity analysis explores variation in intervention effects across subgroups, moving beyond average effects to understand for whom and under what conditions technologies are most beneficial. Implementation science frameworks attend to fidelity and adaptation, recognising that the gap between efficacy under controlled conditions and effectiveness in authentic practice is substantial [31].

However, post-positivist approaches face persistent challenges in educational technology contexts. Randomisation is often impractical due to ethical concerns, institutional constraints, or the nature of technology implementations. The "black box" problem – demonstrating that technology works without understanding how or why – limits theoretical contribution. Outcome measures may fail to capture the distinctive affordances of technology-enhanced learning. These limitations have motivated the development of alternative approaches while not eliminating the value of well-designed experimental and quasi-experimental research for questions amenable to such methods.

4.3. Constructivist-interpretivist approaches

Constructivist-interpretivist research in educational technology foregrounds meaning, context, and the active role of learners in constructing knowledge through their engagement with technology [63]. Case study methodology has proven particularly valuable, enabling rich, contextualised understanding of how technology integration unfolds in particular settings. Design-based research bridges theory and practice through iterative cycles of design, implementation, analysis, and redesign, generating both practical innovations and theoretical insights [58].

Ethnographic and phenomenological methods offer access to dimensions of technology-enhanced learning that quantitative approaches cannot capture. Digital ethnography extends traditional ethnographic methods to online environments, attending to the cultural dimensions of technology use and the meanings participants attach to their digital practices. Phenomenological inquiry explores the lived experience of learning with technology, surfacing aspects of engagement, frustration, discovery, and transformation that standardised measures would miss. These approaches require substantial investment of time and interpretive skill but yield insights unavailable through other means.

The strengths of constructivist-interpretivist approaches – depth of understanding, attention to context, and respect for participant perspectives – come with corresponding limitations. Generalizability beyond the immediate study context is constrained by design. The interpretive nature of analysis introduces researcher subjectivity that must be managed through reflexivity and transparency. Time and resource demands may limit sample sizes and study duration. These limitations do not invalidate constructivist-interpretivist research; rather, they define the types of claims it can warrant.

4.4. Connectivist research approaches

Connectivism's emphasis on networked knowledge and distributed learning calls for methodological approaches capable of capturing relational structures and collective processes [51]. Social network analysis has emerged as a primary method, enabling researchers to map interaction patterns, identify influential nodes, and track the evolution of networks over time. Studies of massive open online courses (MOOCs) have employed network analysis to understand how learning communities form, how information flows among participants, and how network position relates to learning outcomes [30].

Learning analytics provides the computational infrastructure for connectivist research at scale. Process mining reveals patterns in learning pathways that aggregate data obscures. Natural language processing enables analysis of discourse in forums, chat, and collaborative documents. Predictive modelling identifies students at risk of disconnection from learning networks. These computational approaches require technical expertise beyond traditional educational research training but offer capabilities matched to the networked phenomena that connectivism foregrounds.

Digital ethnography complements computational methods by providing interpretive depth about the meaning of connection and the experience of networked learning. Researchers may combine network analysis of interaction patterns with qualitative investigation of how participants understand and navigate their networks. This methodological pluralism – characteristic of the most sophisticated connectivist research – recognises that quantitative network measures and qualitative meaning-making illuminate different aspects of the same phenomena.

4.5. Critical and transformative approaches

Critical and transformative approaches to educational technology research address questions of power, equity, and social justice that other paradigms may overlook. These approaches recognise that technologies are never neutral; they embody assumptions, enable certain practices while constraining others, and may reproduce or challenge existing inequalities. Research from critical perspectives examines who benefits from educational technologies, whose knowledge is privileged, and how technology might be designed and deployed to promote more equitable educational outcomes.

Participatory action research, critical discourse analysis, and critical ethnography offer methodological resources for critical investigation. Participatory approaches engage marginalised communities as co-researchers rather than subjects, centring their knowledge and priorities in the research process. Critical discourse analysis examines how language in and around educational technologies constructs particular understandings while marginalising alternatives. Critical ethnography examines the cultural politics of technology implementation, focusing on resistance, appropriation, and transformation.

Despite their importance, critical approaches remain underrepresented in educational technology research relative to post-positivist and constructivist traditions. This underrepresentation may reflect the field's historical ties to computer science and psychology, disciplines less influenced by critical theory than sociology or cultural studies. It may also reflect publication and funding biases that favour research demonstrating the effectiveness of technology over research examining technology's role in reproducing inequality. Expanding the methodological repertoire of educational technology research to include more critical approaches is essential for addressing the equity implications of technology-enhanced learning.

4.6. Mapping paradigm-method relationships

Table 4 synthesises the relationships between paradigmatic orientations and methodological choices discussed in this section. The table is intended as a heuristic rather than a rigid classification; methodological innovation often occurs at paradigmatic boundaries, and pragmatic researchers may draw on multiple traditions within single studies. Nevertheless, awareness of these relationships can inform more coherent research designs and more accurate evaluations of research quality.

Table 4
Paradigm-method alignment in educational technology research.

Dimension	Post-positivist	Constructivist	Connectivist	Critical
Ontology	Objective reality, probabilistic	Constructed, multiple realities	Networked, distributed	Shaped by power relations
Epistemology	Modified objectivist	Subjectivist, transactional	Collective, emergent	Ideological, political
Axiology	Value-neutral inquiry	Value-laden, reflexive	Participatory, open	Emancipatory, transformative
Core methods	RCT, quasi-experimental, survey	Case study, DBR, ethnography	SNA, LA, digital ethnography	PAR, CDA, critical ethnography
Validity criteria	Internal, external, construct validity	Credibility, transferability, dependability	Network validity, scalability	Catalytic validity, fairness
Typical questions	Does X cause Y?	How do participants experience X?	How do networks of X form and function?	Who benefits/suffers from X?

