Technology Use in Early Childhood Education:

A Review of the Literature

by

R. Nancy Zomer

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the Degree of
Masters of Education
Graduate Department of Education in the
University of Ontario Institute of Technology

Abstract

An overview of research into the impact of technology use on learning and engagement for children aged 3-6 in early childhood education settings from 2009-2014 is presented. Previous efforts to synopsize the literature have not been undertaken since 2009, and thus there was a clear need for a current review of the research. The most recent overviews (2003-2009) have limitations in the form of broad age ranges (0-8years) and narrow subject areas (literacy only). Thirty peer-reviewed articles, selected from an extensive search of the literature, are organized and discussed by topic: literacy, numeracy, social interactions and engagement. Methodological concerns include sample sizes, reliability and validity of data collection tools, lack of control groups, pedagogy and basic design issues. Key findings indicate that 94% of results reported in the studies show a positive impact of technology use. A disproportionate number of studies focus on literacy.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my very great appreciation to Dr. Robin Kay and Dr. Wendy Barber for their inspiring guidance, invaluably constructive criticism, endless patience and words of encouragement throughout my project work. I would also like to sincerely thank my third reader, Dr. Allyson Eamer, for her critical and constructive feedback which allowed me to view the project from an additional perspective.

My special thanks are extended to my husband and partner in all projects, James Pronk. I could not have done this without his unwavering support and faith in me. I thank our boys, Lucas and Marcos, for their enormous patience while waiting for some time with Mommy.

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

Historically, there has been considerable debate as to whether young children should use technology, both at home and at school (Alper, 2011; Blackwell, 2013; Children Now, 2007; Cordes & Miller, 2000; Kirkorian, Wartella & Anderson, 2008; House, 2012; Lindahl & Folkesson, 2012; Morgan, 2010, Parett, Quesenberry & Blum 2010, Plowman & McPake, 2013). One side argues that technology is developmentally inappropriate for young children who need to consolidate their knowledge using concrete materials (Cordes & Miller, 2000; Healy, 2004; House, 2012; Plowman & Stephen, 2003), and that too much screen time can overload their senses (House, 2012) resulting in attention difficulties and poor concentration (Cordes & Miller, 2000; House, 2012). Furthermore, it has been argued that overuse of technology puts young children at risk of developing muscular-skeletal injuries (Children Now, 2007; Cordes & Miller, 2000; Plowman & Stephen, 2003) and visual difficulties (Cordes & Miller, 2000). Other arguments suggest that young children are especially vulnerable to media messages (Cordes & Miller, 2000; Lieberman, Fisk & Biely, 2009) and that violent television and video games have been associated with aggression and anti-social behavior (Anderson & Bushman, 2001; Children Now, 2007; Cordes & Miller, 2000). Other detriments

include impaired literacy skills, loss of imagination (Cordes & Miller, 2000) and a lack of social skills, resulting in social isolation (Cordes & Miller, 2000; Healy, 2004).

The other side of the debate argues that developmentally appropriate use of technology can enhance young children's learning (Blackwell, 2013; Blackwell, Lauricella & Wartella, 2014; Children Now, 2007; Hillman & Marshall, 2009; Lindahl & Folkesson, 2010; Plowman & Stephen, 2003; Vernadakis, Avgerinos, Tsitskari & Zachopoulou, 2005), particularly in the area of emergent literacy skills (Cassell, 2004; Parette, Quesenberry & Blum, 2010; Plowman, Stevenson, McPake, Stephen & Adey, 2011). Technology use is associated with increased motivation (Lindahl & Folkesson, 2010; Plowman & Stephen, 2003; Vernadakis et al., 2005), student-centered learning practices (Blackwell, 2013) and the development of social skills through collaboration (Alper, 2011; Cassell, 2004; Cicconi, 2014; Children Now, 2007; Lieberman, 2009; Shifflet, Toledo & Mattoon, 2012). Another benefit that has been demonstrated is that the use of technology can support children with disabilities and special needs (Children Now, 2007; Cordes & Miller, 2000; Hutinger & Johanson, 2000; Muligan, 2003). Finally, supporters of this side of the debate suggest that early experiences with digital technologies help young children develop the necessary technology skills and fluency that will be needed in their future (Hillman & Marshall, 2009; Rosen & Jaruszewicz, 2009).

More recently, the debate has shifted and the issue has changed from whether technology should be used in early childhood settings, to how it should be used and

whether it makes a difference in children's learning and development (Children Now, 2009; Ko & Chou, 2014; Parette et al., 2010; Rosen & Jaruszewicz, 2009). Indeed, the question for educators and policy-makers has become how to best integrate technology into pedagogical practice and curriculum design in early childhood settings, which often value play-based learning (Plowman, McPake & Stephen, 2012). Several researchers recommend that practitioners take a thoughtful approach to the use of technology by carefully considering the design of the technology to determine if it supports creativity, curiosity, and play, promotes interaction among children and provides an authentic learning experience (McManis & Gennewig, 2012; National Association for the Education of Young Children & the Fred Rogers Center, 2012; Plowman et al., 2012; Rosen & Jaruszewicz, 2009). Rosen & Jaruszewicz (2009) introduce the term *developmentally appropriate technology use (DATU)* and suggest this includes preparing a technology environment in early childhood settings that supports child-initiated learning, encourages collaborative problem solving and takes a play-based, inquiry orientation.

Despite these recommendations for a thoughtful approach to the use of technology with young children, some research suggests that technology use in early childhood education is often inconsistent and/or limited (Aubrey & Dahl, 2014; Blackwell, 2013; Lindahl & Folkesson, 2012; Parette et al., 2010), and when technology is used, it often consists of simple drill and practice software (Chera & Wood, 2003; Children Now, 2007, Mama & Hennessy, 2010; Rosen & Jaruszewicz, 2009; Wang, Kinzie,

McGuire & Pan, 2010; Wohlwend, 2010). Edwards (2013) proposes the reason for this inconsistency is that international curriculum documents separate descriptions of play as learning from descriptions of technology use as learning, rather than combining them. Educators struggle to bridge the gap between pedagogical understandings of play and the use of technologies (Edwards, 2013; Lindahl & Folkesson, 2010; Plowman et al., 2012; Turja, Endepohls-Ulpe & Chatoney, 2009). Rosen & Jaruszewicz (2009) include an inquiry orientation in their description of child-initiated learning in a play-based environment. Play and inquiry are closely related constructs in early childhood education, as children develop inquiry through play (Youngquist & Pataray-Ching, 2004). Integrating technology into such a child-centred setting is more challenging than in the older grades which are more often based on direct instruction, rather than play and inquiry (Plowman et al., 2012).

The most recent literature review of the use of technology in early childhood education is five years old (Burnett, 2010). Burnett's (2010) review included children of a wide age range (infants-8 years old) and focused solely on literacy. Given the details of Burnett's dated review, coupled with the fact that new hardware and software applications have emerged since Burnett's study, in addition to the report of inconsistent use of technology in early childhood settings, an updated review is warranted.

This updated literature review includes studies from 2009-2014, narrows the focus to children aged 3-6 years (early childhood education age), and broadens the scope from literacy to student learning (in any subject) and engagement.

1.2   Previous Literature Reviews

Four previous literature reviews have been conducted focusing on early childhood education and technology (McCarrick & Li, 2007; Lankshear & Knobel, 2003; Yelland, 2005; Burnett, 2010). Each of these reviews will be discussed in turn.

The first review, conducted by McCarrick & Li (2007) focused on research from 1984-2004 with subjects in the age range of three to five years old. They concentrated on research relating technology to four domains of development: social, cognitive, language development and motivation. Their findings indicated that social interactions among children are higher when computers are used. They also cited support for using computers to help scaffold children's learning (either with an adult, peer or computer assisted scaffolding) and related this to the Zone of Proximal Development or the "difference between what a child can learn by himself and what he can learn with a skilled partner" (p. 84, McCarrick & Li, 2007). McCarrick & Li (2007) also noted computers are highly motivating for preschoolers. Finally, they reported that the research does not show an improvement in language skills with computer use, nor was it found to be a hindrance. They suggested that further research be conducted using

larger sample sizes, well-defined learning environments, and multiple developmental domains.

The second review by Lankshear & Knobel (2003) focused on research from 1996-2002, and students up to eight years old. Their literature review concentrated on technology in relation to literacy. The methodology used to find and select articles was clearly explained and uncovered 22 articles, six reviews and nine research reports. They organized the research into three categories: CD-ROM story books and language development, teacher/teaching aspect of using new technology, and new technology in relation to literacy education. The general findings indicated either a positive relationship or no relationship between technology use and literacy skills. However, Lankshear & Knobel categorized the types of studies looking at trends in the type of research. The authors created four quadrants (see Figure 1), which they used to map each study. Quadrant 1 covered research where stand-alone machines were used to enhance reading skills, specifically encoding and decoding skills. Quadrant 2 included research where stand-along machines were used to enhance the discursive prowess within communities of sociocultural practice. Quadrant 3 involved research where networked machines were used to enhance encoding and decoding skills. Quadrant 4 incorporated research where networked machines were used to enhance discursive prowess within communities of sociocultural practice. Within each of these quadrants, other variables were considered, such as the use of non-interactive vs. interactive

software, the diversity of learners and focus on teacher and learners respectively. They

found that very few studies clustered in Quadrant 2 and no studies were found for

Quadrant 4, which, according to Lankshear & Knobel (2003), are the types of literacy

experiences related to higher level thinking. They suggested that their review not only

affirmed that technology use in early childhood is under-researched, but that the

research that did exist was one-sided, focused on areas of reading/receiving (Quadrants

1 and 3) rather than writing/generating (Quadrants 2 and 4). Lankshear & Knobel (2003)

strongly recommended further research into new technologies in early childhood

education which focus on the higher level literacy skills found in Quadrants 2 and 4.

Encode/Decode

```
                    Encode/Decode

                          ↑

              1                   3

Stand Alone   ←───────────────────→   Networked

              2                   4

                          ↓

              Discursive Prowess
```

Figure 1 Quadrants for 'scenarios' in research (Lankshear & Knobel, 2003)

The third review (Yelland, 2005) examined research with children up to eight-years old, from 1994 to 2004, with a focus on four domains; literacy, numeracy, creativity and critical thinking, and the creation of knowledge building communities. Yelland began by outlining the arguments against the use of technology in early childhood settings (such as poor quality software, minimized role of teachers, social isolation, concepts being too abstract) and then cited research to disprove each of these arguments. She followed with a summary of Lankshear's & Knoble's (2003) review, while integrating other research which she organized into the four categories. Yelland (2005) suggested that the research revealed that innovation is possible when technology use is embedded in new curricula and that young children can use technology to experience concepts that were previously well beyond them. She recommended that future research should focus on innovative uses of technology, rather than a replication of previous studies. She argued that simply compared computer to non-computer contexts does not help to stimulate new understandings or add to knowledge of innovative uses of technology.

The final review, conducted by Burnett (2010) was the most recent and included research from 2003-2009. Like Lankshear and Knobel (2003), Burnett focused on literacy and technology within the infant to 8 year old age group. Burnett's (2010) method of finding research articles was well explained and produced 36 peer-reviewed articles. These articles were divided into three categories: technology as deliverer of literacy,

technology as site for interactions around texts, and technology as a medium for meaning-making. For the first category, she reported that technology as a deliverer of literacy had either a positive impact on various language skills, motivation and engagement or no impact. Regarding the second category, technology for interaction, only a few studies were found. These few studies suggested that children interact positively with each other when they work together using digital texts or literacy software. With respect to the third category, she concluded that technology can be used successfully for meaning making with this age group, especially when it is used to connect with the real world. Finally, Burnett (2010) highlighted the need for more extensive research into the area of children's engagement with digital texts. She acknowledged that most studies in her literature review were small-scale (in terms of sample sizes) and narrowly focused. She suggested that a broader 'gaze' should be taken when conducting research with young children and digital texts to allow for the possibility of identifying new possibilities and connections.

