

Just Using Computers for Any Subject is Not Enough to Acquire Computational Thinking in Early Childhood Education

Maria Julia Hermida^{1,2}, María Magdalena Garzón³, and María Cecilia Martínez⁴

¹ Instituto de Educación, Universidad Nacional de Hurlingham, Provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina

² Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Argentina

³ Fundación Sadosky, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina

⁴ Instituto de Humanidades, Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina

Author Note

Maria Julia Hermida  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6835-7864>

María Magdalena Garzón  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7899-0559>

María Cecilia Martínez  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6519-2010>

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Maria Julia Hermida at Instituto de Educación, Universidad Nacional de Hurlingham, Avenida Vergara 2222, Villa Tesei, Buenos Aires, Argentina. B1688GEZ. Email: julia.hermida@gmail.com

Children around the globe are being raised in environments that are saturated with smart devices. Consequently, *teaching computer science at schools is almost universally accepted*, with most countries moving towards its inclusion in the curriculum, even as of kindergarten (Bers, 2019; Bers et al., 2019).

One apparent reason for this educational decision is technology alphabetization: computing is a new literacy for the 21st century (Bers, 2019). Another reason is the *change in the way of thinking about how to solve problems, that is, how we acquire computational thinking* (CT). CT is defined as “... the thought processes involved in formulating problems and their solutions so that the solutions are represented in a form that can be effectively carried out by an information-processing agent” (Wing, 2011). CT includes at least four skills: a) breaking down a problem into easy steps; b) pattern recognition; c) abstraction; and d) the design of algorithms – understood as a series of steps to follow.

Those CT skills are linked – even overlapped – to a group of skills that are crucial for cognition, especially in early childhood: executive functions (EFs) (Robertson et al., 2020). *EFs are a group of cognitive processes that inhibit and manipulate thoughts and actions*, leading to goal-directed behaviors, especially when learning something new. There are three basic EFs (Miyake et al., 2000): inhibitory control (resisting habits, temptations, or distractions), working memory (mentally holding in mind and manipulating information), and cognitive flexibility (switching between mental sets).

It is easy to perceive the overlapping between definitions of EFs and CT. As some authors have pointed (Robertson et al., 2020; Myers, 2021), conceptual analysis of the processes involved in CT indicates that it requires cognitive regulation aspects of EFs. For example, breaking down the problem into easier steps requires holding in mind the whole problem while you separate it into parts. Inhibition is required to not get distracted by details when oneself recognizes patterns or abstracts problems. Finally, flexibility is demanded to change the mindset between a series of steps and select the best option to build an algorithm. Also, the fact that EFs predict academic achievement (Moffett & Morrison, 2020), including the development of mathematical skills and science learning (Cragg & Gilmore, 2014), as well as the evidence showing that educational robotics activities improve EFs (Di Lieto et al., 2020), suggests that EFs are required in CT.

Although the promotion of CT and EFs are desirable aims for early childhood education, there is no agreement in the educational community about how CT should be taught. One of the debate points is *whether to teach CT through general computer use or computer programming* (Denning, 1989). The debate has important practical consequences: if the use of computers for any objective vs. the use of computers to learn programming favors child CT (or EFs) to the same degree, there would be no need to introduce programming concepts in school curricula: it would be enough to use computers for teaching any subject (e.g., history, art, natural sciences), in order to acquire CT skills.

Although not directly designed to address this question, *recent data can indirectly shed light on the issue.* In a cluster-randomized controlled trial (Hermida et al., 2022), five-year-old

classrooms were assigned to a study group (which received programming instruction) or a control group (which received art instruction). The classroom's teachers carried out activities with both groups, including tablets – this is a key point. All children were administered a wide battery of computerized EFs tests before and after the implementation of programming or art activities. Preliminary results showed that programming activities increased children's EFs significantly more than the control group. Thus, it is not the same, at the cognitive level, using computers to teach art as to teach programming because only the programming activities (and not the art activities) improved EFs. In sum, if we want to teach CT, a skill that everyone should have (Bers, 2019; Wing, 2011), and favor the cognitive processes linked to that skill, *the mere use of computers is not enough: we need to use computers specifically to teach computer science contents.*