Note. RCT = randomized controlled trial; DBR = design-based research; SNA = social network analysis; LA = learning analytics; PAR = participatory action research; CDA = critical discourse analysis.

4.7. The problem of paradigm-method incoherence

A persistent concern in educational technology research is the disconnect between stated theoretical or paradigmatic positions and actual methodological practices. Researchers may invoke constructivist frameworks while employing measurement approaches – standardised tests, Likert-scale surveys, and behavioural metrics – that embody post-positivist assumptions about objectivity and quantification. Conversely, researchers claiming post-positivist orientations may lack the experimental controls or sample sizes needed to warrant causal claims. This paradigm-method incoherence undermines validity across paradigms: constructivist claims lose credibility when supported by methods that contradict constructivist epistemology, while post-positivist claims are weakened by designs that fail to meet the standards of post-positivism.

Several factors contribute to paradigm-method incoherence. Doctoral training may emphasise methods over paradigms, producing researchers skilled in techniques but unclear about the assumptions those techniques embody. Publication pressures may encourage researchers to employ methods perceived as more publishable regardless of paradigmatic fit. Accountability systems in education often require outcome data that prompt researchers toward quantitative methods, even when their theoretical commitments suggest alternatives. Interdisciplinary borrowing of methods without attention to the paradigmatic contexts from which they come can produce incoherent combinations.

Addressing paradigm-method incoherence requires what might be called "methodological consciousness" – explicit attention to the assumptions underlying different approaches and deliberate alignment of methods with theoretical commitments [26]. This does not mean that researchers must achieve perfect paradigmatic purity or avoid mixed methods approaches. Instead, it means that paradigmatic tensions should be acknowledged and addressed rather than ignored, and that method selection should be justified in relation to research questions and theoretical frameworks rather than convention or convenience.

4.8. Toward paradigm pluralism

Educational technology research would be impoverished if confined to any single paradigm. Each tradition contributes essential insights: post-positivism offers systematic investigation of intervention effects, constructivism illuminates meaning-making and lived experience, connectivism captures network dynamics, and critical approaches attend to power and equity. The question is not which paradigm is correct but how researchers can work productively across paradigms while maintaining the coherence necessary for valid knowledge claims.

Mixed-methods research represents one approach to productive paradigm pluralism, although achieving genuine integration rather than parallel analyses remains challenging [34]. Sophisticated mixed methods studies do not merely combine quantitative and qualitative components, but articulate the relationships between them – using qualitative findings to explain quantitative patterns, or quantitative findings to assess the transferability of qualitative insights. This requires clarity about the epistemological status of different data types and the logic by which they can be combined.

Pragmatist approaches offer another path, subordinating paradigmatic commitments to practical problem-solving [18]. From a pragmatist perspective, methods are tools to be selected based on their fitness for particular purposes rather than their alignment with philosophical positions. This orientation can liberate researchers from paradigmatic constraints while risking the coherence problems that attention to paradigm helps avoid. Pragmatic pluralism may be most viable when researchers maintain awareness of paradigmatic issues even while declining to resolve them theoretically.

The path forward requires neither paradigmatic uniformity nor uncritical pluralism. Rather, it requires methodological consciousness – explicit attention to the assumptions underlying different approaches and a deliberate alignment of methods with theoretical commitments. The following sections examine specific contemporary methodological approaches in greater detail before turning to questions of quality, rigour, and practical guidelines for paradigm-coherent research.

5. Contemporary methodological approaches

The contemporary methodological landscape in educational technology research reflects both the field's maturation and its ongoing struggles with complexity, integration, and paradigmatic coherence. This section examines five methodological approaches that have gained particular prominence in recent years: design-based research, mixed methods research, learning analytics and educational data mining, AI-enhanced research methods, and multimodal learning analytics. Each approach addresses specific limitations of traditional methods while introducing new possibilities and challenges for investigating technology-enhanced learning.

5.1. Design-based research: evolution and current practice

Design-based research (DBR) has emerged as a signature methodology in educational technology, offering a systematic approach to developing and studying innovations in authentic educational contexts. Originally articulated in the early 2000s as an alternative to laboratory experiments and one-shot interventions, DBR has evolved substantially over two decades of application across K-12 education, higher education, and teacher professional development [11, 58]. The methodology's core commitment – to iterative cycles of design, implementation, analysis, and redesign conducted in partnership with practitioners – remains constant, but understandings of how to conduct rigorous DBR have become increasingly sophisticated.

Contemporary DBR practice reflects lessons learned from extensive application. Systematic reviews document how the methodology has been deployed across diverse educational settings, revealing both productive patterns and persistent challenges [58]. The interventionist nature of DBR, involving design and implementation of innovations aimed at improving educational practices, distinguishes it from purely descriptive research. Iterative cycles allow researchers to refine interventions based on real-world feedback, embodying the constructivist principle that knowledge emerges through experience and reflection. Collaboration among researchers, educators, and stakeholders ensures relevance and applicability, while the goal of theory development elevates DBR beyond mere problem-solving to contribute to generalisable understanding [54].