There are various issues with the four literature reviews which indicate the need for an updated review. The greatest criticism is that they are all outdated. Three of the four literature reviews (Lankshear & Knobel, 2003; McCarrick & Li, 2007; Yelland, 2005) examined studies conducted ten or more years ago, while one review (Burnett, 2010) investigated studies conducted more than five years ago. These studies would be considered dated in many areas of research, but are particularly out-of-date in the field

of technology where the landscape changes so rapidly. An updated review including research from 2009-2014 is justified.

Three of the four reviews (Burnett, 2010; Lankshear & Knobel, 2003; Yelland, 2005) focused on the 0 to 8 age group which represents children at very different stages of development. According to Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development, children aged 0-2 are at the sensorimotor stage, children aged 2-7 are in the preoperational stage, and children aged 7-11 are concrete operational (Piaget & Inhelder, 1969). There is evidence that children think and behave differently at each of these stages and therefore may behave differently with computers. Piaget noted that children in the preoperational stage think intuitively and conceptually, but not logically. They also have difficulty seeing different points of view. On the other hand, children in the concrete operational stage are able to think more logically and they begin to recognize varying perspectives (Piaget & Inhelder, 1969). Limiting the current study to the 3-6 age group might help reduce the variability in reported research findings and provide more reliable conclusions.

Additionally, two of the reviews (Burnett, 2010; Lankshear & Knobel, 2003) had a singular focus on the domain of literacy. Broadening the scope to include research in any subject area would give a more holistic view of technology in early childhood education.

Three of the literature reviews (Lankshear & Knobel, 2003; McCarrick & Li, 2007; Yelland, 2005) had some issues with methodology. Yelland (2005) did not report the strategies used for locating or selecting articles and two reviews (McCarrick & Li, 2007; Yelland, 2005) did not report the number of studies found. Three reviews (Lankshear & Knobel, 2003; McCarrick & Li, 2007; Yelland, 2005) included studies that were not peer-reviewed, such as dissertations, papers presented at conferences and studies cited in books. Each of these sources are not necessarily peer-reviewed which greatly reduces the credibility of the study since the quality cannot be ensured. Thus, results need to be interpreted with caution. The current literature review only includes peer-reviewed research.

Finally, all four literature reviews lacked in the descriptive detail given about each study. Three of the reviews did not provide sample sizes (Yelland, 2005) or provided them inconsistently (Burnett, 2010; Lankshear & Knoble, 2003). All four reviews lacked detail in describing the methodologies of each study. The current review gives sample sizes and a brief overview of the method used for every study.

1.3 Research Goals

The purpose of the following literature review was to analyze peer-reviewed studies on the use of technology in early childhood education settings from 2009-2014,

with a focus on children aged 3-6 years old. Studies were organized within two broad categories: student learning and engagement.

2 Method

This review focused on studies of technology use in early childhood educational settings published from 2009 to 2014. Only peer-reviewed articles (rather than project descriptions, analyses of programs, guidelines for practice, reports or conference papers), were included in this review. Well-known educational databases including EBSCOhost, Scholar's Portal, EdiTLibrary (Digital Library Dedicated to Education and Information Technology) and ERIC (Educational Resource Information Centre) were searched based on the following keywords: 'kindergarten', 'early childhood', 'preschool', 'early years', 'young children', 'technology', 'computers', 'information communication technology', 'ICT', 'multimedia' and 'digital'. Searches were limited by selecting 'only peer reviewed articles' and excluding dissertations, newspaper articles and book reviews.

It is important to note that early childhood settings include the age group 3-6 in preschool as well as Kindergarten classes. Kindergarten starts at various ages in different countries, and limiting the review to 'kindergarten' would miss relevant research papers. This is why 'preschool' was also included as a search term.

Titles and abstracts of articles found via this search were then screened for relevance. Articles that were directly related to the research goal, with subjects within

the 3-6 age groups, were considered to be primary articles. Articles that were

tangentially to the research goal were considered to be secondary articles and filed

separately. Note that several studies where teachers were the only subjects were found

and were included as secondary articles. Each primary and secondary article was then

read in its entirety for key information which was organized into a primary or secondary

database. Primary articles were specifically analyzed based on the following elements:

year of study, population, sample size, sample description, reliability and validity of data

collection tools, type of study and area of focus. See Appendix A for a detailed

description of the coding scheme used and Appendix B for a list of the coded articles.

The final step was to scrutinize the references of each primary article for further relevant

articles. These were then located and underwent the same screening process explained

above.

This search process uncovered 30 primary, peer-reviewed articles of research

studies published from 2009-2014. It should be noted that a meta-analysis was not

conducted because (a) the focus of the studies, method of data analysis and subject

area varied considerably, (b) quantitative measurement of impact was only assessed in

22 of the 30 studies reviewed (but many were mixed methods and also contained

qualitative data), and (c) reliability and validity were inconsistently reported for data

collection tools.

2.1 Description of Studies

In terms of methodological approach, eight studies (27%) collected qualitative or descriptive data, 13 studies (43%) used quantitative methods, and nine studies (30%) used a mixed data collection approach (e.g. involving both quantitative and qualitative data). Sample sizes varied from three to 396 subjects. While all the studies focused on preschool (n=1, 3%), kindergarten (n=25, 83%) or their combined (n=4, 14%) age groups, three studies also included teachers as subjects (10%). Thirteen studies (43%) focused on subjects who were at risk in some way: low socioeconomic status (SES) (n=6, 20%), learning disability or developmental delay (n=2, 7%), at risk for learning disability (n=3, 10%), low performers (n=1, 3%) and disadvantaged (n=1, 3%).

Descriptions of samples were rated as incomplete, partial or complete. Incomplete meant that little to no description was given of the sample. Partial meant that the size and some general characteristics were given (e.g. age, gender), while a complete description meant that this information in addition to further details were given (e.g. socio-economic status, information about income and education level of parents, neighborhood, etc.). Seven studies gave a complete sample description (24%), 19 gave a partial description (63%) and four gave an incomplete description (13%).

Each study was given a yes/no ranking in terms of reliability and validity of data collection methods. This metric typically referred to reporting the reliability and validity estimates for data collection tools. However, several qualitative studies addressed these

issues by taking measures to ensure inter-rater reliability. Fifteen out of 30 studies

(50%) made some attempt to report on reliability in their study. Seven out of 30 studies

(23%) reported on the validity of their study.

A variety of countries were represented in the studies including Australia (n=1),

Canada (n=1), Greece (n=4), Israel (n=5), Jordan (n=1), Korea (n=1), Netherlands (n=2),

Norway (n=1) Taiwan (n=1), UK (n=5), and USA (n=8).

The studies either focused on the impact technology had on student learning

(n=21, 70%), engagement (n=1, 3%) or both (n=8, 27%). The focus of the studies on

student learning included literacy (n=16, 53%), numeracy (n=3, 10%), social interactions

(n=8, 27%) and 'other' (technology that did not fit into a unified category), which

included sequencing (n=1, 3%), visual perception (n=1, 3%), creative thinking (n=1, 3%),

and fine motor capability to use a specific technological tool (n=2, 7%). Some studies

looked at more than one area, which is reflected in these numbers.

3   Literature Review

The review of the 30 articles is organized into two main subcategories: impact on

learning or impact on engagement. Figure 2 gives a visual representation of how the

literature review is organized.

Figure 2: Visual representation of organization of literature review

3.1   Impact of Technology on Learning in Early Childhood Education

3.1.1 Literacy

This category included 16 studies (53%) that described the use of technology to support the development of a wide range of literacy skills including phonological awareness, vocabulary development, concepts of print, reading comprehension and general literacy. Of these 16 studies, several address multiple and overlapping literacy skills which accounts for the total of n=21 as indicated in Figure 2 above.

3.1.1.1Phonological Awareness

Ten studies (33%) addressed phonological awareness or the "ability to analyze the sound structure of language" (p. 172, Maracuso & Rodman, 2011). Specific sub-skills of phonological awareness include the ability to break words into syllables and smaller units of sound, as well as the ability to blend the sounds back together (Maracuso & Rodman, 2011).

Five studies evaluated the use of specific programs, called computer assisted instruction (CAI) in relation to phonological development. These included the web-based program, ABRACADABRA (A Balanced Reading Approach for Canadians Designed to Achieve Best Results for All) (Comaskey, Savage & Abrami, 2009), the CAI programs Early Reading, Primary Reading (Maracuso & Rodman, 2011), and Tutoring Buddy (Volpe, Burns, DuBois & Zaslofsky, 2011), a literacy based PBS program (Penuel et al., 2012) as well as a phonics program presented using an Interactive Whiteboard (Campbell & Mechling, 2009). Five other studies examined the use of e-books and phonological awareness (Wood, Pillinger & Jackson, 2010; Shamir, 2009; Korat, 2009; Korat, Shamir & Arbiv, 2011; Shamir, Korat & Fellah, 2012). An e-book is an electronic version of a printed book with some added features. First, the e-book includes an audio recording of a narrator reading the text. Secondly, the e-book also includes extra visuals and music. Children navigate through the book with forward and back buttons. Finally,

most e-books include interactive features such as hotspots that can be clicked to define tricky words or give further insight into the story (Shamir et al., 2012).

In terms of CAI, Comaskey et al. (2009) compared two aspects of the ABRACADABRA program (synthetic and analytic) to determine if they had different effects on phonological development. The synthetic program involved blending and segmenting sounds, while the analytic program focused on rhyme identification and production. They conducted their study with 53 disadvantaged kindergarten students (26 and 27 in each group, respectively). Each group received 13 weeks of 40 fifteen minute sessions in total or, 10 hours of instruction per student. Comaskey et al. (2009) found that the children in the synthetic group showed significant improvement in CV (consonant-vowel) and VC word blending and articulation of final consonants. The children in the analytic group showed significant improvement in articulation of shared rimes. The researchers concluded that the synthetic and analytic programs have qualitatively different effects on children's phonological development.

Maracuso & Rodman (2011) conducted two studies using the CAI program, Early Reading. The Early Reading program was designed to enhance classroom instruction in building a foundation for early literacy skills. The program consists of two levels, each providing computer-assisted practice in literacy skills. The first study used a sample size of 38 preschool students (aged 4-5) who were equally divided into a control and treatment group. The treatment group participated in a total of 200 minutes of CAI over

the course of four months. Children used the program independently on a classroom

computer. Although both groups experienced some gains in pre-literacy skills, the CAI

treatment group had significantly greater gains in phonological awareness than the

control group (specifically, sound matching and rhyming).

In their second study, Maracuso & Rodman (2011) targeted kindergarten

students who were low performers (based on scoring at least one standard deviation

below the norm on the GRADE assessment). Forty-seven students in the treatment

group (average age was 5.5 years old) participated in 600 minutes of CAI using the Early

Reading program and then potentially progressing to the Primary Reading program

(focuses more on early reading skills), while 19 control group students received similar

instruction in every other aspect of the kindergarten program. Findings indicated that

while both groups made large, significant gains over the school year, the treatment

group showed significantly greater gains in phonological awareness total test scores

and on the word reading subtest.

Volpe et al. (2011) also focused on at-risk kindergarteners in their study with CAI.

They selected four children who were not responding well to the regular kindergarten

program. They used a program called Tutoring Buddy, which uses incremental rehearsal

(IR) to teach letter sounds. Students were removed from their class to receive the

computer instruction in a one-on-one setting with an adult tutor three times per week

(for a total of 25 sessions). All four students gained between six and nine letter sounds

over the course of the intervention. However, there was no control group in this study so findings should be interpreted with caution.

