

EVALUATION OF DIGITAL LEARNING RESOURCES. USE OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY IN HOME EDUCATION AND SCHOOLS, GLOBALLY AND IN TURKEY*

Hatice BÜBER KAYA

*Kırklareli University,
Kayalı (Merkez) Yerleşkesi, Kırklareli, Türkiye*

Ozan KAYA, MBA

Introduction

The US's National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) defines technology as "*any modification of the natural world done to fulfil human needs or desires*" (The National Assessment Governing, 2014, p. 15). Providing a definition of technology will enable us to evaluate its pros and cons with regard to education. Melvin Kranzberg (1986), a well-known scholar in the history of technology, defines technology as "*neither good, nor bad, nor neutral*" (p. 5). Technology describes a broad and yet a focused concept covering all acts of human beings aimed at changing the natural world around them in order to reach their needs and desires, making their ideas real. Although this definition does not say anything about computers, the internet, software, or applications, it covers a much wider and more complex concept than a certain set of tools or devices (The National Assessment Governing, 2014; Levinson, 2013).

** Adapted from the PhD Dissertation in Social Sciences and Health of Hatice Büber Kaya, PhD, completed at Durham University in August, 2019*

According to research, children use a wide range of technologies in their daily life, for example, mobile devices, technological toys, cameras, television, and social media software, where they can actively engage (Dron, 2007; Plowman, McPake, & Stephen, 2010). Digital-age children want a personalised and active learning process that is enriched with the media (McLoughlin & Lee, 2010).

In order to discuss technology in education, we first need to define educational technology, which does not have a single accepted definition, not because of a disagreement, but because it means different things to different people. The descriptions of educational technology include, but are not limited to, computer-aided education, distance education, instructional technology, multimedia, classroom-management systems, and web-based learning systems. While some researchers take technology to mean everything electronic and mainly computer-based technology, others argue that technology can include many other learning technologies that are not computer-based, for example, laser pointers, TVs, sound systems etc. They even consider the chalkboard and chalk as technologic innovations (Moersch, 1995)

Technology acts as a tool for students to gain access to information, to share that information, and to cooperate with their peers (Camilleri & Camilleri, 2016). Moreover, Kozma (2003) reported that

...when teachers use technology to plan and prepare instruction and collaborate with outside actors; and when students also use technology to conduct research projects, analyse data, solve problems, design products and assess their own work, students are more likely to develop new ICT, problem solving, information management, collaboration and communication skills. (p. 13)

In this paper, educational technology will be limited to DLRs that are used to aid the learning process. According to Churchill (2017), “*Digital resources for learning are best described as technology-based multimedia content specifically designed for educational (and training) purposes*” (p. 2). DLRs are produced with the aid of technology and are to be utilised in learning activities in order to encourage learners to construct and use knowledge. In many of our everyday tasks, using DLRs has become a necessity and this intensive use of technology has forced educators to use technology in education (Camilleri & Camilleri, 2016; Durak & Saritepeci, 2017). In education, this technology includes computer-based technologies, TV content, web-based learning, radio content, mobile-learning. Specific DLRs other than these may also be mentioned in this study’s interviews (in the results and discussion sections) and in the literature. The term ‘digital learning resources’ (DLRs) will be used as a catch-all term covering all the technologies mentioned above.

Evaluation of DLRs

Early research in education technology, just like the roots of a plant, still has an influence on educational technology research today (Roschelle, Martin, Ahn, & Schank, 2017).

Using ICT for educational purposes has a long history but the integration of technology in schools started with audio-visual tools. The first examples of the usage of audio and visual tools are found in the early 1900s. For instance, school museums equipped with slides, films, and stereographs were founded in the US. Moving picture projectors became the first widely used tool in schools in the US by 1910 (Reiser, 2010; Saettler, 1967). Overhead projectors, slide projectors, audio equipment, and simulators were used extensively by the army and industry during WWII (Olsen & Bass, 1982; Saettler, 1967). The use of instructional technology is accepted as having started with the radio in the 1920s and was followed by overhead projectors in 1930, videotapes in 1951, and the photocopier in 1959 (Purdue University Online). During the 1950s, we see the tremendous growth of instructional television. Although problems and shortcomings prevented instructional television from having its envisioned effect on education, it continued to be used in many school systems (Riccobono, 1985). Large-scale projects like Sesame Street and the instructional Open University programmes in Britain are among television's successful and favourable applications. DLRs came to classrooms in the form of handheld digital calculators during the 1970s (Purdue University Online, no date).

The Cyberlearning Community Report (2017) gathered research studies together, in order to illustrate the roots of recent research projects and innovation trends and mentioned the following:

- The University of Illinois: It developed the first general-purpose computer-assisted learning system—Programmed Logic for Automatic Teaching Operations—known as PLATO in the 1960s and the system began to be used widely in the 1970s. By taking advantage of the data analysis methods today's learning-at-scale research still depends upon this system.
- Douglas Engelbart: His research (1969) demonstrated what is now referred to as 'The Mother of All Demos'. This research was seen as the factor that enabled human computer interaction to emerge and to make collaboration and learning the core of the design research.
- Alan Kay: His research produced the 'Dynabook' (1972). He is seen as the leader of mobile learning and also the influencer of 'computational thinking' in education.

- Allen Newell and Herbert Simon: These computer science pioneers are known for their ‘Human Problem Solving’ (1972) study. They became leaders of ‘intelligent tutoring systems’ through implementing artificial intelligence and the human cognition connection. Their research is still referred to in adaptive learning system research.
- Semour Papert: With his ‘Mindstorms’ (1980) research and other works in technology-rich environments, Semour Papert became the founder of many robotic applications that are built on exploratory research.

While advances in technology allow researchers and innovators to recognise opportunities in learning approaches, advances in learning theory help them to develop their innovations (Roschelle et al., 2017). Emerging technologies, learning theories, and research projects include, but are not limited to, those mentioned below:

- With the help of location-aware technology, the concern that technologies cause young populations to be isolated is being countered with community-based projects. The target of these research projects is to get young people involved in the community using their skills with mobile technology. One goal is to ensure that they engage with the community productively so that the research can bring forward evidence-based arguments and recommendations. While encouraging young people to participate in community-level problem-solving, the researchers make contributions to computer science by giving learners a vision about how to build a map rather than simply use one. In this way, learning sciences create meaningful opportunities for researchers to realise the role of context and larger education communities by giving an insight into the relationship between community resources and learning (Taylor & Pinkard, 2017).
- Interest-driven activities enable people to express and share their ideas publicly and also enable educational research to use them as pathways. The question of whether or not constructive activities are deep learning activities remains a matter of ongoing debate amongst education experts. While the research projects use expressiveness (creating literacy), representations (supporting learning important ideas) and collaboration (sharing how learners make sense of ideas) to determine ways of using playful environments to develop deeper learning, the dimensions of time, context, and social interactions still require more investigation. The present research indicates that the relationship and communication between learners, and between teachers and learners, clearly affects the learning.