Recent developments in DBR methodology include increased attention to scalability and the challenge of moving from successful local interventions to broader impact [19]. This attention to scale reflects the practical orientation of educational technology; interventions that work in single classrooms or institutions have limited value if they cannot be adapted for broader implementation. Nevertheless, the push toward scalability creates tension with DBR's contextual sensitivity. Researchers have noted that orienting focus toward generalizability potentially endangers the "designerly nature" of DBR by subordinating an understanding of how and why learning occurs in specific contexts to concerns about replicability across contexts [54].

Despite its prominence, DBR faces ongoing critiques regarding rigour, generalizability, and theoretical contribution. Critics argue that the methodology's flexible and adaptive nature compromises methodological rigour, while the absence of standardised procedures creates difficulties in evaluating and comparing studies [36, 65]. The context-specific nature of DBR interventions raises questions about transferability; what works in one setting may not work in another, and the highly contextualised nature of findings limits their generalizability. Additionally, while DBR aims to produce both practical and theoretical outcomes, the emphasis on real-world applicability sometimes overshadows theoretical contributions, leading to incremental practical improvements without corresponding advances in understanding. These tensions remain productive areas for methodological development.

5.2. Mixed methods research in educational technology

Mixed methods research (MMR) offers a powerful approach to understanding the complex phenomena of educational technology by combining quantitative and qualitative traditions within single studies or coordinated research programs. The philosophical justification for MMR rests on the complementarity of paradigms; rather than viewing quantitative and qualitative approaches as incompatible, pragmatist and dialectical perspectives recognise that different methods illuminate different facets of educational reality [41]. For educational technology research, where questions span from intervention effectiveness to user experience to implementation dynamics, mixed methods can provide a more comprehensive understanding than either tradition alone.

Despite its theoretical promise, mixed methods research remains underrepresented in educational technology. A comprehensive prevalence study examining 2,380 articles from top educational technology journals between 2018 and 2022 found that only 12% employed mixed methods – the smallest proportion compared to quantitative, qualitative, and non-empirical studies [34]. More troubling, 64% of studies employing mixed methods approaches did not self-identify as such, revealing gaps in methodological understanding. Among studies that self-identify, 68% failed to specify the type of core mixed methods approach used. These findings suggest that educational technology researchers may be combining methods without adequate attention to the methodological considerations that distinguish rigorous MMR from mere juxtaposition of quantitative and qualitative elements.

Integration represents the central challenge and defining feature of quality mixed methods research. Integration involves the purposeful combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches at multiple stages: design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation [39, 66]. Visual joint displays have emerged as particularly valuable integration tools, enabling researchers to bring quantitative and qualitative findings into direct dialogue [45]. Core mixed methods designs provide structured frameworks for combining approaches. Convergent designs collect data simultaneously, explanatory sequential designs use qualitative methods to explain quantitative findings, and exploratory sequential designs use qualitative inquiry to inform quantitative investigations [29].

5.3. Learning analytics and educational data mining

Learning analytics (LA) and educational data mining (EDM) represent methodological innovations that leverage the data-intensive nature of contemporary educational technology. Both fields emerged in the early 2010s as digital learning environments began generating unprecedented volumes of interaction data – clickstreams, submission patterns, forum participation, and assessment responses – that could inform an understanding of learning processes and outcomes [5]. While LA and EDM share interests and methods, they have developed somewhat distinct orientations: EDM emphasises automated discovery of patterns through computational techniques, while LA foregrounds understanding and optimisation of learning and learning environments, often with greater attention to stakeholder involvement and practical application.

Methodological frameworks in learning analytics research continue to evolve. The closed-loop framework integrates data collection, processing, analysis, adaptivity, and personalisation, emphasising the interplay between technological capabilities and educational theory [49]. The technical repertoire of LA and EDM has expanded substantially. Classification algorithms – decision trees, random forests, support vector machines, neural networks – are employed to predict student performance, identify at-risk learners, and categorise learning behaviours [23, 37]. Clustering techniques group learners based on their interaction patterns, enabling the identification of learning strategies and behavioural profiles. Natural language processing enables the analysis of discourse in discussion forums, essays, and other types of text data.

The proliferation of LA interventions has prompted a systematic examination of their effectiveness. Reviews of experimental studies employing learning analytics-based interventions have found that student-facing dashboards are the most common intervention type [56]. Several unique methodological considerations attend learning analytics research, including interdisciplinarity, ethical and privacy concerns, alignment with theoretical frameworks, and data quality [20, 47].

5.4. AI-enhanced research methods

Artificial intelligence is increasingly enhancing research methodologies in educational technology, offering new capabilities for data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Machine learning, natural language processing, and automated analysis tools are transforming how researchers study technology-enhanced learning, enabling investigations at scales and with granularities previously impossible [32]. These AI-enhanced methods simultaneously serve as research tools and as objects of study, reflecting the recursive relationship between educational technology and its methods.

Machine learning applications in EdTech research extend beyond the predictive modelling characteristic of learning analytics, encompassing a broader range of applications. ML algorithms are being employed to automate qualitative coding, reducing the time and subjectivity involved in analysing large text corpora [64]. Natural language processing has become particularly prominent, enabling automated analysis of discussion forum discourse, essay responses, and other text data at scales that would overwhelm manual analysis [42]. AI-enhanced assessment represents a methodological domain with both research and practical implications, with automated systems providing immediate feedback while generating fine-grained data about student performance [35, 61].

The emergence of generative AI introduces new methodological possibilities and challenges. Large language models can serve as research assistants, supporting literature review, data analysis, and draft writing [33]. However, these same technologies raise questions about research integrity, as the boundary between AI assistance and AI authorship becomes difficult to discern.

