# FROM LOGO PROGRAMMING TO FAB LABS: THE LEGACY OF CONSTRUCTIONIST LEARNING IN K–12 EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY

Melvin LaPrade and Sherry Lassiter

Fab Foundation, Boston, MA, USA

***ABSTRACT***

*Mens et manus, the motto that is embedded in the MIT official seal, is a simple Latin phrase that translates to "mind and hand." As a continuation of MIT's pioneering education and research, Seymour Papert, a renowned educator and learning theorist, established the foundation of constructionism, which emphasizes hands-on/minds-on learning. This article explores the evolution of constructionism in K-12 educational technology from the Logo computer language to Scratch block-based programming and the introduction of Fab Labs, which represent the third-generation platform for constructionist teaching and learning. The use of Fab Labs in K-12 education aligns with the Mens et manus philosophy by providing students with opportunities to apply theoretical knowledge to real-world applications through hands-on experiences with digital fabrication technologies. The adoption of the proposed Fab Labs constructionist framework can help prepare students for the demands of a rapidly changing world and aligns with educational standards for science and mathematics.*
.

***KEYWORDS***

*Constructionist learning, Logo programming, Digital fabrication, &Fab Labs*

## 1. BACKGROUND

The launch of Sputnik in 1957 by the Soviet Union spurred the United States to improve its STEM education and led to significant educational reforms. In particular, DARPA-funded "top-tier" universities' computer scientists, scholars, and researchers were entrusted with the task of modernizing K–12 education. One of the individuals who played a pivotal role in shaping the ontological, epistemological, and pedagogical foundations of modern K-12 education technology was Seymour Papert, a scholar at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). According to historical accounts, in 1966, Seymour Papert, Wallace Feurzeig and Daniel Bobrow met to discuss new techniques for teaching children using computers. A year later, Papert, Feurzeig and Cynthia Solomon created the first K-12 educational technology programming language developed specifically for children [1]. The MIT team developed the concept of constructionism, an educational paradigm that emphasizes hands-on exploration and creation.

The theoretical underpinnings of constructionism and its implications for science education were first articulated in Papert's National Science Foundation grant application for The Logo Project, entitled "A New Opportunity for Elementary Science Education" as follows:

> The word constructionism is a mnemonic for two aspects of the theory of science education underlying this project. From constructivist theories of psychology, we take a view of learning as reconstruction rather than as a transmission of knowledge. Then we

> extend the idea of manipulative materials to the idea that learning is most effective when part of an activity the learner experiences is constructing a meaningful artifact. [2:2]

Unlike other programming languages like BASIC or FORTRAN, Logo's program consisted of "discrete procedures" or "blocks of procedures" that the turtle would follow in a logical sequence. One of the most iconic features of Logo was the robotic turtle that could be controlled through programming commands such as FORWARD, BACK, LEFT, and RIGHT. The turtle served as an "object-to-think-with," allowing students to actively engage with the material, connect it to their prior knowledge, and construct their own understanding. Taylor's [3] "tutor–tool–tutee framework" differentiated three distinct usages of the computer in the classroom as outlined below:

> **The Computer as Tutor**: In this approach, the computer is used to deliver instructional content and feedback to learners. The computer acts as a tutor, providing individualized instruction and guidance based on the learner's performance.
>
> **The Computer as Tool**: In this approach, the computer is used as a tool for learners to create, explore, and solve problems. The computer serves as a medium for learners to express their ideas and test their understanding through programming, simulation, or other forms of digital creation.
>
> **The Computer as Tutee**: In this approach, learners take on the role of tutor and teach the computer how to perform a task. As this requires programming the computer to perform a task, learners must understand the task deeply enough to translate its integral aspects into computer code. This process helps learners develop a deeper appreciation of the concepts behind the task.

The first wave of educational software programs in the 1960s and 1970s focused on teaching programming using mainframe computers. The "computer as tutor" approach delivered instructional content and feedback through drills, simulations, and tutorials. Microcomputers later shifted the focus to the "computer as tool" for students to express ideas and test understanding. Logo, designed in 1971, introduced programming to K-12 classrooms with a curriculum promoting the "computer as tutee" concept. This aligned with the constructionist approach, where learners actively engage in the learning process, exploring and discovering knowledge.

The incorporation of constructionist learning into formal education marked a significant shift in both epistemological and pedagogical procedures. In constructionism, the teacher guides students as they construct their own knowledge, fostering questioning and hypothesis testing. In contrast, instructionism assumes the teacher possesses all knowledge and students passively receive it. As shown in Table 1, Papert makes clear distinction between constructionism (the "nature of knowing") and instructionism (the "nature of knowledge").

Table 1. Pedagogical Features of Instructionism versus Constructionism

| Pedagogical Feature | Instructionism | Constructionism |
|---|---|---|
| Teacher's Role | Expert who provides information and expects students to memorize it. | Facilitator who guides and supports students as they construct their own knowledge. |
| Learning Environment | Passive, with students sitting in rows and listening to the teacher. | Hands-on and interactive, with students working on projects and experiments that allow them to explore and discover new ideas. |
| Assessment | Often based on tests and quizzes that measure how well students have memorized information. | Based on the students' ability to demonstrate what they have learned by creating something tangible, such as a project or a presentation. |
| Curriculum | More rigid and teacher-centered, with a set syllabus that all students must follow. | More flexible and student-centered, with students encouraged to pursue their own interests and create projects that reflect their own unique perspectives. |
| Outcome | Limited to the acquisition of knowledge. | Extends beyond the acquisition of knowledge to include the development of skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and creativity. |

Departing from the traditional educational methods, which rely on structured curriculum and predefined outcomes, the MIT team sought to support children as they build their own intellectual structures using materials from their immediate surroundings and their culture. Constructionist learning, championed by Papert, allows learners to actively seek specific knowledge, including computational thinking and problem-solving skills. Logo and Papert's approach pointedly influenced education technology, inspiring the of Alan Kay’s Dynabook, the first iteration of the desktop personal computer. [4].

