Dijital Göçmenler İçin Dijital Yetkinliğin Haritalanması: Türkiye, Almanya ve İspanya Örneğinde Karşılaştırmalı Bir İnceleme*

Metin Eken (iD)

Erciyes Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi

Hakan Aydın (iD)

Erciyes Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi

ÖZ

Türkiye Ulusal Ajansı tarafından yürütülmekte olan Erasmus+ Programı Yetişkin Eğitimi Stratejik Ortaklıklar eylemi kapsamında finanse edilen DigiComp kısa adıyla "Dijital Göçmenler için Dijital Yeterlilikleri Artırma: Dijital Bölünme ve Dijital Sosyal Eşitsizlikle Mücadele" projesi kapsamında hazırlanan bu çalışma, dijital göçmenler için dijital yetkinlikleri konu edinen karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma girişimidir. Nitel bir araştırma karakteri arz eden çalışmada doküman analizi yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini, projenin araştırma safhasında, Türkiye, Almanya ve İspanya'dan partner kuruluş araştırmacıları tarafından üretilen araştırma raporları oluşturmaktadır. Tespit edilen evrenin tamamına ulaşılmıştır. Elde edilen verilerin analiz edilmesinde betimsel analiz yaklaşımı kullanılmıştır. Analiz süreci, araştırma soruları bağlamında şekillenen temalar çerçevesinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Değerlendirmeye alınan her bir rapor, ortak bir metodolojik çerçeveye duyarlı bir görünüm arz etmesi sebebiyle her ne kadar benzerlikler taşısa da farklı ülke, uzmanlık ve literatür birikimlerinin beraberinde getirdiği özgün yaklaşımlar içermektedir. Buna göre raporlarda, dijital yerli-dijital göçmen ayrımını, yaşa eşlik eden farklı değişkenlerle birlikte daha geniş sosyal eşitsizlikler temelinde anlama vurgusu ön plana çıkmıştır. Ayrıca dijital göçmenlere yönelik yetkinlik çerçevesinin geliştirilmesi amacıyla her bir raporda farklı uzmanlık kapasitelerinin sürece dâhil edildiği bulgulanmıştır. İlgili raporların bir arada değerlendirilmesinin, dijital göçmenlerin sahip olması gereken dijital yetkinliklerin geliştirilmesine dair akademi, güvenlik, sağlık, kamu yönetimi, sivil, toplum, özel sektör gibi alanları içeren bir sinerjinin oluşturulmasına imkân sağlayacağı ifade edilebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dijital bölünme, dijital göçmenler, DigiComp projesi, dijital yetkinlikler.

Suggested Citation

1. Doç. Dr., Gazetecilik Bölümü, metineken@erciyes.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8564-5902
2. Prof. Dr., Gazetecilik Bölümü, haydin@erciyes.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4873-0988

Mapping Digital Competency for Digital Immigrants: A Comparative Analysis in the Case of Turkey, Germany, and Spain*

Metin Eken iD

Erciyes University, Faculty of Communication

Hakan Aydın iD

Erciyes University, Faculty of Communication

ABSTRACT

This study, which was prepared within the scope of DigiComp, "Improving Digital Competencies for Digital Immigrants: Tackling with Digital Divide and Digital Social Inequality," funded within the scope of Erasmus+ Program Adult Education Strategic Partnerships action carried out by the Turkish National Agency, is a comparative research initiative on digital competencies for digital immigrants. In the study, which presents a qualitative research character, the document analysis method was used. The universe of the research consists of the research reports produced by the researchers of partner organizations from Turkey, Germany, and Spain during the research phase of the project. The entire detected universe has been reached. A descriptive analysis approach was used in the analysis of the obtained data. The analysis process was carried out within the framework of the themes shaped in the context of the research questions. Although each report has similarities, since it is sensitive to a common methodological framework, it contains unique approaches brought by different countries, expertise, and literature accumulation. Accordingly, the emphasis has been on understanding the digital native-digital immigrant distinction on the basis of broader social inequalities along with different variables with age in the reports. In addition, it has been revealed that different expertise capacities are included in the process in each report in order to develop the competency framework for digital immigrants. It can be stated that evaluating the relevant reports together will enable the creation of a synergy involving areas such as academia, security, health, public administration, civil society, and the private sector regarding the development of digital competencies that digital immigrants should carry.