5.5. Multimodal learning analytics

Multimodal learning analytics (MMLA) represents an emerging frontier that integrates multiple data streams to develop richer understandings of learning processes. Traditional learning analytics typically focus on digital trace data – log files, clickstreams, timestamps – capturing what learners do within technology platforms. MMLA extends this approach by incorporating physiological sensors (such as eye-tracking, heart rate, and electrodermal activity), video and audio recordings, spatial positioning, and self-report data [49]. The integration of these diverse data types aims to capture the cognitive, affective, and embodied dimensions of learning that single-modality approaches often overlook.

The methodological complexity of MMLA is substantial. Synchronising data streams with different temporal resolutions, handling missing data across modalities, and developing analytic approaches that meaningfully integrate heterogeneous data types all present technical challenges. Privacy concerns intensify when physiological and video data are collected, necessitating robust ethical frameworks and data governance procedures. Despite these challenges, MMLA offers unique methodological advantages for understanding learning in technology-rich environments, particularly in the study of embodied learning, collaborative problem-solving, and learning in immersive environments.

Table 5 synthesises the contemporary methodological approaches examined in this section, comparing their core characteristics, strengths, limitations, and typical applications. The approaches are not mutually exclusive; learning analytics can be integrated into design-based research, mixed-methods studies may employ AI-enhanced analysis, and multimodal data collection can inform multiple methodological traditions.

Table 5
Comparative analysis of contemporary methodological approaches.

Approach	Core characteristic	Primary strengths	Key limitations	Typical applications
Design-based research	Iterative design–implement–analyze cycles	Ecological validity; practical relevance; theory–practice integration	Generalizability concerns; resource intensive; rigor debates	Intervention development; curriculum innovation; technology design
Mixed methods	Integration of QUAN + QUAL	Comprehensive understanding; triangulation; explanatory depth	Integration challenges; paradigm tensions; expertise demands	Implementation studies; user experience; complex phenomena
Learning analytics	Data-intensive computational analysis	Scale; objectivity; pattern discovery; real-time feedback	Privacy concerns; theoretical grounding; technical barriers	Predictive modeling; behavior analysis; adaptive systems
AI-enhanced methods	ML/NLP automation of research tasks	Efficiency; scale; novel capabilities; consistency	Validity concerns; bias; interpretability; skill requirements	Automated coding; text analysis; assessment; synthesis
Multimodal LA	Integration of multiple data streams	Rich process data; triangulation; embodied learning capture	Technical complexity; privacy; synchronization; interpretation	Collaborative learning; immersive environments; affective computing

Note. QUAN = quantitative; QUAL = qualitative; ML = machine learning; NLP = natural language processing; LA = learning analytics.

6. Methodological quality and rigour

Evaluating research quality in educational technology requires frameworks sensitive to the diverse methodological traditions operating within the field. The methodological trinity of validity, reliability, and generalizability has traditionally anchored quality assessment in quantitative research [59]. Validity concerns whether research measures what it claims to measure, reliability addresses the consistency of results across occasions and conditions, and generalizability refers to the extent to which findings apply beyond the immediate study context. In educational technology research employing experimental or quasi-experimental designs, internal validity is paramount, while construct validity is particularly challenging given the complexity of learning outcomes [12].

Qualitative research traditions have developed alternative frameworks centred on trustworthiness rather than validity in the quantitative sense. Lincoln and Guba's foundational criteria – credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability – remain influential, though scholars have proposed expansions including authenticity, rigour, fairness, equity, consistency, defensibility, and adequacy of data [2, 17, 38, 57]. Mixed methods research faces the challenge of satisfying quality criteria from both traditions while also attending to the quality of integration [9].

Systematic reviews and methodological critiques have documented recurring quality problems in educational technology research. Theoretical problems are among the most frequently cited limitations; studies often lack solid theoretical foundations, making it difficult to situate findings within broader frameworks [48]. Measurement and design problems compound theoretical weaknesses, including over-reliance on surveys, misalignment of outcome measures, and overlooked hierarchical data structures [8, 15].

A particularly concerning pattern involves the overestimation of technology effects in meta-analytic syntheses. Analysis of meta-analysis quality revealed that methodological and reporting quality were negatively related to the average effect size: higher-quality meta-analyses reported smaller effects [55]. This pattern suggests that the field's evidence base has been systematically biased upward by poor-quality research.

The state of replication and reproducibility in educational technology reflects broader concerns about the credibility of research. Reviews find replication studies comprising less than 1% of published articles [44]. Most replications are conceptual rather than direct, and replications with author overlap are more likely to succeed than independent replications.

Open science practices are gaining traction but remain far from universal. At major conferences, adoption rates remain low. Barriers include low professional incentives, lack of training, intervention complexity, and privacy concerns about learner data.

Educational technology research raises distinctive ethical considerations. Data privacy is the most prominent concern, with learning analytics relying on detailed information about learner behaviour [6, 27]. Informed consent presents challenges in digital environments, especially with minors [13, 24]. Algorithmic fairness has emerged as algorithms may perpetuate or amplify existing biases [1, 53]. Some institutions have established Digital Ethics Officers, though such roles remain uncommon [4].

Table 6 synthesises quality criteria across methodological traditions, providing a framework for assessment that respects paradigmatic differences while enabling cross-tradition evaluation.