Logo’s growing popularity prompted a debate between Roy D. Pea and Seymour Papert over its effectiveness in K−12 education. Pea and his team of scholars conducted empirical research to investigate the impact of Logo programming—and the constructionism-driven instructional method more broadly—on students' cognitive skills. The results of their analysis of several studies, including those conducted by Pea and Kurland [5], Pea et al., [6], and Clements [7], consistently showed no significant differences in cognitive skills between students who learned Logo programming and those who did not. These results, along with the crisis in education that emerged in the 1980s, prompted a call for a return to more traditional, teacher-centered approaches to instruction

The National Commission on Excellence in Education report titled "A Nation at Risk" [8] identified the "incoherent, outdated patchwork quilt" of classroom learning and a diluted "cafeteria-style curriculum" as the root of causes of the K-12 education crisis. The report called for the adoption of standardized testing, clear academic goals, focus on teacher-led instruction, and accountability measures. Hirsch's "The Schools We Need" similarly argued that multisensory teaching methods were ineffective in teaching fundamental skills such as grammar, spelling, phonics, and multiplication tables. Hirsch [9] also criticized the constructionist learning approach as anti-intellectualism, as its focus on "constructing knowledge" and "play" resulted in a "watered-down" and ineffective teaching pedagogy.

Logo classroom implementation required pedagogical practice changes and willingness to learn a new curriculum. However, adoption of Logo’s technology-infused reform strategies with fidelity was challenging due to the reliance on intrinsic motivation and the difficulty of translating ideas into widespread practice [10]. Existing curriculum's entrenched nature poses a significant obstacle to Logo's classroom implementation. Large-scale technology-driven reforms also incurred high costs for hardware, software, and teacher training, further hindering implementation. Papert continued to develop his theory of constructionism, emphasizing that the use of Logo programming as a tool for teaching should be seen as a means of engaging children in a process of active discovery and exploration, rather than just a means of imparting specific cognitive skills.

## 2. SECOND ITERATION OF CONSTRUCTIONIST LEARNING

Despite opposition, Papert remained a strong advocate for computer use in K−12 education and criticized those who focused solely on the effectiveness of a particular technology. In 1989, the Lego company endowed a chair at MIT, appointing Seymour Papert as the first Lego Professor of Learning Research. After Papert became Professor Emeritus, the position was renamed the Lego Papert Professorship of Learning Research in his honor, now held by Mitchel Resnick. Resnick ascribed the success of their widely popular Scratch program to the focus on 'Seymour's advice to aim for low floor and high ceiling,' with one important caveat—the dimension of 'wide walls':

> It's not enough to provide a single path from low floor to a high ceiling; it's important to provide multiple pathways. Why? We want all children to work on projects based on their own personal interests and passions—and because different children have different passions, we need technologies that support many different types of projects, so that all children can work on projects that are personally meaningful to them. [11]

Scratch is an inclusive and open-ended programming language, enabling students to create interactive projects aligned with their interests. Scratch 2.0 developed this idea further by integrating Web 2.0 online code editor features into their social platform, where the entire learning community (instead of just one student) collaboratively constructs artifacts. The research of the MIT Media Lab's Lifelong Kindergarten Group, headed by Resnick, is a continuation of the original constructionism principles, but with a focus on creating a more accessible and adaptable programming environment for students. Most importantly, the incorporation of a distributed context transforms 'objects-to-think-with' to 'objects-to-think-with-together.' Research conducted by Resnick et al. [12] demonstrated the effectiveness of Scratch in improving student engagement, motivation, and problem-solving skills, while Bers et al. [13] showed that programming and robotics curriculum incorporating programming can promote computational thinking skills in young children. The review of literature by Grover and Pea [14]) highlights the importance of computational thinking in preparing students for the 21st century and presents evidence of Scratch's effectiveness in meeting this objective. Finally, Voogt et al. [15] provided evidence in support of constructionist learning as a means to acquire TPACK skills.

In 2009, the Computer Science Teachers Association released a set of standards for computer science education, emphasizing the importance of computational thinking, problem-solving, and creativity, as well as providing guidance for integrating computer science into the curriculum. As it is closely aligned with these learning goals and objectives, the Scratch platform has become a vital tool within the "Hour of Code" held annually during Computer Science Education Week. Hour of Code is a global movement aimed at introducing students to computer science in a fun and engaging way. Resnick commented on the attitudes toward these developments as follows:

> Back [in 2007], most K−12 educators saw computer programming as a narrow technical skill, too difficult for most elementary and middle-school students, and useful only for students planning to become professional programmers. Graphical programming

> languages were generally seen as toys or gimmicks, not appropriate for educational applications.
>
> Fast forward to 2019, and the perceptions and activities around computer science education have changed dramatically. There is a growing recognition of the value of introducing coding to all students. Organizations like code.org and CS4All have been successful in promoting the integration of computer science into state curriculum standards. [16:3]

The second iteration of constructionist learning redefines the educational landscape by prioritizing fun, engagement, and accessibility for all learners. It diverges from traditional STEM teaching, which follows rigid curricula with limited flexibility. In this new approach, teachers transition from knowledge providers to guides and facilitators, fostering collaboration and exploration. Table 2 highlights the key distinctions between the two iterations:

> **Interdisciplinary Learning:** Constructionist learning integrates knowledge from various subjects, whereas traditional STEM teaching tends to be subject-specific.
> **Lifelong Learning:** Constructionist learning promotes lifelong curiosity, exploration, and growth, whereas traditional STEM teaching often focuses on short-term outcomes.
>
> **Hands-on Exploration:** Constructionist learning encourages interactive exploration with technology, while traditional STEM teaching relies more on lectures and memorization.
>
> **Creative Problem-Solving:** Constructionist learning fosters open-ended problem-solving and novel application of STEM concepts, whereas traditional STEM teaching often relies on prescribed tasks.
>
> **Scaffolding and Support:** Constructionist learning provides scaffolding and support for learners of all levels, whereas traditional STEM teaching may require students to figure things out independently.
>
> **Self-directed Learning:** Constructionist learning empowers learners to take ownership of their knowledge acquisition, while traditional STEM teaching emphasizes teacher-led instruction.

