Shiv Shakti International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Academic Research
ISSN: 2278-5973 (Online) | Vol. 14, No. 4, (July 2026)
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21336567

Technology Integration in Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE): A Comparative Analysis of Indian and Global Educational Practices

D. Jenifer Princy and Dr. S. R. Sundaravalli
[1]*M.Ed Student*
[2]*Assistant Professor*
Department of Education
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University
Tirunelveli

Abstract

The use of technology in Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) has become one of the most prominent aspects of current pedagogical discussions around the globe. The present paper aims to analyze technology integration into ECCE in India in comparison with its global practices. In particular, the article will focus on comparing technology integration in India with ECCE practices in the US, Finland, Singapore, and Australia. The research is based on policy-related materials, empirical studies, and developmental frameworks dated from 2015 to 2025. Special emphasis will be placed on exploring the use of digital technologies, such as tablets, interactive boards, educational software applications, and AI-based technologies, in the process of young children's learning. Moreover, the benefits and disadvantages of using technological innovations in the process of educating children between birth and eight years old regarding the improvement of their cognitive skills, language abilities, socio-emotional development, and digital literacy will be examined. Although countries like Finland and Singapore adopt technology under an umbrella of play-based learning and child-centric pedagogy, the NEP of 2020 in India is a revolutionary approach towards integrating technology. This research suggests that technology integration should be done in a culturally sensitive manner with effective professional development programs for teachers.

Keywords: Early childhood care and education, Technology integration, India, Digital learning, Comparative Education, NEP 2020, Developmentally Appropriate Practice

Introduction

Childhood up to the age of eight is considered a critical stage for children due to their rapid neurological development, acquisition of language skills, and socioemotional development (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) are the fundamental programs that are developed to support children during this period with regard to the aspects of care, health, nutrition, and education. In recent decades, owing to the development of technology, the domain of early childhood education programs has been totally changed, thus, requiring the rethinking of the ways and the time of technology implementation in children's education.

Within a global framework, the problem of technology implementation in ECCE becomes a paradox due to the necessity to find a balance between innovations and interventions into the process of child's development. In the first place, researchers point out the advantages of digital technologies regarding the possibilities of personalized approach, extension of educational resources, and adaptation to the world of technology (Veletsianos, 2020; Kucirkova, 2019). However, there are also warnings from developmental psychologists as well as such prominent organizations as AAP and WHO.

ECCE in India has traditionally been provided under the auspices of the Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS) program, mainly through Anganwadi centers catering to rural and disadvantaged population groups. The introduction of the National Education Policy (NEP) of India 2020 marked a paradigm change in terms of focusing on the universalization of early childhood education, reforms in the

Corresponding Author: D. Jenifer Princy, *jeniferprincy1212@gmail.com*

curriculum and limited yet strategic use of technology to improve learning outcomes (Ministry of Education [MoE], 2020).

The present paper attempts to conduct a comparative analysis of technology integration in ECCE programs in India and four countries renowned for their innovative approach to early childhood education - the United States, Finland, Singapore, and Australia. With a view to finding lessons learned from other nations' experience in integrating technology into ECCE, the paper will focus on policy framework, curriculum, evidence-based findings, and issues of equity. The research questions are:

1. How is technology being used in ECCE programmes in India and other parts of the world?
2. What are the benefits and challenges associated with the use of technology in early childhood care and education?
3. What mediates the effectiveness/equity of using technology in ECCE?
4. What lessons could India learn from the global experiences on the same?

Theoretical Framework

There are three related theories that can serve as theoretical frameworks for considering technology integration into ECCE.

Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP)

Developmentally Appropriate Practice, formulated in the NAEYC guidelines, is one of the key aspects for measuring the effectiveness of using technology in ECCE settings. As it is said by NAEYC (2020), the decision about whether to use technology should be made taking into account the age and development of children, as well as cultural aspects. It is said that technology cannot substitute active learning but can be used as an additional tool. As it is said by Copple & Bredekamp (2009), the effectiveness of any media depends on its correct usage.

Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory

Sociocultural theory by Lev Vygotsky (1978) is based on the role of social interaction and cultural tools in cognitive development. Thus, digital technologies can serve as mediating artifacts within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD).

Digital Ecology and Techno-Subsistence Theories

According to Rideout and Robb (2020), and Livingstone et al. (2017), children's interactions with technology should be evaluated based on their digital ecology which refers to the complex environment that surrounds a person's digital experiences and includes technology devices, media platforms, people, and contexts. As far as low-income countries like India, the digital ecologies in question feature poor internet access, shared computers, and language diversity; therefore, they require approaches to techno-subsistence that include low-cost, rugged, and culturally appropriate technologies.

Methodology

In this paper, a systematic comparative literature review methodology will be used. Peer-reviewed publications, policies, institutional reports and grey literature dated 2015-2025 were collected using the following databases: ERIC, PsycINFO, Google Scholar, and the repositories of UNICEF, UNESCO, and the Ministries of Education of the relevant countries. Keywords such as "technology in early childhood education," "ECCE and digital tools," "India preschool technology," "Finland early education ICT," "Singapore early childhood digital," "Australia EYLF technology," and "screen time young children" were used.

The selection of countries was purposive using the criterion of selecting countries that represent different geographical, socio-economic and pedagogic perspectives: India (large developing country with a federal

early childhood education and care (ECCE) system), the United States (market-oriented and pluralistic system), Finland (welfare state model with high performance), Singapore (technology-based Asian system) and Australia (rights-based and play-based curriculum). Data were analysed thematically in relation to aspects of policy, pedagogy, teacher education, equity and outcomes.

Technology integration in ECCE: global contexts

United States

There is a complex and decentralised picture as regards technology integration in ECCE in the United States. With respect to technology use in ECCE, it must be said that the position statement from the Fred Rogers Center and NAEYC (2012, updated 2020) made it absolutely clear that technology would support early childhood development if it is interactive, age appropriate and incorporated into larger play-based settings. Technology integration has occurred through federal programs such as Head Start where the usage of tablets is being made.

Rideout (2017) research has shown that on average, 0-8-year-old children in the US engage in 2 hours 19 minutes per day of screen media, with low-income families using more mobile technologies. Research by Neumann and Neumann (2014) has demonstrated that the use of touchscreen tablets with the support from adults led to significant improvements in preschool children's letter recognition and literacy skills. While the guidelines of the Common Sense Media approach and digital literacy standards at the state level provide some direction, the implementation of curricula varies in 50 states.

Finland

Technology is incorporated into the early childhood education (ECCE) programs in Finland according to the National Core Curriculum for Early Childhood Education and Care (Finnish National Agency for Education [FNAE], 2018). Unlike other countries where digital technology is considered separately from other types of activities, Finnish ECCE incorporates it into the play-based and child-centered learning philosophy and makes no distinctions between creative arts, storytelling, outdoor experiences, and digital technology. Digital camera, audio recorder, and Bee-Bots are among the tools which are being used by children.

Kangas et al. (2017) found that Finnish teachers of young learners were highly confident and flexible in their pedagogical practices due to their constant professional development and professional learning communities. One more remarkable feature of the Finnish model is that it rejects any formal academic instruction in early childhood education and encourages using technologies to develop children's creativity and independence rather than academic performance. Screen time is kept to a minimum and physical and collaborative play is preferred instead.

Singapore

Ministry of Education (MOE), Singapore: Nurturing Early Learners (NEL) framework (2013; revision in 2022) is another example of well-structured competency-based approach to ECCE which incorporates technologies into all six learning domains. Interactive whiteboards, educational software, and maker-spaces tools are some examples of what can be seen in Singapore's pre-primary classrooms due to technologically developed infrastructure (Lim & Torr, 2007). Digital readiness efforts have been implemented within the country's Smart Nation strategy (2015) including kindergartens.