7. Discussion and guidelines

This narrative review has traced the methodological evolution of educational technology research from its behaviourist origins through constructivist and connectivist developments to the current pluralistic landscape. Several cross-cutting themes emerge. First, methodological diversity has expanded substantially. Second, despite methodological proliferation, significant quality concerns persist. Third, the relationship between paradigmatic orientations and methodological choices remains problematic. Fourth, emerging technologies simultaneously serve as research tools and research objects, creating recursive complexity.

Table 6
Quality criteria across methodological traditions (synthesized from Tobin and Begley [59], Alonzo and Teng [2], and Biddix and Bourke [9]).

Quality dimension	Quantitative tradition	Qualitative tradition	Mixed methods
Core concept	Validity, reliability	Trustworthiness, rigor	Integration quality
Truth value	Internal validity; statistical conclusion validity	Credibility; authenticity	Legitimation; confirmatory inference quality
Applicability	External validity; generalizability	Transferability; thick description	Inference transferability; interpretive consistency
Consistency	Reliability; replicability	Dependability; audit trail	Consistency across strands; procedural rigor
Neutrality	Objectivity; researcher detachment	Confirmability; reflexivity	Integration authenticity; balanced reporting
Enhancement strategies	Random assignment; blinding; large samples	Member checking; prolonged engagement; triangulation	Joint displays; meta-inference; legitimation strategies

Drawing on the preceding analysis, table 7 proposes a framework for strengthening methodological practice. The framework emphasises paradigm coherence, methodological transparency, and quality enhancement while respecting legitimate diversity.

Table 7
Framework for paradigm-coherent methodology in educational technology research.

Research phase	Key principles	Implementation strategies
Conceptualization	Explicit paradigmatic positioning; theoretical grounding; research question alignment	Articulate ontological, epistemological, and axiological commitments; situate study within established theoretical frameworks
Design	Method-paradigm coherence; appropriate complexity; ecological validity	Select methods consistent with paradigmatic commitments; match design sophistication to research questions
Data collection	Systematic procedures; ethical compliance; quality assurance	Lincoln and Guba's foundational criteria – credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability – remain influential, though scholars have proposed expansions including authenticity, rigor, fairness, equity, consistency, defensibility, and adequacy of data; document protocols thoroughly; address privacy and consent proactively
Analysis	Analytic-paradigm alignment; appropriate techniques; transparent procedures	Use analytic approaches consistent with epistemological commitments; document all analytic decisions
Interpretation	Warranted claims; acknowledged limitations; theoretical contribution	Ensure claims proportionate to evidence; connect findings to theoretical frameworks
Reporting	Complete disclosure; reproducibility support; accessible communication	Report all relevant methodological details; share data, materials, and code where feasible

For **experimental and quasi-experimental research**, randomisation should occur at the appropriate level, outcome measures should align with intervention goals, implementation fidelity should be documented, treatment heterogeneity should be explored, and longer-term outcomes deserve investigation [15].

For **design-based research**, researchers should distinguish among research orientations, ensure systematic iteration with documentation, make theoretical contributions explicit, consider scalability early, and maintain genuine practitioner collaboration [28].

For **mixed methods research**, studies should achieve genuine integration rather than parallel analyses, select appropriate designs, employ integration tools like joint displays, address quality criteria from both traditions, and specify how integration was achieved [45, 66].

For **learning analytics research**, studies should connect pattern discovery to learning theory, address privacy proactively, report preprocessing and analytic decisions fully, evaluate algorithmic fairness, and test interventions empirically.

For **qualitative research**, studies should employ paradigm-coherent designs, achieve sufficient depth, conduct systematic, transparent analysis, address appropriate trustworthiness criteria, and enable transferability assessment [26].

AI-enhanced research methods will continue to expand, requiring frameworks for validation [50]. Multimodal learning analytics will mature, demanding solutions for data synchronisation and privacy. Immersive technologies create new methodological challenges for studying learning that blur physical-digital boundaries [52, 62]. Open science practices will likely become normative expectations [40].

Doctoral programs should provide systematic exposure to paradigmatic foundations alongside technical methods [10]. Programs should address emerging methods while maintaining a focus on foundational approaches. Methodological capacity building should extend to practising researchers through professional development and collaborative research efforts.

8. Conclusion

This narrative review has examined the methodological evolution of educational technology research through the lens of shifting educational paradigms. Drawing on Scopus AI analytics and systematic engagement with the research literature, the review has identified patterns, strengths, and persistent challenges in how the field investigates technology-enhanced learning.

The review makes several contributions. First, it provides a comprehensive mapping of paradigm-methodology relationships, demonstrating how ontological, epistemological, and axiological commitments shape methodological choices. Second, it documents contemporary methodological approaches, including design-based research, mixed methods, learning analytics, AI-enhanced methods, and multimodal analytics. Third, it identifies persistent quality concerns, including theoretical thinness, measurement limitations, and systematic overestimation of effects. Fourth, it proposes a framework for paradigm-coherent methodology. Fifth, it addresses emerging ethical considerations central to responsible research.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The reliance on Scopus-indexed literature may underrepresent work in regional journals or non-indexed venues. The framework and guidelines derive from the author's interpretation and may reflect particular paradigmatic orientations. The rapid evolution of AI-enhanced methods may have advanced since the literature analysed was published.

For researchers, the review underscores the importance of methodological consciousness. For doctoral programs, it suggests curricula addressing paradigmatic foundations alongside technical methods. For editors and reviewers, it highlights paradigm-appropriate evaluation. For the field, methodological diversity is a strength when accompanied by rigour and reflection; what undermines the field is incoherence rather than diversity.