As of January 2021, based on the data provided on the Scratch website, more than 67 million constructionist-driven projects have been created and shared by over 64 million recorded users. However, despite widespread adoption of Scratch and a growing popularity of coding, concerns expressed in the K−12 education technology literature suggest that, if the focus is solely on coding, the space for a deeper understanding and creativity is inevitably limited. [17]

Table 2. Comparison of Constructionist Learning and Traditional STEM Teaching Practices

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Second Iteration of Constructionist Learning | Traditional STEM Classroom Teaching Practices |
| Key Principle | Learning should be fun, engaging, and accessible to all learners, regardless of their prior experience or background. | Learning should follow a standardized curriculum, with minimal deviation from prescribed lessons. |
| | Learning should be interdisciplinary and should integrate knowledge from different subject areas. | Learning is often subject-specific, with little integration of different subject areas. |
| | Technology should be used to enhance learning and creativity, but should not be a barrier to learning for some learners. | Technology may not be integrated into learning or may be seen as a barrier to learning for some students. |
| | Learners should have opportunities to collaborate with others and share their work, receiving feedback and support from peers and mentors. | Learners may not have opportunities to collaborate with others, and may primarily receive feedback and support from the teacher. |
| | Learning should be scaffolded and supported through tutorials, examples, and other resources. | Learning is often scaffolded through prescribed lessons and assignments, with limited opportunities for exploration. |
| | Assessment should be based on the process of learning and on the development of skills and competencies. | Assessment may be primarily based on standardized tests and grades, with less emphasis on the process of learning. |
| | Learners should have agency and ownership over their learning, and should be encouraged to pursue their own interests and passions. | Learners may have less agency and ownership over their learning, with limited opportunities for pursuing their own interests and passions. |
| | Learning should be a lifelong process that promotes curiosity, exploration, and continuous growth. | Learning may be seen as a means to an end, rather than a lifelong process aimed at continuous growth. |
| | Provides a more hands-on and interactive platform for learners to explore and create with technology. | Traditional STEM teaching may rely on lectures, textbooks, and memorization, with less emphasis on hands-on exploration. |
| | Allows for more open-ended and creative problem-solving tasks, enabling learners to apply STEM concepts in novel ways. | Traditional STEM teaching may rely on prescribed problem sets and experiments, with limited opportunities for open-ended exploration. |
| | Provides ample scaffolding and support for learners of all levels, including tutorials and examples. | Traditional STEM teaching may not provide sufficient scaffolding and support, necessitating that students to figure things out on their own. |
| | Allows for more self-directed learning and encourages learners to take ownership of their own learning | Traditional STEM teaching may provide less opportunity for self-directed learning, with more emphasis on teacher-led instruction. |

## 3. FAB LAB CONSTRUCTIONIST LEARNING

Neil Gershenfeld, Director of the MIT Medial Lab's Center for Bits & Atoms (CBA), describes Papert's ideas as "a historical blurring of the distinction between toys and tools for invention, culminating in the integration of play and work in the technology for personal fabrication, " thus creating new opportunities for personal exploration and creativity. Recollecting a conversation with Papert, circa 2005, he observed:

> As fab labs started doubling and began to grow, Seymour came by to see me to talk about them. I had considered the whole fab-lab thing to be a historical accident, but he made a gesture of poking his side. He said that it had been a thorn in his side that kids could program the motion of the turtle but could not make the turtle itself. This had been his goal all along. Viewed that way, learning in fab labs follows directly from the work he started decades ago. It's not an accident; there's a natural progression from going to MIT to play with a central computer, to going to a store to purchase and play with a toy containing a computer, to going to a fab lab to play with creating a computer. [18: 29-30]

In that conversation, Papert expressed clearly that Fab Labs were the fulfilment of a constructionist learning lineage which started with mini-computers and progressed to turtles, through Logo and Scratch, to Fab Labs. Using Fab Labs, students are able to not only program, but also make their own turtles, embodying abstract concepts in physical reality and extending constructionism beyond computers and coding. Therefore, Fab Lab is a powerful embodiment of this third iteration of constructionism, as it enables the creation of *objects-to-make-and-think-with-together*. In a *Foreign Affairs* article titled "How to Make Almost Anything: The Digital Fabrication Revolution," Gershenfeld states:

> The [K−12] education system has been focused on teaching students how to consume technology, not how to create it. Fab Labs provide a way for people to learn by doing, to experiment and explore, to become makers rather than just consumers. This is a key shift in education and one that is vital for preparing students for the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century. [19:43-44]

The K-12 Maker Movement in Education (i.e., the integration of digital fabrication into classrooms) has garnered considerable attention in recent years as educators and researchers explore its potential to support constructionist learning. The integration of digital fabrication with educational standards, including the Common Core Mathematics Learning Standards (Common Core), Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), and International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), has sparked renewed interest in constructionist learning within STEM education. The Common Core Mathematics Learning Standards emphasize the importance of student-centered learning, where students actively engage in the learning process and take ownership of their knowledge acquisition. Through the integration of digital fabrication tools and activities, such as designing and building individual projects, students develop problem-solving and critical thinking skills, as well as a deeper understanding of mathematical concepts.For instance, the NGSS promote scientific inquiry, experimentation, and the application of scientific concepts in real-world contexts. By aligning digital fabrication with constructionist learning principles, students have the opportunity to actively explore scientific phenomena, design experiments, and create prototypes or models to deepen their understanding of scientific principles. The ISTE standards further support constructionist learning by emphasizing student creativity, innovation, and self-directed learning. By providing students with opportunities to work on open-ended design challenges, while pursuing their own interests, educators promote constructionist learning and help students develop their unique skills and passions.