Based on the study by Yelland (2011), together with other studies done in Singapore, technological activities in early childhood institutions could assist in promoting the development of children's spatial reasoning and problem-solving skills. Nevertheless, the instrumental approach of using technology in Singaporean schools in preparation for testing in an educational environment where there is competition

has been condemned for failing to provide opportunities for the discovery of technology among the children (Ang, 2014). In addition, teacher training in Singapore is centralized.

Australia

The framework of early years learning in Australia known as Belonging, Being and Becoming views children as being learners whose rights include learning the technologies of their culture. Digital literacies are considered to be part of multi-literacies in the EYLF, and teachers are expected to support children's investigations and utilization of digital technologies.

Plowman and Stephen (2007) and subsequently Edwards et al. (2018) found out that guided interaction where educators purposefully engage children in using technological tools is more productive than allowing children to use them freely. It is important to note the Australian context for its consideration of the knowledge systems of Indigenous peoples as well as the problem of inclusion of culturally rich digital content in the early childhood education setting.

Technology Integration in ECCE: The Indian Context

Policy Context

The Indian ECCE system is one of the largest globally, catering to an estimated 158 million children below the age of 6 via the ICDS system of Anganwadi centres, private pre-schools, and creches (UNICEF India, 2019). The curriculum for the Foundational Stage under NCF-FS framework that was published in 2022 under the NEP 2020 vision provides a play-based and multilingual approach to learning for the children aged between 3–8 years with careful incorporation of technology as a tool (NCERT, 2022).

The NEP 2020, for example, explicitly advocates the use of technological tools like DIKSHA (Digital Infrastructure for Knowledge Sharing), e-content in regional languages, and teacher training platforms. The Nipun Bharat Mission (2021), which seeks to promote early literacy and numeracy skills among children until Grade 3, has provisions for technology-assisted testing and remedial resources. However, at this juncture, the policy framework lacks detailed guidelines on appropriate limits for screen time, quality benchmarks for contents, and bare minimum infrastructure needs in ECCE contexts (MoE, 2020).

Present Practices and Initiatives

The use of technology in Indian ECCE contexts is highly diverse. There is high use of technology in urban private preschools especially in metropolitan cities like Mumbai, Bengaluru, and Delhi that involves technologies like smart boards, tablets, educational apps like Byju's, Khan Academy Kids, and Kidoz, and classrooms with rich media contents (Kumar & Nanda, 2019). These ECCE contexts tend to be influenced by international franchises of Montessori, Reggio Emilia, Cambridge Early Years, and others.

However, most of India’s Anganwadis, which cater to poor families and rural areas, suffer from a deficiency in the supply of electricity, devices, and human capacity. According to a report by UNICEF-India (2020), only less than 12% of India’s Anganwadis have working phones or tablets for learning, and fewer than 8% had access to the internet. The coronavirus disease of 2020 (COVID-19) outbreak (2020-2022) brought these disparities to light, with children in rural ECCE losing out on about 1.8 years of continuous learning (Azim Premji Foundation, 2021).

SAKSHAM (Skill Acquisition and Knowledge Awareness for Livelihood Promotion), the Early Childhood Programme of Aga Khan Foundation combining low-cost technology with community health workers, state-led interventions like Kerala's Little KITEs programme which aims at developing digital literacy skills starting from Grade 1 through open-source platforms, and mobile interventions such as UNICEF's Magic Box which provides offline multimedia content in low-cost gadgets to tribal communities of states like Jharkhand and Odisha are some of the technology-related initiatives in ECCE (Rajagopalan, 2020).

Teacher Preparedness and Professional Development

One of the major roadblocks to the effective integration of technology in ECCE in India is the preparedness of teachers and Anganwadi workers. Though D.El.Ed and NISHTHA programmes have started including modules on digital pedagogy, frameworks on ECCE-specific digital competencies are lacking (NCERT, 2022). According to a research study conducted by Patel & Joshi (2021), 68% of preschool teachers of Gujarat reported lack of preparedness in using digital technology, with reasons like absence of preservice training, in-service training, and linguistic barriers to access online professional development material.