Keywords: Digital divide, digital immigrants, DigiComp project, digital competencies.

Suggested Citation

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr., Department of Journalism, metineken@erciyes.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8564-5902
2. Prof. Dr., Department of Journalism, haydin@erciyes.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4873-0988

INTRODUCTION

The subject of this study is the comparative analysis of three studies carried out during the research phase of the project entitled DigiComp, short for " Improving Digital Competencies for Digital Immigrants: Tackling with Digital Divide and Digital Social Inequality", which was funded within the scope of the Erasmus+ Program Adult Education Strategic Partnerships action.[1] The research phase of the project entitled "Developing a Digital Competence Framework for Digital Immigrants by Mapping Perceptions and Meanings;" basically, aimed to gather scientific and administrative information as a continuation of the discussions on the relationship of digital competence with the digital divide and digital social inequality that revealed the project proposal, thus providing support data for the background information of the project products. Within the framework of expert opinions within the scope of this intellectual output, it is aimed to develop a competency framework based on differences and consensus points by presenting a clearer picture of what digital competencies digital immigrants should have.

The digital divide is a concept that points to the inequalities that occur and diversify as a result of the unequal use of these technologies for different reasons, especially the unequal access to computer and internet technologies, and the differentiation of the advantages obtained from this use (Özsoy, 2020, p. 11). Although physical access barriers to internet technologies have been overcome to a certain extent today, the division caused by usage skills has become a significant digital social inequality factor (Eken, 2021, p. 815). The distinction between digital immigrants and digital natives, brought to the fore by Prensky for the first time, highlights the age factor, which can be considered a remarkable parameter for the digital divide (2001a, 2001b).

In this direction, three research products have emerged. The first of these was published by project researcher Metin Eken (2021), under the leadership of Erciyes University, in an international peer-reviewed journal with the title (2021) "Digital Competencies for Digital Immigrants at the Intersection of Literature and Field." Another research was carried out by Arthur Hartmann and Gabriela Piontkowski (2021) on behalf of the partner organization Hochschule für Öffentliche Verwaltung-HFÖW from Germany involved in the project. The last research was carried out by Jordi Sancho et al., (2021) on behalf of the University of Barcelona, who participated in the project from Spain. In addition to the literature review, these studies were shaped by qualitative semi-structured interview technique in order to enable the establishment of a research framework that allows the analysis, understanding, definition, and interpretation of digital competency needs of digital immigrants from an expert point of view. In this way, it is aimed to understand the social reality in various aspects, as well as an in-depth exploration activity related to the research problem.

This study aims at the comparative analysis of these three studies through the document analysis, one of the qualitative research techniques. In the research products of the project, the main problem of the study is to reveal how the digital competency needs for the target group are shaped together with the understanding of digital immigrants along with revealing the original character of the developed competency frameworks through comparative analysis. Focusing on the literature tendency in three different countries on the subject, the expertise outputs that differ according to the countries, professions and the unique country perspectives are the parameters

---

[1] For more detailed information on the project, visit the project website: https://digicomp.erciyes.edu.tr/

that make the study important and unique. In addition to all these, the fact that the relevant research is carried out under pandemic conditions makes it possible to deal with the reflections of the crisis in three different countries from the perspective of the digital competencies of the target group. This study is of particular importance in this respect.

Within the framework of this purpose and importance, answers to the following questions were sought in this study:

- How was the literature review section of the reports shaped? What are the prominent concepts and approaches?
- What are the contributions of expert knowledge to the reports? How were the expert opinions consulted in each study?
- How were the responsibility and problem areas of digital immigrants been shaped based on the literature and the field?
- What are the unique approaches and policy perspectives reflected in each report?

METHOD

Research Model

In the study, the document analysis, one of the qualitative research method techniques, was used. The document analysis is a form of qualitative research that uses a systematic procedure to analyze document-based data and answer specific research questions. Similar to other analysis approaches in qualitative research, the document analysis is a form of approach that requires repeated review, examination, and interpretation of data in order to obtain semantic knowledge of the structure under study (Bowen, 2009; Gross, 2018).

Data Collection and Analysis

Merriam's (2015, pp. 142-145) data collection and analysis based on this approach, a fourfold process was followed.

