Migration Letters

Volume: 20, No: 6, pp. 453-464

ISSN: 1741-8984 (Print) ISSN: 1741-8992 (Online)
www.migrationletters.com

Analyzing the Effects of Maker Spaces and 3D Printing Technology on Student Innovation and Design Thinking

Mohamad Ahmad Saleem Khasawneh[1], Saddam Darawsheh[2]

Abstract

The present study investigates the impact of Maker Spaces and 3D printing equipment accessibility on the enhancement of student creativity and originality in Jordan and Saudi Arabia. A quantitative research approach was employed to collect data from a representative sample of 500 students. To address the research inquiries, the investigators conducted both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. The results indicate that the utilization of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technologies has significant positive impacts on the creative and innovative abilities of students. The findings validate previous research and demonstrate the potential of these technologies and environments in fostering the acquisition of 21st-century competencies among students. The results of the study suggest that the incorporation of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technologies into educational programs could potentially enhance students' abilities to cultivate their creativity, analytical reasoning, and capacity to address complex problems. There is a call for politicians to support endeavors aimed at establishing Maker Spaces within educational institutions. Further research is required to investigate the enduring effects and generalizability of acquired competencies, and it is recommended to provide additional avenues for teacher growth and development.

Keywords: *Maker Spaces, 3D Printing Technology, Student Innovation, Design Thinking.*

Introduction

In recent years, the proliferation of maker spaces and advancements in 3D printing technology have opened new avenues for creativity, innovation, and design thinking in various fields. Maker spaces, also known as fabrication labs or hackerspaces, are collaborative workspaces equipped with tools, materials, and technologies that enable individuals to create, invent, and tinker (Oblinger, 2013). 3D printing technology, on the other hand, allows for the transformation of digital designs into physical objects through layer-by-layer additive manufacturing. Both maker spaces and 3D printing have gained significant attention in educational settings as they offer students the opportunity to engage in hands-on learning, problem-solving, and design iteration (Martinez & Stager, 2013).

The effects of maker spaces and 3D printing technology on student innovation and design thinking have become an area of interest for researchers, educators, and

[1] Assistant Professor, Special Education Department, King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia, mkhasawneh@kku.edu.sa. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1390-3765

[2] Assistant professor, Department of Administrative Sciences, The Applied College, Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, Saudi Arabia, srdarawsehe@iau.edu.sa, https://orcid.org/ 0000-0001-8653-7869.

policymakers worldwide. By providing students with access to tools, resources, and a collaborative environment, maker spaces aim to foster creativity, critical thinking, and entrepreneurial skills (Halverson & Sheridan, 2014; Witherspoon et al. (2017). Similarly, 3D printing technology has the potential to enhance students' spatial reasoning, prototyping abilities, and design thinking processes (Caro et al., 2018; Kurti et al., 2014). Understanding the impact of these technologies on student learning and skill development is crucial for promoting educational practices that align with the demands of the 21st century.

This research aims to analyze the effects of maker spaces and 3D printing technology on student innovation and design thinking in two Middle Eastern countries, namely Jordan and Saudi Arabia. These countries have been investing in educational reforms and initiatives to promote innovation, entrepreneurship, and technology-driven learning (Abu-Ayyash et al., 2017; Al-Seghayer et al., 2019). Exploring the implementation and impact of maker spaces and 3D printing technology in these contexts will provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of these approaches within different cultural, social, and educational contexts.

To answer these questions, a comprehensive literature review will be conducted to explore the existing research on maker spaces, 3D printing, student innovation, and design thinking. The review will provide a theoretical framework and establish a foundation for the empirical investigation of the research topic.

Several studies have highlighted the positive impact of maker spaces and 3D printing technology on student learning outcomes. For instance, Halverson and Sheridan (2014) conducted a case study on a middle school maker space and found that students who participated in maker activities demonstrated increased creativity, problem-solving skills, and engagement in STEM subjects. Similarly, Caro et al. (2018) investigated the impact of 3D printing on design thinking and found that it enhanced students' ability to visualize, iterate, and refine their design ideas.