Methodological challenges also emerge from the relationship between people, things, technology in varied contexts, and timescales (Berland, Halverson, Polman, & Wilkerson, 2017; Fusco, Martin, Lane, & Chase, 2017).

- Use of touchscreen interfaces and table-tops to enhance learning and improve collaboration has brought more active participation to the learners' classrooms by encouraging them to collaborate and communicate more with each other while interacting with touchscreens. However, researchers argue that that technology is not being used as effectively as it could be. While the research projects indicated that touchscreen technology contributed more to joint activity than laptop computers did, most teachers use the two technologies in the same way; however, the touchscreen interfaces are less expensive. More research is needed into how teachers use computer-supported collaborative learning and, especially, how they can implement effective use of that technology. Moreover, scholars such as Lane and Mercier (2017) have suggested that there is a need for more research on data logging and analysing.
- Interactive whiteboard (IWB) is a tool that can help with teaching the whole class; in addition, IWBs allow more attractive presentation of the normal course material as well as new presentation content developed for the IWB itself. IWBs make it easy and practical to combine and utilise different audio-visual resources. The most commonly highlighted advantage of IWBs is that they help to motivate students by increasing their attention and, thus, their learning. Their disadvantages are mostly their cost or the value for money they offer compared to other cheaper solutions for display and presentation. Moreover, teachers need more time to prepare for their classes when they use IWBs. The technology can also be seen as teacher-centred; therefore, IWBs are not necessarily interactive at all, even when the teacher prepares well for the class. Although an IWB can increase the class' motivation and attention, this technology did not provide enough tangible improvements in learning. IWBs were originally designed around 1990 to be used in office environments and very soon after they were introduced they began to be used in higher education institutions and then moved to middle and primary schools. From the early 1990s, new education strategies in literacy and numeracy teaching started to involve more class interaction both between student and teacher and between students. It was suggested that teachers and students should listen to each other, discuss, and build on each other's ideas and that students should learn as a group through this process. Hence, IWB use was supported widely as a tool to enhance teaching and/or support learning. Potential benefits of IWBs are thought to be that they are interactive,

versatile, efficient in terms of multimedia presentation, and useful for the planning and development of resources and ICT skills. With the use of IWBs, the traditional class setting started to change. Students discovered the opportunity to learn from some source other than the teacher, while also using modern tools when presenting in front of their peers and sharing knowledge with them. Such activities help students to articulate thoughts, interact, and comment about each other's work. Nonetheless, more work and emphasis should still be put, not on the existence and number of IWBs in schools, but on the way they are used by teachers and students to change the traditional mode of teacher instruction into a class forum where the ideas of students are presented and discussed with their peers. In order to make IWBs the transforming tool of education they were initially seen to be, further research has to be conducted and different approaches to their use need to be examined. Examples where IWBs are really used as the tool to change the learning environment through dialogic interaction between the teacher and student and the physical interaction of the students with the board should be studied and best practices and applications should be duplicated (Higgins, Beauchamp, & Miller, 2007; Smith, Hardman, & Higgins, 2006; Smith, Higgins, Wall, & Miller, 2005).

Use of Technology in Schools in Turkey

In the 1930s and 1940s, the education tools and materials in Turkish schools were basic educational items like maps and laboratory equipment, although some schools did have still film projectors. Instructional materials were mainly printed. In 1961, the Teaching Materials Centre and in 1962 the Centre of Educational Radio—where educational programmes for radio broadcasting were produced—were founded in Ankara (Alkan, 1998).

From the 1950s to the 1970s, schools were given new teaching materials including audio cassettes and overhead projectors as learning materials. During the 1970s video players and video cassettes were introduced as learning tools. The first applications of distance education were started in higher education in 1974 (Akkoyunlu, 2002; Akkoyunlu & Orhan, 2001). Although some universities started offering graduate courses in the field of educational technology back in the 1970s, there were actually very few teachers who knew how to use computers, let alone teach with them (Hizal, 1991).

Between 1984 and 2013, 32 projects were implemented by the Ministry of National Education in order to promote effective use of technology in education in Turkey (Topuz & Göktaş, 2015). The largest of these are summarised below.

Computer-based instruction was introduced into secondary education in 1984 (Akbaba-Altun, 2006). Between 1985 and 1986, 1100 computers were given to secondary schools as part of a pilot project. As a continuation of the project, 2400 more computers were introduced to secondary and vocational schools in the following years. At that stage, computers were used only for teaching students how to use computers. They were not used as a tool to learn other subjects (Fidan, 1988).

In 1989, the Ministry of Education invited private IT contractors to develop course materials to be used with computers in schools. This development made it more obvious that the teachers needed to be trained in computer-aided teaching so that the computers could be used as a tool for conveying teaching material (Akkoyunlu & Orhan, 2001).

Internet usage was first developed within Turkey between some universities and science institutes. In 1991, the first intra-country connection was set up (Tonta & Kurbanoglu, 1995). The first internet connection, as we know it today, was established on April 12, 1993 between the Middle East Technical University and the National Science Foundation in the US (Merc, 2015; Tonta & Kurbanoglu, 1995).

In 1998, Turkey's Ministry of National Education initiated a large-scale investment programme. It had a one billion USD budget (Uluyol, 2012), with finance coming from the Turkish Government's contribution and funds from the World Bank (\$600 million USD) and the European Union. This educational investment programme ran until 2008 and aimed to improve the quality of Turkish education to that of other developed nations (Kurt, 2010; Tezci, 2011) by increasing the computer literacy of students and teachers (Akbaba-Altun, 2006). Between 1998 and 2003 schools were provided with computers, printers, scanners, televisions, videos, multimedia software and slides, and overhead projectors. Teachers and computer coordinators were trained to use them (Akbaba-Altun, 2006). By 2002, 3000 computer labs with 25000 computers in them had been built at 2481 schools (Akkoyunlu, 2002).

