Educational Innovation: Using Robots as Learning Tools

A. Jdidou[1], S. Aammou[1]
1 Ecole Normale Supérieure, Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Tetuan, MOROCCO
Jdidou.aymane@gmail.com

Abstract. In the context of evolving educational approaches, robotics has become a prominent tool for teaching, facilitated by its increasing accessibility and affordability. This research explores the role of robotics in enhancing fundamental STEM education for young learners, extending beyond basic programming. Over a 12-week period, 60 participants were split into control and experimental groups, with the latter integrating robotics into activities such as algorithmic thinking and maze navigation. The results, analyzed with statistical software, showed notable differences in learning outcomes between the two groups. The study provides insights and recommendations on the effectiveness of robotics in educational settings.

Keywords: Educational Robots, Experiential Learning, Programming Skills, STEM Education .

1 Introduction:

As educational innovation progresses, teachers are continuously seeking new tools and methods to improve learner learning experiences. The 21st century, marked by rapid technological advancements, offers a unique opportunity: the use of robots in educational settings [1]. The growing availability and affordability of robotic components have led to a new paradigm in how learners interact with and learn from their educational environments. Robots, with their tangible and interactive nature, not only capture learners' attention but also provide a hands-on platform for understanding complex concepts, particularly in STEM subjects. This paper presents an empirical study that examines the significant impact of integrating robotics into basic STEM education. The study goes beyond simple programming to investigate how robotics can be a transformative tool, enhancing skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, teamwork, and creativity. Through a carefully structured 12-week course, which includes challenges like navigating mazes and applying algorithmic logic, we evaluate the differences in learning outcomes between a control group, using traditional teaching methods, and an experimental group, actively engaging with robots.
The research utilized quantitative methods for data collection and analysis to assess the impact of prior experience within each group. Descriptive statistics and ANOVA were used to determine the average level of each group. The significance of the differences observed between the groups was assessed using Levene's and Fisher's tests. Before conducting the ANOVA, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was confirmed with Levene's test.

M. Khaldi et al. (eds.), Proceedings of the E-Learning and Smart Engineering Systems (ELSES 2024), Atlantis Highlights in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities 36,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-408-2_51

2 Theoretical Background

2.1 Educational robots

As the field of educational robotics continues to grow, it is important to consider the integration of interdisciplinary approaches that combine robotics with other subjects, such as art, literature, and social studies. This holistic approach can provide learners with a well-rounded education that connects STEM concepts with real-world applications and cultural contexts [2].

One way to achieve this is through project-based learning (PBL), where learners work on robotics projects that require them to apply knowledge from various disciplines [3]. For example, a project might involve designing a robot that can perform a task inspired by a historical event or a literary plot. This not only deepens learners' understanding of robotics but also enhances their appreciation for other subjects [4].

Additionally, the use of educational robotics can be extended beyond the classroom to after-school programs, clubs, and competitions. These extracurricular activities provide learners with additional opportunities to explore their interests in robotics, work collaboratively on projects, and showcase their skills [5]. Robotics competitions, in particular, can be highly motivating for learners, as they offer a platform for them to demonstrate their creativity, problem-solving abilities, and technical prowess.

Incorporating educational robotics into the curriculum also requires attention to accessibility and inclusivity. It is crucial to ensure that all learners, regardless of their socio-economic background or learning abilities, have access to robotics resources and activities. This can be achieved through partnerships with local community organizations, universities, and industry partners that can provide funding, equipment, and expertise.

Furthermore, the evaluation of robotics programs in education should go beyond traditional assessment methods. Innovative assessment techniques, such as portfolio assessments and peer reviews, can better capture the diverse skills and competencies developed through robotics activities. These assessments can provide a more comprehensive picture of learner learning and progress.

Lastly, educational robotics presents a dynamic and multifaceted approach to STEM education that can be enriched through interdisciplinary integration [6], extracurricular engagement, attention to accessibility and inclusivity, and innovative assessment methods. By embracing these elements, educators can create a learning environment that not only fosters technical skills but also nurtures creativity, critical thinking, and a lifelong passion for learning.

