Proceeding International Conference of Innovation Science, Technology, Education, Children and Health
Voume 4 Number 2 Year 2024
e-ISSN : 2776-9062, page 321-324
Available online at: https://icistech.org/index.php/icistech

The Role of Robotics in Enhancing STEM Learning for Young Learners

Samiur Rahman Khan [1*], Nadeem Hossain [2], Zahid Karim Ullah [3]
[1-3] East West University, Bangladesh
Email : samiurkhan@gmail.com *

Abstract, *The integration of robotics in education is transforming the way students engage with STEM subjects. This paper explores the effectiveness of robotics in developing problem-solving, programming, and critical thinking skills in young learners. Case studies from various educational institutions demonstrate the positive impact of robotics-based learning in fostering innovation and creativity among children.*

Keywords: *Robotics, STEM Education, Hands-on Learning, Programming for Kids, EdTech*

1. INTRODUCTION

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education is critical in preparing young learners for the future workforce. Robotics has emerged as an innovative tool in STEM education, providing students with hands-on learning experiences that develop essential cognitive and technical skills. As educational systems shift towards interactive and application-based learning, robotics has gained attention as an effective means to enhance engagement and comprehension.

This paper examines the role of robotics in STEM education, highlighting its benefits in fostering problem-solving, logical reasoning, and programming skills in young learners. Through case studies and literature reviews, the effectiveness of robotics-based education is analyzed to demonstrate its potential in shaping future generations of STEM professionals.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The integration of robotics in education has been explored in multiple studies. Research suggests that robotics enhances student engagement and motivation by making learning more interactive and enjoyable. Scholars argue that hands-on activities with robots allow students to develop computational thinking and engineering design skills. Furthermore, robotics-based learning aligns with constructivist theories of education, where students learn by doing rather than passively absorbing information.

Incorporating robotics into the curriculum has also been linked to improvements in problem-solving abilities. Studies indicate that students who participate in robotics programs demonstrate higher levels of creativity, teamwork, and logical reasoning. Additionally, robotics

Received: November 23, 2024; Revised: December 07, 2024; Accepted: December 21, 2024; Published: December 31, 2024;

introduces students to coding concepts at an early age, which is increasingly recognized as a fundamental skill in the digital era.

3. METHODOLOGY

To explore the impact of robotics on STEM learning, this study employs a qualitative research approach. Data was collected through a review of existing literature, case studies from educational institutions, and expert interviews with educators implementing robotics programs. The study focuses on young learners aged 6–14 years, assessing how robotics contributes to their cognitive and skill development.

4. RESULTS

Findings indicate that integrating robotics into STEM education significantly enhances student engagement and learning outcomes. Schools that have implemented robotics programs report increased student interest in STEM subjects, with noticeable improvements in problem-solving and analytical thinking. Educators also observe that students involved in robotics-based learning demonstrate higher levels of creativity and perseverance when tackling complex tasks.

Additionally, case studies highlight the role of robotics in promoting collaboration among students. Robotics competitions and group-based learning projects encourage teamwork, communication, and leadership skills. The exposure to real-world applications of STEM concepts through robotics has been found to increase students' confidence in their technical abilities.

5. DISCUSSION

The results suggest that robotics is an effective tool for enhancing STEM education by providing hands-on learning opportunities. Unlike traditional teaching methods, robotics-based learning engages students actively, making abstract STEM concepts more tangible and comprehensible.

One of the key advantages of robotics in education is its ability to cater to diverse learning styles. Visual learners benefit from observing robot movements, kinesthetic learners gain from hands-on assembly and programming, and logical learners enhance their analytical skills through coding exercises. Moreover, robotics fosters an early interest in STEM careers, bridging the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application.

However, challenges remain in implementing robotics education universally. Access to resources, high costs of robotics kits, and the need for teacher training are barriers that must be addressed. Policymakers and educators must work together to integrate robotics more effectively into school curriculums and make it accessible to a broader range of students.

6. CONCLUSION

Robotics is revolutionizing STEM education by providing young learners with interactive and engaging learning experiences. The integration of robotics into classrooms has proven effective in enhancing problem-solving skills, programming proficiency, and critical thinking abilities. As educational institutions continue to embrace technology-driven learning, robotics will play a pivotal role in shaping the future of STEM education.

Future research should focus on expanding access to robotics education and evaluating long-term impacts on students' academic and professional careers. By investing in robotics-based learning, educators can equip young learners with the skills and knowledge needed to excel in an increasingly technology-driven world.

REFERENCE

Alimisis, D. (2013). Educational robotics: Open questions and new challenges. *Themes in Science and Technology Education*, 6(1), 63–71.

Benitti, F. B. V. (2012). Exploring the educational potential of robotics in schools: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, 58(3), 978–988.

Bers, M. U. (2018). *Coding as a Playground: Programming and Computational Thinking in the Early Childhood Classroom.* Routledge.

Bers, M. U. (2019). *Beyond Coding: How Children Learn Human Values Through Programming.* MIT Press.

Eguchi, A. (2014). Educational robotics for promoting 21st-century skills. *Journal of Automation, Mobile Robotics & Intelligent Systems*, 8(1), 5–14.

Kandlhofer, M., & Steinbauer, G. (2016). Evaluating the impact of educational robotics on pupils' technical and social skills. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 75, 679–685.

Kim, C., Yuan, J., Hill, R. B., Doshi, P., & Thai, C. N. (2015). Robotics to promote elementary education pre-service teachers' STEM engagement. *Computers & Education*, 91, 14–31.

Lin, C.-P., & Lin, Y.-H. (2021). The impact of educational robotics on students' STEM self-efficacy: A meta-analysis. *Computers & Education*, 164, 104114.

Martínez, S. L., & Stager, G. (2013). *Invent to Learn: Making, Tinkering, and Engineering in the Classroom.* Constructing Modern Knowledge Press.

Mikropoulos, T. A., & Bellou, I. (2013). Educational robotics as mindtools. *Themes in Science and Technology Education*, 6(1), 5–14.

Nugent, G., Barker, B., Grandgenett, N., & Adamchuk, V. (2010). The impact of robotics and geospatial technology interventions on youth STEM learning and attitudes. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(4), 391–408.

Papert, S. (1980). *Mindstorms: Children, Computers, and Powerful Ideas.* Basic Books.

Sullivan, F. R., & Bers, M. U. (2016). Robotics in the early childhood classroom: Learning outcomes from an 8-week robotics curriculum in pre-kindergarten through second grade. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 26(1), 3–20.

Williams, D. C., Ma, Y., Prejean, L., Ford, M. J., & Lai, G. (2007). Acquisition of physics content knowledge and scientific inquiry skills in a robotics summer camp. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 40(2), 201–216.

Wing, J. M. (2006). Computational thinking. *Communications of the ACM*, 49(3), 33–35.