In the meantime, progress was seen on the teacher training side. Some universities opened Computer Education and Instructional Technology departments; they aimed to produce graduate computer and education technology teachers for primary and secondary schools. Moreover, all existing teacher education departments incorporated new compulsory courses in computer literacy and instructional technologies and material development (Akkoyunlu, 2002).

After 2002, the investment programme was extended to cover a greater number of schools and this time it also covered preschool and special education. According to Uluyol (2012), by 2008, 98% of all Turkish secondary schools and 93% of all primary schools had personal computers, printers, notebooks, projectors, and

scanners. Usun (2006) states that during the development of this project some companies provided free internet for a year; some residences near the schools could even also use the internet at the weekends. Internet penetration to Turkish households reached 69.5% in 2015 (Merc, 2015). The research conducted by Topuz and Göktaş (2015) revealed, however, that the results of these projects were not logged and analysed properly; therefore, the results of these projects remain unclear, despite the fact that substantial amounts of investment were made in them.

The study conducted by Yalın, Karadeniz, & Şahin (2007) in Turkey reveals that although teachers had positive attitudes towards ICT methods and materials in education, they believed that ICT methods were limited to visual materials and that the limited usage of ICT opportunities created no fundamental changes in teaching practices. The study concluded that the participant teachers were not knowledgeable enough about ICT-based instructional methods and that, as a result, ICT had little to no impact on their traditional teaching methods (Yalın et al., 2007). These results were consistent with those of other studies in the area that revealed that teachers' use of ICT in their classrooms was limited to presentation and word processor software and that they rarely used the innovative ICT-based materials (Kazu & Yavuzalp, 2010; Seferoğlu, Akbıyık, & Bulut, 2008). Kazu and Yavuzalp's (2010) study reveals that a noticeable percentage of participants (26.8 %) did not know about the software that the government had provided for use in their classrooms. All the aforementioned studies suggested offering courses on the use of ICT-based materials and the methods to help the teachers to adopt ICT-based innovations more effectively. The suggested courses were for both working teachers (through in-service training centres) and teacher candidates (via teacher training institutes). However, more recent studies reveal that teacher training problems still exist. Even those teachers who received in-service trainings about ICT use do not use ICT-based materials and see themselves as inadequate when it comes to technology (Saritepeci, Durak, & Seferoğlu, 2016).

FATİH Project

In 2008, the Turkish Government started another project called FATİH. This project aimed to create 'Smart Classes' by providing every student and teacher with a tablet computer and by installing LCD smart boards in classrooms all around the country (Fatihprojesi.Meb.Gov.Tr, no date). The term FATİH stands for 'movement of enhancing opportunities and improving technology'. It is one of the biggest projects of its kind in the world in terms of its budget and coverage (Hemphill, Caliskan, & Hemphill, 2015; Tamim, Borokhovski, Pickup, & Bernard, 2015).

The project had a five-year term and aimed to help students to engage their sensory organs in the learning process by using IWB and other ICT devices. Approximately 85,000 IWBs were installed in classrooms in the initial stage. Interactive usage of ICTs was the key in this decision to allow measurable and controllable teaching (Akçay, Arslan, & Guven, 2015). According to Türel and Johnson (2012), at that period European countries such as Denmark had a 50% and the US had a 35% rate of IWB usage in their classrooms, while Turkey was installing one in each and every classroom.

FATİH aimed to provide IWBs, tablet computers, and internet network infrastructure to all schools providing basic education. IWBs were given to pre-primary and primary level schools and IWBs and tablets were provided for all lower and upper secondary school students. The project intended to set up ICT hardware in 40,000 schools and 620,000 classrooms across Turkey. Although initially launched in secondary schools, it was planned to expand to all grade levels. The scale of the project covered the delivery of about 570,000 IWBs and 10,600,000 tablet computers in the first three years (Pouzevara, Dinçer, Kipp, & Sarışık, 2013). The project was aimed to be completed in five years, ending on December 31, 2015 as announced in the latest government regulations. Despite what was aimed at and announced in the government regulations, with seven months to the finish date remaining, only 8% of the targets had been met (Nebil, 2015). In 2016, the situation was not too different; however, the commentators argued that it was a good sign that the government was still working on the project, and thus, that it would not become a total failure (Nebil, 2016).

According to the plan, 680,000 teachers would receive training to implement the project nationwide. Two training modules were involved. ICT use in education was a 30-hour-long course and the second module, called preparatory education, provided 25 hours of training. By April 2013, according to the Ministry of Education, more than 120,000 teachers had received training at 110 distance learning centres in Turkey's 81 cities. Although the usage of computers, IWBs, and the computer classroom was initiated at least ten years ago, only a few pilot state school and some private schools could finance these technologies from their own funds (Pouzevara et al., 2013).

Despite the large and ambitious scale of the project, the Ministry of Education of Turkey was not successful in training the teachers to use the new technology. Although teachers were meant to receive professional development via the FATİH project (Akkoyunlu & Baskan, 2015), Turkey did not have the required infrastructure to educate teachers through distance learning. The teachers had to travel to training centres in each province and sometimes they had to travel long distances for the training. Moreover, there was no solid plan for how to train teachers to use the technology so that these technologies could be incorporated into the existing curriculum (Uluyol, 2012).

Furthermore, teachers were not given any incentives to use the technology, or for trying to improve teaching through this technology. Additionally, there were no penalties if they did not use the technology, or if they did not look after the technological tools and keep them in working order (Durak & Saritepeci, 2017; Pouzevara et al., 2013). Vatanartiran and Karadeniz (2015) carried out a large-scale research project to examine the challenges and needs of teachers during the FATİH project. From this study, it became apparent that teachers need to have a technology integration plan that includes leadership strategies to solve the problems encountered by the teachers. These problems were grouped under three main headings: executive issues, infrastructural issues, and instructional issues. The teachers not only sought managerial, financial, and technical support from their principals, but also demanded effective training programmes to prepare them prior to and during the project. In order to improve teacher autonomy within the centralised education system, the teachers focused mostly on TPACK, (Karadeniz & Vatanartiran, 2013; Vatanartiran & Karadeniz, 2015).