In a large study by Penuel et al. (2012), teachers of 80 low income preschool classes received training to integrate Public Broadcasting Station (PBS) videos, online games and print-based activities in the classroom for a period of 10 weeks. The materials were either based in literacy (intervention group) or science (control group). Four or five children from each of the 80 classes were randomly selected to complete pre and post tests on literacy skills (for a total of 396 children). The intervention group scored significantly higher than the control group on two phonological subtests: upper letter naming and letter sound awareness. The researchers concluded that supplemental materials from public broadcasting stations hold the potential for improving literacy skills, especially among low income children, although it is not clear which materials influenced the actual change (videos, online games or print-based activities).

Campbell & Mechling (2009) examined the effectiveness of a program used with an Interactive Whiteboard (IWB) targeting phonological awareness. They conducted a small study with three kindergarten children who had learning disabilities. They used a combination of 1:1 sessions and small group sessions (3:1) to teach students letter names and sounds. Each student had certain target letters to learn, and the researchers were interested to see if they would also learn the non-target letters by working in a

small group. Students received 34 sessions in total (10 minutes for individual sessions,

15 minutes for group sessions). Findings indicated that the three students increased

their letter-sound knowledge for both their own targeted letters in addition to the

targeted letters of the other students, but it should be noted that there was no control

group in this study. The researchers suggested that the amount of information a

student learns may be increased by including non-target stimuli and that the use of IWB

was an effective and efficient way to present information.

Use of e-books was another area examined in relation to phonological

awareness. Wood, Pillinger & Jackson (2010) re-examined the findings from a study of

80 five and six year old kindergarteners. Forty children were assigned to an intervention

group which worked independently with the e-book on the computer, and 40 children

were assigned to the control group which worked one-on-one with an adult tutor

reading a printed book. Both groups participated in six 15 minute sessions. The

researchers created four categories to analyze the interactions of the children:

bookbinding (computer/adult primarily reads the book, child is attentive), chiming in

(child chimes in to say word(s) with the computer or adult, or repeats them afterwards),

supported reading (child does most of reading, but uses the adult/computer to help

them with difficult words), and fluent reading (child reads fluently and independently

and does not require the adult/computer for support). Children in the e-book group

were more likely to engage in bookbinding, while children in the control group were

more likely to engage in chiming in with the adult reader. The e-book group (who engaged in more bookbinding) showed greater growth in phonological awareness than the control group who used chiming in. The authors explained that although this may seem counterintuitive (one might think that chiming in is a more advanced skill and thus would correspond to greater gains in phonological awareness), engaging in bookbinding serves an important literacy function in early reading development. Supported reading in both groups was negatively associated with phonological awareness. Fluent reading in the e-book group was negatively associated with phonological awareness, but the opposite was true for the adult-led group. Wood et al. (2010) recommended that there are situations where e-books may be more effective (e.g. with early readers) and situations when adult-led instruction is better (e.g. with more advanced readers), but noted the need for further research.

The remaining studies examining e-books and phonological awareness addressed populations of at-risk children. Shamir (2009) targeted 96 kindergarteners (average age was 6.1 years) of low socioeconomic status (SES). The 46 children in the intervention group engaged in three 35 minute sessions, working in pairs (formed based on friendships) to interact with the e-book on the computer. The control group received regular kindergarten programming. The researchers focused their analysis on the use of two of the activity's features: frequency of activation of e-book hotspots (dictionary, phonological awareness and pictures) and collaborative talk (between

participants). The intervention group showed significant improvement between pre and post test scores of emergent literacy. Within these results, collaborative talk was significantly correlated with improved phonological awareness, and activation of dictionary hotspots was significantly correlated with improved word meaning. Shamir (2009) suggested the potential for e-books to help narrow the gap in literacy skills for children with low SES.

Korat (2009) also studied children of low SES and the use of e-books. He examined literacy skills as a function of age (pre-kindergarten and kindergarten) and the number of times students used the e-books (three or five times). Participants included 107 pre-kindergarteners (ages 4.1 to 5.2) and 108 kindergarteners (5.2 to 6.3), randomly assigned to one of three conditions: control, three e-book sessions, or five e-book sessions. The e-book sessions occurred in a separate room where children worked in groups of three, lasting for about 20-25 minutes each. Korat (2009) found that the five session group performed significantly better than the control group (but not the three session group) in a measure of phonological awareness. The same was true for word reading ability. No differences were found between age groups in these areas.

A second study by Korat, Shamir & Arbiv (2011) added another dimension to the original e-book study (Korat, 2009) by adding a group of children who read an e-book with adult support (compared to children in a group who read the e-book without support and the control group who did not have an e-book). Once again, this study

targeted children of low SES. The study included 95 kindergarten students (aged 5-6)

equally divided between the three conditions (control, e-book, e-book with adult). The

four sessions (20 minutes each) took place in a separate room where children worked in

pairs. They found the e-book group with adult support performed significantly better

on particular subsets of the phonological measure, specifically, opening and closing

sounds, as well as word writing, than the e-book and the control groups. The

researchers concluded that adult support is important when children work with

computers.

Shamir, Korat & Fellah (2012) conducted another study with three groups

including a control (34 subjects), e-book (42 subjects) and a printed book read by an

adult (34 subjects). They also concentrated on at-risk kindergarteners (aged 5-7) but

this time on students who were at risk for having a learning disability. Intervention

groups received six sessions of between 20-35 minutes each. The printed book group

took place in small groups of three to five students. They found that the e-book group

showed significantly higher growth in sub-syllabic segmentation than the other two

groups. Note that this study is a mixed study, involving subjects within the age range of

this paper, but also slightly out of the age range (up to age 7), so results should be

interpreted with some caution.

In summary, with respect to phonological awareness, all of the studies reported

that technology use had a positive effect on some aspect of phonological development.

More specifically, two CAI studies and four e-book studies found a significant positive effect on phonological development. Two CAI studies found a positive relationship with phonological development, but these studies had small sample sizes and did not have a control group with which to compare the results. Two studies found that phonological awareness is affected differently depending on the situation: the synthetic and analytic aspects of a CAI program affect different aspects of phonological development, reading an e-book alone vs. a printed book with an adult can have different roles in phonological development. Overall, it appears that both CAI and the use of e-books can support phonological awareness in both typically developing children, as well as at-risk children, although the length of intervention and possibility of adult support need to be considered.

3.1.1.2 Vocabulary

The second literacy category, vocabulary development, included four studies (13%) in the areas of e-books and robotics (Korat, 2009; Shamir et al., 2012; Shamir, Korat & Shlafe, 2011; McDonald & Howell, 2012).

Korat's (2009) study with e-books targeted 107 pre-kindergarten and 108 kindergarten students of low SES. Students in the intervention groups engaged in either three or five repeated readings of an e-book for 20-25 minutes per session. Vocabulary levels of low SES children (regardless of age) who read the e-book five times progressed

significantly more than those who read the e-book three times and both of these groups performed significantly better than the control.

Shamir et al.'s (2012) study compared three groups of children at risk for learning disabilities (control vs. e-book vs. printed book read by an adult). The e-book and printed book groups received six sessions of 20-35 minutes each. A total of 110 children participated in the study. The e-book group scored significantly higher than both the printed book and control groups with respect to vocabulary. The printed group also scored significantly higher than the control group.

Shamir, Korat & Shlafe's (2011) study compared the vocabulary development of 60 typically developing kindergarten students with 76 kindergarten students at risk for a learning disability (aged 5-7) with the use of e-books. Intervention groups participated in six e-book sessions of 20-35 minutes each. Both typical and at-risk e-book groups scored significantly higher than the control group. In addition, the at-risk group scored significantly higher than the typically developing group which suggested that e-books might be a way to help close the gap in vocabulary development between these two groups.

McDonald & Howell (2012) conducted a study using a robotics program, focusing on several areas, including vocabulary development. The LEGO robotics program *WeDo* had previously only been used with children aged 7 and up. McDonald & Howell (2012) selected a class with 16 students ranging in age from 5.5 to 7 years old.

These children were considered to be of low SES and did not have computer access at home. The classroom had four computers which the children had previously used with commercially produced software programs, basic word processing and Power Point presentations. The researchers used a three phase model (model, explore and evaluate) to introduce and use the robotics program. Their study took place over the course of six weeks, with one visit a week. The model phase took place over two 60 minute sessions (instructed construction of pre-selected robots and basic programming), the explore phase took place over three 60 minute sessions (independent construction of group-selected robots and extended programming) and the final evaluation phase took place over one 90 minute session (prediction of movement of pre-constructed robot and assessment). They found that students showed an improvement in their literacy skills (specifically, use of vocabulary related to robotics and oral language). This was measured through observation, teacher and student surveys, and a student vocabulary assessment. It is important to note that this study did not have a control group with which to compare the intervention group.

Note that these two studies (Shamir et al., 2011 and McDonald & Howell, 2012) are mixed studies, involving students within the age range of this paper, but also slightly out of the age range (up to age 7), so results should be treated with caution.

In summary, all four studies showed an improvement in vocabulary associated with technology use for at-risk children. Three of the studies used quantitative methods

with sample sizes over 100 and focused on e-book use. The fourth study, centered on robotics, used qualitative measures to determine an improvement in vocabulary development.

3.1.1.3 Concepts of Print

Two studies (7%) focused on concepts of print which Shamir et al. (2012) describes as "a knowledge of book and text handling as well as the direction in which reading proceeds" (p. 55). Levy (2009) was interested in exploring if children would develop concepts of print through a computer format just as well as with an actual book. She followed 12 children ages 3 to 6 over the course of a year in their home and at their school. Levy found that exposing children to computer texts allowed them to develop confidence in handling print. Specifically, children figured out what both symbols and words meant (despite not yet being able to read) usually through trial and error and were confident in doing so. With paper text, they did not have the same confidence and believed they needed to be taught how to do it. Levy (2009) concluded that using computer texts allowed children to develop a sense of print in a holistic context better than paper texts.

In the other study, Shamir et al. (2012) targeted 110 kindergarten children who were at risk for a learning disability. They compared the use of e-books to a group who read a printed book with an adult. The intervention consisted of six sessions (20-35 minutes in length). Both the e-book and printed book groups showed significant

improvement over the control group in terms of concepts of print. However, the e-book group did not show significant improvement over the printed book group, which implied that reading a book with an adult, had the same effect on concepts of print as reading an e-book. The researchers pointed out that children used the e-book on their own and proposed that the use of e-books to develop concepts of print could be particularly valuable when there is a lack of adult availability.

In summary, Shamir et al. (2012) showed a statistically significant positive relationship while Levy (2009) showed a positive association between technology use and the development of concepts of print. Levy's (2009) study was qualitative by design with a small sample size, while the Shamir et al. (2012) used quantitative methods and a large sample size.

3.1.1.4 Reading Comprehension

Two studies (7%) examined reading comprehension. Shamir et al.'s (2011) study compared the use of e-books of 76 at-risk kindergarteners with 60 typical kindergarteners. E-books were used for six sessions of 20-35 minutes in length. The typically developing kindergarteners scored significantly higher than the at-risk group in terms of reading comprehension. However, both groups scored quite low which led the researchers to suggest that comprehension might be taught more effectively with some adult support. These groups could not be compared to the control group whose reading comprehension was not assessed because they had not read the book.

Korat's (2009) study focused on the use of e-books with 107 pre-kindergartners and 108 kindergarteners of low SES. Children received either three or five sessions with the e-books (20-25 minutes each). No difference between the groups was found in terms of reading comprehension. However, age differences were found. Kindergarten aged children did better than the pre-kindergarten aged children, suggesting a developmental aspect to reading comprehension and the use of e-books.