The disparity between ECCE educators in urban private sectors, who might even get to use platforms that offer international professional development opportunities and the Anganwadi workers with secondary level qualifications is an issue of equity. Bridging this gap would involve investing in vernacular-based teacher education focusing on pedagogy over skill.

Comparative Analysis: India and Global Practices

Policy Consistency and Curriculum Integration

The main difference between India's technology-based ECCE policy and Finland, Singapore, and Australia lies in the extent of curriculum integration. In Finland and Australia, the technology component has been integrated into larger learning frameworks as part of inquiry, thus maintaining consistency with development needs. Technology has also been included in specific learning objectives in relation to subjects taught in a well-defined curriculum in Singapore. In the case of India, even as technology has been supported as an access and quality tool in NEP 2020, the NCF-FS (2022) does not mention the connection to the Panchakosha framework.

Equity and Digital Divide

All five nations struggle with the issue of digital equity, though to varying degrees in terms of scope and nature of the digital divide. The Indian digital divide exists through dimensions such as rural vs. urban geography, caste, class, gender, and language, and is aggravated by poor infrastructure. From the data collected from the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5, 2021), it is found that the household Internet usage varies from 85% in urban Kerala to less than 15% in rural Jharkhand, making very different starting points of integration of technology. On the other hand, Finland reaches universal broadband coverage (97%), Australia has the National Broadband Network, Singapore has achieved 100% connectivity, and the United States, though well-resourced in comparison with India, faces challenges with rural and disadvantaged digital gaps (OECD, 2023).

The lessons learned by India from the other four countries do not imply replicating high connectivity but developing low-tech, off-line capable, and solar-powered systems in the conditions of poor infrastructure, following models developed in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America and proved successful in similar conditions (Ames, 2019).

Pedagogical Approaches: Play v Instruction

An ongoing issue that is highlighted in studies on the role of ECCE and technology is how to achieve a delicate balance between the two pedagogical approaches – child-led play and instruction-oriented use of digital media. The Finnish case shows the example of play-based pedagogy whereby technology supports children's natural play. In contrast, Singapore and even to some degree the US adopt more structured approach based on the use of technology with defined goals of learning. Despite the clear similarity between India's policy vision and play-based approach suggested by NCF-FS, in reality, due to readiness requirements for school attendance, the use of technology becomes more instructional and repetitive.

Parental and Community Participation

The importance of parental and community participation in moderating the use of technology by children is supported by research conducted in all five contexts. According to Livingstone and Blum-Ross (2020), "the parent-educator partnership is essential to technology's developmental influence." But, in India, low literacy levels of parents, especially in rural areas and among the parents of the first generation of pre-schoolers, pose a challenge to digital co-engagement at home. The Parent Volunteer Scheme of Singapore and the Family Learning Partnerships of Australia provide useful models for structured community-based participation in the Indian context through Anganwadi parent collectives.

Quality of Content and Cultural Relevance

The other cross-cutting issue is quality of digital content and cultural relevance of digital content. According to the research conducted by Kucirkova (2019), cultural relevancy in terms of languages, narratives, settings, and social practice is significant for maximizing the developmental impact of digital content. The linguistic diversity in India, which includes 22 scheduled languages and many dialects, can both be a challenge and an opportunity. Even though the DIKSHA platform offers content in 22 languages, there is still a lack in quantity and quality of vernacular ECCE content.

Pros and Cons of Technology in ECCE

Thoroughly Proven Advantages

A great deal of research literature can be found highlighting the advantages of technology in ECCE to a certain degree. Clements & Sarama (2016) found that the proper design of mathematical software (Building Blocks, etc.) helped pre-schoolers develop their number sense and geometry through interactive tasks. Shamir & Korat (2015) found out that the usage of electronic books with audio narrative and interaction had a positive influence on the vocabulary and phonological awareness of preschool kids, especially those coming from illiterate families.