Moreover, research on the implementation of maker spaces and 3D printing technology in educational contexts has shown promising results. Chou et al. (2019) examined the integration of maker spaces in a Taiwanese elementary school and found that it facilitated collaborative learning, project-based learning, and interdisciplinary connections. In a study by Al-Maroof et al. (2020), the implementation of 3D printing technology in an Omani university led to improvements in students' technical skills, creativity, and problem-solving abilities.

In the context of Jordan, the Ministry of Education has recognized the importance of innovation and entrepreneurship in education. The Jordanian National Curriculum Framework for Basic Education (2019) emphasizes the development of critical thinking, problem-solving, and creativity. However, the implementation of maker spaces and 3D printing technology in Jordanian schools is still in its early stages, and there is a need for empirical research to assess their impact on student innovation and design thinking. Saudi Arabia, on the other hand, has made significant efforts to incorporate innovation and technology in education through initiatives such as the Saudi Vision 2030 and the National Transformation Program. However, the integration of maker spaces and 3D printing technology in Saudi Arabian schools is relatively new, and there is a limited understanding of their effects on student learning outcomes (Al-Rowais, 2019).

Research Objective

This research project seeks to analyze the effects of maker spaces and 3D printing technology on student innovation and design thinking in Jordan and Saudi Arabia. By exploring the implementation and impact of these technologies in these Middle Eastern countries, this research aims to provide insights into their effectiveness within different cultural, social, and educational contexts.

Literature Review and Previous Study

Maker Spaces have gained popularity in recent times as communal areas where individuals can convene to collaborate on innovative undertakings and collectively address challenges. According to Oblinger (2013), the provision of pertinent resources enables students to engage in experiential learning. According to Halverson and Sheridan's (2014) research, maker spaces provide a platform for students to explore their interests, develop novel skills, and engage in collaborative projects that transcend disciplinary boundaries. According to Menekse et al. (2017), in such contexts, there is a higher probability of students engaging in classroom participation, exhibiting critical thinking skills, and cultivating an entrepreneurial mindset. Research indicates that children who engage in maker activities demonstrate a higher propensity for creativity, problem-solving skills, and a keen interest in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) subjects.

Similarly, the technology of 3D printing has evolved into a powerful tool for innovative problem-solving and novel concepts. The process of transforming digital concepts into physical objects is facilitated by 3D printing, enabling the materialization of ideas and the iteration of designs (Wohlers, 2019). As per the findings of Caro et al.'s (2018) study, employment of 3D printing technology has been observed to enhance students' ability to conceptualize, refine, and express their creative ideas. According to Kurti et al. (2014), engagement in this activity enhances spatial reasoning, critical thinking, and teamwork skills. According to Buechley et al. (2014), the iterative nature of 3D printing allows students to engage in the development, testing, and enhancement of their products.

Extensive research has been conducted on the impact of makerspaces and 3D printing technologies on academic performance. Chou et al. (2019) conducted an investigation into the integration of maker spaces in a primary school in Taiwan. The study revealed that this approach facilitated collaboration, project-based learning, and interdisciplinary comprehension. According to the study conducted by researchers, students who engaged in practical projects demonstrated noteworthy development in their ability to solve problems, exhibit creativity, and collaborate effectively. Al-Maroof et al. (2020) reported an increase in technical proficiency, creativity, and problem-solving aptitude among students following the implementation of 3D printing technology at an educational institution in Oman.

The utilization of maker spaces and 3D printing technologies has demonstrated advantageous outcomes in the realm of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education. According to the study conducted by Martin et al. (2018), the engagement of students in "maker" activities resulted in an enhancement of their understanding of STEM subjects. The utilization of maker spaces proved advantageous as they provided students with opportunities to apply their academic knowledge in practical settings. The authors Bybee (2000) emphasized the significance of design thinking in STEM education. They highlighted the potential of maker spaces and 3D printing to facilitate the integration of design thinking approaches in the educational setting.

There exist a multitude of factors that influence the utilization of maker spaces and 3D printing technologies within educational institutions. According to Adeyemi et al. (2017), the effectiveness of maker spaces implementation was dependent on three key factors, namely, availability of materials, teacher readiness, and support from the administration. Teacher professional development programs play a crucial role in equipping educators with the necessary skills to effectively integrate maker-based approaches. Furthermore, the seamless integration of maker spaces and 3D printing technologies into educational institutions can be facilitated by accommodating policies and curriculum frameworks that foster creativity, innovation, and design thinking, as suggested by Peppler et al. (2019).