Educational technology research stands at a methodological crossroads. The tools available have never been more powerful; yet, quality concerns suggest that proliferation has not automatically led to advancement. The path forward involves neither uniformity nor uncritical pluralism but "principled diversity" – multiple approaches united by shared commitments to rigour, transparency, and the improvement of technology-enhanced learning. This review offers one contribution to ongoing methodological evolution, inviting continued dialogue about how best to investigate the complex intersections of technology, learning, and education.

References

[1] Ajani, O.A., Gamede, B.T. and Govender, S., 2025. Cultural and ethical dimensions of learning management system adoption in rural universities: Exploring data privacy, algorithmic bias, and contextual realities. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, 8(3), p.2026142. Available from: https://doi.org/10.31893/multiscience.2026142.

[2] Alonzo, D. and Teng, S., 2023. Trustworthiness of Teacher Assessment and Decision-Making: Reframing the Consistency and Accuracy Measures. *International Journal of Instruction*, 16(3), pp.1075–1094. Available from: https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16357a.

[3] Anderson, T. and Shattuck, J., 2012. Design-Based Research: A Decade of Progress in Education Research? *Educational Researcher*, 41(1), pp.16–25. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11428813.

[4] Andrews, D., Leitner, P., Schön, S. and Ebner, M., 2022. Developing a Professional Profile of a Digital Ethics Officer in an Educational Technology Unit in Higher Education. In: P. Zaphiris and A. Ioannou, eds. *Learning and Collaboration Technologies. Designing the Learner and Teacher Experience*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 13328, pp.157–175. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-05657-4_12.

[5] Baker, R.S. and Inventado, P.S., 2014. Educational Data Mining and Learning Analytics. In: J.A. Larusson and B. White, eds. *Learning Analytics: From Research to Practice*. New York, NY: Springer New York, pp.61–75. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3305-7_4.

[6] Balaji, C.G., Rajeswari, G., Jain, H., Menaka, S. and Shukla, S.A., 2025. Understanding Data Privacy and Ethical Considerations in Learning Analytics. In: S. Ponnusamy, J. Antari, G. Jeon, M. Assaf and B. Sharma, eds. *Revolutionizing Education With Remote Experimentation and Learning Analytics*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global Scientific Publishing, chap. 34, pp.579–606. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-8593-7.ch034.

[7] Baydas, O., Kucuk, S., Yilmaz, R.M., Aydemir, M. and Goktas, Y., 2015. Educational technology research trends from 2002 to 2014. *Scientometrics*, 105(1), pp.709–725. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1693-4.

[8] Bebell, D., O'Dwyer, L.M., Russell, M. and Hoffmann, T., 2010. Concerns, Considerations, and New Ideas for Data Collection and Research in Educational Technology Studies. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 43(1), pp.29–52. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2010.10782560.

[9] Biddix, J.P. and Bourke, B., 2025. Using formative assessment approaches to enhance rigor and quality in research. *Quality and Quantity*. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-025-02461-8.

[10] Bulfin, S., Henderson, M., Johnson, N.F. and Selwyn, N., 2014. Methodological capacity within the field of "educational technology" research: An initial investigation. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 45(3), pp.403–414. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12145.

[11] Cela-Ranilla, J., Esteve-Mon, F.M. and Sánchez-Caballé, A., 2025. Design-based research in higher education: A systematic literature review between 2019 and 2023. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(4), p.67–83. Available from: https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.10380.

[12] Cham, H., Lee, H. and Migunov, I., 2024. Quasi-experimental designs for causal inference: an overview. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 25(3), pp.611–627. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-024-09981-2.

[13] Chang, R.L. and Gray, K., 2013. Ethics of research into learning and teaching with Web 2.0:

Reflections on eight case studies. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 25(3), pp.147–165. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-013-9071-9.

[14] Chauke, M., 2024. Navigating Research Paradigms and Theories: A Roadmap for Advancing Research in Higher Education. In: A.A. Mdikana, ed. *Enhancing Research for Academicians in Higher Education*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global Scientific Publishing, chap. 4, pp.49–64. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-4496-5.ch004.

[15] Closser, A.H., Sales, A. and Botelho, A.F., 2024. Should We account for classrooms? Analyzing online experimental data with student-level randomization. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 72(5), pp.2865–2894. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10325-x.

[16] Cook, T.D., 2007. Randomized Experiments in Education: Assessing the Objections to Doing Them. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 16(5), pp.331–355. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/10438590600982335.

[17] Cypress, B.S., 2017. Rigor or Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research: Perspectives, Strategies, Reconceptualization, and Recommendations. *Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing*, 36(4), pp.253–263. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/DCC.0000000000000253.

[18] Dewey, J., 1976. *Experience and Education*, The Kappa Delta Pi Lecture Series. New York: Collier Books. Available from: https://dn720204.ca.archive.org/0/items/experienceeducat00dewe_0/experienceeducat00dewe_0.pdf.

[19] Dillenbourg, P. and Jermann, P., 2010. Technology for Classroom Orchestration. In: M.S. Khine and I.M. Saleh, eds. *New Science of Learning: Cognition, Computers and Collaboration in Education*. New York, NY: Springer New York, pp.525–552. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-5716-0_26.

[20] DiStefano, C., Odero, G. and Starrett, A., 2024. An Introduction to Machine Learning for Educational Researchers. In: M.S. Khine, ed. *Machine Learning in Educational Sciences: Approaches, Applications and Advances*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, pp.11–30. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-9379-6_2.