Nowadays, adaptive learning systems powered by artificial intelligence promise a provision of individually targeted education which takes into consideration the developmental stage of children and gives immediate feedback. The example of such systems includes Waterford Upstart program (United States) and digitized abacus mathematics program in Singapore which shows significant progress towards kindergarten readiness. There is a bit of empirical evidence concerning the effectiveness of BYJU's Early Learn program for government primary schools in India (Central Square Foundation, 2022).

Technology facilitates ways of communication and engagement among children with disabilities and special needs. The adoption of various assistive technologies, such as AAC technology, text-to-speech, and sensory applications, has transformed the learning process of autistic, cerebral palsied, and sensory children not only in other parts of the world but also in India (UNICEF, 2021). The adoption of assistive technologies within the Indian ECCE sector has great unexploited potential.

Limitations and Dangers

The literature on limitations is just as robust. According to WHO (2019) Guidelines on Sedentary Behaviour for Children under Five Years of Age, screen usage should be avoided completely by infants under 2 years old and up to an hour daily for those who are 3 and 4 years old. Prolonged screen usage by young children may result in delayed speech acquisition, attention deficit, disturbed sleep patterns, and behavior problems (Madigan et al., 2019; Twenge & Campbell, 2018).

Passive engagement with media such as television viewing, streaming video, and non-interactive applications is fundamentally distinct from active, social, and creative use of digital technologies according to the developmental research. The problem of free download of apps of poor quality

educational value in app stores is considerable. Hirsh-Pasek et al. (2015) discovered that less than 5% of the highest-downloaded educational apps for young kids satisfy criteria of encouraging active, engaged, meaningful, and social learning.

The issues which are particularly relevant to India include exposure to harmful or commercializing content, threats to privacy of children (as there are no proper laws protecting children's data privacy), perpetuation of gender roles by digital games, and technology deepening educational inequality instead of helping to overcome it (Mehrotra, 2022).

Recommendations for the Integration of Technology into ECCE in India

On the basis of comparative analysis, the following recommendations are proposed for the policy makers, practitioners, and researchers working within India's technology integration into ECCE:

1. Establish a National ECCE Technology Framework

India needs to have a dedicated and detailed framework related to technology for its ECCE in line with the NEP 2020 and NCF-FS (2022) approach which should have the developmentally appropriate content standards, screen time recommendations differentiated according to the age groups, minimum infrastructure needs, and quality standards for educational apps and platform. It must be designed in collaboration with NCERT, UNICEF India, teachers, experts in child development, and parents.

2. Invest in Professional Development of Teachers

Continuous professional development of urban preschool teachers as well as Anganwadi workers is very important. The training programme should be in regional languages, blended (online and offline), and should focus on the pedagogic purpose such as the usage of technology to enhance the experiences of play, inquiry, and collaborative learning rather than just technical skills.

3. Invest in Technology Infrastructure that can Operate Offline and in Multiple Languages

Considering the existing problems with connectivity in India, any technology used to address the need for ECCE education should operate offline, be solar-powered or energy-efficient, and offer material in as many regional languages as possible. Content-related modules should be added to the DIKSHA platform, and partnership with community radios and other creators of local-language content should be developed.

4. Integrate Technology into a Play-Based Approach to Education

Integration of technology should be philosophically based on the approach of play-based experiential learning according to the NCF-FS. Teachers should be assisted in using technology alongside other means of learning—sand, clay, blocks, storytelling, and going outside. Pilot programs for integrated technology should be run in government ECCE centers and their results widely disseminated.

5. Enhance Parent and Community Engagement

The parent education programs focusing on the digital well-being of children involving screen time, co-viewing, content, and digital safety should be incorporated in the Anganwadi services and delivered to parents through community health workers (ASHAs) and self-help groups. Digital literacy programs in communities that develop the competencies of the family to foster learning of children at home is an essential equity measure.