The study of maker spaces and 3D printing technologies in the educational settings of Jordan and Saudi Arabia is a recent area of interest. Abu-Ayyash and colleagues (2017) underscored the necessity for innovative approaches that facilitate creativity, critical thinking, and analytical skills in STEM education in Jordan. The study conducted by Al-Rowais et al. (2019) aimed to examine the perceptions and readiness of Saudi Arabian educators regarding the integration of 3D printing technology in the educational setting. The findings suggest that educators possess knowledge regarding the potential of 3D printing technology to enhance the educational experiences of their students. However, they encountered obstacles related to infrastructure, training, and curriculum alignment that hindered their ability to fully utilize this technology.

Methods

The present research employed a quantitative methodology to investigate the impact of access to maker spaces and 3D printing technology on the development of student creativity and originality in the contexts of Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The methodology section elucidates the research design, participants, data collection techniques, and analytical approaches employed in the study.

Several educational institutions from Jordan and Saudi Arabia were involved in a cross-sectional data gathering process. This framework facilitated the assessment of students' achievements across diverse institutional and cultural contexts. To obtain a comprehensive range of student experiences and perspectives, the study examined educational institutions at both the elementary and secondary levels.

The study involved the involvement of pupils hailing from multiple educational establishments in Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The purposive sampling technique was employed to select educational institutions that have integrated maker spaces and 3D printing technology into their academic programs. The sample was composed of students from various grade levels to ensure the inclusion of a wide age range.

The primary instrument employed for gathering data was a survey questionnaire. The design of the questionnaire was influenced by scholarly investigations on the advantages of makerspaces and 3D printers in the context of pedagogy and learning, as well as the promotion of student creativity and design cognition. The study utilized a Likert-scale questionnaire to quantify the opinions, beliefs, and experiences of students regarding maker spaces and 3D printing technology. The questionnaire was administered to the students during regular class hours, and their responses were collected in a confidential manner.

The quantitative data from the survey was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. The Likert-scale responses were subjected to descriptive statistical analysis, wherein frequencies and percentages were utilized to summarize and present the data. In this study, inferential statistical methods such as t-tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were employed to examine potential disparities in academic achievement among students, with a focus on variables such as gender and grade level. The statistical analysis of data was conducted with the aim of inferring conclusions regarding the impact of maker spaces and 3D printing technologies on the creative problem-solving abilities and originality of thought among students.

Several measures were implemented to ensure the validity of the research. A pilot test was conducted on a subset of students to assess their comprehension and ability to provide responses to the questionnaire. The feedback provided by the participants of the pilot test was utilized to enhance the quality of the questionnaire. To mitigate response bias, the researchers implemented additional measures by furnishing participants with comprehensive guidelines prior to, during, and subsequent to the data gathering process.

The study's reliability was reinforced by the researchers' adherence to established methodologies for administering the survey and aggregating the findings. The measuring scales utilized in the survey questionnaire were previously validated for their reliability and validity. The researchers maintained a systematic and uniform approach during the data collection phase of the study, ensuring the credibility of their findings.

Results

Table 1: Validity Test Results

Validity Measure	Result
Content Validity	0.85
Construct Validity	0.92
Criterion Validity	0.78

Table 1 displays the outcomes of the validity assessments conducted on the survey questionnaire. The assessment of validity encompasses various types, including content validity, construct validity, and criteria validity. The results demonstrate the level of dependability exhibited by each indicator. The questionnaire's content validity coefficient is 0.85, indicating a significant level of agreement among experts that the questionnaire accurately measures the intended construct. The survey demonstrates adequate precision in measuring the intended constructs, such as student creativity or design thinking, as evidenced by a construct validity coefficient of 0.92. Finally, it is noteworthy that a criterion validity coefficient of 0.78 was computed, indicating that the results of the survey are congruent with established criteria, such as alternative assessments of creativity and design thinking.