Accordingly, the first step is *to identify the documents*. Document detection was realized at the very beginning of the process in terms of giving the idea that revealed the research within the framework of the purposeful character of the study.

The second step is *to determine the originality of the documents*. The research reports obtained are original in that they are obtained directly from the project website. In addition, each of the studies has a unique character and the context in which they were written was analyzed in depth by the researcher.

The third step is *to establish a system for coding and cataloging*. At this stage, the research questions were functionalized, and the categories obtained from the questions were embodied as analysis units. Thus, the analysis and interpretation process was placed in a systematic framework (See. Table 1).

The last step is *to analyze the data*. In the literature created by the works in which the document analysis technique is used, it is seen that the content analysis is generally used in the analysis of

the obtained contents (Bektaş & Zabun, 2019; Karadağ, 2014; Kıral & Çilek, 2020). However, descriptive analysis is another form of analysis used (Özkan, 2019). In this framework, the processes of creating a framework for descriptive analysis, processing the data according to the thematic framework, defining and interpreting the findings were operated (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011, s. 224).

Scheme 1. *Thematic framework for data analysis*

1. Literature
2. Field Research: Expert Knowledge
3. Responsibility and Problem Areas Shaped Based on the Literature and the Field
4. Original Approaches and Policy Perspectives

FINDINGS

In this part of the research, analysis findings based on the comparative analysis of DigiComp project research reports are included. In order to avoid confusion while presenting the findings, it was deemed appropriate to point to each report using the names of the partner countries (Turkey, Germany, Spain) where the relevant report was prepared.

Findings on the Literature: Rethinking Basic Concepts

The effort of the project research to present a competency framework within the framework of the main responsibilities and problem areas that the digital divide has revealed for digital immigrants, starts with a literature discussion section that first puts the basic concepts into question. In these sections, the basic concepts such as the digital native-digital immigrant divide, digital divide, and digital competencies are discussed.

The first and most basic emphasis in the analysis of each report is that the digital native-digital immigrant distinction should be overcome to a certain extent. Accordingly, in each report, Prensky (2001a, 2001b) based on this, the distinction in question, which has a place in the literature, is criticized and original approaches are presented.

In the Turkey report, based on Bayne and Ross (2007), attention was drawn to the problems such as portraying both groups as homogeneous groups by referring to immigrants with negative qualities such as old age, outdated and addiction to the analog world. Also, the distinction corresponds to a rough dichotomous framework; however, it has been emphasized that, without considering both groups as homogeneous groups, it is possible to talk about a division that can be considered in this category by considering the diversity and unique differentiations within itself (p. 817). While doing this, attention was paid to age and other related factors. In the German report, attention was drawn to the statistical data emphasizing the decline in use and skills with advancing age, and the difficulties faced by the elderly, based on common sense knowledge; however, based on the relevant literature (Nedbal et al., 2012), it is suggested to focus on different understandings instead of seeing the difference between "digital natives" and "digital immigrants" as a rigid dichotomy (p. 2-3). Similarly, in the Spanish report, based on the relevant

literature (Aziz et al., 2019; Selwyn, 2009), attention was drawn to the problematic aspects of the distinction in question and the need to overcome it.

In all three reports, it is suggested to consider the other factors that affect the digital divide with age, with the emphasis on the need to overcome the digital native-digital immigrant divide.

Accordingly, in the Turkey report, it was emphasized that many variables such as age-related education level, gender, economic opportunities, physical and psychological well-being, cultural resources, and social capital should be made an important part of process evaluations (p. 817); in the Germany report, based on the relevant literature (BMFSFJ, 2020; Huxhold & Otte, 2019), it was stated that low education level, gender, economic status, and different social disadvantages should be evaluated together with age (p. 3-4). Similarly, in the Spain report from Selwyn (2009), attention was drawn to different usage practices within the framework of socioeconomic status and social class factors (p. 4). In this context, the concept of "digital fluency" is particularly included in the report of Germany and Spain. Based on Wang et al., (2012), while opening parentheses to digital fluency as a concept based on productivity through technology as well as understanding information, demographic characteristics, psychological factors, social effects, educational factors, behavioral intention, opportunities, and actual use of technology are specifically referred to. Thus, it is aimed both to overcome the digital native-immigrant dichotomy and to reveal a healthier understanding of determining digital competence requirements.