2.2 Experiential Learning

Experiential learning is a dynamic and learner-centered approach that places learners at the heart of the learning process. This educational method is grounded in the idea that learning is most effective when it is active, engaging, and connected to real-life experiences [7]. By immersing learners in hands-on activities and real-world scenarios, experiential learning fosters a deep understanding of concepts and skills that are directly applicable to their future careers and personal lives.

One of the key components of experiential learning is reflection [8]. After participating in an experiential activity, learners are encouraged to reflect on their experiences, analyze their actions and outcomes, and draw connections between what they learned and how it relates to their academic studies and personal goals. This reflective process is crucial for internalizing knowledge and developing critical thinking skills [9, 10 , 11].

Experiential learning can take many forms, including:

- Internships and Co-ops: These provide learners with opportunities to gain practical work experience in their field of study, allowing them to apply theoretical knowledge to real-world situations and develop professional skills.
- Service Learning: This combines community service with academic coursework, enabling learners to engage with their communities, address social issues, and reflect on the impact of their actions.
- Field Trips: Visits to museums, historical sites, scientific laboratories, or industry facilities can provide valuable insights and enhance understanding of subject matter.
- Simulations and Role-Playing: These activities allow learners to immerse themselves in realistic scenarios, practice decision-making, and develop problem-solving skills.
- Hands-on Laboratory Experiments: In STEM disciplines, conducting experiments and working with scientific equipment can deepen understanding of scientific principles and methodologies.

The benefits of experiential learning extend beyond academic achievement. It promotes personal growth by encouraging learners to step out of their comfort zones, take initiative, and develop resilience. By facing real challenges and learning from their experiences, learners build confidence and a sense of responsibility.

Experiential learning is also highly adaptable and can be tailored to meet the diverse needs and learning styles of learners. It fosters a collaborative learning environment where learners can work together, share ideas, and support each other's learning journey.

Incorporating experiential learning into the curriculum requires careful planning and coordination. Educators need to design activities that are relevant to the course content, provide clear objectives and guidance, and ensure that there are opportunities for reflection and feedback. Additionally, establishing partnerships with community organizations, businesses, and industry professionals can enhance the quality and relevance of experiential learning opportunities.

Finally, experiential learning is a powerful educational approach that prepares learners for the complexities of the real world. By combining theory with practice and reflection, it equips learners with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for success in their academic, professional, and personal lives.

3 Methodology

3.1 Preparation Phase

To create an optimal learning environment for learners, a carefully selected collection of resources related to robotics and coding was compiled. Mazes with varying levels of difficulty were designed to challenge and enhance learners' problem-solving abilities. These mazes were adjustable to accommodate both beginner and advanced learners. A user-friendly coding platform, compatible with the robots and suitable for young learners, was selected as the primary tool for learner interaction with the robots. Educators underwent comprehensive training in robotics software and maze challenges to ensure they could effectively guide learners through the course's complexities. Finally, 60 participants were introduced to the program, briefed on the course structure, its goals, and overall expectations, laying the groundwork for their educational journey in robotics and coding.

3.2 Course Structure and Implementation

The course structure outlined above provides a clear progression from introductory concepts to more advanced challenges, with a focus on developing algorithmic thinking and problem-solving skills. Here's a detailed breakdown of the course implementation:

- Weeks 1-2: Introduction to Algorithmic Thinking
  - Control Group: Learners were introduced to the basics of algorithms using traditional teaching methods such as lectures, textbooks, and paper-based exercises. They learned about the definition of algorithms, basic control structures (sequence, selection, and iteration), and simple algorithmic problems.
  - Experimental Group: In addition to the traditional methods, learners had the opportunity to visualize algorithms through the movements of robots. They were introduced to basic programming concepts and learned how to control the robots to perform simple tasks. This hands-on experience helped them grasp the concept of algorithms in a more concrete way.
- Weeks 3-4: Basic Maze Challenges
  - Control Group: Learners applied their understanding of algorithms to solve basic maze challenges on paper. They used logical reasoning to find the shortest path or to navigate through the maze using specific rules.
  - Experimental Group: Learners programmed their robots to navigate through physical mazes. They used trial and error to refine their algorithms and improve the robots' performance. This hands-on approach allowed them to experiment with different strategies and learn from their mistakes.
- Weeks 5-7: Intermediate Maze Challenges
  - Control Group: The complexity of the maze challenges increased, requiring learners to enhance their logical reasoning skills. They were introduced to more complex algorithms and problem-solving strategies.