In summary, one study suggested that reading comprehension is not enhanced by the use of e-books, while the other suggested that it might be enhanced for children who are developing typically. An additional consideration is that there may be a developmental aspect and adult support may be needed to teach reading comprehension more effectively.

3.1.1.5 General Literacy

Three studies (10%) were related to general literacy and included emergent reading, writing, and/or oral language skills. Two of these studies used a specific program called PictoPal (which is based in Clicker software) (McKenney & Voogt, 2009; Cviko, McKenney & Voogt, 2011). PictoPal is a program that combines the use of pictures and words to enable students to express themselves in print, even before they are able to read (McKenney & Voogt, 2009). The third study by Huffstetter, King, Onwuegbuzie, Schneider & Powell-Smith (2010) looked at early reading ability in

relation to the use of another specific software program from the Headsprout Early Reading program.

McKenney & Voogt (2009) conducted four small studies examining PictoPal and early literacy skills, as well as the impact of adult guidance. Early literacy skills were defined as understanding the functions of written language and the ability to connect spoken and written language. The subjects in each study are kindergarten students and were matched by age, gender and language skills. One subject from each pair was then randomly assigned to the intervention or control group. The first study focused on the child's ability to use the PictoPal program and their gains in early literacy skills. Twenty-one students in the intervention group used the program four times over a period of five weeks (20 minutes for each session). Nineteen students were in the control group. Most learners were able to work independently with the program after some initial help. However, no evidence was found for an improvement in early literacy skills. The second study sought to double the intervention time (8 sessions of 20 minutes each), and use greater adult support with the program (in the form of parent volunteers). Students used semi-open activities only (the first study had closed and open) that were directly related to a current classroom theme. The sample sizes were very small in this study (seven in each group). Students in the intervention group experienced significantly higher gains in early literacy skills than the control group.

In the third study, McKenney & Voogt (2009) kept the length of intervention the same but increased sample sizes to 40 in the intervention group and 39 in the control group. Parent volunteers were used again. This time the control group participated in an alternative language program. Additionally, off-computer classroom activities for the intervention group were added. Again, the intervention group had a significantly higher learning gain than the control group.

In the fourth study, McKenney & Voogt (2009) focused on the types of interactions adults had with the children. Other aspects of the study remained the same as in the third study, except for smaller sample sizes (intervention group had 19 students, control had 18). In this study, the control group showed a significant higher learning gain. The researchers noted that the parent volunteers differed in the kind of feedback they gave to students, and in their ability to interact in a way that encouraged quality products and suggested that the type of adult support has an effect on student learning. They advised that parent volunteers may need training to learn how to best support the students when using PictoPal. Since the results were inconclusive, McKenney & Voogt (2009) also suggested the need for further research.

Cviko, McKenney & Voogt (2011) revisited the PictoPal program. This time the intervention group consisted of 95 children from four classrooms (two junior kindergarten and two senior kindergarten with children aged 3-4, and 4-5, respectively). The control group consisted of 73 children from two other classrooms. The intervention

groups used PictoPal for 10-15 minutes a week for eight weeks. Grade 6 students

helped the children work with the program. Each week students also participated in an

introductory activity in class and a related off-computer activity. Findings indicated that

the learning gains in terms of emergent literacy were significantly higher for the

intervention group than the control group, suggesting that PictoPal may be an

appropriate tool for use with kindergarteners (with the related activities, and a helper at

the computer).

Finally, a study by Huffstetter et al. (2010) focused on using a computer software

program (Headsprout Early Reading Program) with children of low SES. The Headsprout

Early Reading Program consists of a series of online episodes that use explicit instruction

and cumulative practice to teach early literacy skills. The intervention and control

groups consisted of 31 children each, ranging in age from 4.5 years old to 5.6 years old.

The intervention group used the Headsprout Early Reading program, while the control

group used a math-based computer program called Millie's Math House. Each child

used these programs for 30 minutes daily over the course of 8 weeks. The computers

were located in a mobile computer laboratory (school bus fitted with 18 computers). All

children engaged in regular literacy activities in the classroom setting. Findings

indicated that the early reading ability significantly increased for the intervention group

compared to the control group. They also found that although both groups showed

improvements in oral language skills, children in the intervention group experienced

significantly greater gains. The researchers advised that the Headsprout Early Reading

program is an effective intervention for improving early reading and oral language skills

of at-risk children.

In summary, the results of these studies of technology use and general literacy

were mixed. Of the five PictoPal studies (McKenney & Voogt, 2009, conducted four

studies, while Cviko et al., 2011, conducted one), three showed significant improvements

in early literacy skills, one showed no improvement and one showed a significant

improvement for the control group. Of the two studies not showing significant gains

for the intervention group, one had the lowest intervention time (only four sessions of

20 minutes) and the other noticed that the types of interactions of parent volunteers

with the students was very inconsistent. This suggests that length of intervention (the

significant studies had doubled the intervention time) and the variable of parent

volunteers could be having an effect and should be considered in future research. The

Huffstetter et al. (2010) study showed a significant improvement in early reading ability

with the use of the Headsprout Early Reading Program.

3.1.2 Numeracy

In contrast to the number of studies focusing on literacy (n=16, 53%), only three

studies (10%) focused on numeracy. One study was based in robotics (McDonald &

Howell, 2012), while the other two examined specific online programs (Fesakis,

Sofroniou & Mavroudi, 2011; Fessakis, Gouli & Mavroudi, 2013).

McDonald & Howell (2012) examined the use of a robotics program with sixteen 5-7 year old children of low SES. The program was used in three phases over the course of six weeks (for a total of 6.5 hours). They reported that using a robotics program improved children's numeracy skills (e.g. ability to count, identify colors and shapes and use of positional language). This improvement was inferred based on qualitative observations and the study did not have a control group with which to compare results.

Fesakis et al. (2011) conducted a small case study (four children, aged 5-6 years old) exploring an online program called Monster Exchange, which involved creating a monster and communicating directions over the internet to another class to recreate the monster. Data collection included videos of interactions, children's drawings and recordings of children describing their drawings. According to these qualitative measures, all four children showed improvement in geometry skills (making monsters focused on the use of shapes), although this study did not have a control group for comparison.

Fessakis et al. (2013) examined two programs which required basic programing skills to move a ladybug under a leaf or navigate through a maze. In this case study, 10 kindergarteners (aged 5) engaged in a series of seven activities using an Interactive Whiteboard to display the program (as a group, with teacher support). Based on qualitative analysis of video recordings, the researchers concluded that the programs supported the development of mathematical skills, specifically, 1-to-1 correspondence,

counting, number comparison, orientation skills and angle turn concepts. They did not have a control group in their study. They also noted the importance of having adult guidance to complete these activities.

In summary, all three studies suggested an improvement in mathematical skills with technology use. The studies were based on qualitative observations and interviews and did not have control groups. Sample sizes were fairly small, ranging from 4 to 16 subjects. One study mentioned the importance of adult guidance in completing the activities. Such qualitative studies should be interpreted using valid qualitative research standards.

3.1.3 Social Interaction

Eight studies (27%) focused on social interactions of children surrounding the use of technology. Two studies focused on social interactions and robotics programming (McDonald & Howell, 2012; Lee, Sullivan & Bers, 2010), three studies examined social interactions occurring around the computer in the classroom (Lim, 2012; Roberts-Holmes, 2014; Wild, 2011) and three other studies examined social interactions around specific technology or software programs (Sandvik, Smordal & Osterun , 2012; Papadimitriou, Kapaniaris, Zisiadis & Kalogirou, 2013; Fesakis, et al., 2011).

Robotics programming appeared to increase social interaction among students (McDonald & Howell, 2012; Lee, Sullivan & Bers, 2010). McDonald & Howell (2012) used a robotics program with 16 children of low SES over the course of six weeks (6.5

hours) and found that social skills of students improved, specifically with respect to students' ability to interact socially with their peers in the form of turn-taking, sharing ideas and comfort level working in groups. These results were based on qualitative observations, teacher and student surveys and did not include a control group.

Lee, Sullivan & Bers (2010) examined the use of the Creative Hybrid Environment for Robotic Programming (CHERP) in conjunction with the LEGO Mindstorms and social interaction. The study took place over five days with kindergarten students participating in a summer robotics program. The 19 children were divided into two groups (average age was 5.7 years). Nine children were in a group that received structured curriculum lessons (pre-designed, teacher-guided challenges) while the other ten children were in an unstructured curriculum group, following a constructivist approach where they were given free time to explore ideas and concepts on their own. Data was collected using video to verify children's self-reported interactions with others (represented by drawing arrows on a web with pictures of everyone in the classroom). Children in the unstructured group were found to have engaged in significantly more social interactions and peer collaborations than children in the structured group. The researchers suggested that a less structured, "learning by doing" approach might be useful for teachers when integrating technology to help foster peer collaboration.

The following three studies focused on the social interactions that occurred around the computer. Roberts-Holmes (2014) conducted a study to observe peer

interactions while working on computers. The selected school had employed a digital

media consultant and was considered to be quite advanced in their adoption of

technology. Observations and interviews took place over 16 visits (each a half day or full

day in length). Fifteen preschoolers from four different classrooms (age 4 to 6 years old)

were observed. Robert-Holmes tracked two types of interactions. The first was

Sustained Shared Attention (SSA) defined as "mutual attention and focus on the

computer tasks, tuning in and showing genuine interest" (p. 8). The second interaction

was Sustained Shared Thinking (SST) which is an inter-subjective process involving both

cumulative and exploratory talk. The researcher deemed SST to be more cognitively

challenging than SSA and thus a higher level of interaction. Findings based on his

qualitative observations indicated that when playing together on the computer

(engaging in software programs and games) children tended to have a higher level of

SSA. However, when engaged in a more constructive activity, such as making mini-

movies, children engaged in a higher level of SST. Robert-Holmes speculated that the

computer programs were too narrowly focused to encourage a high level of

collaborative thinking. These results were based on qualitative observations and did not

include a control group.

Wild (2011) also conducted a study examining SST and SSA in terms of

technology use. Wild further developed the definition of SST to include clarifying ideas,

making suggestions, offering other points of view, asking questions and co-constructing

ideas. Wild examined the interactions of pairs of children (5-6 years old) working on a literacy-based computer task compared to pairs working on a paper-pencil task. There were 44 children in the computer group and 43 in the paper-pencil group, from six different schools. The observations took place over the course of six weeks, one session per week (20-25 minutes per session). Based on these qualitative observations, the pairs working on the computer task were found to have a greater number of incidents of both SST and SSA than the paper-pencil pairs.

Lim (2012) was also interested in the social interactions around computers. Lim studied the interactions of 28 children in a full day kindergarten classroom (5-6 years old). Observations took place over a three month period. Students and the two teachers were interviewed. Lim observed that in the computer area, collaborative learning occurred 68.4% of the time whereas in the other activity areas in the classroom, children worked collaboratively for 53.9% of the time. The types of social interactions that occurred in the computer area were the same as those occurring at other activity areas (parallel play, simple verbal conflicts, sociable interactions, knowledge gained through positive interaction process, knowledge gained through negative interaction process and non-verbal communication). Lim recommended that the computer area should not be viewed as an isolating activity and that teachers need to be aware that peers can interact with each other in developmentally meaningful ways, just as they can

at any other activity area. These results are based on the qualitative observations of the same group of children playing at various learning centers within their classroom.