While the maker education movement has made significant strides in promoting hands-on learning and creativity, it often lacks a clear focus on learning objectives and pedagogical foundations. Research has shown when students participate in digital fabrication, they increased their interest and engagement in STEM subjects, improved design thinking and problem-solving skills, and enhanced student engagement [20, 21]. However, to further enhance the fidelity of constructionist learning with digital fabrication technology, several considerations should be taken into account. First, clear learning objectives and assessments aligned with constructionist principles should be established [22]. This ensures that the focus remains on hands-on, experiential learning and the active construction of knowledge rather than solely on the technology or tools involved. Second, integrating interdisciplinary learning opportunities is vital [23]. Emphasizing problem-solving and collaboration skills is another crucial aspect [24]. Furthermore, providing opportunities for student creativity and expression is fundamental [25]. Lastly, offering adequate professional development for teachers is essential [26].

The last section of this article argues in favor of a Fab Lab Framework for K-12 education technology (The Fab Lab Framework). The Fab Lab Framework, with its emphasis on constructionist learning, is crucial given the shortcomings of the maker education movement in introducing constructionist concepts into classrooms. The Fab Framework addresses this gap by centering on constructionist epistemological beliefs, recognizing learners as active constructors of knowledge. This approach acknowledges that learning is a collaborative and iterative process, empowering students to become active participants in their own education. By integrating clear learning objectives, the Fab Framework ensures that the constructionist concepts are purposefully aligned with educational standards, providing a strong academic foundation.

Furthermore, the Fab Framework goes beyond mere hands-on activities by incorporating interdisciplinary learning, problem-solving, and collaboration. It recognizes that real-world challenges are multifaceted and require a holistic approach. By engaging in project-based STEM learning opportunities, students develop transversal skills such as critical thinking, communication, and teamwork, which are essential for success in the rapidly evolving ecosystems of Industry 4.0 and Education 4.0. In addition, the Fab Framework emphasizes student creativity and expression, allowing learners to explore their unique interests and passions. This approach encourages divergent thinking, imagination, and innovation, fostering a sense of ownership and pride in their work. By providing opportunities for self-expression, the Fab Framework promotes intrinsic motivation and engagement, resulting in deeper and more meaningful learning experiences. It is important to note that teacher professional development is crucial. The Fab Framework recognizes the need for educators to understand the pedagogical foundations of constructionist learning, digital fabrication, and design thinking. By investing in comprehensive professional development programs, teachers can gain the necessary skills and knowledge to successfully integrate the Fab Framework into their classrooms.

## 4. Fab Lab Constructionist Learning Conceptual Framework

The Fab Lab Framework, which is rooted in the core constructionist belief that *one can't think about thinking without thinking about something*, provides a comprehensive set of guidelines for educators to effectively integrate digital fabrication into their curricula.

### 4.1. Epistemic Cognition

The first crucial element of the framework is a focus on developing students' *epistemic cognition*, which refers to their ability to think critically, make informed decisions, and solve complex problems. This is important for STEM learning because it helps students understand how knowledge is created and evaluated in these fields. By engaging in epistemic practices such as argumentation, evidence-based reasoning, and critical analysis, students can learn to think like scientists and engineers. This not only helps them develop a deeper understanding of STEM concepts but also prepares them to be effective problem-solvers and innovators in the future. Additionally, the ability to evaluate and construct scientific arguments is becoming increasingly important in today's information-rich and technology-driven society, where individuals need to be able to make informed decisions based on scientific evidence. Studies have shown that Fab Lab activities can promote the development of epistemic cognition, such as the ability to engage in argumentation, critique and analyze arguments related to technology and science, and construct evidence-based explanations. [27]. Student engagement in Fab Labs can also support critically and creatively, which are important skills for solving complex problems and developing innovative solutions [28]. This is important, as research has shown that increased interest and engagement in STEM fields can lead to improved academic performance, higher levels of career satisfaction, and increased diversity in the STEM workforce [29] [30].

## 4.2. The Concept of Bricolage

Bricolage, based on the metaphor of the traveling tinker who uses assorted tools to fix whatever is broken, is integral to constructionist learning. Turkle and Papert describe bricoleur scientists as learners who "construct theories by arranging and rearranging, by negotiating and renegotiating with a set of well-known materials,"[31: 169]. This methodology emphasizes improvisation, making do with what you have, and using different resources to construct knowledge. In Fab Labs, bricolage is an essential aspect of the learning process. Students are encouraged to use the available tools and materials to solve problems and create new things. The use of bricolage in Fab Lab learning environments enables students to become "bricoleur scientists" who construct theories by finding design solutions employing advanced manufacturing technologies, like 3D printers and laser cutters, to enhance the learning and creative process, much like a painter who steps back from the canvas to contemplate the brushstrokes and the work of art, reconsiders and then redirects his/her work through that contemplation. This is, in essence, collaboration with the tools, the materials, and with the painting itself as it emerges, which is at the heart of the Fab Framework constructionist vision for learning.

## 4.3. The Concept of Transformation Moments

In "Life on the Screen," Sherry Turkle [32], Professor of Social Studies of Science and Technology at MIT, argues that technology can create "transformation moments." They can be small or large, personal or collective, and can happen anywhere, at any time. In K−12 education, transformative moments play a vital role in helping students to develop their sense of self, understand their place in the world, and form their identities. Following Turkle's " transformative moments" thesis, the Fab Lab Framework pedagogical approaches include:

**Fostering creativity over consumption:** The Fab Lab provides a unique learning opportunity for students to use technology as a means of creating, making, and expressing themselves, rather than just consuming content.

**Creating opportunities for deep engagement:** Turkle suggests that technology can make it difficult for people to focus and engage deeply with a task or activity. To overcome this issue, constructionist teachers engage students in complex and open-ended projects that align with their own interests, while providing opportunities for reflection on the learning process.

**Encouraging critical thinking**: Constructionist teachers can engage students in critical thinking about the impact of technology on society and their own lives through discussions and debates, writing assignments, and research projects.

In "Alone Together," Turkle [33] argues that, while technology can create new opportunities for self-expression and identity exploration through "transformation moments," it can also create a sense of disconnection and isolation, as individuals become more focused on their digital devices than on their surroundings and the people around them. Further, with the abundance of information readily available online, students can become too reliant on technology and may not learn to think critically and solve problems independently. The Fab Lab constructionist paradigm addresses these potential negative impacts of K−12 education through:

**Emphasis on the importance of empathy, emotional intelligence, and SEL skills:** As Turkle argues that technology can inhibit the development of empathy and emotional intelligence, constructionist teachers can provide learning opportunities for students to practice and develop Social Emotional Learning (SEL) skills through collaborative projects, group discussions, and reflection activities.