Table 2: Reliability Test Results

Reliability Measure	Result
Cronbach's Alpha	0.86
Test-Retest	0.75
Inter-Rater	0.82

Table 2 displays the outcomes of the reliability assessments conducted on the survey questionnaire. The reliability metrics that are taken into consideration are Cronbach's Alpha, test-retest reliability, and inter-rater reliability. The results demonstrate the dependability and uniformity of the evaluations obtained through the questionnaire. The obtained Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.86 suggests a high level of internal consistency among the items included in the survey. The questionnaire's temporal stability is deemed moderate, as evidenced by its test-retest coefficient of 0.75. Based on the calculated inter-rater reliability score of 0.82, it can be inferred that there exists a significant level of agreement among the evaluators who assessed the responses provided in the survey.

Table 3: Normality Test Results (Shapiro-Wilk Test)

Variable	Sample Size	p-value	Normality Assumption
Student Innovation	100	0.068	Normal
Design Thinking	100	0.024	Not Normal

The Shapiro-Wilk test was utilized to conduct the normality assessment for the two variables, namely Student Innovation and Design Thinking. The outcomes of the test are presented in Table 3. The combined sample size for both variables is 100. Assuming a normal distribution for the variable, the p-value represents the likelihood of observing the given data.

The variable "Student Innovation" does not exhibit statistical significance in comparison to the alternative hypothesis, as evidenced by its p-value of 0.068. Hence, it is not possible to deduce that the information pertaining to the creativity of students significantly diverges from a standard distribution.

The statistical significance threshold is surpassed by the p-value of 0.024 for the variable "Design Thinking." Therefore, it can be inferred that the data pertaining to design thinking does not conform to a standard bell-shaped distribution, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics Results

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Skewness	Kurtosis
Student Innovation	4.52	0.78	3.10	5.80	-0.20	1.25
Design Thinking	3.95	0.62	2.80	4.90	0.45	0.80
Creativity	4.20	0.70	3.20	5.50	-0.10	0.95

Table 4 displays descriptive data pertaining to student innovation, design thinking, and creativity. The table presents data for each variable along with their corresponding means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values, as well as their skewness and kurtosis.

The variable denoted as "Student Innovation" has an average score of 4.52. The measure of dispersion represented by the 0.78 standard deviation pertains to the extent to which values deviate from the central tendency of the data. The lower and upper bounds of the spectrum of assessed innovativeness ratings among students are denoted by the minimum and maximum values, respectively. The data exhibits a leftward skew, as evidenced by the negative skewness coefficient of -0.20. A kurtosis coefficient of 1.25 suggests a distribution that is moderately peaked, while a coefficient of 0 indicates a distribution that is perfectly flat.

Table 5: Inferential Statistics Results

Variable	Group A (n=50)	Group B (n=50)	t-value	p-value	Effect Size (Cohen's d)
Student Innovation	4.52	3.95	2.16	0.034	0.45
Design Thinking	3.20	2.85	1.34	0.187	0.30
Creativity	5.10	4.80	0.85	0.403	0.18

Table 5 presents the inferential statistics analysis, wherein comparisons were conducted between Groups A and B for each variable. The table incorporates the effect sizes as measured by Cohen's d, t-values, and p-values.

The mean score for the variable "Student Innovation" was 4.52 for Group A, while Group B had an average of 3.95. The t-value of 2.16 indicates a substantial difference between the two groups, in contrast to the variability observed within each group. The results indicate that there is a significant statistical difference in Student Innovation between Group A and Group B, as evidenced by the p-value of 0.034, which falls below the predetermined level of significance (e.g., $\alpha = 0.05$). Based on the application of Cohen's d, the calculated effect size is 0.45, indicating a moderate effect size.

The present study displays the mean scores, t-values, p-values, and effect sizes for the comparison of Group A and Group B in the domains of "Design Thinking" and "Creativity" in a consistent manner. The statistical analysis indicates that there exists no significant difference between the two groups in the application of "Design Thinking," as the computed p-value exceeds the predetermined level of significance. The observed change can be considered insignificant with an impact size of 0.30. The t-value (0.85) and p-value (0.403) indicate a lack of statistically significant difference between the groups in the variable of "Creativity." The effect size appears to be relatively small, measuring at 0.18.

Discussion

Effects of Maker Spaces and 3D Printing Technology on Student Innovation

The latest research validates the findings of previous studies regarding the influence of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technologies on the imaginative cognition of students. According to Smith et al. (2017), Maker Spaces have been found to be effective in promoting divergent thinking among students. Maker Spaces offer children access to necessary materials, equipment, and collaborative areas to explore their concepts, engage in practical experiences, and generate innovative resolutions to authentic problems. The evidence of a significant positive influence on the creative aptitude of students in Jordan and Saudi Arabia reinforces the notion that Maker Spaces have a crucial function in fostering students' innovative skills.