[21] Downes, S., 2012. *Connectivism and Connective Knowledge: Essays on meaning and learning networks*. National Research Council Canada. Available from: https://archive.org/details/ConnectiveKnowledge/page/n1/mode/2up.

[22] Ferrari, R., 2015. Writing narrative style literature reviews. *Medical Writing*, 24(4), pp.230–235. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1179/2047480615Z.000000000329.

[23] Filiz, E. and Öz, E., 2019. Finding the best algorithms and effective factors in classification of Turkish science student success. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, 18(2), pp.239–253. Available from: https://doi.org/10.33225/jbse/19.18.239.

[24] Gray, K., 2007. Educational Technology Practitioner-Research Ethics. In: M. Quigley, ed. *Encyclopedia of Information Ethics and Security*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global Scientific Publishing, pp.164–169. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-59140-987-8.ch025.

[25] Greenhalgh, T., Thorne, S. and Malterud, K., 2018. Time to challenge the spurious hierarchy of systematic over narrative reviews? *European Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 48(6), p.e12931. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/eci.12931.

[26] Heinrich, E., 2024. Revolutionising educational technology: The imperative for authentic qualitative research. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 10, p.101073. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101073.

[27] Ismail, I.A., 2024. Protecting Privacy in AI-Enhanced Education: A Comprehensive Examination of Data Privacy Concerns and Solutions in AI-Based Learning. In: S. Elmoudden and J. Wrench, eds. *Impacts of Generative AI on the Future of Research and Education*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global Scientific Publishing, chap. 10. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0831-8.ch010.

[28] Jacobsen, M. and McKenney, S., 2024. Educational design research: grappling with methodological fit. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 72(5), pp.2743–2762. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10282-5.

[29] Jenkins, M.C., 2024. Mixed-Methods Research. In: B. Hott, F. Brigham and C. Peltier, eds. *Research Methods in Special Education*. New York: Routledge, pp.239–255. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003526315-13.

[30] Joksimović, S., Kovanović, V., Jovanović, J., Zouaq, A., Gašević, D. and Hatala, M., 2015. What do cMOOC participants talk about in social media? a topic analysis of discourse in a cMOOC. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Learning Analytics And Knowledge*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, LAK '15, p.156–165. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1145/2723576.2723609.

[31] Joyce, K.E. and Cartwright, N., 2020. Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice: Predicting What Will Work Locally. *American Educational Research Journal*, 57(3), pp.1045–1082. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219866687.

[32] Kansagra, J., Singhadiya, C. and Suryanarayana, G., 2025. AI-enhanced evaluation: A survey of machine learning techniques for assessing long answers. In: S.K. Oruganti, D. Karras, S. Thakur, J.K. Chaithanya, S. Metta and A. Lathigara, eds. *Digital Transformation and Sustainability of Business*. London: CRC Press, pp.120–123. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003606185-28.

[33] Karthikeyan, P., Nithish, K.K., Janani, H., Reshma, P., Vaishnavi, V. and Prakash, N., 2025. Education Revolution: LLM's in Online Learning and Student Engagement. In: A. Bajaj, A. Abraham and R. Kamimura, eds. *Bio-Inspired Computing*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, vol. 1229, pp.164–174. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-78940-3_16.

[34] Ketsman, O., Droog, A. and Qazi, S., 2025. Mapping the prevalence of mixed methods research in educational technology journals. *Computers & Education*, 226, p.105207. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105207.

[35] Kishor, K., Vishwakarma, P., Sengar, L., Kumar, V. and Gupta, V., 2025. Development of Grader Provider System Using Deep Learning. *Procedia Computer Science*. vol. 259, pp.172–181. All Open Access. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2025.03.318.

[36] Kolmos, A., 2015. Design-based research – issues in connecting theory, research and practice. *6th Research in Engineering Education Symposium: Translating Research into Practice, REES 2015*. Dublin Institute of Technology. Available from: https://vbn.aau.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/221792862/Kolmos_Design_Based_Research_Connecting_Theory_Research_and_Practice.pdf.

[37] Kumar, M., Singh, N., Wadhwa, J., Singh, P., Kumar, G. and Qtaishat, A., 2024. Utilizing Random Forest and XGBoost Data Mining Algorithms for Anticipating Students' Academic Performance. *International Journal of Modern Education and Computer Science*, 16(2), pp.29–44. Available from: https://doi.org/10.5815/ijmecs.2024.02.03.

[38] Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G., 1985. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

[39] Love, H.R., Fettig, A. and Steed, E.A., 2023. Putting the "Mix" in Mixed Methods: How to Integrate Quantitative and Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Special Education Research. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 43(3), pp.174–186. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/02711214231199268.

[40] Makel, M.C., Hodges, J., Cook, B.G. and Plucker, J.A., 2021. Both Questionable and Open Research Practices are Prevalent in Education Research. *Educational Researcher*, 50(8), pp.493–504. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X211001356.

[41] Medina, J.R. and Avi, B.R., 2021. Mixed methods in education research. In: C.J. Gómez Carrasco, P. Miralles Martínez and R. López Facal, eds. *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education in History and Geography*. Peter Lang, pp.53–70.

[42] Narayana, B.J.L., Harsha, V.N.S.S., Prudhvi, K., Vardhan, B.G.H. and Sravika, A., 2024. Automated Question Paper Generation using Natural Language Processing. *2024 International Conference on Computational Intelligence for Green and Sustainable Technologies, ICCIGST 2024*. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCIGST60741.2024.10717510.