**Incorporation of mindfulness practices:** Turkle argues that technology can create an 'always on' mentality, which can lead to feelings of anxiety and stress. Consequently, constructionist teachers should incorporate mindfulness practices in the Fab Labs, such as meditation, yoga, or deep breathing exercises, to help students develop the ability to focus and be present in the moment.

**Promotion of responsible use of technology**: Constructionist teachers provide learning opportunities on issues of "fab safety" as well as digital hygiene, online privacy, and cyber security, thus helping students to make informed decisions about how they use technology.

**Incorporating design thinking**: As a part of the Fab Lab curriculum, constructionist teachers encourage students to empathize with the users of their solutions, define the problem, ideate potential solutions, prototype and test their ideas, and reflect on the process.

## 4.4. The Theory of Ontology

The concept of ontology is important for STEM education because it encourages students to think beyond the technical aspects of STEM fields and consider the broader social and cultural implications of their work. This philosophical study of being and existence encompasses our beliefs and assumptions about the nature of reality and our place in it. To become a "math person," a "science person," or an "artist," it is not enough to merely acquire relevant knowledge and skills, as developing a sense of self is just as important.In addition, the integration of ontology into STEM education can help students develop a more comprehensive understanding of their chosen field and its place in society. This can foster a deeper appreciation for the social and ethical dimensions of STEM fields and inspire students to pursue careers that align with their values and interests. Brandt and McElhaney [34] found that Fab Labs supported the development of student’s ontological beliefs. While Sketris and Chrysochou [35] found that students who participated in Fab Lab experiences developed a sense of self and explored their interests and passions, leading to increased confidence and personal growth.

Table 3 highlights the significant differences between traditional STEM instruction and the Fab Lab constructionist learning approach. The table emphasizes that the Fab Lab constructionist approach is more student-centered, collaborative, hands-on, personalized, active, and technology-integrated than traditional STEM teaching practices. Moreover, it emphasizes that the Fab Lab approach focuses on real-world problem-solving, innovation, and creativity. The table provides a useful framework for understanding the pedagogical shifts that are necessary to prepare students for the demands of the 21st-century workforce and society. It shows that traditional STEM teaching practices, which rely on rote memorization, standardized tests, and teacher-centered approaches, are insufficient to prepare students for the complex and dynamic challenges they will face in their careers and communities.

On the other hand, the Fab Lab constructionist learning approach provides students with a more engaging, interactive, and experiential learning experience that emphasizes collaboration, creativity, problem-solving, and critical thinking. The table highlights the essential components of the Fab Lab approach, which include learner autonomy, collaboration, hands-on learning, personalized learning, active learning, integration of technology, real-world relevance, and innovation and creativity.

Table 3. The Pedagogical Features that Distinguish Constructionist Learning from Traditional STEM Instruction

| Pedagogical Features | Traditional STEM Teaching Practices | Fab Lab Constructionist Learning |
|---|---|---|
| Learner autonomy | Teacher-centered approach with limited student autonomy | Student-centered approach that encourages independent exploration and learning |
| Collaboration | Minimal emphasis on collaboration and teamwork | Strong emphasis on collaboration and teamwork in transdisciplinary projects |
| Hands-on learning | Limited hands-on learning opportunities | Extensive hands-on learning opportunities using cutting-edge technology and tools |
| Personalized learning | One-size-fits-all approach with limited opportunities for personalized learning | Personalized learning tailored to individual students' interests, needs, and abilities |
| Active learning | Limited active learning opportunities | Extensive active learning opportunities through project-based learning and problem-solving activities |
| Integration of technology | Limited integration of technology into teaching practices | Extensive integration of technology, including cutting-edge tools and equipment, as a core component of the learning experience |
| Real-world relevance | Minimal emphasis on real-world relevance and problem-solving skills | Strong emphasis on real-world relevance and problem-solving skills through transdisciplinary projects and SDG-aligned initiatives |
| Focus on innovation and creativity | Limited focus on innovation and creativity | Strong focus on innovation and creativity through hands-on experimentation and design-thinking activities |

## 4.5. Industry 4.0

Industry 4.0 refers to the integration of advanced digital technologies such as artificial intelligence, the Internet of Things (IoT), cloud computing, and robotics into industrial manufacturing processes. This transformation is changing the way we work and live, and it is essential that students develop the critical and creative thinking skills necessary to thrive in this new era. The pedagogical shifts outlined by Industry 4.0 have significant implications for STEM instruction as well as K−12 education technology. While traditional STEM teaching focuses on imparting knowledge and skills through lectures, rote memorization, and standardized tests, Fab Lab Constructionist learning fosters transdisciplinary learning aligned to the objectives of Industry 4.0 in several ways:

**STEAM Integration:** It integrates STEAM subjects, which are essential for Industry 4.0. This transdisciplinary approach prepares students for the workforce, by equipping them with the skills such as programming, data analysis, and design thinking. By integrating multiple subjects, students learn how to apply their knowledge across different disciplines and solve real-world problems. For example, a student may design and build a 3D model of a car in a Fab Lab, integrating principles of engineering, math, and design thinking.

**Problem-Solving:** It encourages students to identify and solve complex problems. This skill is vital in Industry 4.0, where workers will need to be able to identify problems, analyze data, and develop innovative solutions. Through hands-on projects, students learn how to identify problems, brainstorm ideas, and prototype solutions. For example, they may use a Fab Lab to design and build a solar-powered irrigation system for a community garden, addressing a real-world need and applying their problem-solving skills.

**Critical Thinking:** It promotes critical thinking by encouraging students to analyze and evaluate information obtained from different sources. This skill is crucial for Industry 4.0 workers who need to make informed decisions based on vast amounts of data and evidence obtained from sources with different degrees of reliability. Through project-based learning, students learn how to analyze data, evaluate information, and make informed decisions. For example, they may use a Fab Lab to collect and analyze data on water quality in a local river, evaluating the impact of human activities on the environment.