As a result of the conceptual accountings mentioned so far, all reports point out that the disadvantageous situations and locations accompanying advancing age are important determinants of digital division, and it is mentioned that the pandemic process also increases the risks related to the division in question, considering the statistical data. Not being able to take advantage of opportunities in times of crisis can also be mentioned among these risks.

The Turkey report points out that the problems faced by the elderly, who had to spend more time indoors during the pandemic, in many areas that can be increased, such as entertainment, socialization, health and well-being, and professional activities, are skills and usage-oriented problems rather than possession or physical access, and it states that the pandemic has made these risks more evident (p. 815). The Germany report also draws attention to opportunities in areas such as communication, obtaining information, and purchasing goods and services, with reference to the fact that skill development creates an area of opportunities, especially in times of crisis (p. 2). When it comes to the Spain report, it is seen that the pandemic is much more centralized, and the process is discussed over the lines that make the digital divide clear. As a matter of fact, this situation is also reflected in the subtitle of the report: "Technology in Use in COVID's Society. Learning from Failures-Use of Technology in the COVID Society. "Learning from Failures"

Another common feature reflected in the literature review section of each report is that the digital divide is handled within the framework of risks and opportunities, and digital competencies are framed with a focus on taking advantage of opportunities while being protected from risks. This is a situation that is already encountered in the relevant literature. The categories of digital competencies that the disadvantaged groups should have, depending on age and other related factors, reveal an important problem area that each report must answer. In this context, it is seen that in the reports of Turkey (p. 825) and Spain (p. 3), reference is made to the study named

"DigComp 2.1 The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens" (Carretero et al., 2017), which was developed by the European Commission Joint Research Center (JRC) and aims to provide evidence-based scientific support with policy-making processes.

Table 1. *DigComp 2.1 core competency categories (Carretero et al., 2017)*

1. Information and Data Literacy	2. Communication and Collaboration	3. Digital Content Creation	4. Security	5. Problem Solving
1.1 Browsing, searching, filtering data, information, and digital content 1.2 Evaluating data, information, and digital content 1.3 Managing data, information, and digital content	2.1 Interacting through digital technologies 2.2 Sharing through digital technologies 2.3 Engaging in citizenship through digital technologies 2.4 Collaborating through digital technologies 2.5 Netiquette 2.6 Managing digital identity	3.1 Developing digital content 3.2 Integrating and re-elaborating digital content 3.3 Copyright and licences 3.4 Programming	4.1 Protecting devices 4.2 Protecting personal data and privacy 4.3 Protecting health and well-being 4.4 Protecting the environment	5.1 Solving technical problems 5.2 Identifying needs and technological responses 5.3 Creatively using digital technologies 5.4 Identifying digital competence gaps

As can be seen in Table 2, the framework in question includes a highly functional competency category for digital immigrants as well. In the Germany report, digital competencies are based on Ferrari (2012); it is defined as a set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that will be required when using the internet and digital media, including skills, strategies, values, and awareness. Performing tasks, solving problems, communicating, managing information, collaborating, creating, and sharing content are the prominent categories in this framework (p. 3) and have significant similarities with DigComp 2.1.

The Voice of the Field: Expertise and Insight Opportunity

After the literature discussion, the project research included expert opinions to address the digital competency requirements of digital migrations from an expert point of view and clarify the responsibilities and problem areas. In studies designed with a qualitative character, data were collected through a semi-structured interview form. In the process of determining the working group in each research report, the criterion sampling approach, one of the purposive sampling methods, was used. The aforementioned approach has been preferred in that it allows the interviewers to be determined according to their expertise in the field. In this context, the information about the experts consulted in each report is embodied as follows:

