RoboSTEAM Project Systematic Mapping: Challenge Based Learning and Robotics

Abstract—STEAM Education is nowadays a key element for our current digital society. Integrating STEAM and developing competences such as Computational Thinking is highly demanded by the industry and higher education institutions. In order to do so new methodological approaches are required. RoboSTEAM project is an Erasmus+ project defined to address these topics by using of physical devices and robotics employing Challenge Based Learning methodology. One of the first steps in the project development is the definition of current landscape in the research field. Which means to carry out a literature mapping that considers previous applications of Challenge Based Learning in STEAM education and use of robots and physical devices to do so. This paper shows the mapping review process and the main results obtained. The mapping analyze 242 candidate works from the most relevant bibliographic sources and selected 54. Form them it was possible to see that there are not many initiatives on STEM Education related to Challenge Based Learning methodology. One of the first steps in the project development is the definition of current landscape in the research field. Given this context the students (as future workers) need to be adapted to the requirements and reality of the context where they are developed. Nowadays we are immersed in which is known as Digital Society and there is a need of professionals ready to address the problems that arise in it, which require that they have a deep knowledge about the methodologies, tools, devices to be used in each situation [1, 2].

In this sense active and collaborative methodologies are specially relevant and a sample of them could be Project Based Learning - PBL [4], Project Based Learning - PrBL [5] and Challenge Based Learning - ChBL [6]. With these methodologies in mind and taking into account the idea that the definition of tangible solutions can be really interesting for the students, something that can be achieved with Physical Devices and Robotics (PD&R) [7-10], the RoboSTEAM project was defined [11].

RoboSTEAM is an Erasmus+ Strategic Partnership project that involves 8 partners from 4 different countries (4 schools and 4 universities). It aims to define a methodology and a set of tools that help learners to develop computational thinking by using/programming PD&R in pre-university education stages. The project will also improve teacher education, providing them with a framework for easy STEAM integration in different educational contexts, by providing guidelines for good practices and lessons learned adapted to those contexts. All these products will be tested in different countries and cross-validated in different educational institutions [12]. This will be done through a set of pilots and by the exchange of students and teachers between the schools involved in the project.

The project development consists of several activities and different outcomes are expected. One of them was Output2, “Guides for designing Open Hardware PD&R”. The output aims to define guides that allow designing learning challenges for the development of STEAM competencies and computational thinking by using PD&R. To achieve this, the researchers need a previous knowledge of the existing technology and what to apply depending on students’ age or context. Given this fact, it is necessary to explore the current landscape regarding the project topic and to do that the project team carried out a literature review.

To carry out an analysis of the existing works Systematic Mapping (SMP) was carried out. The main goal of a systematic mapping study is to provide an overview of a research area, and identify the quantity and type of research and results available within it. The SMP provides a structure of the type of research reports and results that have been published by categorizing them and often gives a visual summary, the map, of its results. It often requires less effort than other methodologies while providing a more coarse-grained overview [13, 14].
As the project requires to understand the existing landscape of PD&R application, the partners decided that the mapping could be a more suitable option. The main objective of this review is to collect and analyze the existing works related to the application of PD&R in education. This paper aims to describe the Systematic Mapping process and main results. The rest of this work is structured as follows. The next section presents the mapping methodology. In the third section the results are described and finally some conclusions are posed.

II. METHODOLOGY

The main phases of the systematic mapping are planning, conducting and reporting. In this section each of them is described.

A. Planning

We are applying a systematic mapping following a software engineering strategy. Hence, the principal topic and aims of the mapping were fixed, research domain was explored (which define what issues should be addressed by the review), and selection criteria were set up (which describe the works to include or exclude from the review). Finally, an analysis was undertaken of the results emerging from the review. Fig 1 shows, the different steps followed.
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**1) Research domain**

In this first step it is necessary to set up the issues to explore during the mapping in order to clarify the landscape of the project. Given the project objectives the main issues were:

- Find existing initiatives or projects that apply Robotics or Mechatronics for the development of computational thinking or STEM in education.
- Explore if any of these these initiatives apply learning methodologies based on challenges.

**1) Search String**

Once defined the research domain the next step is the definition of the search string. The terms used in the searches depended on the research question being addressed, though in many instances these were shared. Searches were made for the following terms:

- "Robotics", either alone or in combination with the terms "mechatronics" or "physical devices".
- “Education”.
- “STEAM” or the similar term “STEM”.
- “Computational thinking”, whether on its own or combined with "challenge based learning" or its abbreviation "CBL"; "Problem-based Learning" or "Project-based Learning" or "Problem Based Learning" or "Project Based Learning" or its abbreviation "PBL".

In building up the search strings for the various different libraries, the terms listed above were combined using the Boolean AND operator. An example could be:

```
("robotics" OR "mechatronics" OR "physical devices") AND Education AND ("STEAM" OR "STEM") AND ("Computational Thinking" OR "Challenge Based Learning" OR "CBL" OR "Problem-based Learning" OR "Project-based Learning" OR "Problem Based Learning" OR "Project Based Learning" OR "PBL")
```

However, because of the variable nature of the search services and the variety of available library sources, it became clear that it was not possible to use a single search string for all the bibliographic sources. For example, in searching the ACM Digital Library, it was necessary to build up various search strings in order to seek items on a basis that could be considered equivalent to other sources (like IEEE Digital Library or Science Direct). Hence, the decision was to design and use different search strings for different sources.