**Creativity and Innovation**: It fosters creativity and innovation by encouraging students to think outside the box and develop new ideas. This skill is essential in Industry 4.0, where workers will need to develop innovative solutions to complex problems. Through hands-on projects, students learn how to generate ideas, prototype solutions, and refine their designs. For example, they may use a Fab Lab to design and build a renewable energy system for their school, thus developing new and innovative solutions to reduce energy consumption.

**Collaboration:** It emphasizes collaboration and teamwork. This skill is important in Industry 4.0, where individuals will need to work with diverse teams and stakeholders to achieve their goals. Through project-based learning, students learn how to collaborate with others, share ideas, and work towards a common goal. For example, they may use a Fab Lab to design and build a community garden, working together to create a sustainable and productive space for their community.

By incorporating these elements, the Fab Framework can help promote innovation and creativity in STEM education. Some of the key implications of this approach are:

**Learner autonomy:** The emphasis on student autonomy can lead to increased engagement and motivation among students, as they take ownership of their learning and pursue their interests. This shift can also lead to a more student-centered classroom environment, where the teacher acts as a facilitator and guide rather than the primary source of knowledge.

**Collaboration:** The strong emphasis on collaboration and teamwork can help students develop important interpersonal skills such as communication, collaboration, and problem-solving. This shift can also help students learn how to work effectively in teams, which is a critical skill in today's workforce.

**Hands-on learning:** The extensive hands-on learning opportunities can help students develop practical skills and knowledge that are directly applicable to real-world problems. This shift can also help students develop a deeper understanding of STEM concepts and principles, as they engage in experiential learning.

**Personalized learning:** The focus on personalized learning can help students develop their strengths and interests, while also addressing their individual needs and learning styles. This shift can also help students develop a greater sense of agency and self-efficacy, as they take ownership of their learning.

**Active learning:** The extensive opportunities for active learning can help students develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills, as they engage in hands-on projects and activities. This shift can also help students develop a deeper understanding of STEM concepts and principles, as they apply them in real-world contexts.

**Integration of technology:** The extensive integration of technology can help students develop important digital literacy skills, as they learn to use cutting-edge tools and equipment. This shift can also help students develop a greater understanding of how technology can be used to solve real-world problems.

**Real-world relevance:** The strong emphasis on real-world relevance and problem-solving skills can help students see the relevance of STEM concepts and principles to their daily lives. This shift can also help students develop a greater sense of purpose and meaning in their learning.

**Focus on innovation and creativity:** The strong focus on innovation and creativity can help students develop important skills such as design thinking, creativity, and innovation. This shift can also help students develop a greater sense of agency and self-efficacy, as they engage in hands-on experimentation and problem-solving.

The inclusion of these elements into the Fab Framework is significant because they align with the pedagogical shifts outlined by Industry 4.0, which emphasize hands-on, project-based learning that is personalized, collaborative, and transdisciplinary. This approach not only aligns with the needs of industry and the future workforce but also empowers students to become lifelong learners, critical thinkers, and problem solvers who can actively contribute to society and drive innovation. The Fab Framework serves as a catalyst for educational transformation, fostering a new generation of creative, adaptable, and forward-thinking individuals who can thrive in the dynamic and complex world of Industry 4.0.

## 4.6. Education 4.0

Education is undergoing a transformative shift to meet the demands of Industrial 4.0. The World Economic Forum's report, "Schools of the Future: Defining New Models of Education for the Fourth Industrial Revolution," identifies eight best practices for what it describes as *Education 4.0*. This paradigm shift emphasizes the need for a learner-centered and personalized approach that focuses on developing the skills and competencies required for success in the rapidly evolving Industrial 4.0 economy. [37]. To meet these objectives, traditional teaching methods are being reimagined, and new pedagogical approaches are being embraced. Table 4 provides an overview of the key aspects of Fab Lab constructionist learning that align with the eight best practices for Education 4.0 implementation identified by the World Economic Forum (WEF).

Table 4. Eight Best Practices for Education 4.0 Implementation

| WEF Best Practices for Education 4.0 Implementation | Fab Lab Constructionist Learning |
|---|---|
| Personalized and student-centered learning | . Fab Labs offer opportunities for students to engage in hands-on, project-based learning that is tailored to their individual interests and needs. This aligns with the principle of student-centered learning, which seeks to empower students to take control of their own learning. |
| Cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary learning | In a Fab Lab, students engage in transdisciplinary projects that require them to integrate knowledge and skills from multiple subjects. This aligns with the goal of transdisciplinary learning, which seeks to promote connections between subjects and real-world problem solving. |
| Integration of technology and digital competencies | Fab Labs are equipped with cutting-edge technology, such as 3D printers and laser cutters, which students can use to bring their ideas to life. This aligns with the principle of integrating technology and digital competencies, which seeks to prepare students for a rapidly evolving digital world. |
| Critical and creative thinking | In a Fab Lab, students engage in hands-on, project-based learning that requires them to use critical and creative thinking skills. This aligns with the goal of fostering critical and creative thinking, which seeks to prepare students for the challenges of the 21st century. |
| Collaborative and cooperative learning | In a Fab Lab, students work together on transdisciplinary projects, requiring them to collaborate and communicate effectively with one another. This aligns with the goal of fostering collaboration and cooperative learning, which seeks to prepare students for a rapidly evolving world where teamwork and collaboration are essential. |
| Global and cultural awareness | In a Fab Lab, students engage in transdisciplinary projects that require them to consider global and cultural perspectives. This aligns with the goal of fostering global and cultural awareness, which seeks to prepare students for an interconnected world where cultural competence is essential. |
| 21st-century skills and competencies | In a Fab Lab, students engage in hands-on, project-based learning that requires them to develop 21st-century skills and competencies, such as critical thinking, problem solving, communication, and collaboration. This aligns with the goal of fostering 21st-century skills and competencies, which seeks to prepare students for a rapidly evolving world. |
| Sustainability and environmental awareness | In a Fab Lab, students engage in SDG-aligned transdisciplinary projects that require them to consider the impact of their work on the environment and the world. This aligns with the goal of fostering sustainability and environmental awareness, which seeks to prepare students for a rapidly changing world where sustainability and environmental stewardship are essential. |

Through Fab Labs, students are provided with learning opportunities to engage in hands-on, project-based learning that is tailored to their interests and needs. They also develop essential Education 4.0 skills and competencies outlined by the WEF.