References

- Bers, M. U. (2019). Coding as another language: A pedagogical approach for teaching computer science in early childhood. *Journal of Computers in Education*, 6, 499–528. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-019-00147-3>
- Bers, M. U., González-González, C., & Armas-Torres, M. B. (2019). Coding as a playground: Promoting positive learning experiences in childhood classrooms. *Computers & Education*, 138, 130–145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.04.013>
- Cragg, L., & Gilmore, C. (2014). Skills underlying mathematics: The role of executive function in the development of mathematics proficiency. *Trends in Neuroscience and Education*, 3(2), 63–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tine.2013.12.001>
- Denning, P. J. (Ed.). (1989). A debate on teaching computing science. *Communications of the ACM*, 32(12), 1397–1414. <https://doi.org/10.1145/76380.76381>
- Di Lieto, M. C., Pecini, C., Castro, E., Inguaggiato, E., Cecchi, F., Dario, P., Cioni, G., & Sgandurra, G. (2020). Empowering executive functions in 5- and 6-year-old typically developing children through educational robotics: An RCT study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 3084. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03084>
- Hermida, M. J., Goldin, A. P., Perez Santangelo, A., Lipina, S. J., & Schapachnik, F. P. (2022, September 11–14). *Effects of teaching programming on executive functions in children from low socioeconomic status*. 3rd FALAN Congress, Belem, Brazil. https://osf.io/s4h35/?view_only=6bce1ce66daf4855b6d63110bb495132
- Miyake, A., Friedman, N. P., Emerson, M. J., Witzki, A. H., Howerter, A., & Wager, T. D. (2000). The unity and diversity of executive functions and their contributions to complex “frontal lobe” tasks: A latent variable analysis. *Cognitive Psychology*, 41(1), 49–100. <https://doi.org/10.1006/cogp.1999.0734>
- Moffett, L., & Morrison, F. J. (2020). Off-task behavior in kindergarten: Relations to executive function and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(5), 938–955. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000397>
- Myers, E. K. (2021). The role of executive function and self-regulation in the development of computational thinking. In M. Bers (Ed.), *Teaching computational thinking and coding to young children* (pp. 64–83). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-7308-2>
- Robertson, J., Gray, S., Toye, M., & Booth, J. (2020). The relationship between executive functions and computational thinking. *International Journal of Computer Science Education in Schools*, 3(4), 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.21585/ijcses.v3i4.76>
- Wing, J. M. (2011). Research notebook: Computational thinking--what and why? *The Link – Magazine of Carnegie Mellon University's School of Computer Science*. <https://www.cs.cmu.edu/link/research-notebook-computational-thinking-what-and-why>

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-chief

Cristiane Silvestre de Paula

Associated editors

Alessandra Gotuzo Seabra
Ana Alexandra Caldas Osório
Luiz Renato Rodrigues Carreiro
Maria Cristina Triguero Veloz Teixeira

Section editors

"Psychological Assessment"

Alexandre Luiz de Oliveira Serpa
André Luiz de Carvalho Braule Pinto
Vera Lúcia Esteves Mateus
Juliana Burges Sbicigo

"Psychology and Education"

Alessandra Gotuzo Seabra
Carlo Schmidt
Regina Basso Zanon

"Social Psychology and Population's Health"

Enzo Banti Bissoli
Marina Xavier Carpena

"Clinical Psychology"

Carolina Andrea Ziebold Jorquera
Julia Garcia Durand
Natalia Becker

"Human Development"

Maria Cristina Triguero Veloz Teixeira
Rosane Lowenthal

Technical support

Camila Fragozo Ribeiro
Giovanna Joly Manssur
Maria Fernanda Liuti Bento da Silva

EDITORIAL PRODUCTION

Publishing coordination

Ana Claudia de Mauro

Editorial interns

Isabela Franco Rodrigues
Victória Andrade

Language editor

Paula Di Sessa Vavlis

Layout designer

Acqua