**2) Sources**

The next step in the planning process was the selection of bibliographic sources. In this case those chosen were:

- ACM Digital Library ([https://dl.acm.org/advsearch.cfm](https://dl.acm.org/advsearch.cfm))
- ISI Web of Science ([http://www.isiknowledge.com](http://www.isiknowledge.com))
- SCOPUS ([https://www.scopus.com/](https://www.scopus.com/))
- Springer Link ([http://link.springer.com](http://link.springer.com))

The reason to use these sources is that they are the most complete (specially web of science or scopus) and popular in the context of PD&R and ICT and Education (ACM, IEEE and Springer).

**3) Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

Once the bibliographic sources were chosen the next step was defining the inclusion and exclusion criteria in order to carry out the selection study. During this part of the process and having these criteria, paper titles and or abstracts should be analyzed to know if they met the inclusion criteria, or whether on the contrary they should be excluded from further study.

The inclusion criteria defined for the mapping were:

- IC1. Include one or more of the keywords, have an appropriate structure and some type of implementation initiative.
• IC2. Include one or more of the terms related to the topics included in the research questions.
• IC3. Paper published in a peer review journal or conference.
• IC4. Published after the year 2000.
• IC5. Written in English.

On the other hand, the exclusion criteria were:
• EC1. Documents that covered the subject area and included the search terms, but did not answer the research questions.
• EC2. Documents that included keywords but only to redefine general concepts.
• EC3. The paper is not accessible.
• EC4. It is not an article.
• EC5. Papers not published in a peer review journal or conference.

4) Quality Assessment Checklist
From the papers selected after analyzing how they met the inclusion and exclusion criteria; the following step is to analyze the quality of the papers as a second to choose those of acceptable quality for later use in the extraction of data.

Questions:
• QC1. Does the paper describe the application of PD&R in education?
• QC2. Is the paper based on research or is it merely a report based on expert opinion?
• QC3. Is there a description of the context in which the research was carried out?
• QC4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?
• QC5. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?
• QC6. Was there a control group with which to compare the results?
• QC7. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?
• QC8. Is there a clear statement of findings?
• QC9. Is the study of value for research or practice?
• QC10. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?
• QC11. Is there a clear statement of the aims of the research?

All the question except the first one followed a scale that assessed the quality of the items reviewed with only three possible answers “YES”, “PARTLY” or “NO”. These grades were quantified as scores by assigning a value of 1 for “YES”, 0.5 for “PARTLY” and 0 for “NO”. The first question that is the most relevant for this research can be valued from 0-10.

5) Data Extraction Form
Once the elements that met the established quality criteria were selected, the next step was to extract the data from these works address the main issues identified. For this, a form with the following mapping questions were chosen.
• MQ1. Which are the main applications of robots and physical devices to develop STEAM and computational thinking?
• MQ2. Which are the most relevant authors, sources and location?
• MQ3. Classify the applications by physical device (Robots and type of robots and physical devices).
• MQ4. Classify the methodology applied:
  o Challenge Based Learning.
  o Problem Based Learning.
  o Project Based Learning.

Answering these questions, it will be easy to analyze the remaining paper and look for information about how they deal with the topics that the project is dealing with.

B. Conducting
The conducting phase implies the application of the instruments defined during the planning in order establish which is the most relevant literature for a later affordable analysis. The results obtained during the conducting phase can be seen in Fig 2.

• Search Phase 1: This involved individual searching in the electronic databases previously commented and then gathering those papers that can be understood as suitable works for the mapping.
• Selection Phase 1: During this phase the inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied to the candidate papers in order to identify relevant articles that would provide the data for answering the research questions posed during the planning stage.
• Search Phase 2: It requires analyzing the references lists of the relevant articles to find further documents that might also be considered significant. After this analysis those suitable papers will be included in the relevant works set.
• Selection Phase 2: This phase applied quality assessment criteria to relevant documents with the aim of choosing those of acceptable quality for later use in extracting data.

Fig 2. Shows the distribution of papers from each source that define an initial set of 242 candidate papers, that after applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria (Fig 2. A) were reduced to 117 that later include 12 more papers (search phase 2 – Fig 2. B) to reach 129 works (Fig 2. C), that after the selection phase 2 (Fig 2. D) were reduced to 54 works.
III. RESULTS

The reporting part of the methodology include the results of the mapping which is discussed in this section. To presents the results first we show a quantitative distribution of the works and later the results answering each of the mapping questions.

A. Quantitative Distribution

A distribution of accepted articles per source could be seen in Fig 3. It is possible to see that the most relevant source has been SCOPUS, followed by WOS, because although initially we found several papers in Springer Link most of there were rejected.