The remaining three studies examined the use of specific types of technology or programs and social interactions. Sandvik et al. (2012) conducted a study with five children (aged 5) and noted that the size and portability of an iPad$^©$ tablet lent itself naturally to social interactions. The children in this study worked with a teacher and often a peer partner to use two apps. The *See and Say* app is a simple app requiring students to find images in a detail-rich picture. The *Puppet Pals* app is a more constructivist and creative app, allowing children to produce their own unique stories with animation and audio. The children shared their work with the rest of the group by connecting the iPad$^©$ to a larger screen. The researchers found that the children helped each other in both partner and full group activities, by cooperating, sharing and participating. These results are based on qualitative analysis of video recordings and transcripts. The study did not have a control group with which to compare the results.

Papadimitriou, Kapaniaris, Zisiadis & Kalogirou (2013) conducted a study with 19 five to six year old children over a period of three weeks. They explored digital storytelling (using a digital camera, webcam and computer) with a focus on social interactions. Their data collection methods included group interviews, observations, notes and video recordings. They found that digital storytelling increased the number of both child-to-child and child-to-teacher social interactions over the course of the

intervention. However, there was no control group and these findings are based on qualitative observations.

Fesakis, et al. (2011) conducted a small case study (four children, aged 5-6 years old) exploring an online program called Monster Exchange (creating and giving directions to build a monster). Researchers noted an improvement in collaboration skills among the children over the course of working with this program. Again, these results were based on qualitative methods and did not include a control group for comparison.

In summary, all eight studies reported a positive relationship between technology use and social interactions. However, of the eight studies, seven were based on qualitative research and six did not include a control group with which to compare results. Additionally, six of the studies had sample sizes smaller than 20. Interpretation of these qualitative studies is variable depending on the methodology of these researchers.

3.1.4 Other Technology-Based Studies

Five studies (17%) did not clearly fit into any unified categories. Three of the studies (10%) examined sequencing (Kazakoff & Bers, 2012), visual perception (Chen, Lin, Wei, Liu & Wuang, 2013) and creative thinking (Shawareb, 2011). The remaining two studies (7%) examined the fine motor capability of children to physically navigate a specific technological tool (Panagiotakou & Pange, 2010; Couse & Chen, 2010).

Kazakoff & Bers (2012) explored the use of a robotics program and sequencing skills. Sequencing is an important component in the development of early math and early literacy learning. They were interested in examining whether robotics programming would improve sequencing skills, and the moderating impact of class size, years of teaching experience and teacher's technology competence. Fifty-four children participated in the study from two classes (one small class and one large class) with teachers of varying experience and technological competence. Each class was further subdivided into intervention and control groups. The intervention groups received twice weekly curriculum lessons from the TangibleK robotics program, taught by the kindergarten teacher, for about 60-90 minutes. The control group participated in art during this time. All students completed a pre- and post-test in sequencing skills. The results showed a significant improvement in sequencing skills of the intervention groups, regardless of class size, teacher experience or teacher competence with technology. It is worth noting that the difference in years of teaching experience (one year) and technological competence (one level) may not have been diverse enough to properly assess the relative impact of these variables.

Chen et al. (2013) focused their study on children with developmental delays and visual perception training. They divided 64 children (4-6 year olds, with developmental delays) into one of four groups: multimedia visual perceptual group training, multimedia visual perceptual individual training, paper visual perceptual group training, and a

control group (no training). The three intervention groups participated in 40 minute training sessions each week for 14 weeks. The results indicated that all intervention groups showed significant gains in their visual perception skills. However, on closer analysis, only the two multimedia based interventions showed a significant effect that could not be explained by a developmental effect (age-related effect). They also found that the multimedia training group had a greater effect than the individual multimedia training group. Chen et al. (2013) suggested that in the group training, children might have benefited from observing other children. They noted that group treatment might be a solution to the shortage of therapists, service hours and increasing number of children requiring treatment.

Shawareb (2011) examined creative thinking and the use of technology with 76 kindergarten children. He compared the results of a creative thinking test between two classes: one that had a computer in their classroom for 12 weeks (37 children), and the control class which did not have a computer (39 children). The children in the intervention class were given 10-15 minutes daily to work on the computer on their own for 12 weeks (the computer had programs such as Millie's Math House, Bailey's Book House, Sammy's Science House, KidPix, Dr. Seuss's ABC, Thinking' Things I). They were also given 45 minutes in the lab weekly to learn more about how to use computers. He found that the computer group scored significantly higher on the creative thinking test than the control group. However, Shawareb (2011) did not do a pretest to establish that

there was no difference between the two groups before the intervention, so these results should be interpreted with caution.

Panagiotakou & Pange (2010) compared the use of a regular mouse and a camera mouse with respect to students' performance on a music activity. A camera mouse uses automatic movement recognition technology to enable the user to control the mouse pointer just by using a part of his/her body that is framed by the camera. Twenty-eight children (4 to 6 years old) worked on either using the regular mouse or camera mouse with a music activity. Students listened to a sound and identified the instrument making the sound. The intervention took place for 15 minutes a week for four weeks. They found that even though the camera mouse was more challenging for the children to use, the children in this group scored significantly better on the music activity than the group using the regular mouse. They speculated that the extra challenge and novelty of using the camera mouse resulted in a higher level of interest and concentration for the children, enabling them to do better on the music activity.

Couse & Chen (2010) conducted a study examining the viability of using tablets in an early childhood environment. They looked at ease of use and quality of self-portrait designs. Forty-one children (3-6 years old) from three preschool classes participated in the study. The children worked in pairs with one researcher in a small, adjoining room from their classroom (each child had their own tablet) for three sessions over two weeks. The researchers examined the level of tablet use (being able to use the

functions and solve problems) and found that 98% of children achieved the highest level

of use by the second session, suggesting that children can learn to use a tablet very

quickly. Children's ability to draw self-portraits with a stylus on a tablet compared to

traditional writing tools was also examined. Their teachers compared the electronic self-

portrait with one that they had drawn with traditional materials. Teachers ranked their

tablet portrait as below expectation, typical or above expectation compared to their

paper version. Teachers ranked 20% of the tablet self-portraits as above expectation.

Couse & Chen (2010) also conducted a survey with the children and found that 64% of

them preferred the tablet over traditional materials. Some of the reasons children gave

for this preference was that it was easier to draw on, the colors were brighter and it was

easier to erase and change things. For these reasons, the researchers suggested that

tablets may be a good technological tool for use in preschool classes.

In summary, three of these five studies indicated that technology use may have a

positive influence on sequencing, visual perception skills and possibly, creative thinking

skills (although that study should be interpreted with caution due to the lack of a

pretest). The remaining two studies had a different focus, being more about if children

were able to successfully learn how to use a specific technology and if this helped with

their achievement on a music activity and self-portrait drawing, respectively. These

studies suggested that children are capable of successfully using a camera mouse and a

stylus with a tablet, and that these devices helped them answer more questions correctly

on the music activity, and draw a reasonable self-portrait, comparable or better to what they can draw with traditional materials. All of the studies were either quantitative or mixed methods with sample sizes ranging from 28 to 76 subjects.

3.2 Impact of Technology on Engagement in Early Childhood Education

Nine studies (30%) focused on the impact of technology on student engagement in early childhood education. Of the nine studies assessed, four used some type of quantitative tool to measure engagement (Howard et al., 2012; Couse & Chen, 2010; Cviko et al., 2011; McDonald & Howell, 2012). The remaining five studies used qualitative measures to assess engagement (Fesakis et al., 2011; Fessakis, et al., 2013; Papdimitriou et al., 2013; Roberts-Holmes, 2014; Panagiotakou & Pange, 2010). Although many definitions exist for the term engagement, for the purpose of this paper, engagement refers to sustained involvement in learning activities, accompanied by interest and enjoyment (Parsons & Taylor, 2012).

Howard et al. (2012) examined various types of computer use and children's levels of engagement. Twelve schools participated in the study, each of which followed a play-based curriculum. The schools represented a variety of settings (rural, semi-rural, urban), school sizes (ranging from 30-364 children) and class sizes (ranging from 15 to 60 students). Each classroom had at least one desktop computer, eight classrooms had a SMARTboard and 11 classes had access to a computer lab. Children ranged in age

from three to seven years old. Children's engagement was assessed using the Leuven

Involvement Scale to analyze 39 recorded sessions. The mean Leuven score was 3.6,

indicating moderate to high levels of engagement. The researchers compared the

Leuven scores from the 39 sessions to look for differences based on settings, teacher

presence, and the type of use (continuous use where children direct their own learning

with the technology, focused use when a particular skill was being taught with

technology and enhanced use which lay somewhere in between, the child was given

some direction but also had some choice). No significant differences were found in

engagement according to the type of use or teacher presence. The only difference the

researchers did note was based on group size. Whole class computer activities had

marginally significant lower levels of engagement compared to computer activities with

smaller groups (Howard et al., 2012).

Two studies noted that the level of engagement increased with the age of the

student (Couse & Chen, 2010; Cviko et al., 2011). Couse & Chen (2010) examined the

use of tablets with 41 preschoolers (aged 3-6) to assess ease of use and impact on the

ability to draw a self-portrait. They noted that based on their qualitative observations,

as age increased, so did the length of time engaged with tablet use. Cviko et al. (2011)

studied 168 junior and senior kindergarteners using the PictoPal program over the

course of 8 weeks. They measured engagement using a rating checklist and found that

senior kindergarten (SK) students were significantly more engaged in the computer

activity than junior kindergarten (JK) students. The researchers offered a developmental reason for this difference. SK's language use during engagement in computer activities was richer in vocabulary and more socially oriented than that of the JK's. They also noted that both JK and SK engagement with the computer program increased over time, which they speculated was due to increased familiarity and ability to use the program.

McDonald & Howell (2012) worked with 16 students (aged 3-7) of low SES on a robotics program for six weeks (6.5 hours). The program was introduced in three phases (model, explore and evaluate) to help students develop skills in robotics. At the end of the program, they administered a simple survey to determine student's opinions and attitudes towards the program. Students filled in happy, neutral or sad faces to indicate their opinion. They found that students reported high levels of motivation and engagement. The study did not have a control group and although most subjects were within the age range of the review, some were slightly out of range (7 years old), so these results should be interpreted with this in mind.

Fesakis et al. (2011) conducted a small case study with four children (5-6 years old) using an online program called Monster Exchange. The program required students to create a monster and then describe their monster to another class over the internet to see if they could recreate it. In a second study, Fessakis et al. (2014) explored two online programs with 10 students (5 years old), using basic programming skills to direct a ladybug to a leaf, or through a maze. Both studies reported that students appeared

highly engaged and motivated, showing enthusiasm and pleasure when working with the programs. These conclusions were based on anecdotal observations (expressions on children's faces, body language, words they said).

Papadimitriou et al. (2013) explored digital storytelling over a period of three weeks with 19 children (5-6 years old). Based on their qualitative data collection methods, including group interviews, observations, notes and video recordings, they reported that children were engaged and motivated throughout all of the activities.

Roberts-Holmes (2014) conducted a study at a preschool that was well known for its adoption of technology. He observed 15 preschoolers (4-6 years old) from four different classrooms over the course of 16 visits. He viewed children during free play at the computers and also while they were working with the digital media consultant to create their own mini movies. Although the focus of his study was on peer interactions, he noted that the collaborative creation of mini-movies was highly engaging for the children. This finding is based on qualitative observation and should be interpreted using standards appropriate to this methodology.

Panagiotakou & Pange's (2010) study compared the use of a regular mouse with a camera mouse to complete a music activity. Twenty-eight children (aged 4-6) participated for 15 minutes a week for four weeks. The researchers observed that the children using the camera mouse were able to engage for longer periods of time. Students used the camera mouse for an average 3.1 minutes, while students used the

regular mouse for an average of 1.7 minutes. The researchers also suggested based on qualitative observations that the children appeared to be enjoying using the camera mouse more than the regular mouse.