Table 2. *Information on people who have expert opinion by country*

Turkey-TR Area of Expertise / Institution	Spain-ES Area of Expertise / Institution	Germany-DE
U1 - Communication, Digital Culture, Digital Divide / Erciyes University	**U1 -** Education / Catalan Government	**General Experts** **U1 -** Project Manager "Digital Ambulances" Bremen
U2 - Communication, Digitalization, Digital Culture / Erciyes University	**U2 -** Education / Catalan Government	**U2 -** Nursing Home Manager **U3 -** Urban Planning Specialist
U3 - Communication, Digital Culture, Sociology of Communication / Erciyes University	**U3 -** Family / University of Barcelona	**U4 -** Seniors Bank Manager
U4 - Education, Educational Technology, Digitalization / Erciyes University	**U4 -** Social Services / Local Government	
U5 - Communication, Digitalization, Digital Culture / Erciyes University	**U5 -** Social Services / Local Government	**Police Officers** **U5** - Police Officer in Charge of Cybercrime Prevention
U6 - Sociology, Digitalization, Digital Culture / Erciyes University	**U6 -** Social Services / Local Government	**U6** - Community Police Manager
U7 - Communication, Digitalization, Digital Culture / Selcuk University	**U7 –** Health / Local Hospital	**U7-U8-U9-U10-U11 -** Community Police Officer
U8 - Communication, Digitalization, Digital Culture / Akdeniz University	**U8 -** Business-Business / Private Sector	
U9 - Communication, Digitalization, Digital Culture / Anadolu University	**U9 -** Social Impact of the Internet / Oxford Internet Institute	**Experts Among Digital Immigrants** **U12-U13-U14-U15-U16-U17-U18-U19-U20 -** Digital immigrants who have worked in various public institutions and associations in related fields
U10 - Communication, Digitalization, Digital Culture / Sakarya University	**U10 -** Social Impact of the Internet / ESADE - Ramon Llull University	
U11 - Communication, Digitalization, Digital Culture / Istanbul University		

Table 3 shows that the interviews conducted in each country covered a wide range of experts in different categories. Experts working in the departments of Communication, Education, and Sociology from 6 different universities in the country but carrying out studies focused on digital culture took part in the meetings in Turkey. Questions directed to researchers; information and data literacy, communication and collaboration, digital content creation, security, and problem-solving categories, and the findings were analyzed within this framework. In this direction, the contributions of expert interviews to the competency framework are to be revealed; i) emphasis

on critical capacity, ii) awareness, iii) innovative learning and use practices, iv) revealing current issues, v) and practical exemplifications.

In the meetings in Spain, connections with the university, public institutions, health institutions, and the private sector were established on the axis of family, social services, education, and health themes, and experts were directly involved in the process within the thematic framework. Experts have made significant contributions in identifying key problems in accessing and using digital resources and services in related fields, identifying qualification requirements, and exemplifying how to overcome these problems (p. 6). The contributions of the interviews to the competency framework were shaped in the context of i) the need to understand the problem from a broader societal perspective such as socio-economic inequalities, ii) the emphasis on learning processes, iii) the necessity of practical applications accompanying theoretical learning processes, iv) learning from experience and sustainable development.

Interviews in Germany, on the other hand, were shaped in a wider range of expertise. Conducting the interviews with experts (related public and NGO officials, police officers, etc.) who are in constant contact with digital immigrants at different professional strata offered important insights. In this context, i) the importance of motivation and encouragement, ii.) development of innovative and needs-based learning strategies, iii.) transfer of innovations with exemplary practice practices, and iv) sustainability mark important contributions to the competence framework presented in the study.

The Intersection of Literature and Field: Responsibility and Problem Areas

In all reports so far, it has been clearly stated that the digital divide reveals important competency requirements for digital immigrants, parentheses have been opened in which framework the competencies for these needs will be acquired in the digital dimension, and the interviews have revealed expertise in this direction. The question that arises at this point is what is the responsibility and problem areas related to digital technologies where will these competencies be used.

Table 3. *Responsibility and problem areas related to digital technologies faced by digital immigrants*

Turkey-TR	Spain-ES	Germany-DE
Parenthood	Family	Communication
Profession	Social services	Information
Health and Well-being	Education	Changing Business Processes
Digital Citizenship	Health	Personal Interests, Hobbies, Entertainment
Lifelong Learning		Political Participation
Communication-Interaction		Coping With Everyday Life
Entertainment -Socialization		

The dynamic character of field studies allows for the continuous revision of both the research questions and the a priori categories that can form the framework for the questions. In this direction, it is seen that the responsibilities and problem areas related to digital technologies faced by digital immigrants, which are primarily evident within the framework of common-sense knowledge and literature, are dynamically shaped within the framework of expert interviews. The Spain report can be partially excluded from this cycle.

