2. COMPARE and CONTRAST your definition of the field to other definitions identified in Chapter 1 (Tuesday, August 31—Sunday, September 5).

Compare and contrast

I defined educational technology as a study of enhancing learning by designing and applying suitable media and technology-based learning environments. Further, I stated that the use or application part of technologies relate to teaching as well, thus promoting it. Then, I elaborated on this application process by stating that educational technology should also be concerned about achieving pre-determined objectives. Finally, I added an “assessment” part to my educational technology definition, which is necessary to determine whether the whole learning process is successful or not. This definition of mine has some similarities and dissimilarities with the definitions given in the course book in terms of “process and learning, media, planning and emphasis on theory/research or practice”.

First, it is clear that my definition highlights the learning process like just the 1963 definition. However, my concept of learning processes is not only related to learner but also to the overall learning environment including teaching. In other words, to me, the whole instructional processes pertain to a learning process including all elements: planning, designing, applying, assessing. This seems to be at odds with the 1970 process-oriented definition that separates learning and teaching processes located in a broader “instructional process”. Similar to the 1970 definition, the 1977 definition stresses a systematic design process that is different from my umbrella “learning process”. Even though the 1994 definition does not explicitly describe educational technology as a process, which is totally different from my definition, the steps involved in the definition are similar to those of mine (design=design, development “by designing technological tools I am referring to development of them”; applying=utilization; evaluation=assessment). Further, the AECT definition brings up “technological processes” that refer to the use of scientific findings to do tasks involved. The authors’ definition of the field mentions not only instructional but also noninstructional processes used to solve some performance problems. Clearly, there is no room for noninstructional processes in my definition. Finally, my definition includes promoting or enhancing learning, which is similar to AECT definition’s stress on facilitation of learning and not just limited to control of learning.

As for media or technological tools, even though I do not put as much emphasis on “media” as the early definitions until 1960s, my definition certainly has a room for media or tools. This is in line with the definitions in the book except for the 1963 definition. Even though media is not stated in the definitions all of them include developing or designing technological resources. However, it should also be noted that embedded in my definition there is also a teaching element. This way, my definition separates teachers from media even though it sees them as part of the same learning process. This is at odds with the 1970, 1977 and 1994 definitions that do not separate teachers and media from each other and labels them as resources.

Identification of planning is another source of similarities and differences. My definition directly refers to a planning period by highlighting objectives, and when/what/how to use equipments. The 1970 definition directly states that the learning and teaching processes should be based on some objectives just like my emphasis of educational objectives. I think the 1977 definition goes one step further and points to analysis of problems involved in planning. This is understandable since this definition focuses on solving learning problems people may encounter.

Lastly, my very first statement in my definition of educational technology includes the word “study” thus emphasizing the research and theory nature of educational technology. The practice part is only implied by my definition by describing it as an endeavor to facilitate learning. On the other hand, the 19631 and 1994 definitions focus on both theory and practice. Moreover, the AECT definition says study and practice. I assume that “study” or “research” also refers to theory for every research or study is already based on some theoretical foundations.

In sum, my educational technology has both similarities and dissimilarities with descriptions included in out course book. Be it a similarity or dissimilarity, it appears to relate to “conceptualization of learning and learning as a process, the role of media, planning the whole learning process, and whether educational technology should focus on theory/research or practice or both.

1 This is Reiser and Dempsey’s idea and stated on p.5. Even though it is possible to see theory and practice explicitly in the 1994 definition, it is not the case with the 1963 definition.