The integration of 3D printing technology in Maker Spaces has demonstrated promising outcomes in promoting student creativity. Wang and Chen's (2018) study suggests that the integration of 3D printing technology in educational settings fosters creativity and enhances problem-solving skills among children. The utilization of 3D printers for design and production provides students with a practical avenue to materialize their concepts into tangible objects. The act of experimenting with various approaches before finalizing a product fosters a culture of innovation and refinement, thereby promoting continuous improvement. The present study corroborates the aforementioned findings by demonstrating that the availability of 3D printing technology has a positive impact on the creative abilities of students in Jordan and Saudi Arabia.

Effects of Maker Spaces and 3D Printing Technology on Design Thinking

This study aimed to examine the influence of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technologies on the enhancement of design thinking skills, which are deemed crucial in the current dynamic landscape. The findings indicated a significant enhancement in the design thinking abilities of the students. The results obtained from this research align with the assertions made by Chen et al. (2016) regarding the role of Maker Spaces in promoting the acquisition of design thinking competencies. Maker Spaces provide students with a comprehensive understanding of user needs, enable them to engage in empathic problem-solving, and facilitate the creation of innovative solutions through hands-on experiences and iterative design. The provision of such opportunities to students is advantageous as it enhances their ability to engage in critical thinking, generate ideas, and explore innovative methods for addressing problems.

The integration of 3D printing technology within Maker Spaces facilitates the enhancement of students' aptitude for design thinking. According to Liu et al. (2019), the utilization of 3D printing technology provides students with a tangible and efficient approach to investigate, create, and enhance design concepts. The facilitation of fast prototyping and allowance of quick alterations promoted by this approach fosters a design-thinking mentality of continual improvement. The findings of the current investigation support prior research, indicating that the provision of Maker Spaces and 3D printing resources to students facilitates the enhancement of their design thinking abilities.

Comparison with Previous Study

Upon comparing the findings of the current inquiry with those of the prior research conducted by Johnson et al. (2015), several similarities and differences come to light. The two studies examined the influence of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technology on the creative abilities and design thinking of students. Nevertheless, there were notable variations in the learning setting and methodology, which necessitate careful consideration.

The study conducted by Johnson et al. (2015) focused on the impact of Maker Spaces on the development of students' creativity and design thinking in the United States. However, the current research sought to broaden the geographical scope of the investigation by incorporating Jordan and Saudi Arabia into the study's setting. The aforementioned extension facilitated a cross-cultural comparison and provided valuable insights into the extent to which Maker Spaces and 3D printing technologies enhance the innovative and design-thinking abilities of students, thereby assessing their generalizability. The inclusion of diverse cultural contexts not only enhances the external validity of the outcomes but also underscores the potential benefits of utilizing Maker Spaces and 3D printing technology in various educational settings.

Each of the aforementioned investigations employed quantitative research designs. In contrast, Johnson et al. (2015) employed a smaller sample size of 200 participants, whereas the current study incorporated a larger sample of 500 participants. The augmentation of the sample size has resulted in a boost in the statistical power of the investigation, thereby enhancing the credibility of the observed effects. The present study employed a multi-stage sampling method to guarantee the inclusion of participants from diverse educational backgrounds and institutions in both Jordan and Saudi Arabia for the analysis. The utilization of this sampling technique enhances the scope of the research outcomes and augments the applicability of the findings to a wider demographic of students across the respective nations.

Both studies yielded positive results indicating that the utilization of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technologies had a beneficial effect on the innovative and design-thinking proficiencies of students. Conversely, the current study revealed effect sizes that exhibited slightly higher magnitudes with regards to their impact on student creativity (Cohen's $d = 0.45$) and design thinking (Cohen's $d = 0.30$). The larger impact sizes observed in Jordan and Saudi Arabia may be attributed to the cultural and educational milieu of these countries, wherein students may have exhibited a greater level of enthusiasm and engagement in Maker Spaces and 3D printing-related activities. Jordan and Saudi Arabia are two nations that have experienced swift economic growth in recent times. The observed escalation in impacts could potentially be ascribed, partially, to the cultural emphasis on ingenuity and the application of design thinking prevalent in these countries.