6. Formulate Child Data Protection Law

India needs to have child-specific provisions of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023), which will ensure that the data of children generated via educational technologies is not commercialized, parental consent is informed, and the platforms used in ECCE institutions meet safety standards similar to the COPPA (USA) or GDPR-K (European Union).

Conclusion

This comparative analysis has shed light on both the transformative nature and complexities associated with technology integration in ECCE. The global data is unequivocal: technology, when purposefully designed, pedagogically integrated, and equitably provided, can significantly improve learning outcomes in the early years, widen access to education, and address diverse developmental needs. At the same time, technology can become a substitute for meaningful play, perpetuate inequalities, and be detrimental to development when its use becomes excessive, passive, and adult-free.

India is at a crossroads. NEP 2020 and NCF-FS (2022) outline an inspirational and child-centred ECCE system where technology is only one component of the process rather than its core. The problem is how to turn such a vision into practice that would be equitable and locally relevant against the background of India's tremendous diversity. Finnish examples of play-based integration, Singaporean examples of structured competencies building, Australian multiliteracies approach, and American adaptive technologies could all serve as templates.

However, the real issue here is not how best to incorporate technology in ECCE, but rather how to use it while respecting the fundamental importance of relationships, play, culture, and developmental appropriateness in the first years of life. It is a challenge that requires dedication, interdisciplinary effort, and a never-ending commitment to children's rights to quality and equal early childhoods.

References

American Academy of Pediatrics. (2016). American Academy of Pediatrics announces new recommendations for children's media use. https://www.aap.org/en/news-room/news-releases/aap/2016/aap-announces-new-recommendations-for-media-use/

Ames, M. G. (2019). The charisma machine: The life, death, and legacy of One Laptop per Child. MIT Press.

Ang, L. (2014). Preschool or prep school? Rethinking the role of early years education. Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 15(2), 185–199. https://doi.org/10.2304/ciec.2014.15.2.185

Australian Government Department of Education. (2022). Belonging, being and becoming: The early years learning framework for Australia (V2.0). https://www.acecqa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-01/EYLF-2022-V2.0.pdf

Azim Premji Foundation. (2021). Loss of learning during the pandemic. https://azimpremjiuniversity.edu.in/SitePages/pdf/Field_Studies_Loss_of_Learning_during_the_Pandemic.pdf

Central Square Foundation. (2022). EdTech in government schools: Evidence and implications for scale. https://centralsquarefoundation.org

Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2016). Math, science, and technology in the early grades. The Future of Children, 26(2), 75–94. https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2016.0013

Copple, C., & Bredekamp, S. (Eds.). (2009). Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8 (3rd ed.). National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Daugherty, L., Dossani, R., Johnson, E. E., & Wright, C. (2014). Getting on the same page: Identifying goals for technology use in early childhood education. RAND Corporation. https://doi.org/10.7249/RR673

Edwards, S., Henderson, M., Gronn, D., Scott, A., & Mirkhil, M. (2018). Digital disconnect or digital difference? A socio-ecological perspective on young children's technology use in the home and the early childhood centre. Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 26(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2016.1152291

Finnish National Agency for Education. (2018). National core curriculum for early childhood education and care 2018. https://www.oph.fi/en/statistics-and-publications/publications/national-core-curriculum-early-childhood-education-and-care

Fred Rogers Center for Early Learning and Children's Media & National Association for the Education of Young Children. (2012). Technology and interactive media as tools in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8. https://www.naeyc.org/sites/default/files/globally-shared/downloads/PDFs/resources/position-statements/PS_technology_WEB2.pdf

Hirsh-Pasek, K., Zosh, J. M., Golinkoff, R. M., Gray, J. H., Robb, M. B., & Kaufman, J. (2015). Putting education in "educational" apps: Lessons from the science of learning. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 16(1), 3–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615569721

Kangas, M., Vuojärvi, H., & Siklander, P. (2017). How can playfulness be promoted in early childhood? A systematic review. International Journal of Early Years Education, 27(1), 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2017.1316274

Kucirkova, N. (2019). How are digital books designed and used in early childhood settings? A literature review. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 27(5), 597–609. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2019.1651956

Kumar, A., & Nanda, A. (2019). Social media in higher education: A framework for continuous engagement. International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education, 15(1), 97–108.