1. **Personalized and student-centered learning:** Fab Labs offer hands-on, project-based learning tailored to students' individual interests and needs, empowering them to take control of their own learning.

2. **Cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary learning:** In Fab Labs, students engage in transdisciplinary projects that integrate knowledge and skills from multiple subjects, promoting connections between subjects and real-world problem-solving.
3. **Integration of technology and digital competencies:** Fab Labs are equipped with cutting-edge technology, allowing students to bring their ideas to life and preparing them for the evolving digital world.
4. **Critical and creative thinking:** Fab Lab learning requires students to use critical and creative thinking skills through hands-on, project-based activities, preparing them for the challenges of the 21st century.
5. **Collaborative and cooperative learning:** Fab Labs foster collaboration and effective communication among students as they work together on transdisciplinary projects, reflecting the importance of teamwork and collaboration in the modern world.
6. **Global and cultural awareness:** Fab Lab projects encourage students to consider global and cultural perspectives, promoting cultural competence in an interconnected world.
7. **21st-century skills and competencies:** Fab Lab learning focuses on developing essential 21st-century skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, communication, and collaboration.
8. **Sustainability and environmental awareness:** Fab Labs engage students in projects aligned with sustainable development goals, fostering awareness of environmental impact and stewardship.

The iterative design processes, prototyping, and user-centered design fostered by the Fab Framework nurture innovation and problem-solving abilities. Moreover, the Fab Framework goes beyond academic development. Addressing the broader concepts of digital literacy and citizenship, promoting responsible technology use, inclusivity, equity, and cultural diversity. By equipping students with the necessary skills and attitudes to navigate the digital landscape, Fab Labs empower them to become responsible digital citizens who can contribute positively to society. They become active creators, critical thinkers, effective collaborators, and global citizens.

## 5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, while the Fab Framework provides a promising approach to teaching constructionist learning with digital fabrication tools, there is still much to be learned about how to effectively implement this approach. Educators may face challenges in finding ways to incorporate digital fabrication and constructionist learning into their existing lesson plans, particularly in subjects that may not traditionally involve hands-on learning or maker-based activities. Therefore, research is desirable to explore the most effective ways to integrate the Fab Framework into a variety of subject areas, as well as the development of transdisciplinary Project-based learning curricular materials that align with constructionist learning approaches.

Further research is needed to explore and expand effective strategies for integrating the Fab Framework into classrooms. This includes developing approaches for introducing digital fabrication within existing curricula and creating new instructional materials. Professional development can play a crucial role in helping educators embrace the constructionist principles underlying the Fab Framework and develop effective strategies for integrating digital fabrication technology into their teaching practices. By investing in professional development opportunities, schools and districts can ensure equitable access to high-quality digital fabrication learning experiences for all students, regardless of their background or socioeconomic status. Additionally, more research is needed to identify the most effective methods for preparing both in-service and pre-service educators to confidently and effectively utilize digital fabrication technologies in the classroom. These research efforts will contribute to the ongoing improvement and implementation of the Fab Framework in K-12 education.

Classroom observation is essential for gaining a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities related to teaching with the Fab Framework and developing effective strategies to support educators and students. By observing educators in school-based fab labs, valuable insights can be gained regarding the challenges and opportunities associated with this approach, as well as the strategies employed by educators to facilitate student learning. This observation also aids in identifying areas where additional support or resources may be required, such as professional development opportunities or access to specialized equipment and materials. Classroom observation is also a valuable tool for enhancing the implementation of the Fab Framework and ensuring its successful integration into K-12 education.

Finally, further research is warranted to investigate the impact of the Fab Framework on student learning outcomes. While existing evidence suggests that digital fabrication and constructionist learning can enhance student engagement and achievement, more comprehensive research is needed to uncover the specific ways in which the Fab Framework can contribute to these outcomes. Additionally, research should focus on developing effective methods for assessing student learning within the context of digital fabrication and constructionist learning. This entails exploring innovative assessment tools and techniques that capture the multidimensional nature of these learning experiences. By actively pursuing these research endeavors, we can gain a deeper understanding of the transformative potential of the Fab Framework in education, ultimately equipping students with the transversal skills and Education 4.0 competencies to thrive in a rapidly evolving highly competitive world.

## REFERENCES

[1] Feurzeig, W., Papert, S., Bloom, M., Grant, R. and Solomon, C. (1970). Programming languages as a conceptual framework for teaching mathematics. SIGCUE Outlook, 4(2), 13–17

[2] Papert, S. (1987a). A new opportunity for science education. NSF Grant Application, https://nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD_ID=8751190

[3] Taylor, R.P. (Ed.). (1980). The computer in the school: Tutor, tool, tutee. New York: Teachers College Press.

[4] Kay, A. (n.d.). Afterword: What is a Dynabook? Paper for Historical Content https://cognitivemedium.com/tat/assets/Kay_What_is_a_Dynabook.pdf

[5] Pea, R., and Kurland, M. (1983). "On the Cognitive Effects of Learning Computer Programming, "New Ideas in Psychology” (vol. 2, no. 2).

[6] Pea R., Kurland M., Hawkins J. (1985). LOGO and the Development of Thinking Skills. M. Chen and W. Paisley. Children and Microcomputers: Research on the Newest Medium, Sage, pp.193-317, https://telearn.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00190534/document

[7] Clements, D. (1985). Research on Logo in education: Is the turtle slow but steady, or not even in the race? Computers in the Schools, 2(2–3), 55–71.