As reported by Wilson & Gielniak (2012) :

... using technology in schools to improve learning performance ... outcomes (include) personalize(d) learning for all students through frequent, appropriate use of technology integrated with curriculum and instruction in all classrooms and other learning places. Technology cannot be viewed as a supplement. It must be an integral part of students' lives in the classroom and must be integrated in meaningful ways into the core curriculum. (p. 14)

Moreover, Moher and Enyedy (2017) discussed the changes required in the physical properties and interior design of the classroom in an era where technology is being adopted for everyday use in more and more classrooms. In the traditional classroom setting, the physical space is arranged to enhance the engagement of students with the teacher. The traditional setting, therefore, has to change in accordance with advances in technology such as interactive whiteboards and touch-tablets. In order to engage more actively with the technology in their classrooms, students need to move around an interior space that was originally designed to keep them in a fixed place.

FATİH started as a huge investment with high hopes to evolve education in Turkey and, unfortunately, ended up with thousands of interactive boards and tablets that could never be used for the purpose for which they were designed. Indeed, most of these devices are now outdated, if not broken and lost altogether. Moreover, the media brought public attention to the fact that some students had sold the tablet computers given to them and the public was informed that disciplinary action would be taken against those who were advertising stolen computers on the internet (Www.Shiftdelete.Net, 2016). As part of the FATİH project, many tablet computers have been delivered to students since 2011; however, no research has

been conducted to study how they were used. Nevertheless, despite a lack of information, new tablets continued to be given to the next set of students (Topuz & Göktaş, 2015).

As a result of not learning from past experiences in implementing technology into education, for example, providing overhead projectors but not overhead transparencies, or computers without the required software or teaching content (World Bank, 2008) due to bad planning or insufficient coordination between the government bodies, the FATIH project too faced many problems of a similar nature (Pouezevara et al., 2013). Between 1984 and 2013, the same mistakes were repeated for each of the 32 projects that were instigated, since all these projects share similar patterns in terms of their execution: they were focused on the purchase and delivery of technological hardware without enough planning as to how the technology would be utilised to change the way education is carried out (Topuz & Göktaş, 2015). It seems that a habit of indifference on the part of the authorities to the results of IT-related education projects that were implemented in the past resulted in a failure to monitor them through research. This time, for the FATIH project, several research projects (cited above) were conducted. However, the government did not act on the research findings.

In 2016, the Minister of National Education was hopeful, saying that in the coming year, it would proceed as far as it had done in the last six years. However, according to the Ministry of Education Report (2017b) that promise did not materialise. Only 20% of the FATIH project was completed by then (Çepni, 2018; Odatv.Com, 2018). This report was seen as the acknowledgement of the failure of the project (Bildircin, 2018; Odatv.Com, 2018; Www.Cumhuriyet.Com.Tr, 2018).

In 2018, the Ministry of Education stated that it had not given up on the FATIH project as a whole but added that it would change the structure of the project, open a new tender for purchases and, in the new system, would provide laptop computers instead of tablets (Bildircin, 2018 ; Çepni, 2018; Www.Shiftdelete.Net, 2018; Www.Teknolojioku.Com, 2018). Nevertheless, despite the fact that technological devices age and quickly become outdated, the bulk of the budget allocated to the FATIH project was spent on tablets that became out-dated in a very short period of time. However, according to (Topuz & Göktaş, 2015) investment in such large-scale projects should be focused on the development of content and structural reforms in education rather than on supplying the end users with technological hardware.

Use of Technology at Home

The opportunities to access new computer and communication technologies have increased every year. For example, by 1984, 8% of all households in the US had a computer. That figure had grown to about 51% by 2000 (Kinsella & Velkoff, 2001). According to a recent OECD report (2018a), computer access in US homes had increased to 78.9% by 2012. However, it is interesting to see the computer access from home decreased from 78.9% to 72% between 2012 and 2013 (the latest data from the US is for 2013 on this report). According to the OECD (2018a), the Netherlands had the highest rate of computer access from home at 97.6%, while Colombia had the lowest rate at 44.3 in 2018. In the same year, 91.7% of homes in the UK and 50% of homes in Turkey had computer access (OECD, 2018a).

In 1998, 57% of homes with school-aged children had computers, while 51% of classrooms had a computer in the US (Becker, 2000). However, in that year the rate of internet-connected classrooms was much higher than that for households with school-aged children (NCES, 2000). By 2007, home internet access had increased to 61.8% and to 73.4% by 2015 (OECD, 2018b) (the latest data from the US is for 2015 in this report). According to a recent OECD report (2018b), Korea has the highest household rates of internet access at 99.5%, while Colombia had the lowest rate (50%) in 2018. In the same year, 94% of households in the UK and 80.7% of households in Turkey had internet access; beginning from 2005, that represents an increase from 60% for the UK and 7.7% for Turkey (OECD, 2018b). The gap between having a computer (50% of homes in Turkey had computer access in 2018) and the subsequent internet access rates (80.7% of households in Turkey had internet access in 2018) might be interpreted as reflecting the rise in access to mobile devices.

As technology develops rapidly, more technological tools offer more media options to keep children occupied for longer hours (Curtice, 2014). For example, children are now exposed to digital media from the age of four months of age, while in 1970 children encountered TV at four years of age (Chassiakos, Radesky, Christakis, Moreno, & Cross, 2016). According to recent data collected and published by Common Sense Media (2017), children aged between zero and eight years spend an average of two hours and nineteen minutes per day with screen media. While that figure is about the same as found in previous reports, where they spent that time had changed. TV was the media that children engaged with the most at 58 minutes per day and showed a decrease of just eleven minutes from 2011. The decrease in TV screen time may have been brought about by parents following expert recommendations on TV watching. Many experts, including the American Academy of Paediatrics, recommend that parents manage their children's screen time. In a poll conducted by the University of Michigan Department of Pediatrics and Communicable Diseases most parents indicated that they agreed with the recommendations. However, they struggled to apply them (Chear, 2014).

Therefore, the decrease in TV viewing suggests that TV has been replaced in today's emerging and quickly evolving media environment (Chassiakos et al., 2016). For instance, the use of mobile devices rose from five minutes per day in 2011 to fifteen minutes per day in 2013 and to 48 minutes per day in 2017 (Common Sense Media, 2017).

