



Review

How features of educational technology applications affect student reading outcomes: A meta-analysis

Alan C.K. Cheung^{a,*}, Robert E. Slavin^{b,1}

^a The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Department of Educational Administration and Policy, Shatin, Hong Kong

^b Johns Hopkins University and University of York, 200 W Towsontown Blvd., Towson, MD 21204, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 1 February 2012

Revised 8 May 2012

Accepted 9 May 2012

Available online 22 May 2012

Keywords:

Educational technology applications

Reading achievement

K-12

Meta-analysis

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this review is to learn from rigorous evaluations of alternative technology applications how features of using technology programs and characteristics of their evaluations affect reading outcomes for students in grades K-12. The review applies consistent inclusion standards to focus on studies that met high methodological standards. A total of 84 qualifying studies based on over 60,000 K-12 participants were included in the final analysis. Consistent with previous reviews of similar focus, the findings suggest that educational technology applications generally produced a positive, though small, effect ($ES = +0.16$) in comparison to traditional methods. There were differential impacts of various types of educational technology applications. In particular, the types of supplementary computer-assisted instruction programs that have dominated the classroom use of educational technology in the past few decades were not found to produce educationally meaningful effects in reading for K-12 students ($ES = +0.11$), and the higher the methodological quality of the studies, the lower the effect size. In contrast, innovative technology applications and integrated literacy interventions with the support of extensive professional development showed more promising evidence. Although many more rigorous, especially randomized, studies of newer applications are needed, what unifies the methods found in this review to have great promise is the use of technologies in close connection with teachers' efforts.

© 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Contents

1. Introduction	199
2. Research on educational technology applications	200
2.1. Working definition of educational technology	201
2.2. How might technology enhance reading outcomes?	201
2.2.1. Quality of instruction	201
2.2.2. Appropriate levels of instruction	202
2.2.3. Incentive	202
2.2.4. Time for practice and feedback	202
3. Method	202
3.1. Literature search procedures	203

* Corresponding author. Address: Room 415, Ho Tim Building, Department of Educational Administration and Policy, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, NT, Hong Kong. Tel.: 852 3943 3045.

E-mail addresses: alancheung@cuhk.edu.hk (A.C.K. Cheung), rsalavin@jhu.edu (R.E. Slavin).

¹ Tel.: +1 410 616 2310.

3.2.	Criteria for inclusion	203
3.3.	Study coding	203
3.4.	Effect size calculations and statistical analyses	204
4.	Findings	204
4.1.	Overall effects	204
4.2.	Substantive features of the studies	204
4.2.1.	Types of interventions	205
4.2.2.	Program intensity	205
4.2.3.	Levels of Implementation	205
4.2.4.	Grade levels	206
4.2.5.	Socio-economic status (SES)	206
4.3.	Within-study subgroup analyses	206
4.3.1.	Ability	206
4.3.2.	Gender	206
4.3.3.	Race	207
4.3.4.	English language learners	207
4.4.	Methodological features of studies	207
4.4.1.	Sensitivity analysis	207
4.4.2.	Publication bias	208
4.4.3.	Year of publication	208
4.4.4.	Methodological Features	208
5.	Limitations	209
6.	Discussion	210
7.	Practical implications for designing effective technology applications	211
8.	Conclusions	212
	References	212

1. Introduction

The classroom use of educational technology such as computers, interactive whiteboards, multimedia, and the internet, has been growing at a phenomenal rate in the last two decades. According to a recent survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education (SETDA, 2010) on the use of educational technology in U.S. public schools, almost all public schools had one or more instructional computers with internet access, and the ratio of students to instructional computers with internet access was 3.1–1. In addition, 97% of schools had one or more instructional computers located in classrooms and 58% of schools had laptops on carts. A majority of public schools surveyed also indicated their schools provided various educational technology devices for instruction: LCD (liquid crystal display) and DLP (digital light processing) projectors (97%), digital cameras (93%), and interactive whiteboards (73%). The U.S. Department of Education provides generous grants to state education agencies to support the use of educational technology in K–12 classrooms. For example, in fiscal year 2009, the Department made a \$900 million investment in educational technology in elementary and secondary schools (SETDA, 2010).

The debate around the effectiveness of educational technology for improving student learning has been carried on for over three decades. Perhaps the most widely cited debate was between Clark (1983) and Kozma (1994). Clark (1983) first argued that educational technology had no impact on student learning under any condition and that “media are mere vehicles that deliver instruction but do not influence student achievement any more than the truck that delivers our groceries causes changes in our nutrition”. He continued to argue that the impact of technology on student learning was mainly due to novelty effects or instructional strategies, but not technology itself. Kozma (1994) responded to Clark’s argument by saying the analogy of “delivery truck” creates an “unnecessary schism between medium and method”. Kozma believed that technology had an actual impact on student learning and played an important role in student learning.

The Clark–Kozma debate of the 1980’s has been overtaken by the extraordinary developments in technology applications in education in recent years. It may be theoretically interesting to ask whether the impact of technology itself can be separated from the impact of particular applications, but as a practical matter, machine and method are intertwined. As is the

Table 1
Summary of major meta-analysis in education technology.

Reviews	Grade	Number of studies	Effect sizes
Kulik and Kulik (1991)	K–12	18	+0.25
Becker (1992)	K–8	10	+0.18
Ouyang (1993)	K–6	20	+0.16
Fletcher-Finn and Gravatt (1995)	K–12	23	+0.12
Soe et al. (2000)	K–12	17	+0.13
Blok et al. (2002)	K–3	42	+0.19
Kulik (2003)	K–6	27	+0.06–0.43

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/355175>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/355175>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)