If we attend to the number of publications per year (Fig 4.), and taking into account only works after 2000 (as decided by the researchers in IC4) we can see that from 2013 to 2019 there is a higher quantity of works related to the mapping topics.
B. MQ1 - Which are the main applications of robots and physical devices to develop STEAM and computational thinking?

Taking into account the first question, the main applications can be divided into four topics:

- Topic 1. Papers that describe the effects of the application of robotics in education by using methodologies such as Project Based Learning (PrBL), Challenge Based Learning (ChBL) or Problem based learning (PBL).
- Topic 2. Papers specially focused on describing the application of PD&R to foster STEAM disciplines.
- Topic 3. Developing computational thinking skills by applying PrBL, PBL or ChBL and using PD&R.
- Topic 4. Works that applies different tools and techniques in the field of STEAM Education but special focused on the development of PD&R, Evaluation Tools, Educational Tools.

The papers per topic can be seen in Table 1. With more emphasis in the papers related to competence development and in the tools to facilitate it.

C. MQ2 - Which are the most relevant authors, sources and location?

Regarding the authors, the selected papers have a total of 210 authors. From them, those with more than 1 publication between the studied papers are Amy Eguchi [15, 16] and Andrea Gomoll, Selma Šabanović, Cindy E. Hmelo-Silver and Matthew Francisco [17, 18].

Most of the publications come from the USA, followed by Spain. Regarding the types of publications 29 contributions are conference proceedings, 24 contributions are journals and 2 are book chapters. The conferences with more publications among the selected papers are the ASEE (American Society for Engineering Education) Annual Conference and Exposition with 4 papers, the IEEE Integrated STEM Conference with 3 papers and others with 2 papers such as Frontiers in Education, the ACM technical symposium on Computer Science Education or the Annual Conference on Creativity and Fabrication in Education. Regarding the journals the Journal of Science Education and Technology with 23 papers and the International Journal of Technology and Design Education with 2. The rest of the papers are published in other proceedings and journals.

D. MQ3 - Classify the applications by physical device (Robots and type of robots and physical devices).

The experiments described by the selected papers employ Robotics and Physical Devices (also known as Mechatronics). The distribution of the papers based on the used device can be seen in Table 2. It should be noted that some of the studied works can apply both robotics and physical devices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Nº PAPERS</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[16, 17, 19-24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>[15, 16, 18, 22, 24-42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>[27, 31, 36, 38, 41, 43-54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>[28, 30, 42, 44, 46, 55-68]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOOL EMPLOYED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF WORKS</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Devices</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>[26, 27, 40, 41, 51-54, 56, 63-66, 68]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>[19, 22, 24, 28, 32, 35, 37, 42, 47, 50, 55, 58, 67]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODOLOGY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF WORKS</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>[18, 19, 21, 24, 27, 30, 31, 36, 50-54, 57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrBL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>[16, 20, 21, 23-27, 32-35, 37, 39-45, 47, 55, 56, 59-61, 63-65]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChBL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>[15, 17, 28, 38, 48, 62, 66-68]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[29, 46, 58]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible to see in Table 2 that robotics is the most common device to use but also mechatronics are employed. It should be also mentioned that the most popular type of devices are LEGO in different varieties such as LEGO NXT or LEGO MINDSTORM [27, 34, 38, 39, 46, 50, 58] and Arduino [51, 52, 55, 57, 65, 66].

E. MQ4 - Classify the methodology applied (Challenge Based Learning, Problem Based Learning and Project Based Learning).

As commented above the methodologies studied due to their similarities were PBL, PrBL and ChBL. Table 4 shows the distribution of works depending on the applied methodology.

Table 3 shows that the most popular methodology is PrBL and that there are not many initiatives that apply ChBL and Robots of Physical devices. It is necessary also to point out that several of the works posed the application of more than one methodology [24, 27].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The first stages of every project needs from the analysis of the existing landscape in the research field. This should be done in advance of the project proposal to support your approach. However, authors have not always time enough to complete a systematic search and analysis of the existing work. In those cases, a key stage for the project will be to set up this background. The present paper has described how this
was done for the RoboSTEAM project, looking for the employment of PD&R in Challenge based Learning approaches for the specific context of STEAM Education.

The mapping carried out, after exploring 242 papers from the most relevant bibliographic sources shows than only 54 papers were relevant for the research. The mapping reports allow the researchers to obtain an idea about what was happening with regard to the project main topics. Some of the key issues learned: 1) This is a quite new topic because most of the contributions were published in the last 5 years; 2) The works are mostly focused on the development of some specific competences by the students and/or on the application of concrete tools and techniques; 3) Robotics is the most popular tool to use in this context; and 4) While PBL and PrBL are methodologies very common in the selected papers, there are only a few works about ChBL. With this information the researchers can see the innovation of their project, can use the selected papers as a reference, can detect the main gaps on the research field and can see which are the most common journals and conferences to publish their results.

The next step on this work is to develop the project but also to research about why of this lack of other studies about this topic, something that could be addressed from the more specific perspective of a Systematic Literature Review.
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