Many initiatives and projects related to the introduction of new technologies into schools start with the assumption that giving equal access to ICTs will solve the inequality between rich and poor students. However, according to OECD reports, inequality is not only about having access to the technology, but also about having the ability to use these technologies. Those students who are from underprivileged backgrounds cannot always fill this gap by simply getting access to ICTs. Those from advantaged groups can further increase their skills and benefit from ICTs by having more access to them (Noster, 2015). According to a small-scale study conducted by Kabali et al. (2015) and data collected from a paediatric clinic within a low-income area, 96.6% of zero to four year-old children had used mobile devices and 75% of them had their own devices. However, these numbers do not say anything about the quality of content, the reliability of wi-fi or the digital divide (Chassiakos et al., 2016). According to Common Sense Media's Zero to Eight Report (2017), the digital divide has become a lot narrower in terms of mobile device ownership and downloading apps for children. While 99% (73% in 2011 and 91% of 2013) of higher income families have a mobile device, the rate is 96% (34% in 2011 and 61% of 2013) for lower income families. Similarly, 73% (47% in 2011 and 79% of 2013) of higher income families have downloaded apps for their children's use, while 67% (14% in 2011 and 41% of 2013) of lower income families have done so. However, there is no information about whether these applications are considered as educational or not. Previous research that was conducted by Rideout (2014) indicates interesting differences between educational media use by low and high income families. For example, 12% of children from lower-income families use educational apps on mobile devices on a daily basis while only 5% of higher-income children do so. However, it is important to state that no specific definition for the term 'educational media' was given in the survey; therefore, the difference may be caused by the types of media that these two groups of children use or different views of high- and low-income families on which specific media were rated as 'educational'.

Some research has investigated whether there is a correlation between the use of technology at school and home. Over time, more and more assignments and homework have required the use of computers and the internet; thus, access to such technology at home has become an increasingly important aspect that effects the success of a student at school (Penuel et al., 2002). Additionally, research indicates that there is no connection between what and how children practise with technology at home and their use of technology at school (Jack & Higgins, 2018).

According to Rideout's (2014) research findings, 40% of surveyed parents who have children of preschool age indicated that their children's teachers suggested the use of media at home for the children.

Research on the frequency and type of technology used by students suggests that they spend more time at home using technology than they do at school. In their study, Gronn et al. (2013) found that students spend twice as much time using technology at home compared to school. For students, the most used technology is the internet and, regardless of the age, gender, or ethnicity of the students, the most popular activity is playing games both at school and home. By contrast, when they are at home children in all age groups use technology for enjoying themselves (Landerholm, 1994; Mckenney & Voogt, 2010). Students say that, when they are out of school, searching the internet is their second most frequent activity after playing games (Vourloumi, 2015). Video gaming is also the main activity that children engage in at home. It is also the activity that takes up the most time and bandwidth and is, therefore, the primary factor that makes families alarmed about their children's excessive technology use (Curtice, 2014). According to a 2014 study, children aged between two to ten in the US spend 56 minutes a day with educational media; that includes 42 minutes of TV or watching DVDs, five minutes engaging with educational software on a computer, five minutes with educational applications on mobile devices, and three minutes with educational video games. The time children spend with educational media in a day drops as the child gets older (Rideout, 2014).

After 2006, we see that parents became even more concerned about their children's media use. Nevertheless, when asked, most parents seem to also believe that their children have a balanced life in terms of technology use and non-technological activities (Curtice, 2014). Technology, however, can also offer solutions to children's excessive use of technology and so address parental concerns. There are tools that parents can use to limit the use of technology as well as simply talking to children about browsing safely, spending less time online and in front of a PC, and engaging in other activities (Curtice, 2014).

According to Rideout's (2014) findings, 80% of 1577 surveyed parents of children aged from two to ten indicated that their children use educational media. All of the families whose children use educational media at least once a week think that their children have benefitted from educational media, namely from educational TV the most and from educational apps on mobile devices the least. A more recent (2017) report that surveyed 1400 parents suggests that 74% per cent of parents think their children benefit more from screen media in terms of learning (67%), creativity (57%), social skills (33%), ability to focus (33%), and behaviour (26%) than they suffer from its potential harms. Additionally 80% of the surveyed parents were satisfied with the educational media that their children can access in terms of

amount and quality, although most think that less screen time is better for their children (Common Sense Media, 2017).

According to Curtice (2014), the attitudes of parents with regard to their children's use of technology at home fall into two main groups: they either allow an almost infinite amount of time to use technology or they try to control and limit the time spent with technology and to spend some quality time with sports, socialising, or playing games together. A Child Health Evaluation and Research Center (CHEAR) poll report (2014) adds another dimension of limitation which is the location where children can use media devices. (*Figure 1, represents parents' rules for screen time*)




Figure 1-1 Parents' rules for screen time for young children.

Source: (Chear, 2014)

Plowman et al.'s (2010) project suggests that certain dimensions in the family environment effect the children's use of technology at home. These are: the family's perspectives on the efficacy and ways of using educational technology to support children's learning; family interaction relationship types; the personal characteristics of both children and other family members that affect the children's preferences; and, other demands on both children's and parents' time at home. At the same time, use of technology at home becomes a factor that forms and enhances family relations for the children (Curtice, 2014).

Joint media engagement (JME) is the term used to explain multiple people experiencing media (digital or traditional) together, anywhere, and anytime. For many years physiological experts have suggested that co-viewing is a way to decrease negative effects of the media; additionally, co-viewing enhances the likelihood of learning from media. Several studies have found that JME can enhance learning both in school and in the home setting by helping to make sense,

albeit that co-viewing needs more attention from researchers (Stevens & Penuel, 2010). While cooperative learning helps children to stay engaged (Solomon, 2016), it gives families an opportunity for observing their children, pointing out their confusions or questions, stepping in and providing information, and encouraging their children to value specific activities (Takeuchi & Stevens, 2011)

In fact, when technology is carefully designed to be applied thoughtfully, the impact of learning can be enhanced in terms of speed, strength, and breadth (Thomas, 2016). Each new technology brings new opportunities to improve the education as a whole. Every new information technology resource allows students to engage more with their classes, teachers to develop new teaching methods, and parents to deal more with their children's education (Penuel et al., 2002). For example, with technology-enabled education it is possible to use: virtual labs, simulations, serious games, applications that connect the tangible and the abstract to enhance interaction, software that uses 3D imaging to create transformational learning, and augmented reality to support learning through a critical inquiry process (Thomas, 2016).