  - Experimental Group: Learners learned and applied new algorithms to guide their robots through more challenging mazes. They experimented with different programming techniques and developed a deeper understanding of algorithmic thinking.
- Weeks 8-10: Advanced Maze Challenges and Collaborative Problem-Solving
  - Control Group: Learners participated in group discussions to solve advanced maze challenges. They collaborated to develop solutions and shared their reasoning with their peers.
  - Experimental Group: Learners worked in teams to collaboratively program their robots to navigate through complex mazes. This phase emphasized teamwork, communication, and the integration of different ideas to achieve a common goal.
- Weeks 11-12: Review and Project Development
  - Control Group: Learners revisited key concepts and refined their techniques. They made connections between the theoretical knowledge and real-world applications. The course concluded with a paper-based project that required them to apply their learning to a practical problem.
  - Experimental Group: Learners focused on improving their robots' maze-navigation abilities and started developing a final project. This project involved designing a maze and programming their robot to navigate through it efficiently. This phase allowed learners to showcase their creativity, problem-solving skills, and mastery of the concepts learned throughout the course.

Throughout the course, the control group relied on traditional learning aids, while the experimental group had the added advantage of interacting with robots. This hands-on experience provided the experimental group with a tangible way to apply their knowledge and see the real-world implications of their algorithms. The course structure was designed to gradually increase the complexity of the challenges, ensuring that learners had a solid foundation before tackling more advanced problems.

4 Experimentation

The experimentation section of this study aims to investigate the effectiveness of educational robotics in enhancing the coding skills and problem-solving abilities of learners. To achieve this, we designed a controlled experiment involving 60 participants, who were randomly assigned to either an experimental group or a control group. The experimental group engaged in a curriculum that integrated educational robotics, while the control group followed a traditional curriculum without the use of robotics. The study sought to compare the outcomes of these two approaches in terms of their impact on learners' coding and problem-solving skills. Additionally, we collected demographic data on each participant, including gender and prior programming experience, to explore any potential influences these factors might have on the results. The data collected from pre- and post-assessments were analyzed using quantitative methods, including ANOVA and Fisher's exact test, to assess the effectiveness of the educational robotics intervention and to ensure the validity of the findings. This experimentation section details the methodology, data analysis, and interpretation of results, providing insights into the potential benefits of incorporating educational robotics into STEM education. Details of the experiment design are:

1. Objective:
   - To evaluate the impact of educational robotics on the coding skills and problem-solving abilities of learners.
2. Participants:
   - Total number of learners: 60
   - Randomly assigned to two groups: Experimental group (n = 30) and Control group (n = 30)
3. Demographic Data Collection:
   - Gender (Male/Female)
   - Prior programming experience (Yes/No)
4. Study Design:

- Pre-Assessment:
  - All learners take a specialized assessment tool to evaluate their baseline coding skills and problem-solving abilities. The scores range from 0 to 100.
- Intervention:
  - Experimental Group: Engages in educational robotics activities, including algorithm visualization, maze navigation, and collaborative problem-solving with robots.
  - Control Group: Follows a traditional curriculum without the use of robotics, focusing on theoretical concepts and paper-based exercises.
- Post-Assessment:
  - After the intervention, all learners retake the specialized assessment tool to evaluate any changes in their coding skills and problem-solving abilities.

5. Data Analysis:

- Quantitative Methodology:
  - Use descriptive statistics to summarize the demographic data and pre/post-assessment scores.
  - Assess the impact of prior programming experience within each group.
- ANOVA (Analysis of Variance):
  - Perform ANOVA to compare the average performance of the experimental and control groups.
  - Use Levene's test to check the assumption of homogeneity of variances.
    - If Levene's test is non-significant ($p > 0.05$), proceed with ANOVA.
    - If Levene's test is significant ($p \leq 0.05$), consider alternative statistical methods or transformations.