In summary, all nine studies reported a positive relationship between engagement and technology use, and each was challenged by difficulties of precisely defining and measuring behaviors that indicate engagement. Of the nine studies reported here, four studies use some type of quantitative tool to measure engagement (rating scale, length of time, checklist and student survey), however, the reliability and validity were not reported for any of these tools. The other five studies used qualitative measures (anecdotal evidence and observations) with relatively small sample sizes to report engagement. Seven studies did not have a control group with which to compare the findings. Indeed, there are significant challenges in accurately measuring engagement as it may appear differently in different students and as such is a difficult construct to measure.

3.3 Methodological Challenges

The 30 papers from 2009-2014 that have been reviewed present some interesting findings. However, it is important to address several key methodological concerns including sample size and description, reliability and validity of data collection tools, pedagogy and design issues that may affect the credibility of the results.

3.3.1   Sample Size and Description

Sample size is important as it influences the ability to make generalizations to a larger population. Larger sample sizes have greater potential for generalizability. Of the studies reviewed, 15 (45%) had fairly large sample sizes over 50. On the other hand, 11 studies (34%) had sample sizes of less than 20 students, four of which had sample sizes of less than 10. Seven (21%) had samples sizes between 20 and 50. These are generally considered small sample sizes (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2010), although there is some disagreement in this regard. Nikolopoulou (2010) argued that even though sample sizes may be small, when research involves young children and are therefore not easily generalizable, they can still give valuable information for early childhood education settings. Small case studies or qualitative research can provide information and more detailed explanations about phenomena observed. Regardless, it is important to keep in mind that over half of the studies have relatively small sample sizes when considering the results.

In terms of description of samples, seven studies (24%) gave a complete sample description, 19 (63%) a partial description and four (13%) an incomplete description. A detailed description of a sample provide the context of a study and helps researchers make generalizations when the sample size is large enough, or if researchers wish to repeat the study.

3.3.2   Reliability and Validity of Data Collection Tools

The reliability and validity of the data collection tools for the quantitative studies in this literature review was lacking. It is somewhat challenging to have confidence in the data if the tools are not reliable or valid. Of the 13 quantitative studies, only three (23%) reported on both reliability and validity. Five (38%) described validity but not reliability and one (8%) reported on validity but not reliability. Four (31%) of the quantitative studies reported neither.

The mixed methods studies were similarly lacking. Only two of the nine studies (22%) reported both validity and reliability for the tools used. Two other studies (22%) described reliability but not validity. The remaining five studies (56%) did not report either measure.

Three of the eight qualitative studies (38%) explained how they achieved aspects of reliability in their studies. They accomplished inter-rater reliability by having more than one person independently rate/code/organize observations, video recordings and/or transcripts. Of the remaining five qualitative studies, three did not mention reliability or validity, while two acknowledged and explained the limitations and challenges of their study.

3.3.3   Intervention vs. Control Groups

Ideally, quantitative research assessing the impact of technology should have both an intervention and control group. Eleven of the 13 quantitative studies (85%) and

six of the nine mixed methods studies (67%) had both intervention and control groups. One qualitative study also used a control and intervention group, which is unusual for qualitative research. The use of a control group gives credibility to the study because it allows for the intervention group to be compared to a baseline, to help determine if the intervention had any effect.

3.3.4 Pedagogy

Pedagogy refers to the strategies that were used with the technology in each study. These details are important for replicating the study, as well as for teasing apart the impact of the device from the impact of instruction. Overall, the studies assess in this review were rigorous with respect to reporting pedagogy used. In 23 studies (76%), the details of the technology and the basics for how it was used were clear. If the technology was used independently, in partners, small groups, or with an adult was mentioned in 20 studies (67%). However, the role of the adult was rarely explained clearly. It is important to understand how the adult engaged with the child or children working with the technology, as the level of support could affect the results.

Three studies also mentioned the use of supplemental materials (although the type of material and how it was used was not necessarily clear), which might also effect the overall impact of technology use. It is difficult to discern if the impact came from the use of the supplemental materials or the technology itself. Not having these details affects the credibility of the studies and makes them difficult to replicate.

3.3.5   Design Issues

Only four studies in this literature review has significant issues with respect to experimental design. Two studies used control and intervention groups that were quite different in size (Cviko et al., 2011 and Maracuso & Rodman, 2011). One study used a posttest experimental design, but did not include a pretest making it impossible to conduct a statistical comparison (Shawareb, 2001). A fourth study (Kazakoff & Bers, 2012) wanted to examine if teacher experience and comfort with technology had any interaction in their robotics and sequencing study. However, the two teachers they chose only differed in their years of teaching experience by one year, and their comfort level by one ranking. These kinds of design issues reduce the credibility of the results reported, however, for the most part they were not present in a majority of the studies reported.

3.4   Summary

Keeping the methodological challenges in mind, some general trends and summaries will be discussed. A brief overview of the findings will be given, followed by a discussion of each subcategory (literacy, numeracy, social interactions, other and engagement)

3.4.1 Overview

Table 1 shows the number of studies in each subcategory and whether the impact of technology was positive, negative or neutral.

Table 1. Summary of Impact of Technology for Early Childhood Education

Area of Impact	Type of Relationship		
	Positive	Negative	Neutral
Literacy			
Phonological awareness	11		
Vocabulary	4		
Concepts of print	2		
Reading comprehension	1		1
General literacy	4	1	1
Numeracy	3		
Social Interaction	8		
Other	5		
Engagement	9		

Although the review covered 30 studies, many of these studies reported findings in more than one area for a total of 50 results. Ninety-four percent of these results showed a positive relationship, 2% showed a negative relationship, and 4% showing no effect.   Note that a disproportionate number of studies (50%) were reported in the area of literacy

3.4.2 Findings in Literacy

Almost all of the studies indicated an improvement in literacy skills with the use of technology. One neutral result was found in the area of reading comprehension

where the e-book did not appear to have an effect (Korat, 2009). The other neutral and negative finding came from a series of four studies with the software, PictoPal (McKenney & Voogt, 2009). Two of four studies found a positive relationship between PictoPal use and early literacy skills, while the other two found the neutral and negative relationship. Two themes came up in these studies, as well as in many of the other literacy studies: the need for consideration of the length of time of the intervention and use of adult support. In regards to the type of technology used in these literacy results, 48% used e-books, 44% specific literacy-based programs, 4% robotics and 4% the computer in general. Sixty-eight percent of the literacy studies focused on at-risk children. Of these, 47% were of low SES, 29% at risk for a LD, 6% diagnosed with an LD, 12% low performers and 6% educationally disadvantaged (based on mother's level of education). This indicates a high percentage of at-risk children in literacy studies, compared to the other subcategories (see Table 2).

Table 2. Summary of Technology Impact on Literacy

Area of Impact	Number of studies	Number of studies with at-risk children
Literacy		
Phonological awareness	11	9
Vocabulary	4	4
Concepts of print	2	1
Reading comprehension	2	2
General literacy	6	1
Numeracy	3	1

Social Interaction	8	1
Other	5	1
Engagement	9	1

One possible reason for the high proportion of studies in literacy is that traditional print-based literacy skills (e.g. alphabet awareness, phonological awareness, concepts of print, vocabulary, reading comprehension) are valued by principals, parents and governments (Lynch & Redpath, 2014; Wohlwend, 2010; Yelland, 2011). This may also help explain the high proportion of at-risk children in literacy based studies, as presumably these populations need to be addressed to improve literacy skills.

It is also worth noting that e-books and literacy-based software are the technology used in 92% of these studies. In the other categories, a wider variety of technologies are represented. However, if the focus is to improve literacy skills, perhaps these technologies are thought to be the most cost effective with the greatest gains. E-books and programs can be used on desktop computers that most classrooms already have and both can be used independently by a child after some brief training, as opposed to requiring the purchase of new technologies (such as iPads[©], robotics, webcams) which may require more adult support. Given the positive findings reflected in these studies, literacy skills appear to improving with the use of these technologies.

3.4.3   Findings in Numeracy

All three studies in numeracy suggested an improvement in mathematical skills. One study used robotics technology and two used specific programs. One of the studies targeted children of low SES and one study mentioned the importance of adult guidance.

3.4.4   Findings in Social Interactions

All eight studies reported a positive relationship between technology use and social interactions. Of the eight studies, two used robotics technologies (25%), two used computers in general (25%), one used digital storytelling (12%), one mini-movies (12%), one iPad$^{©}$ with two apps (12%) and one a specific program (12%). Only one study focused on at-risk children of low SES (12%). Generally, these studies supported more open-ended or unstructured activities and found positive social interactions around computer centers.

3.4.5   Findings with Other Technology-Based Studies

These five studies did not fit into any unified category. Each of these studies used a different type of technology: robotics, general computer use, specific program, camera mouse and tablet with stylus. One study focused on at-risk children diagnosed with a developmental delay. Three of the studies indicated a positive influence on sequencing, visual perception skills and creative thinking skills. Two studies suggested

that children are capable of successfully using a camera mouse and a stylus with a tablet.

3.4.6   Findings with Engagement

All nine studies reported a positive relationship between engagement and technology use. Of the nine studies, two used specific programs (22%), one robotics (11%), one tablets (11%), one camera mouse (11%), one digital storytelling (11%) and one mini-movies (11%). One study focused on at-risk children of low SES (11%). It was noted that engagement increased with age and familiarity of the program and decreased in whole class computer activities.

4   Conclusions

4.1   Educational Implications

It is clear from the research that technology can have a positive influence on aspects of both learning and engagement in early childhood settings. However, given the wide range of studies and the methodological challenges, it is important for each teacher to make an appropriate fit between the technology tool, their pedagogical approach and the children they are working with. It appears from the research that a wide variety of possibilities exist in terms of types of technology use (desktops computers with specific programs, e-books, tablets, video cameras, interactive whiteboards and robotics), how the technology is used (individually, partners, small

groups), where technology is used (within the classroom or another location), what support is needed (independently use or with adult or older peer support) and if supplemental materials are used (such as introductory lessons and print-based materials).

4.2 Future Research

There are several important areas that need further exploration. Given the variability and the differing methodologies of many of the studies in this literature review, future research needs to ensure that appropriate methodology is matched to meet the specific goals of the study. For example, action research by individual teachers using small case studies has a different goal than board-wide research. In any case, a clear description of methodology and pedagogy must be given, and reliability and/or validity of data collection tools included as best fits the study design.

Additionally, research into the impact technology use has on areas beyond literacy is needed. The research field is currently characterized by a disproportionate number of studies relating to literacy, and a wider view needs to be taken to investigate the influences of technology on the many areas of development in early childhood.

Establishing recommendations for best practices based on the integrated and ubiquitous use of technology in early childhood education would be helpful for educators.   However, this is a challenging goal since there is an ever growing ocean of

possible technology tools for classroom use. Helping teachers navigate this ocean and

learn to select the right tool for the right situation must be one objective of professional

development/training for educators. Exploring effective methods for delivering this

training and providing support in the implementation of technology use in

developmentally appropriate ways is an important area for future research. It is crucial

to examine how to deliver this training in a way that is meaningful and actually imparts

change (Lindahl & Folkesson, 2012; Parette, Quesenberry & Blum, 2010).