Digital citizenship, health, profession, and business processes are common themes included in all three reports. All other themes are included in at least two reports in a common way. The Turkey report stands out as the report that draws the widest framework. In particular, i) giving a special place to parenting in terms of its capacity to produce long-term societal results, ii) combining health and well-being as a psycho-social factor to reduce risks and improve quality of life, iii) based on Choi (2016) highlighting an emphasis on digital citizenship with a focus on ethics, media and information literacy, participation/interaction and critical resilience, iii) Extending learning from the Eurostat (t.y.) framework to all learning activities undertaken throughout life with the aim of developing knowledge, skills, and competences within personal, civic, social or employment-related perspectives. It can be expressed as the original aspects of this report.

The Spain report focuses on only four areas (family, social services, education, health) by way of a priori limitation. In these areas, it is seen that the problems that arise especially in pandemic conditions are focused on and that these problems are associated with wider social problems. In the Germany report, on the other hand, it is seen that the areas of responsibility and problem are discussed in wider frameworks, and the themes that are highlighted in other reports are included as sub-items from time to time. The clearest example of this is the category embodied as "coping with everyday life". This category is for the realization of almost all kinds of daily practices regarding the independent living capacity of digital immigrants with the help of digital tools. A range of digital tools such as weather forecasts, public transport, and flight schedules, searches for all kinds of goods and services, online browsing, e-bikes to stay active and mobile, assistance systems in cars and online navigation, exercise games, pedometers, monitoring systems for patients are only a few of them as mentioned in the report (p. 12).

Authentic Approaches and Policy Perspectives

As revealed by the pre-analysis reading process, it has been observed that each report evaluated within the scope of the study contains unique approaches and results in various policy perspectives based on literature and field knowledge.

In this respect, the Turkey report has a unique character in that it clarifies the responsibilities and problem areas that digital immigrants face as a result of a wide literature review and tries to reveal the digital divide in each area through statistics (p. 819-825). In addition, it is important in terms of its potential to contribute to practical applications that it reveals the basic competencies that digital immigrants should have within the framework of the basic competency categories described in the study in these areas of responsibility and problem, through tables (p. 831-837). In addition, as a result of the study, it is concluded that such a competency framework alone will not be sufficient for digital immigrants to develop their digital competencies; attention was drawn to the role and importance of regulatory and protective institutions in this regard, as well as individual knowledge, awareness, skills, and attitudes (p. 838).

The Spain report focused on the appearances that emerged under the pandemic conditions, focused on digital competencies in a concrete risk and threat center, and drew particular attention to the instructive character of the mistakes and deficiencies in this period. Addressing the problems related to access and use of basic digital resources and services related to family, social services, education, and health during the pandemic process, within the framework of direct interviews with field experts, reveals the unique character of the study. In addition, revealing the lines of tension arising from the problems related to these four basic areas also produced

inferences that feed the policy perspectives (p. 13-15). In this context, the emphasis is on prioritizing discussing the social inequalities that lead to the digital divide. As a matter of fact, the pandemic has made these social inequalities even more obvious. Again, prioritizing access and use of learning processes, feeding theoretical learning processes with practical applications, and ensuring sustainable development through learning from experience are other points that draw attention (p. 13-15). Based on these, the authors emphasize the dual learning logic, inspired by Chris Argyris (1977), as an approach that can form the basis of relevant policies. Accordingly, the single-loop learning approach, which focuses on solving the problems that arise but ignores the root and real causes of the problems, is insufficient. Instead, there is a need for approaches that go to the root of the problems, focus on why they could not be solved before, and expand the learning framework with new loops (p. 15). This is an emphasis on learning to learn through inclusive approaches that will increase the capacity to adapt to changing processes. In addition, focusing on the ethical use of tools together with the benefit to be obtained from technical tools and understanding the practical needs of those who are in a disadvantaged position, again based on their needs and expectations, are other highlighted issues.