Collins and Halverson (2018) listed incompatibilities between schooling and technology by arguing that schooling fails to address issues including, but not limited to, customisation, diversity, specialisation, and the interactivity opportunities of technology. The advances in technology-enhanced learning enable the learners to go beyond the walls of the school that they have access to and beyond the only resources that can be found locally by allowing the student to use a wide range of resources and collaborate with peers anywhere in the world. With the spread of online academic courses, resources, and rich multimedia, it is easier for learning to become personalised and 'right on time', meaning that it is accessible wherever and whenever needed. Furthermore, less experienced learners have access to specialised communities where they can get expert advice on their personal interest and participate more deeply in a subject and so to be able to do more complex activities in order to pursue their passions (Curtice, 2014; Sharples, Lonsdale, Meek, Rudman, & Vavoula, 2007; Thomas, 2016).

Jack and Higgins (2018) draw on Stephen and Plowman's (2013) taxonomy on technology-enhanced learning. According to that taxonomy, there are three kinds of learning opportunities with ICT. These are: 'operational' (how to use ICT), 'curricular knowledge and understanding' (learning a content and new skills), and 'developing positive dispositions to learn' (developing independence, confidence and willingness). Similar to Collins and Halverson's (2018), Stephen and Plowman's research suggested that home settings for children's ICT experiences are more likely to cover all these types of learnings, whereas school settings are limited to basic operational skills.

Sefton-Green (2004) adds the key learning theories that were applied to children's informal learning with ICTs by defining ICT use out of the school as a "*complex educational experience*" (p. 30) and outlines these as follows:

- Constructivism in which every learner constructs their own way of understanding by developing principles and thought patterns to evaluate their experiences. As ICT's can be used to show likely outcomes of given conditions of a problem in a learning situation, they can also be useful in the learning process of the children in a constructivist way.
- Experimental learning in which learning through playing has a place and the learners construct their understanding in a similar way to constructivism, but through experimenting. ICT can be used to support informal learning through interactive activities for children in non-school settings.
- Situated learning in which the learning is accepted as a social process. While the learner's social practices are strongly attached to their learning (according to this approach), computer games can play a role as a community of practice.

Use of Technology at Home by HE Parents

According to Solomon (2016), reliable research on the use of technology by homeschoolers is an area that is attracting the attention of academic research. Neil, Bonner, and Boner (2014) indicated the state of this undiscovered research territory when they said: "Home school populations have been studied for socialization and academic preparedness, but there are few studies on the use of technology among home schooled families" (p. 1). The limited amount of research on how homeschoolers use technology suggests that unschooling parents have been supportive of the use of computers (Curtice, 2014; Solomon, 2016).

Andrade (2008) researched the role of technology in homeschooling and he lists the technologies that research participants use to support their homeschooling. Educational software and the internet were the most cited technologies that were used to enhance the participants' homeschooling experiences and were used for things such as communicating with other homeschooling families, researching instructional resources, and supporting instruction. This study's participants did not initially list technology as an influence on their decision to homeschool when they were surveyed, but they did comment in discussions that technology makes homeschooling easier. Gann and Carpenter (2018) mentioned a couple of studies whose results showed that the accessibility of resources via the internet has helped

| www.ejsr.org

homeschooling families to broaden the instructional methods they use. Research conducted in Malaysia indicated that social media and mobile learning are the most popular ways in which HE families support their teaching and their children's learning, followed by blogs and wikis, digital story-based learning activities, and accessing information via the internet. According to their findings, usage of web-portals and interactive video games were ranked least popular (Alias, Rahman, Siraj, & Ruslina, 2013).

According to Andrade (2008), the technology most trusted by unschooling parents is the internet. The rich and dynamic content that is available through the internet is the essence of their trust. Homeschooling families take advantage of the educational content on the internet, especially for subjects that they are not familiar with (Andrade, 2008). A wide variety of homeschooling websites offer curriculum, teaching materials, and techniques (Heller, 2013; Skelton, 2016). Nevertheless, internet usage also entailed a great deal of browsing through rich and yet unrelated information content (Curtice, 2014).

Skelton (2016) surveyed the parents of 89 elementary grade children, 61 of whom were being home educated, to find out their beliefs about using technology with educational purposes. Their findings suggest that HE children use mobile devices for educational purposes almost twice as much as formal-schooled children do. Interestingly, the study also found that formal-schooled children were more likely to be encouraged to use technology than HE children were.

Unschooling parents believe that the skills that can be gained from and practised with a computer constitute a better learning experience than, for example, watching videos and playing video games. However, contrary to the wishes of their parents, children use computers for playing video games 80% of the time instead of creating presentations or photo albums (Curtice, 2014). Ever since their earliest development, this interest in computer games has presented researchers with a great opportunity to consider that games can be a useful tool to enable some children to learn easily (Sefton-Green, 2004).

Using games in education has a long history; however, using digital games in education is relatively new and has come only with advances in technology like broadband, the internet, and mobile devices. Games that are being played with educational purposes are defined as 'serious games' (Beavis, 2017). A new learning method called 'gameschooling' was initiated for use by families, children, and the communities in all types of learning environments such as schooling, homeschooling, afterschooling (where children use games with educational purposes after school), or virtual schooling (Www.Gameschooling.Org, no date). The rise of homeschoolers, especially in the US, has caught the attention of game developers, since homeschoolers increasingly use the digital games for entertainment and education (Solomon, 2016). In their research, Marino, Basham,

and Beecher (2011) concluded that videogames helped at-risk learners and children with SEN when they were used not as a replacement for other educational materials but as a substitute. In another study, families of gifted children were encouraged to use games for educational purposes by inviting the families to be 'creative' with their methods (Rivero, 2002). HE families are mostly criticised for restraining their children from socialising; however, this is not the case and most HE families are rich in terms of social networks (Murphy, 2012). Moreover, digital games that act as an additional tool for homeschoolers' socialisation can be played online with friends (Solomon, 2016). While the use of technology by HE families is an understudied area, as mentioned earlier, research into the use they make of games is even more limited. Solomon (2016) adds another point of view when pointing out that, although HE families might not differ from other families in terms of using digital games, these families may have different expectations and expectations that current games cannot fully fulfil.

Although the TPACK framework (Koehler & Mishra, 2009) was proposed for the classroom environment, it can be broadened to the home environment, especially for those homeschooling families who have their own learning goals and methods for their children (Vourloumi, 2015). Gann and Carpenter (2018) supported this idea by citing literature that reported homeschooling parents' seeking guidance on how to use technological resources effectively for their children's education. Gann and Carpenter concluded that homeschooling parents often use individualised instruction methods for their children's personalised education and encourage their children to engage in self-directed learning; this approach leads parents to adopt STEM strategies to enhance their children's learning through collaboration.