5 Results

At the end of the course, participants were evaluated through an assessment. The data collected from this assessment was thoroughly analyzed using advanced statistical software.

5.1 Descriptive statistics

Firstly, the descriptive statistics were examined for each group and moderator variable.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Experimental and Control Groups

Group	N	Mean	SD
Experimental	30	65.3	8.2
Control	30	58.5	7.5

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Gender and Prior Programming Experience

Variable	N	Mean	SD
Gender (Male)	34	62.7	7.4
Gender (Female)	26	60.6	6.7
Prior Experience (Yes)	12	63.3	7.4
Prior Experience (No)	48	60.8	7.2

5.2 ANOVA test

To conduct the ANOVA, a general linear model (GLM) is used with programming score as the dependent variable, Group (experimental vs. control), Gender (male vs. female), and prior programming Experience (yes vs. no) as the independent variables. The results of the ANOVA analysis are as follows:

Table 3: ANOVA Results for Treatment and Moderators

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Group	849.65	1	849.65	32.63	<0.001
Gender	12.46	1	12.46	0.47	0.491
Exp. x Gen.	1.54	1	1.52	0.06	0.805
Prior Exp.	19.93	1	19.93	0.76	0.384
Exp. x Prior Exp.	13.27	1	13.27	0.51	0.478

Gender x Prior Exp.	6.17	1	6.17	0.24	0.628
Exp. x Gen. x Prior Exp.	5.74	1	5.75	0.22	0.641
Error (Residual)	1751.54	132	13.27		
Total	2649.00	139			

The results of the ANOVA analysis reveal that the main effect of the group is significant ($F(1, 132) = 32.63$, $p < 0.001$), showing that the experimental group achieved higher average programming scores than the control group. However, the main effects of gender and prior programming experience are not significant ($p > 0.05$).
Additionally, the interaction effects between group and gender, group and prior programming experience, and gender and prior programming experience are also not significant ($p > 0.05$).
These findings suggest that the use of robots provides a significant advantage in learning outcomes, regardless of the participants' gender or previous programming experience.

6 Discussion and Recommendations

This research highlights the transformative impact of robotics in education. The physical nature of robots, combined with their immediate feedback mechanisms, offers a rich learning environment where even abstract concepts become tangible, enhancing understanding and engagement.

The results of the ANOVA analysis from the experimentation provide several important insights into the impact of educational robotics on learners' coding skills and problem-solving abilities. Here's a detailed discussion of the findings:

- Significant Effect of Group:

The main effect of the group is significant ($F(1, 132) = 32.63$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that there is a statistically significant difference in the average programming scores between the experimental and control groups.

The experimental group, which engaged in educational robotics activities, had a higher mean score (65.3) compared to the control group (58.5). This suggests that incorporating robotics into the curriculum positively impacts learners' coding skills and problem-solving abilities.

The significant difference between the groups supports the hypothesis that hands-on, experiential learning through robotics can enhance understanding and application of algorithmic concepts compared to traditional teaching methods.

- Non-Significant Effect of Gender:

The main effect of gender is not significant ($F(1, 132) = 0.47$, $p = 0.491$), indicating that there is no statistically significant difference in programming scores between male and female participants.

This finding suggests that both genders benefited equally from the educational interventions, whether it was the traditional approach or the robotics-based approach. It highlights the inclusivity of educational robotics in promoting STEM skills irrespective of gender.

- Non-Significant Effect of Prior Programming Experience:

The main effect of prior programming experience is not significant ($F(1, 132) = 0.76$, $p = 0.384$), indicating that the programming scores did not differ significantly between participants with and without prior experience.

This result suggests that educational robotics can be an effective tool for teaching coding skills to both novices and those with some background in programming. It indicates that the robotics activities were accessible and engaging for all learners, regardless of their prior experience.

- Non-Significant Interaction Effects:

The interaction effects between group and gender, group and prior programming experience, and gender and prior programming experience are all not significant ($p > 0.05$).

These non-significant interactions imply that the advantage provided by educational robotics is consistent across different subgroups. The benefits of using robots for learning do not depend on the learners' gender or previous programming experience.