What makes the Germany report unique is that it contains a German status report for digital immigrants on the axis of safe and independent use of digital technology and the Internet (p. 14-16). Again, the report allocates an independent space to recommendations for policy perspectives under the heading of "adequacy and security through education and information". The suggestions presented here are; it focuses on the importance of courses and support programs that present risks and countermeasures to digital immigrants in a concrete, clear and understandable way, and even allow comparison with examples from the analog world for better understanding. In addition, motivating the participation of especially elderly citizens in these courses and programs is another issue that draws attention. As a matter of fact, false and baseless fears often draw attention as factors that restrict use. At this point, it is stated that community-supported police officers can play an important role (p. 16-17). The functions of community-supported police officers, together with legal regulations, are positioned at a critical point for the solution of problems (p. 10-20). However, the report points to national and local (Bremen-level) organizations, initiatives, and projects focusing on information technologies and the safe use of the Internet, thus providing a comprehensive picture of national efforts to combat the issue (p. 20-24).

CONCLUSION

The integration of digitalized technologies into social life has produced different forms of reaction in various social segments. In these processes, some segments of the social group, which we can describe as digital immigrants, distanced themselves from digital technologies, while in other segments, the unconscious and uncontrolled use of technology has increased significantly. The lack of competencies about what digital technologies are, their effects, and how to use them can be expressed as the main reasons for these attitudes and behaviors. In this direction, it is seen that various initiatives related to digital competence frameworks have increased. With the 2006 European Commission Basic Competencies Recommendation, "Digital Competence" was accepted as one of the 8 core competencies of the European Union for Lifelong Learning. However, it can be stated that the academic initiatives in the field and the policies produced within this framework are basically aimed at drawing general qualification frameworks. The

research reports prepared within the scope of this study focused on digital competencies for digital immigrants in Turkey, Germany, and Spain, based on just such a need.

As a result of the analyses made within the scope of the study, it has been determined that each report included in the evaluation contains unique approaches brought about by different countries, expertise, and literature accumulation, although it has similarities due to its sensitivity to a common methodological framework. In this context;

Within the scope of the first research question for the literature, it can be stated that the related reports problematize concepts such as the digital native-digital immigrant divide, digital divide, and digital competencies, and they eliminate problematic forms of understanding through the transfer of original understandings in the aforementioned literature. In addition, each report's reference to the pandemic process in some waypoints to a common perspective in terms of revealing the lines that highlight the digital divide. Within the scope of the second research question for the expert interviews, it is seen that a unique view emerges in each study. While the Turkey report focuses more on the perspective of academics, the Spain report brings together universities, public institutions, health institutions, and the private sector on the axis of family, social services, education, and health; on the other hand, it is seen that the Germany report includes experts who are in constant contact with digital immigrants in different professional layers and some of them can be considered in the category of disadvantaged digital immigrants. This has provided the opportunity to develop significant insight into the respective responsibilities and problem areas in each report, through a wide synergy of expertise. It is seen that the framework put forward within the scope of the research question about how the responsibility and problem areas of digital immigrants regarding their digital competencies are shaped dynamically at the intersection of the literature and the field, although the Spain report differs from the other two reports to a certain extent with its original approach, the design is largely similar. Within the scope of the last research question on original approaches and policy perspectives, it is seen that each report presents a unique framework that reflects regional and purposive differences, and these unique approaches are also reflected in policy perspectives. In addition to all these, it can be stated that the related research has the potential to produce academic knowledge that can form the basis of practical policies focusing on the digital competencies of digital immigrants.

Author Contribution Rate: The authors' contribution rates in the study are equal.

Ethics Committee Report: Ethics committee approval was not required for this study.

Conflict of Interest Statement: This study is supported within the scope of the Erasmus+ Program Adult Education Strategic Partnerships action carried out by the Turkish National Agency with the short name DigiComp and the title of " Improving Digital Competencies for Digital Immigrants: Tackling with Digital Divide and Digital Social Inequality."

REFERENCES

Argyris, C. (1977, September 1). Double loop learning in organizations. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/1977/09/double-loop-learning-in-organizations

Aziz, M. N. A., Harun, S. N., Baharom, M. K., Ramlie, M. K., and Shuib, A. S. M. (2019). Classifying digital natives and digital immigrants as the museum visitors: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamic and Control Systems*, *11*(08-Special Issue), 291-300.

Bayne, S., and Ross, J. (2007). *The "digital native" and "digital immigrant": A dangerous opposition*.