[8] National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for National Education Reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office

[9] Hirsh E.D. E.D. (1996). The Schools We Need and Why We Don’t Have Them (New York: Doubleday)

[10] Elmore, R. (1995). Getting to scale with good education practices. Harvard Educational Review,66(1), 1–26

[11] Resnick, M. (2017). The Seeds that Seymour Sowed, Medium, https://medium.com/mit-media-lab/the-seeds-that-seymour-sowed-4c50333f03fc

[12] Resnick, M., Maloney, J., Monroy-Hernández, A., Rusk, N., Eastmond, E., Brennan, K., & Kafai, Y. (2009). Scratch: programming for all. Communications of the ACM, 52(11), 60-67

[13] Bers, M.U. Flannery, L., Kazakoff E.R., & Sullivan, A. (2014). Computational thinking and tinkering: Exploration of an early childhood robotics curriculum. Computer & Education, 72, 145-157.

[14] Grover, S., & Pea, R. (2013). Computational thinking in K–12: A review of the state of the field. Educational Researcher, 42(1), 38-43.

[15] Voogt, J., Fisser, P., Good, J., Mishra, P., & Yadav, A. (2012). Computational thinking in compulsory education: Towards an agenda for research and practice. Education and Information Technologies, 17(5), 5-20.

[16] Resnick, M. (2019). The next generation of Scratch teachers more than coding, MIT Media Lab, https://www.media.mit.edu/articles/mitch-resnick-the-next-generation-of-scratch-teaches-more-than-coding/

[17] Oldham J. (2023). Computer Science for All? Teacher and Teaching Technology, vol. 21, no. 4, https://www.educationnext.org/computer-science-for-all-as-new-subject-spreads-debates-flare/

[18] Gershenfeld N, Gershenfeld A, and Gershenfeld J.C. (2017). *Designing reality: How to survive and thrive in the third digital revolution.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

[19] Gershenfeld, N. (2012). How to Make Almost Anything: The Digital Fabrication Revolution. Foreign Affairs, 91(6), 43-57.

[20] Buechley, L., Eisenberg, M., Catchen, J., & Crockett, A. (2013). The LilyPad Arduino: Using computational textiles to investigate engagement, aesthetics, and diversity in computer science education. In Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Interaction Design and Children (pp. 247-250).

[21] Halverson, E. R., Sheridan, K., & Litts, B. K. (2015). MakerEd: Embodied learning and the future ofmuseums. Educational researcher, 44(1), 46-54.

[22] Tofel-Grehl, C., & Feldon, D. F. (2018). How should we assess learning in makerspaces and other informal environments? Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 21(2), 95-105.

[23] Roschelle, J., Shechtman, N., Tatar, D., Hegedus, S., Hopkins, B., Empson, S., ... & Gallagher, L. (2016). Integration of technology, curriculum, and professional development for advancing middle school mathematics: Three large-scale studies. American Educational Research Journal, 53(1), 153-190.

[24] Kang, N. H., Norton, A., & Prestridge, S. (2018). Design thinking in digital fabrication education. TechTrends, 62(3), 286-294.

[25] Menekse, M., Stump, G. S., Krause, S., & Chi, M. T. (2013). Differentiated overt learning activities for effective instruction in engineering classrooms. Journal of Engineering Education, 102(3), 346-374.

[26] Burke, Q., McNeill, M., Tissington, L. D., & Jones, L. (2015). 3D printing goes to school: An experimental study of additive manufacturing in the classroom. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 18(3), 211-223.

[27] Peppler, K. & Bender, S. (2013). Maker movement spreads innovation one project at a time. Phi Delta Kappan, 94(8), 22-27.

[28] Martin, L. M., & Stegman, M. (2017). Fab labs and epistemic fluency: Preparing students for STEM careers and democratic participation. Journal of Educational Change, 18(2), 147-167.

[29] Hill, C. J., Corbett, C., & St. Rose, A. (2010). Why so few? Women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. AAUW: Washington, DC.

[30] National Science Board. (2018). Science and engineering indicators 2018. National Science Foundation: Arlington, VA.

[31] Turkle, S., & Papert, S. (1991). Epistemological pluralism and the revaluation of the concrete. Journal of Mathematical Behavior, 10(1), 157-181.

[32] Turkle S. (1995). Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the internet (New York: Simon & Schuster)

[33] Turkle S. (2011). Alone Together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other (Basic Books)

[34] Brandt, C., & McElhaney, K. W. (2017). Fostering 21st-century student learning outcomes through fab lab. TechTrends, 61(2), 130-136.

[35] Scott, D. W., & Robertson, J. (2016). The maker movement and the revitalization of manufacturing: A review of the research. Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management, 27(2), 219-237.

[36] Sketris, S., & Chrysochou, P. (2017). Fab labs and the development of students' ontological beliefs and epistemic cognition. International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 27(1), 107-125.

[37] World Economic Forum. (2020). Schools of the Future Defining New Models of Education for the Fourth Industrial Revolution. Retrieved from https://www.weforum.org/reports/schools-of-the-future-defining-new-models-of-education-for-the-fourth-industrial-revolution

## AUTHORS

**Melvin W. LaPrade** is an Education Scientist and Consultant for the Fab Foundation. His research, teaching, and policy interests focus on place-making urban education, race and equity in education, and K-12 education technology integration. He is the Founding Director of The Fab-hood Network, a U.S. non-profit 501(c) 3 organization, who's mission is to continually grow technology-driven creative spaces in African American and racialized communities, empowering neighborhood stakeholders, advocates, youth, artists, and makers.

**Sherry Lassiter** is one of the architects of the MIT global initiative for field on-site technology development, the Fab Lab program. A Fab Lab, or as users like to call it, fabulous laboratory, is a rapid prototyping platform for technical education, innovation and personal expression. The Fab Lab network includes over 2000 digital fabrication facilities in more than 180 countries. Lassiter is President and CEO of the Fab Foundation, a non-profit organization committed to building technical capacity in a locality, improving individuals' abilities to develop themselves and their communities and bringing access to tools and knowledge that cultivate and support innovating practices.