Use of Technology at Home in Turkey

According to the EU Kids online report (2016), the age at which children access technology has decreased from five to two (Izci, Yalcin, Bahcekapili, & Jones, 2017). Turkish parents think that technology use is necessary in the digital era and ICT enhances the academic skills of their children. They also think that parents who are familiar with computers have higher expectations of the benefits of the internet and DLRs (Odabasi, 2005). Drawing on data collected on 4942 students from 160 schools in Turkey, PISA 2006 found that, when asked about the frequency of computer use at home, 39% of students said they used a computer almost every day and 41% said they never used one. With regard to the gender of the students, 37% of female students said they used computers at home every day; 29% said they never used them; 17% used a computer 1-2 times a week; and, 6% said they used computers a few times per month or even less than that. The findings for the use of computers by boys at home revealed that 41% said they used

one every day; 41% said they never used a computer; and, 13% indicated they used a computer 1-2 times per week (Aypay, 2010).

As shown earlier, more recent data suggest that 50% of Turkish households have a computer and 80.7% of households have home internet access (OECD, 2018a, 2018b). The difference between the computer ownership rates and internet access rates in Turkey suggests that 30% of Turkish people tend to use only mobile devices to access the internet. This figure is in line with global trends.

Genc (2014), which focused on 85 parents of three-six-year-olds (preschoolers) in Turkey, reported that 37.65% of parents said that their children spent two hours watching TV and/or DVDs/videos on weekdays, with 41.18% of parents reporting that this time increases to three to four hours at the weekends. The time parents spent reading with preschool children is lower than that spent watching TV together. Children whose mothers are housewives spend more time watching TV than do the children of mothers who are employed. According to Genc (2014), 70.31% of parents reported that they had mobile phone applications on their smartphones and that they allowed their children to use these apps. When asked about games, 28.86% of the respondents said that their children use smartphones for playing games and 20.13% said their children watched videos on the phone. Only 18.79% of parents reported that their children used a smartphone for learning (Genc, 2014).

Izci et al. (2017) compared the tablet use of children in Turkey and the US. Their study found children use mobile devices for an hour or less on weekdays and for at least an hour on weekends in both Turkey and the US. The Turkish parents commented on the lack of high quality digital content for their children and they were concerned about their children's safety (Izci et al., 2017). Therefore, they believed that allowing their children to use the internet only at home under their control was safer (Odabasi, 2005). The same study showed that 56.8% of the children use a tablet with their parents and they used it mostly for video watching (71.6%), playing games (62.1%), drawing/colouring (59.2%), and educational purposes (41.6%). Turkish parents are more likely to allow their children to choose which applications to download than the parents from the US (Izci et al., 2017). As regards the mobile applications downloaded in Turkey for children, 58.82% are classified as games for entertainment, 26.47% as educational applications, and 14.70% as games for learning (puzzles, maths games, and storytelling applications).

Furthermore, 31.37% of the surveyed parents reported that their children used smartphones one to two hours every day. Only a few parents reported three-four hours' use per day. According to Izci et al. (2017), reading to children has been replaced by giving children access to digital technological tools nowadays and

echoes the findings of research done on similar age groups in the US (Common Sense Media, 2013; Genc, 2014).

Homeschooling is unregulated in Turkey, with the exception of children with SEN whose education is provided by government-appointed teachers. Consequently, HE in Turkey is a very new concept and opportunities for research are limited for that reason. Although only a few studies have been conducted on the subject of HE in Turkey, as yet, no study has been conducted in the subject of home educators' use of technology in Turkey. Taşdan and Demir (2010) suggest that amongst other reasons, the lack of material and instructional technology make it even harder to implement HE as an alternative education method in Turkey. Aymen-Peker and Taş (2017) examined a sample case to determine the positive aspects and the difficulties that children with SEN in Turkey faced in the practice of HE. Their findings suggest not only that the HE interaction is often one-sided, but also that the experiments that are included in the curriculum cannot be carried out most of the time, because it is either not practical to carry the materials to the child's house or incompatible with health and safety rules. Therefore, they recommended use of technology to make the practice of HE more effective. The current study will, therefore, be the first in Turkey which examines unregulated Turkish home educators and as such it will fill the gap in our understanding in terms of both their approach to HE and their use of resources, including DLRs, in their children's HE.

Conclusion

The literature proposes a rather wide definition of technology and what technology means in education without pointing to any specific technology in particular. A wide range of technologies ranging from basic technologies like a blackboard and chalk to the most advanced computer-based technologies have been considered as educational technology. Nevertheless in recent years discussion of digital technologies, definitions and practices has centred mainly on information technology hardware, software, and applications. Therefore, in this research the term 'technology' is used as an umbrella term covering all digital software, hardware, and applications.

As technology has developed over time, DLRs have become a necessity in education rather than just an add-on. The more technology became a part of our everyday life at home and work, the more it was brought into education.

Moreover, as internet speed and content increased and their accessibility and popularity grew, the use of personal computers, tablets, smartphones also affected the ways in which they are used in education. While the particular technology employed in education varies from country to country mostly in terms of their level of economic development, discussions were often about whether or not the

technology actually changed the way education was conducted, rather than simply adding an extra dimension.

The FATİH project has been the biggest project in Turkish education history in terms not only of its budget, but also of its scale and the ambition of its intended outcomes. It is one of the largest examples of its kind in the world and has set a precedent for those wondering how a developing country can, or perhaps cannot, catch up with developed countries through such large-scale projects. The broad conclusion was that if the required infrastructure and teacher trainings are not in place, the traditional pedagogy and mind-set about education is unlikely to change. Göğüş, Nistor, Riley, and Lerche (2012) noted a significant difference in the way such projects unfold, stating that while it is typical for underdeveloped countries to attempt such large-scale projects, it is typical for developed countries to conduct research on the acceptance of technology in education where technology infrastructure also allows higher penetration and better acceptance of technology use. Consequently, further in-depth research into the experiences from projects like FATİH should be useful for other developing countries which plan large-scale technology-assisted education reforms.

With the availability of new technologies and devices technology use at home has increased over time both globally and in Turkey. Previous technologies have given way to newer ones and this trend continues as new technologies are supplied to the market. We can see that the time children spend watching television has declined, not particularly as the result of the advice of experts, but merely because newer media like smart mobile phones are becoming popular and children are spending their time using them.