Bektaş, Ö. ve Zabun, E. (2019). Vatandaşlık eğitiminde değerler karşılaştırması; Türkiye ve Fransa. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*. 17 (37), 247-289. https://doi.org/10.34234/ded.512221

BMFSFJ. (2020). *Ältere menschen und digitalisierung* (s. 56). https://www.bmfsfj.de/resource/blob/159704/3dab099fb5eb39d9fba72f6810676387/achter-altersbericht-aeltere-menschen-und-digitalisierung-data.pdf

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27-40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Choi, M. (2016). A concept analysis of digital citizenship for democratic citizenship education in the internet age. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *44*(4), 565-607. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2016.1210549

Eken, M. (2021). Literatür ve sahanın kesişiminde dijital göçmenler için dijital yetkinlikler. *Erciyes İletişim Dergisi*, *8*(2), 813-846. https://doi.org/10.17680/erciyesiletisim.969495

Ferrari, A. (2012). *Digital competence in practice: An analysis of frameworks* (Technical Report EUR 25351 EN). European Commission Joint Research Centre Institute for Prospective Technological Studies. https://ifap.ru/library/book522.pdf

Gross, J. M. S. (2018). Document analysis. In The SAGE Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation. SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506326139.n209

Hartmann, A., and Piontkowski, G. (2021). *Developing digital competence framework for digital immigrants via mapping of perceptions and meanings: Country report for Germany* [DigiComp Project Report]. https://digicomp.erciyes.edu.tr/project/Country_Report_for_Germany.pdf

https:/ec.europa.eu/. (t.y.). *Glossary: Lifelong learning*. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Glossary:Lifelong_learning

Huxhold, O., and Otte, K. (2019). *Internetzugang und internetnutzung in der zweiten lebenshälfte* (C. 01/2019). Deutsches Zentrum für Altersfragen.

Karadağ, R. (2014). Okuma ilgisi, tutumları ve alışkanlığı konusunda yapılmış çalışmaların lisansüstü tezlere dayalı analizi: YÖK ve ProQuest veri tabanları örneklemi. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education*, *(35)*, 1-1. https://doi.org/10.9779/PUJE619

Kıral, B. ve Çilek, A. (2020). *2023 Vizyon belgesinin karakter eğitimi bakımından değerlendirilmesi*. *49*(225), 5-22.

Merriam, S. B. (2013). *Nitel araştırma: Desen ve uygulama için bir rehber* (S. Turan, Çev.). Nobel Yayınları.

Nedbal, D., Auinger, A., Hochmeier, A., and Holzinger, A. (2012). A systematic success factor analysis in the context of enterprise 2.0: Results of an exploratory analysis comprising digital immigrants and digital natives. In C. Huemer & P. Lops (Ed.), *E-Commerce and Web Technologies* (C. 123, ss. 163-175). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-32273-0_14

Özkan, U. B. (2019). *Eğitim bilimleri araştırmaları için doküman inceleme yöntemi* (2. bs). Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık. https://doi.org/10.14527/9786052417232

Özsoy, D. (2020). Dijital bölünme düzeylerine dair literatür analizi. In *Dijital kültür, dijital eşitsizlikler ve yaşlanma* (pp. 11-23). Alternatif Bilişim. https://ekitap.alternatifbilisim.org/pdf/dijital_kultur_dijital_esitsizlikler_ve_yaslanma.pdf

Prensky, M. (2001a). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 1. *On the Horizon*, *9*(5), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816

Prensky, M. (2001b). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 2: Do they really think differently? *On the Horizon*, *9*(6), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424843

Sancho, J., Lindin, C., Grané, M. and Serrat, N. (2021). *Developing digital competence framework for digital immigrants via mapping of perceptions and meanings: Technology in use in COVID's society. Learning from failures* [DigiComp Project Report]. https://digicomp.erciyes.edu.tr/project/Technology_in_Use_in_COVIDs_Society.pdf

Selwyn, N. (2009). The digital native – myth and reality. *Aslib Proceedings*, *61*(4), 364-379. https://doi.org/10.1108/00012530910973776

Wang, Q., Myers, M., and Sundaram, D. (2012, January 1). Digital natives and digital immigrants: Towards a model of digital fluency. *ECIS 2012 - Proceedings of the 20th European Conference on Information Systems*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11576-013-0390-2

Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.