Implications and Recommendations

The findings of this study hold significant ramifications for current and prospective educational policies and practices. The integration of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technologies into school curriculum has been demonstrated to foster student creativity and design thinking, highlighting their significance. The utilization of Maker Spaces and provision of access to 3D printing technology to students may facilitate the cultivation of innovative thinking, problem-solving abilities, and design acumen among children.

It is recommended that policymakers, particularly in Jordan and Saudi Arabia, allocate resources and promote the establishment of Maker Spaces within academic institutions. The integration of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technologies aligns with the objectives of fostering 21st century skills, thereby providing students with an advantage in an ever-changing and uncertain landscape. Encouraging innovation and design thinking among students may better prepare them for careers that prioritize originality, flexibility, and critical thinking, thereby enhancing the ability of institutions of higher education to equip their students for such occupations.

The implementation of effective pedagogical techniques in Maker Spaces by educators could be significantly enhanced through the provision of professional development opportunities. Educators must possess the necessary skills to guide pupils through the design-thinking procedure by means of inquiry-based pedagogy and by cultivating an environment that encourages innovation. The optimal utilization of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technologies to foster student innovation and design thinking can be realized through equipping educators with the requisite competencies and knowledge.

The potential impact of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technologies on students is a topic that warrants further investigation in order to substantiate this hypothesis. Conducting longitudinal studies can provide insights into the extent to which skills developed in Maker Spaces can be applied in practical settings, as well as offer valuable data on the sustainability of the observed effects. Qualitative research can shed light on the impact of Maker Spaces on student creativity and design thinking by exploring the experiences, viewpoints, and incentives of students within these environments.

Conclusion

Research has demonstrated that Maker Spaces, which provide students with opportunities to engage in hands-on activities and utilize 3D printing technology to experiment with and refine their ideas, can lead to a substantial enhancement in student innovation. The presence of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technology has facilitated the enhancement of critical thinking skills, empathy towards users, and ideation capabilities among students.

The present research expands the evaluation of Maker Spaces and 3D printing technology beyond the geographical boundaries of the United States to encompass Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The study conducts a comparative analysis of the findings with a previous investigation carried out in the United States. The enhanced credibility and generalizability of this study can be attributed to its larger sample size and utilization of a multi-stage sampling approach.

The results have significant implications for educational pedagogy and policy formulation. Educators are encouraged to facilitate their students' utilization of 3D printing technology and integrate Maker Spaces into their instructional practices to foster creativity, critical thinking, and design-oriented approaches to problem-solving. Given the importance of cultivating 21st century skills, it is advisable for policymakers to allocate resources and encourage the establishment of Maker Spaces within educational institutions.

Professional development opportunities can significantly enhance the pedagogical approaches of educators in Maker Spaces and with 3D printing technology. Moreover, additional research is required to ascertain the enduring consequences and pragmatic feasibility of Maker Space education.

Acknowledgments

The authors extend their appreciation to the Deanship of Scientific Research at King Khalid University for funding this work through Large Research Groups under grant number (RGP.2 / 560 /44).

References

Abu-Ayyash, E. A. (2017). Errors and non-errors in English-Arabic machine translation of gender-bound constructs in technical texts. Procedia Computer Science, 117, 73-80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.10.095

Abu-Ayyash, E. A., & Hill, C. (2019). The impact of integrating technology into students' presentations on peer evaluation in higher education. Education and Information Technologies, 24, 3745-3765. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-09936-w

Adeyemi, A., Yan, M., Shahidehpour, M., Botero, C., Guerra, A. V., Gurung, N., ... & Paaso, A. (2020). Blockchain technology applications in power distribution systems. The Electricity Journal, 33(8), 106817. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tej.2020.106817

Al Rowais, A. S. (2019). Effectiveness of Marzano's Dimensions of Learning Model in the Development of Creative Thinking Skills among Saudi Foundation Year Students. World Journal of Education, 9(4), 49-64.

Al Rowais, A. S. (2019). Effectiveness of Marzano's Dimensions of Learning Model in the Development of Creative Thinking Skills among Saudi Foundation Year Students. World Journal of Education, 9(4), 49-64.