5 References

Alper, M. (2011). Developmentally appropriate new media literacies: Supporting cultural competencies and social skills in early childhood education. *Journal of Childhood Literacy, 13*(2), 175-196. doi: 10.1177/1468798411430101

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2001). Effects of violent video games on aggressive behavior, aggressive cognition, aggressive affect, physiological arousal, and prosocial behavior: A meta-analytic review of the scientific literature. *Psychological Science, 12*(5), 353-359. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00366

Aubrey, C., & Dahl, S. (2014). The confidence and competence in information and communication technologies of practitioners, parents and young children in the early years foundation stage. *Early Years, 34*(1), 94-108. doi:10.1080/09575146.2013.792789

Blackwell, C. (2013). Teacher practices with mobile technology integrating tablet computers into the early childhood classroom. *Journal of Education Research, 7*(4), 231-255. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.uproxy.library.dc-uoit.ca/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=95761851&scope=site

Burnett, C. (2010). Technology and literacy in early childhood educational settings: A review of research. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *10*(3), 247-270. doi: 10.1177/1468798410372154.

Campbell, M. L., & Mechling, L. C. (2009). Small group computer-assisted instruction with SMART board technology. *Remedial and Special Education, 30*(1), 47-57. doi: 10.1177/0741932508315048

Cassell, J. (2004). Towards a model of technology and literacy development: Story listening systems. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 25*(1), 75-105. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2003.11.003

Chen, Y., Lin, C., Wei, T., Liu, C., & Wuang, Y. (2013). The effectiveness of multimedia visual perceptual training groups for the preschool children with developmental delay. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 34*(12), 4447-4454. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2013.09.023

Chera, P., & Wood, C. (2003). Animated multimedia 'talking books' can promote phonological awareness in children beginning to read. *Learning and Instruction, 13*(1), 33-52. doi:10.1016/S0959-4752(01)00035-4

Cicconi, M. (2014). Vygotsky meets technology: A reinvention of collaboration in the early childhood mathematics classroom. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 42*(1), 57-65. doi: 10.1007/s10643-013-0582-9

Comaskey, E. M., Savage, R. S., & Abrami, P. (2009). A randomised efficacy study of web-based synthetic and analytic programmes among disadvantaged urban kindergarten children. *Journal of Research in Reading, 32*(1), 92-108. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9817.2008.01383.x

Couse, L. J., & Chen, D. W. (2010). A tablet computer for young children? Exploring its

viability for early childhood education. *Journal of Research on Technology in

Education, 43(1)*, 75-98. Retrieved from http://go.galegroup.com.uproxy.library.dc-

uoit.ca/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA238093998&v=2.1&u=ko_acd_uoo&it=r&p=AONE&s

w=w&asid=4efc0b13f8785fecf1c9e5149d6e710f

Cordes, C. & Miller, E. (2000). Fool's gold: A critical look at computers in childhood.

College Park, MD: Alliance for Childhood. Retrieved from

http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED445803.pdf

Cviko, A., McKenney, S., & Voogt, J. (2012). Teachers enacting a technology-rich

curriculum for emergent literacy. *Educational Technology Research and

Development, 60*(1), 31-54. doi: 10.1007/x11423-011-9208-3

Edwards, S. (2013). Digital play in the early years: A contextual response to the problem

of integrating technologies and play-based pedagogies in the early childhood

curriculum. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 21*(2), 199-212.

doi:10.1080/1350293X.2013.789190

Fesakis, G., Sofrouniou, C., & Mavroudi, E. (2011). Using the internet for communicative

learning activities in kindergarten: The case of the "Shapes Planet." *Early Childhood

Education Journal, 39*(5), 385-392. doi: 10.1007/s10643-010-0422-0

Fessakis, G., Gouli, E., & Mavroudi, E. (2013). Problem solving by 5–6 years old

kindergarten children in a computer programming environment: A case study.

Computers & Education, 63(4), 87-97. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2012.11.016

Healy, J. M. (2004). Young children don't need computers. *Education Digest, 69*(5), 57-58.

Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.uproxy.library.dc-

uoit.ca/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=11968042&scope=site

Hillman, M., & Marshall, J. (2009). Evaluation of digital media for emergent literacy.

Computers in the Schools, 26(4), 256-270. doi:10.1080/07380560903360186

Howard, J., Miles, G. E., & Rees-Davies, L. (2012). Computer use within a play-based early

years curriculum. *International Journal of Early Years Education, 20*(2), 175-189.

doi:10.1080/09669760.2012.715241

House, R. (2012). The inappropriateness of ICT in early childhood education: Arguments

from philosophy, pedagogy and developmental psychology. In S. Suggate & E.

Reese (Eds.), *Contemporary debates in childhood education and development* (pp.

105-121). New York: Routledge.

Huffstetter, M., King, J. R., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Schneider, J. J., & Powell-Smith, K. A.

(2010). Effects of a computer-based early reading program on the early reading and

oral language skills of at-risk preschool children. *Journal of Education for Students

Placed at Risk, 15*(4), 279-298. doi:10.1080/10824669.2010.532415

Hutinger, P. L., & Johanson, J. (2000). Implementing and maintaining an effective early childhood comprehensive technology system. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 20*(3), 159-173. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.uproxy.library.dc-uoit.ca/docview/233615073?accountid=14694

Kazakoff, E., & Bers, M. (2012). Programming in a robotics context in the kindergarten classroom: The impact on sequencing skills. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia, 21*(4), 371-391. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org/p/39512/

Kirkorian, H. L., Wartella, E. A., & Anderson, D. R. (2008). Media and young children's learning. *The Future of Children, 18*(1), 39-61. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.uproxy.library.dc-uoit.ca/stable/20053119

Ko, C.H. & Chou, M.J. (2014). Aesthetics in early childhood education: The combination of technology instruments in children's music, visual arts and pretend play. *Journal of Social Sciences, 10*(1), 39-45. doi: 10.3844/jssp.2014.39.45

Korat, O. (2009). The effects of CD-ROM storybook reading on Israeli children's early literacy as a function of age group and repeated reading. *Education and Information Technologies, 14*(1), 39-53. doi: 10.1007/s10639-008-9063-y

Korat, O., Shamir, A., & Arbiv, L. (2011). E-books as support for emergent writing with and without adult assistance. *Education and Information Technologies, 16*(3), 301-318. doi: 10.1007/x10639-010-9127-7

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2003). New technologies in early childhood literacy

  research: A review of research. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 3*(1), 59-82. doi:

  10.1177/14687984030031003

Lieberman, D. A., Fisk, M. C., & Biely, E. (2009). Digital games for young children ages

  three to six: From research to design. *Computers in the Schools, 26*(4), 299-313.

  doi:10.1080/07380560903360178

Lee, K. T. H., Sullivan, A., & Bers, M. U. (2013). Collaboration by design: Using robotics to

  foster social interaction in kindergarten. *Computers in the Schools, 30*(3), 271-281.

  doi:10.1080/07380569.2013.805676

Levy, R. (2009). 'You have to understand words … but not read them': Young children

  becoming readers in a digital age. *Journal of Research in Reading, 32*(1), 75-91. doi:

  10.1111/j.1467-9817.2008.01382.x

Lim, E. M. (2012). Patterns of kindergarten children's social interaction with peers in the

  computer area. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning,

  7*(3), 399-421. doi: 10.1007/s11412-012-9152-1

Lindahl, M. G., & Folkesson, A. (2012). ICT in preschool: Friend or foe? The significance of

  norms in a changing practice. *International Journal of Early Years Education, 20*(4),

  422-436. doi:10.1080/09669760.2012.743876

Lynch, J., & Redpath, T. (2014). 'Smart' technologies in early years literacy education: A

  meta-narrative of paradigmatic tensions in iPad use in an Australian preparatory

classroom. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 14*(2), 147-174. doi:
10.1177/1468798412453150

Macaruso, P., & Rodman, A. (2011). Efficacy of computer-assisted instruction for the
development of early literacy skills in young children. *Reading Psychology, 32*(2),
172-196. doi:10.1080/02702711003608071

Mama, M., & Hennessey, S. (July 2010). Level of technology integration by primary
teachers in Cyprus and student engagement. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education,
19*(2), 269-275. Doi: 10.1080/1475939X.2010.491238

McCarrick, K., & Li, X. (2007). Buried treasure: The impact of computer use on young
children's social, cognitive, language development and motivation. *AACE Journal,
15*(1), 73-95. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org/p/19982/

McDonald, S., & Howell, J. (2012). Watching, creating and achieving: Creative
technologies as a conduit for learning in the early years. *British Journal of
Educational Technology, 43*(4), 641-651. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2011.01231.x

McKenney, S., & Voogt, J. (2009). Designing technology for emergent literacy: The
PictoPal initiative. *Computers & Education, 52*(4), 719-729.
doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2008.11.013

McManis, L., & Gunnewig, S. (2012). Finding the education in educational technology
with early learners. *Young Children, 67*(3), 14-24. Retrieved from
http://web.a.ebscohost.com.uproxy.library.dc-

uoit.ca/ehost/detail/detail?sid=68d64680-0412-4309-9c99-

25f2ef24e5df%40sessionmgr4004&vid=0&hid=4204&bdata=JnNjb3BlPXNpdGU%3

d#db=eue&AN=79364398

Morgan, A. (2010). Interactive whiteboards, interactivity and play in the classroom with

children aged three to seven years. *European Early Childhood Education Research

Journal, 18*(1), 93-104. doi:10.1080/13502930903520082

Muligan, S.A. (2003). Assistive technology: Supporting the participation of children with

disabilities. *Young Children, 58*(6), 50-51. Retrieved from

www.naeyc.org/files/yc/file/200311/AssistiveTechnology.pdf

National Association for the Education of Young Children & the Fred Rogers Center.

(2012). *Technology and interactive media as tools in early childhood programs serving

children from birth through age 8.* Washington, DC: Authors.

Nikolopoulou, K. (2010). Methods for Investigating Young Children's Learning and

Development with Information Technology. In A. McDougall, J. Murnane, A. Jones,

& N. Reynolds (Eds.), *Researching IT in Education: Theory, Practice and Future

Directions* (pp. 183-191). London: Routledge.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2010). Generalization practices in qualitative research:

A mixed methods case study. *Quality and Quantity, 44*(5), 881-892.

doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11135-009-9241-z

Panagiotakou, C., & Pange, J. (2010). The use of ICT in preschool music education. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 3055-3059. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.464

Papadimitriou, E., Kapaniaris, A., Zisiadis, D., & Kalogirou, E. (2013). Digital storytelling in kindergarten: An alternative tool in children's way of expression. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(11), 389-396. doi: 10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n11p389

Parette, H., Quensenberry, A., & Blum, C. (2010). Missing the boat with technology usage in early childhood settings: A 21st century view of developmentally appropriate practice. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 37(5), 335-343. doi: 10.1007/s10643-009-0352-x

Parsons, J., & Taylor, L. (2012). *Student engagement: What do we know and what should we do?* Edmonton, Alta: University of Alberta. Retrieved from http://books2.scholarsportal.info.uproxy.library.dc-uoit.ca/viewdoc.html?id=/ebooks/ebooks0/gibson_cppc/2012-11-25/1/10610811#tabview=tab1

Penuel, W. R., Bates, L., Gallagher, L. P., Pasnik, S., Llorente, C., Townsend, E.., Hupert, N., Dominguez, X. & VanderBorght, M. (2012). Supplementing literacy instruction with a media-rich intervention: Results of a randomized controlled trial. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 27*(1), 115-127. doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2011.07.002

Plowman, L., & Stephen, C. (2003). A 'benign addition'? Research on ICT and pre-school

children. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 19*(2), 149-164. doi: 10.1046/j.0266-

4909.2003.00016.x

Plowman, L., & McPake, J. (2013). Seven myths about young children and technology.

Childhood Education, 89(1), 27-33. Retrieved from

http://go.galegroup.com.uproxy.library.dc-

uoit.ca/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA317469011&v=2.1&u=ko_acd_uoo&it=r&p=AONE&s

w=w&asid=2e798ab9c1c01ff9986ded12b0420144

Plowman, L., McPake, J., & Stephen, C. (2012). Extending opportunities for learning: the

role of digital media in early education. In S. Suggate & E. Reese (Eds.),

Contemporary debates in childhood education and development (pp 95-104). New

York: Routledge.