In summary, the results of this study provide strong evidence for the effectiveness of educational robotics in improving coding skills and problem-solving abilities. The significant difference in programming scores between the experimental and control groups underscores the value of integrating hands-on robotics activities into STEM education. Additionally, the lack of significant differences based on gender and prior programming experience suggests that educational robotics is a versatile and inclusive tool that can benefit a diverse range of learners.

7 Conclusions

In conclusion, this study provides compelling evidence for the transformative power of educational robotics in enhancing STEM education. The incorporation of robotics into the curriculum has proven to be a highly effective pedagogical approach, significantly improving learners' coding skills and problem-solving abilities. The results of the ANOVA analysis clearly demonstrate that students who engaged in hands-on robotics activities outperformed their counterparts in the control group, who were exposed to traditional teaching methods.

Notably, the benefits of educational robotics were not confined to a specific demographic. The findings indicate that both male and female students, as well as those with and without prior programming experience, benefited equally from the robotics-based learning approach. This underscores the inclusivity and accessibility of educational robotics, making it a valuable tool for bridging gaps in STEM education.

The study's outcomes highlight the importance of experiential learning and the need for educational institutions to embrace innovative teaching methods that resonate with the technological advancements of the 21st century. By integrating educational robotics into their curricula, schools and universities can provide students with engaging and relevant learning experiences that prepare them for the challenges and opportunities of the digital age.

Furthermore, the positive impact of educational robotics on learners' skills and abilities reinforces the argument for increased investment in STEM education. Governments, educational policymakers, and industry stakeholders should collaborate to ensure that students have access to the resources and opportunities needed to thrive in a technology-driven world.

In summary, this research adds to the growing body of evidence supporting the effectiveness of educational robotics in STEM education. It calls for a paradigm shift in teaching methodologies, advocating for a more interactive, learner-centered approach that fosters creativity, critical thinking, and a passion for learning. As we move forward, the integration of educational robotics into educational frameworks will be pivotal in shaping the future of STEM education and in equipping the next generation with the skills necessary to navigate an increasingly complex and technologically advanced world.

References

1. Eguchi, A. (2016). RoboCupJunior for promoting STEM education, 21st century skills, and technological advancement through robotics competition. Robotics and Autonomous Systems, 75, 692-699.
2. Sapounidis, T., & Alimisis, D. (2020). Educational robotics for STEM: A review of technologies and some educational considerations. In Science and mathematics education for 21st century citizens: Challenges and ways forward (No. September, 2020, pp. 167-190). Hauppauge, NY, USA: Nova Science Publishers.
3. Jdidou, A., Aammou, S., & Er-Radi, H. (2023). ENHANCING PROBLEM-SOLVING AND PROGRAMMING ABILITIES IN CHILDREN THROUGH PROJECT-BASED LEARNING. Conhecimento & Diversidade, 15(39), 11-21.
4. Dole, S., Bloom, L., & Kowalske, K. (2016). Transforming pedagogy: Changing perspectives from teacher-centered to learner-centered. Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning, 10(1), 1.
5. Evripidou, S., Georgiou, K., Doitsidis, L., Amanatiadis, A. A., Zinonos, Z., & Chatzichristofis, S. A. (2020). Educational robotics: Platforms, competitions and expected learning outcomes. IEEE access, 8, 219534-219562.
6. Greca Dufranc, I. M., García Terceño, E., Fridberg, M., Cronquist, B., & Redfors, A. (2020). Robotics and early-years STEM education: The botSTEM framework and activities. European Journal of STEM Education, (1), 1-13.
7. Akintolu, M., Letseka, M., & Dlamini, N. P. (2022). AN EXPLORATION OF STUDENT-CENTRED APPROACHES AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING STRATEGIES FOR A YOUTH-BASED INITIATIVE. Youth Voice Journal.
8. Boyd, E. M., & Fales, A. W. (1983). Reflective learning: Key to learning from experience. Journal of humanistic psychology, 23(2), 99-117.

9. Wurdinger, S. D., & Carlson, J. A. (2009). Teaching for experiential learning: Five approaches that work. R&L Education.
10. Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. Academy of management learning & education, 4(2), 193-212.
11. Kolb, D. A. (2014). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. FT press.