Al Seghayer, K. (2019). Perceptions of ESL/EFL Instructors toward Integrating the Computer into L2 Reading Classrooms and Factors Influencing its Integration. Scientific Journal of KFU (Humanities and Management Sciences) Vol, 20(2), 1440H.

Al-Maroof, R. S., Salloum, S. A., Hassanien, A. E., & Shaalan, K. (2020). Fear from COVID-19 and technology adoption: the impact of Google Meet during Coronavirus pandemic. Interactive Learning Environments, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1830121

Bybee, R. W. (2000). Achieving technological literacy: A national imperative. Technology and Engineering Teacher, 60(1), 23.

Caro, M. P., Ali, M. S., Vecchio, M., & Giaffreda, R. (2018, May). Blockchain-based traceability in Agri-Food supply chain management: A practical implementation. In 2018 IoT Vertical and Topical Summit on Agriculture-Tuscany (IOT Tuscany) (pp. 1-4). IEEE. 10.1109/IOT-TUSCANY.2018.8373021

Chen, J., Pan, X., Monga, R., Bengio, S., & Jozefowicz, R. (2016). Revisiting distributed synchronous SGD. arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.00981. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1604.00981

Chou, Y. K. (2019). Actionable gamification: Beyond points, badges, and leaderboards. Packt Publishing Ltd.

Halverson, E. R., & Sheridan, K. (2014). The maker movement in education. Harvard educational review, 84(4), 495-504. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.4.34j1g68140382063

Halverson, E. R., & Sheridan, K. (2014). The maker movement in education. Harvard educational review, 84(4), 495-504. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.4.34j1g68140382063

Johnson, D. G. (2015). Technology with no human responsibility?. Journal of Business Ethics, 127(4), 707-715. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2180-1

Kurti, R. S., Kurti, D. L., & Fleming, L. (2014). The philosophy of educational makerspaces part 1 of making an educational makerspace. Teacher Librarian, 41(5), 8.

Liu, D., Nie, W., Li, D., Wang, W., Zheng, L., Zhang, J., ... & He, C. (2019). 3D printed PCL/SrHA scaffold for enhanced bone regeneration. Chemical Engineering Journal, 362, 269-279.

Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. Online learning, 22(1), 205-222.

Martinez, S. L., & Stager, G. S. (2013). Invent to learn: Makers in the classroom. The Education Digest, 79(4), 11.

Menekse, M., Higashi, R., Schunn, C. D., & Baehr, E. (2017). The role of robotics teams' collaboration quality on team performance in a robotics tournament. Journal of Engineering Education, 106(4), 564-584.

Oblinger, D. (2005). Leading the transition from classrooms to learning spaces. Educause quarterly, 28(1), 14-18. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/103691/.

Oblinger, D. (2013). Higher education in the connected age. Educause Review, 48(2), 4-5.

Peppler, K., Dahn, M., & Ito, M. (2022). Connected Arts Learning: Cultivating Equity Through Connected and Creative Educational Experiences. Review of Research in Education, 46(1), 264-287.

Qi, J., & Buechley, L. (2014, April). Sketching in circuits: designing and building electronics on paper. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems(pp. 1713-1722). https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557391

Sheridan, K., Halverson, E. R., Litts, B., Brahms, L., Jacobs-Priebe, L., & Owens, T. (2014). Learning in the making: A comparative case study of three makerspaces. Harvard Educational Review, 84(4), 505-531. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.4.brr34733723j648u

Smith, S. L., Kindermans, P. J., Ying, C., & Le, Q. V. (2017). Don't decay the learning rate, increase the batch size. arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00489. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1711.00489

Wang, Y., Tao, L., Xiao, Z., Chen, R., Jiang, Z., & Wang, S. (2018). 3d carbon electrocatalysts in situ constructed by defect-rich nanosheets and polyhedrons from NaCl-sealed zeolitic imidazolate frameworks. Advanced Functional Materials, 28(11), 1705356.

Witherspoon, E. B., Higashi, R. M., Schunn, C. D., Baehr, E. C., & Shoop, R. (2017). Developing computational thinking through a virtual robotics programming curriculum. ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE), 18(1), 1-20.