Plowman, L., Stevenson, O., McPake, J., Stephen, C., & Adey, C. (2011). Parents, pre-

schoolers and learning with technology at home: Some implications for policy.

Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 27(4), 361-371. doi:10.1111/j.1365-

2729.2011.00432.x

Roberts-Holmes, G. (2014). Playful and creative ICT pedagogical framing: A nursery

school case study. *Early Child Development and Care, 184*(1), 1-14.

doi:10.1080/03004430.2013.772991

Rosen, D. B., & Jaruszewicz, C. (2009). Developmentally appropriate technology use and early childhood teacher education. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 30*(2), 162-171. doi: 10.1080/10901020902886511

Sandvik, M., Smordal, O., & Osterud, S. (2012). Exploring iPads in practitioners' repertoires for language learning and literacy practices in kindergarten. *Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy, 7*(3), 204-220. Retrieved from http://www.idunn.no/ts/dk/2012/03/exploring_ipads_in_practitioners_repertoires_for _language_

Shamir, A. (2009). Processes and outcomes of joint activity with e-books for promoting kindergarteners' emergent literacy. *Educational Media International, 46*(1), 81-96. doi: 10.1080/09523980902781295

Shamir, A., Korat, O., & Fellah, R. (2012). Promoting vocabulary, phonological awareness and concept about print among children at risk for learning disability: can e-books help? *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 25*(1), 46-69. doi: 10.1007/s11145-010-9247-x

Shamir, A., Korat, O., & Shlafer, I. (2011). The effect of activity with e-book on vocabulary and story comprehension: A comparison between kindergarteners at risk of learning disabilities and typically developing kindergarteners. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 26*(3), 311-322. doi:10.1080/08856257.2011.593824

Shawareb, A. (2011). The effects of computer use on creative thinking among

kindergarten children in Jordan. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 38*(4), 213-220.

Retrieved from http://go.galegroup.com.uproxy.library.dc-

uoit.ca/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA289619983&v=2.1&u=ko_acd_uoo&it=r&p=AONE&s

w=w

Shifflet, R., Toledo, C. & Mattoon, C. (2012). Touch tablet surprises. *Young Children,

67*(3), 36-41. Retrieved from http://web.b.ebscohost.com.uproxy.library.dc-

uoit.ca/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=32fbc4a9-10ea-4e2a-9638-

1b2f2ab3b0b6%40sessionmgr114&vid=1&hid=118

Turja, L., Endepohls-Ulpe, M., & Chatoney, M. (2009). A conceptual framework for

developing the curriculum and delivery of technology education in early childhood.

International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 19(4), 353-365.

doi:10.1007/s10798-009-9093-9

Vernadakis, N., Avgerinos, A., Tsitskari, E. & Zachopouou, E. (2005). The use of computer

assisted instruction in preschool education: Making teaching meaningful. *Early

Childhood Education Journal, 33*(2), p 99-104. doi: 10.1007/s10643-005-0026-2

Volpe, R. J., Burns, M. K., DuBois, M., & Zaslofsky, A. F. (2011). Computer-assisted

tutoring: Teaching letter sounds to kindergarten students using incremental

rehearsal. *Psychology in the Schools, 48*(4), 332-342. doi:10.1002/pits.20557

Wang, F., Kinzie, M., McGuire, P. & Pan, E. (2010). Applying technology to inquiry-based learning in early childhood education. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 37(5), 381-389. doi: 10.1007/s10643-009-0364-6

Wild, M. (2011). Thinking together: Exploring aspects of shared thinking between young children during a computer-based literacy task. *International Journal of Early Years Education, 19*(3-4), 219-231. doi:10.1080/09669760.2011.629490

Wohlwend, K. (2010). A is for avatar: Young children in literacy 2.0 worlds and literacy 1.0 schools. *Language Arts, 88*(2), 144-152. Retrieved from

http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ906330

Wood, C., Pillinger, C., & Jackson, E. (2010). Understanding the nature and impact of young readers' literacy interactions with talking books and during adult reading support. *Computers & Education, 54*(1), 190-198.

doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2009.08.003

Yelland, N. (2005). The future is now: A review of the literature on the use of computers in early childhood education (1994-2004). *AACE Journal, 13*(3), 201-232. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org/p/6038/?nl

Yelland, N. (2011). Reconceptualising play and learning in the lives of young children. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood, 36*(2), 4-12. Retrieved from

http://go.galegroup.com.uproxy.library.dc-

uoit.ca/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA260494527&v=2.1&u=ko_acd_uoo&it=r&p=AONE&s

w=w&asid=586044e73ee126a6bb6d0bbb40d46c89

Youngquist, J. & Pataray-Ching, J. (2004). Revisiting "play": Analyzing and articulating

acts of inquiry. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 31*(3), 171-178. doi:

10.1023/B:ECEJ.0000012135.73710.0c

Appendix A

Coding Scheme for Primary Articles

Variable	Description	Scoring Criteria
Year	Year study was conducted	Year
Population	Sample population	0 = Preschool 1 = Kindergarten 2 = Grade 1 3 = Teachers
Sample Size	Size of sample population	Leave blank otherwise report actual number of subjects
Sample Description	Description of sample	Brief summary of description
Sample Description Rating	Rating of sample description	0 = incomplete 1 = partial 2 = complete
Country	Where study took place	Name of country
Reliability	Were reliability estimate given for measure used?	1 = yes 2 = no
Validity	Were validity estimates given for measure used?)	1 = yes 2 = no
Subject	Area of focus	Literacy, mathematics, etc.
Type	Type of research method used	0 = qualitative 1 = quantitative 2 = mixed methods
Lit Review	Percentage of peer reviewed papers in reference	Percentage
Impact on Student Learning	Was this addressed?	Yes indicated with an X, otherwise left blank
Impact on Student Engagement	Was this addressed?	Yes indicated with an X, otherwise left blank
Purpose of Paper	What was the purpose of the paper?	Brief summary

Appendix B

List of Coded Articles

Authors	Popul-ation	Sample Size (#)	Sample Description	Sample Desc Rating	Country	Rel	Val	Subject Area	Type	Lit Review	Impact on Student Learning	Impact on Engageme nt
Campbell & Mechling, 2009	1	3	3 K students with LD, 2 males/1 female, scores on WISC-III, age 5-6	1	US	1	2	literacy	1	95%	X	
Chen, Lin, Wei, Liu & Wuang, 2013	1	64	DD diagnosis, eligibility and exclusion criteria, age 4-6	2	Taiwan	1	1	visual perceptio n	1	85%	X	
Comaskey & Savage 2009	1	53	4 K classes, ESL, level of education of mothers, one school, urban, English, high needs (average age/gender not included)	1	Canada	1	2	literacy	1	70%	X	
Couse & Chen, 2010	0, 1	41	3 preschool classes, detailed info of ethnicity, home computer use, age 3-6, gender, classroom details	2	US	1	1	drawing- art- fine motor	2	70%	X	X
Cviko, McKenney & Voogt, 2011	1	168	4 K classes, upper middle class, gender, age 4-6, classroom details	2	Holland	1	2	literacy	2	75%	X	X
Fesakis, Sofroniou & Mavroudi, 2011	1	4	4 K students	0	Greece	2	2	numeracy - geometry	0	40%	X	X

Fessakis, Gouli & Mavroudi, 2012	1	10	5-6 year olds, gender, public semi-urban Kindergarten class	1	Greece	2	2	numeracy - problem solving	0	50%	X	X
Howard, Miles & Rees-Davies, 2012	0, 1, 2, 3	12 schools	details of variety of schools (size, location, tech access, ages 3-7)	1	UK - South Wales	2	2	engageme nt & play	2	60%		X
Huffstetter, King, Onwuegbuzie, Schneider & Powell-Smith, 2010	1	62	students from two Head Start Centres, age 4.5-5.6, gender, ethnicity, educational considerations, poverty rating, ESL	2	US	1	1	literacy - reading	2	75%	X	
Kazakoff & Bers, 2012	1	54	Kindergarten students, 2 classes (private/public, large/small), age 5-6, gender, ethnicity	2	US	2	2	robotics-sequencin g skills	1	75%	X	
Korat, 2009	1	214	10 classes (5 preK, 5 K),low SES, age 4-6, gender	1	Israel	1	2	literacy	1	80%	X	
Korat, Shamir & Arbiv, 2011	1	96	12 Kindergarten classes, low SES; detailed info on parents, mean age (5.7 years), gender	2	Israel	1	2	literacy	1	80%	X	
Lee, Sullivan & Bers, 2013	1	19	2 classes, gender, mean age (5.68)	1	US	2	2	robotics - social interactio ns	1	55%	X	
Levy, 2009	0, 1	12	age 3-6, gender, 2 classes	1	UK	1	1	literacy	0	45%	X	
Lim, 2012	1	28	middle to upper class, age 5-6, gender	1	Korea	2	2	social interactio ns	0	90%	X	
Macaruso & Rodman, 2011	1	Study 1 - 38 - Study 2 - 202	14 classes from 3 schools, ethnicity, gender, mean age 5 years	1	US	2	1	literacy	1	75%	X	
McDonald & Howell, 2012	1, 2, 3	16	urban school, lower socioeconomic, indigenous, 5-7 years old	1	Australia	2	2	literacy & numeracy - robotics	2	60%	X	X

McKenney & Voogt, 2009	1	4 studies -ranging from 14 to 79	K, ages 4/5, matched for age, gender, language skills	1	Holland	2	2	literacy	2	65%	X	
Panagiotakou & Pange, 2010	1	28	age 4-6, gender	1	Greece	2	2	music	2	50%	X	X
Papadimitriou Kapaniaris, Zisiadis & Kalogirou, 2013	1	19	Kindergarten, gender, age had to be inferred	0	Greece	2	2	literacy - storytelling	0	60%	X	X
Penuel, Bates, Gallagher, Pasnik, Llorente, Townsend, Hupert, Dominguez & VanderBorght 2012	0, 1	396	urban, low SES, 8 preschools, mean age 4.7, detail about ethnicity, income, mother's education, number books at home, children's lit scores	2	US	2	2	literacy	1	80%	X	
Roberts-Holmes, 2014	0, 3	15	socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds, school details, does not give age and gender	1	UK	1	2	media literacy (mini movies)	0	50%	X	X
Sandvik, Smordal & Osterun, 2012	1	5	aged 5, Kindergarten, multicultural, suburban	1	Norway	2	2	literacy	0	40%	X	
Shamir, 2009	1	96	4 Kindergarten classes, low SES, aged 5-6, gender	1	Israel	1	2	literacy	2	90%	X	
Shamir, Korat & Fellah, 2012	1, 2	110	aged 5-7, middle SES, at risk for LD, gender	1	Israel	1	1	literacy	1	85%	X	
Shamir, Korat & Shlafer, 2011	1, 2	136	aged 5-7(mean 5.9), at risk for LD, gender	1	Israel	1	1	literacy	1	80%	X	
Shawareb, 2011	1	76	Kindergarten, gender	0	Jordan	2	2	creative thinking	1	50%	X	

Volpe, Burns, DuBois & Zaslofsky, 2011	1	4	urban, 5-6 year olds at risk, gender	1	US	1	2	literacy	1	80%	X	
Wild, 2011	1	87	6 schools, 5-6 year olds	0	UK	1	2	sustained shared thinking and attention	0	75%	X	
Wood, Pilllinger & Jackson, 2010	1	80	one school, aged 5-6, matched on age, gender, phonological awareness	1	UK	2	2	literacy	2	70%	X	