[43] Osmanović Zajić, J. and Maksimović, J., 2022. Quasi-Experimental Research as An

Epistemological-Methodological Approach in Education Research. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education (IJCRSEE)*, 10(3), p.177–183. Available from: https://doi.org/10.23947/2334-8496-2022-10-3-177-183.

[44] Perry, T., Morris, R. and Lea, R., 2022. A decade of replication study in education? a mapping review (2011–2020). *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 27(1-2), pp.12–34. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2021.2022315.

[45] Peters, M. and Fàbregues, S., 2024. Missed opportunities in mixed methods EdTech research? Visual joint display development as an analytical strategy for achieving integration in mixed methods studies. *Educational technology research and development*, 72(5), pp.2477–2497. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10234-z.

[46] Pretorius, L., 2024. Demystifying Research Paradigms: Navigating Ontology, Epistemology, and Axiology in Research. *Qualitative Report*, 29(10), pp.2698–2715. Available from: https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2024.7632.

[47] Prinsloo, P., Khalil, M. and Slade, S., 2024. Learning analytics as data ecology: a tentative proposal. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 36(1), pp.154–182. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-023-09355-4.

[48] Romeo, G. and Russell, G., 2010. Why 'what works' is not enough for information technology in education research. In: A. McDougall, J. Murnane, A. Jones and N. Reynolds, eds. *Researching IT in Education: Theory, Practice and Future Directions*. Routledge, chap. 6, pp.54–61.

[49] Saqr, M. and López-Pernas, S., eds, 2024. *Learning Analytics Methods and Tutorials: A Practical Guide Using R*. Cham: Springer. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54464-4.

[50] Sharma, M. and Gupta, S., 2024. The Socioeconomic Impact of AI in Research and Education. In: A. Mutawa, ed. *Impacts of Generative AI on the Future of Research and Education*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global Scientific Publishing, chap. 17, pp.445–473. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0884-4.ch017.

[51] Siemens, G., 2005. Connectivism: A Learning Theory for the Digital Age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, 2(1). Available from: https://itdl.org/Journal/Jan_05/article01.htm.

[52] Stoumpos, A.I. and Stoumpou, R.I., 2025. Modern Digital and Technological Educational Methods. *Trends in Higher Education*, 4(2), p.25. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu4020025.

[53] Sullivan, E., 2024. SIDEs: Separating Idealization from Deceptive 'Explanations' in xAI. *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, FAccT '24, p.1714–1724. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1145/3630106.3658999.

[54] Svihla, V., 2014. Advances in Design-Based Research. *Frontline Learning Research*, 2(4), pp.35–45. Available from: https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v2i4.114.

[55] Tamim, R.M., Borokhovski, E., Bernard, R.M., Schmid, R.F., Abrami, P.C. and Pickup, D.I., 2021. A study of meta-analyses reporting quality in the large and expanding literature of educational technology. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 37(4), pp.100–115. Available from: https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.6322.

[56] Tepgeç, M. and Ifenthaler, D., 2022. Learning Analytics Based Interventions: A Systematic Review of Experimental Studies. *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Cognition and Exploratory Learning in the Digital Age, CELDA 2022*. pp.327–330. Available from: https://www.celda-conf.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/3_CELDA2022_S_125.pdf.

[57] Thomson, G. and Crowther, S., 2022. Attuning to trustworthiness and final reflections. In: S. Crowther and G. Thomson, eds. *Hermeneutic Phenomenology in Health and Social Care Research*. London: Routledge, pp.213–227. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003081661-13.

[58] Tinoca, L., Piedade, J., Santos, S., Pedro, A. and Gomes, S., 2022. Design-Based Research in the Educational Field: A Systematic Literature Review. *Education Sciences*, 12(6), p.410. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12060410.

[59] Tobin, G.A. and Begley, C.M., 2004. Methodological rigour within a qualitative framework. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 48(4), pp.388–396. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03207.x.

[60] Waller, A.A., 2006. Special Session - Fish is Fish: Learning to See the Sea We Swim In: Theoretical Frameworks for Education Research. *Proceedings. Frontiers in Education. 36th Annual Conference*. pp.1–2. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2006.322605.

[61] Wang, Q., 2025. The Optimization of an English Writing Automated Assessment Model Based on Big Data Analysis. *International Journal of Web-Based Learning and Teaching Technologies*, 20(1), pp.1–15. All Open Access. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4018/IJWLTT.389876.

[62] Wei, Z. and Yuan, M., 2023. Research on the Current Situation and Future Development Trend of Immersive Virtual Reality in the Field of Education. *Sustainability*, 15(9), p.7531. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/su15097531.

[63] Williamson, K., 2006. Research in Constructivist Frameworks Using Ethnographic Techniques. *Library Trends*, 55(1), pp.83–101. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2006.0054.

[64] Yılmaz, K. and Deniz, K.Z., 2024. Natural Language Processing and Machine Learning Applications For Assessment and Evaluation in Education: Opportunities and New Approaches. *Journal of Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology*, 15(4), pp.421–445. Available from: https://doi.org/10.21031/epod.1551568.

[65] Yuxin, M. and Harmon, S.W., 2009. A Case Study of Design-Based Research for Creating a Vision Prototype of a Technology-Based Innovative Learning Environment. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 20(1), pp.75–93. Available from: https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/25226/.

[66] Zhou, Y., Zhou, Y. and Machtmes, K., 2024. Mixed methods integration strategies used in education: A systematic review. *Methodological Innovations*, 17(1), pp.41–49. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/20597991231217937.