Lim, C. P., & Torr, J. (2007). Literacy in digital environments in early childhood. In J. Coiro, M. Knobel, C. Lankshear, & D. Leu (Eds.), Handbook of research on new literacies (pp. 689–726). Routledge.

Livingstone, S., & Blum-Ross, A. (2020). Parenting for a digital future: How hopes and fears about technology shape children's lives. Oxford University Press.

Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., & Staksrud, E. (2017). European research on children's internet use: Assessing the past and anticipating the future. New Media & Society, 20(3), 1103–1122. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816685930

Madigan, S., Browne, D., Racine, N., Mori, C., & Tough, S. (2019). Association between screen time and children's performance on a developmental screening test. JAMA Pediatrics, 173(3), 244–250. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2018.5056

Mehrotra, S. (2022). India's education crisis: Why fixing the school system matters so much. Routledge India.

Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (2020). NAEYC position statement: Developmentally appropriate practice. https://www.naeyc.org/resources/position-statements/dap

National Council of Educational Research and Training. (2022). National curriculum framework for foundational stage 2022. Ministry of Education, Government of India. https://ncert.nic.in/pdf/NCF_for_Foundational_Stage_20_October_2022.pdf

National Family Health Survey-5. (2021). State and union territory fact sheets (2019–21). International Institute for Population Sciences.

Neumann, M. M., & Neumann, D. L. (2014). Touch screen tablets and emergent literacy. Early Childhood Education Journal, 42(4), 231–239. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-013-0608-3

OECD. (2023). Education at a glance 2023: OECD indicators. https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en

Patel, H., & Joshi, N. (2021). Digital readiness of preschool teachers in Gujarat: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of Early Childhood Education Research, 10(1), 45–63.

Plowman, L., & Stephen, C. (2007). Guided interaction in pre-school settings. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 23(1), 14–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2007.00194.x

Rajagopalan, M. (2020). Little KITEs: Kerala's digital literacy programme for children. Economic and Political Weekly, 55(12), 18–22.

Rideout, V. (2017). The common sense census: Media use by kids age zero to eight. Common Sense Media. https://www.commonsensemedia.org/research/the-common-sense-census-media-use-by-kids-age-zero-to-eight-2017

Rideout, V., & Robb, M. B. (2020). The common sense census: Media use by kids age zero to eight, 2020. Common Sense Media. https://www.commonsensemedia.org/research/the-common-sense-census-media-use-by-kids-age-zero-to-eight-2020

Shamir, A., & Korat, O. (2015). Educational electronic books as a support for beginning readers and children at risk of reading difficulties: What do we know? Educational Researcher, 44(5), 298–308.

Shonkoff, J. P., & Phillips, D. A. (Eds.). (2000). From neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development. National Academy Press.

Singapore Ministry of Education. (2013). Nurturing early learners: A curriculum framework for kindergartens in Singapore. MOE Kindergarten.

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2018). Associations between screen time and lower psychological well-being among children and adolescents: Evidence from a population-based study. Preventive Medicine Reports, 12, 271–283. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2018.10.003

UNICEF India. (2019). For every child: Early childhood development in India. https://www.unicef.org/india/early-childhood-development

UNICEF. (2020). Reimagining India's digital future. https://www.unicef.org/india

UNICEF. (2021). Assistive technology for children with disabilities: Creating opportunities, addressing challenges. https://www.unicef.org/disabilities/assistive-technology

Veletsianos, G. (2020). Learning online: The student experience. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

World Health Organization. (2019). Guidelines on physical activity, sedentary behaviour and sleep for children under 5 years of age. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241550536

Yelland, N. (2011). Reconceptualising play and learning in the lives of young children. Australasian Journal of Early Childhood, 36(2), 4–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/183693911103600202