The reasons why children are being allowed to use technology, especially the smartphone, are that parents use the smartphone as a tool to distract their children. It can be said that smartphones are the carrot and also the stick of modern times in terms of stick and carrot discipline. Parents download more game apps than education apps and give or take the tool away from the children to persuade them to do something or refrain from a certain behaviour. When questioned, many parents voice negative concerns about preschool-aged children's use of technology and especially smartphone use; however, they do not take any measures to curtail the time such devices are used and the way in which they are used by their children (Genc, 2014).

References and notes:

- O. Çarıkçı. “*Türkiye’de E-Devlet Uygulamaları Üzerine Bir Araştırma.*”, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 12, 1, 2010, 98-104.
- İ . Kirçova. “*E-Devlet Uygulamaları ve Ekonomiye Etkileri*”, İstanbul Ticaret Odası, İstanbul, 2003, s.17.
- Ece F. Köroğlu. “*Bilgi Toplumu ve E-Devlet: TBMM’de ‘Türkiye’de Bilişim Stratejileri ve e-Türkiye’ Genel Görüşmesinin Çözümlemesi.*” Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, (yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Ankara, 2004, s.32-33.
- A .Macintosh. “*Characterizing E-Participation in Policy-Making.*” Proceedings of the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences ,2, 2004.
- G.Maraş, “*Kamu Yönetimlerinde E-Devlet ve E-Demokrasi İlişkisi.*”, Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 37, 2011, 122-125.
- Ç.Odabaş.. “*Stratejik Yönetim ve E-Devlet.*”, Sayıştay Dergisi, 55, 2004, 86-96.
- OECD. “*e-Government for Better Government, e-Government Studies Report.*”, 2005, 11-15.
- K.Özdamar. . “*Paket Programlar İle İstatistiksel Veri Analizi .*” Eskişehir, Kaan Kitapevi, 2004, 633.
- J. Rose . “*FLAK.*” *Government Information Quarterly*, 25, 2008, 402 http://unpan3.un.org/egovkb/egovernment_overview/eparticipation.htm
- M. Sağsan . “*E-Devlet Topluların Yeni Umut Işığı Mı?*” *Stratejik Analiz Dergisi*, Kasım, Asam Yayınları, 2, 9, 2001, 66-72.
- A.Şahin, E. Örselli. “*E-Devlet Anlayışı Sürecinde Türkiye.*” Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 9, 2003, 343-345.
- John. Weeney. “*The New Internationalism.*” *Global Backlash: Citizen Initiatives in a Just World Economy*, edited by Robin Broad, MacMillan Press, 2002, pp. 55-62.
- Y.Yazicioğlu, S. Erdoğan.. *Spss uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık, 2004. P. 34.
- Y.Yazicioğlu, S. Erdoğan, S. “*Spss Uygulamalı Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*”. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık, 2004, pp 86-92.
- M.Yıldız. “*Bir Kamu Politikası Aracı Olarak İnternet Kafeler.*” *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 35, 2, 2002, s. 77-78.
- M.Yıldız. “*E-Government Research: Reviewing the Literature, Limitations and Ways Forward.*” *Government Information Quarterly*, 6,4, 2007, 68-70.

XÜLASƏ

Rəqəmsal Öyrənmə Resurslarının Qiymətləndirilməsi. Ev və məktəb təhsili üçün Rəqəmsal texnologiyanın qlobal səviyyədə və Türkiyədə istifadəsi

Hatice BÜBER KAYA
Kırklareli Universiteti,
Kayalı (Mərkəz) Yerləşkəsi, Kırklarəli, Türkiyə

Ozan KAYA, MBA

Bu məqalədə təhsil texnologiyaları və Rəqəmsal Öyrənmə Resursları (DLR), həm valideynlər, həm də uşaqlar tərəfindən məktəbdə, evdə, qlobal səviyyədə və Türkiyədə necə istifadə edildiklərinə aid ədəbiyyata bir baxış təqdim olunur. Tədqiqat işi təhsil üçün texnologiya və DLR-lərin təriflərini və tarixini araşdırmaqla başlayır. Məktəblərdə texnologiyanın istifadəsini, xüsusən də Türkiyədə texnologiyanın istifadə prosesini izləyir, analiz edir, FATİH layihəsinin tətbiqi, nəticələri və tənqidləri baxımından ətraflı araşdırılır. Bu layihə Türk təhsil tarixindəki ən böyük layihə idi; məqsədi hər bir tələbə və müəllimi tablet kompüterlə təmin etmək və ölkənin hər yerindəki siniflərdə LCD Ağıllı lövhələr quraşdırmaqla 'Ağıllı Dərslər' yaratmaq idi.

Nəhayət, dünyada və Türkiyədə evdə texnologiyanın istifadəsi izah olunur. Burada uşaqların mediadan istifadəsinə dair statistika və texnologiya istifadəsinə təsir edən ailə faktorları kontekstində müzakirələr aparılmışdır.

Açar sözlər: Təhsil ,texnologiya, Rəqəmsal öyrənmə mənbələri, FATİH layihəsi, ağıllı dərslər

РЕЗЮМЕ

Оценка ресурсов цифрового обучения. Использование цифровых технологий для домашнего и школьного образования в Турции и во всем мире

Хатидже БЮБЕР КАЯ
Университет Кыркларели, Каялы, Киркларали, Турция

Озан КАЯ, МБА

В этой статье представлен обзор литературы о том, как образовательные технологии и цифровые учебные ресурсы используются родителями и детьми в школе, дома, на глобальном уровне, а также в Турции и во всем мире. Исследование начинается с изучения определений и истории технологий образования. Контролирует и анализирует использование технологий в школах, особенно в Турции, и подробно изучает применение, результаты и критику проекта FАТІН. Этот проект был крупнейшим в истории турецкого образования; Цель заключалась в том, чтобы предоставить каждому ученику и учителю планшетный компьютер и создать «умные уроки», установив смарт-доски с ЖК-дисплеем в классах по всей стране. Наконец, объясняется использование технологий дома в мире и в Турции. Обсуждения проходили здесь в контексте статистики использования детьми СМИ и семейных факторов, влияющих на использование технологий.

Ключевые слова: образование, технологии, цифровые обучающие ресурсы, проект FАТІН, умные уроки.

ELM VƏ İNNOVATİV
TEKNOLOGİYALAR
JURNALI