Journal of Research in Education, SXCE, Patna    Vol. 13 No. 1 June, 2025

ISSN (P) : 2347-5676
ISSN (O) : 2582-2357

# Journal of Research in Education

(A Peer Reviewed and Refereed Bi-annual Journal)
(SJIF Impact Factor 5. 196)

ST. XAVIER'S COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (AUTONOMOUS)
For GOD AND COUNTRY
1988
DIGHA GHAT PATNA

St. Xavier's College of Education
(Autonomous)
P.O.. Digha Ghat, Patna - 800 011 (Bihar)

Vol. 13 No. 1
June, 2025

# CONTENT & AUTHOR

Journal of Research in Education ISSN (P): 2347-5676 | ISSN (O) 2582-2357
JUNE - 2025 | VOL. 13, No. 1

**Antaryami Hissaria**
Research Scholar,
Department of Education,
Punjab University, Chandigarh
Email: antaryamihissaria@gmail.com

**Prof. Jatinder Grover**
Professor,
Department of Education,
Punjab University, Chandigarh
Email: jatinder1633@gmail.com

**8**

# Computational Thinking in Education: A Key to Enhancing Analytical and Problem-Solving Abilities

## Abstract

*Computational Thinking (CT) has emerged as a fundamental skill in modern education, equipping students with the ability to analyse problems, design solutions, and apply logical reasoning. This paper explores the role of CT in enhancing analytical and problem-solving abilities, emphasizing its integration across various disciplines beyond computer science. By fostering key CT components such as decomposition, pattern recognition, abstraction, and algorithmic thinking students develop a structured approach to problem-solving that can be applied in real-world scenarios. The study examines how CT is embedded within educational curricula, particularly in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) education, and its impact on students cognitive development. It also highlights pedagogical approaches and instructional methodologies that facilitate effective CT learning, including project-based learning, gamification, and collaborative learning. The research also addresses challenges in CT implementation, such as teacher preparedness, accessibility to resources, and curriculum alignment. Through a systematic review of existing literature this paper evaluates the effectiveness of CT-based interventions in improving students analytical reasoning and problem-solving skills. The findings suggest that integrating CT into early education enhances students logical thinking, creativity, and adaptability critical skills for the digital age. Also, the study underscores the need for comprehensive teacher training programs and policy initiatives to support widespread CT adoption in schools. By bridging the gap between computational methodologies and educational practices, this research contributes to the ongoing discourse on*

*21st-century skill development. It advocates for a holistic approach to CT integration, ensuring that students not only acquire technical proficiency but also develop a problem-solving mindset essential for future academic and professional success.*

***Keywords:*** *Computational Thinking, Problem-Solving Skills, Analytical Reasoning, STEM Education, Pedagogical Approaches, 21st-Century Skills*

## Introduction

In an era defined by rapid technological advancements and a growing reliance on data-driven decision-making, the ability to think computationally has become an essential skill for students across disciplines. Computational Thinking (CT), as conceptualized by Wing (2006), goes beyond programming and computer science, offering a structured approach to problem-solving that involves decomposition, pattern recognition, abstraction, and algorithmic thinking. These skills empower learners to analyse complex problems, design efficient solutions, and apply logical reasoning in diverse contexts (Cuny, Snyder, & Wing, 2010). The integration of CT into education is not merely a response to the demands of the digital age but also a transformative pedagogical shift aimed at fostering critical thinking, creativity, and adaptability skills essential for navigating 21st-century challenges (Barr & Stephenson, 2011). The importance of CT lies in its interdisciplinary applicability. While traditionally rooted in computer science, CT has found relevance in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) education and beyond. For instance, CT principles can be applied to model scientific phenomena, optimize engineering processes, and analyze mathematical patterns (Dagienė & Sentance, 2016). By embedding CT into STEM curricula, educators can help students develop a deeper understanding of core concepts while enhancing their analytical reasoning and problem-solving abilities (Irgens et al., 2020). This dual benefit has led to a growing emphasis on integrating CT into K–12 education as a means of preparing students for future academic and professional success (Angeli et al., 2016). Despite its potential, the integration of CT into educational systems faces several challenges. Teacher preparedness is a significant barrier; many educators lack the training or resources to effectively teach CT concepts (Ezeamuzie & Leung, 2021). Additionally, disparities in access to technology further exacerbate inequities in CT education (De Santo et al., 2022). Curriculum alignment is another critical issue; without clear frameworks that integrate CT into existing subjects, its implementation risks being fragmented or superficial (Csizmadia et al., 2015). Addressing these challenges requires comprehensive strategies that include teacher training programs, equitable resource allocation, and robust curriculum design.

Pedagogical approaches play a crucial role in the successful integration of CT into education. Research highlights several effective methodologies that promote student engagement and learning outcomes. Project-based learning (PBL), for instance, allows students to apply CT principles to real-world problems, fostering both technical proficiency and critical thinking skills (Karan & Brown, 2022). Gamification has also emerged as a powerful tool for enhancing student motivation and engagement while teaching CT concepts in an interactive manner (Asigigan & Samur, 2021). Additionally, coding exercises tailored to students developmental levels can serve as an entry point for introducing algorithmic thinking and problem-solving (Li et al., 2023). These approaches not only make CT accessible but also demonstrate its relevance across various disciplines. The impact of CT on students cognitive development is well-documented. Studies show that incorporating CT into early education enhances logical reasoning, creativity, and adaptability skills that are critical for lifelong learning (Denner et al., 2019). CT-based interventions have been linked to improved academic performance in STEM subjects, as they encourage students to approach problems systematically and think critically about solutions (Beyazsacli, 2016). By fostering these skills from an early age, educators can help students build a strong foundation for tackling complex challenges in both academic and real-world settings.

This paper aims to explore the role of Computational Thinking in enhancing analytical and problem-solving abilities among students. Specifically, it investigates the impact of CT on cognitive development and academic performance while examining effective pedagogical approaches for its integration into STEM education. Through a systematic review of existing literature, the study identifies best practices for teaching CT and addresses the challenges associated with its implementation. The findings underscore the need for a holistic approach that combines teacher training programs with policy initiatives to support widespread adoption of CT in schools. By bridging the gap between computational methodologies and educational practices, this research contributes to the ongoing discourse on 21st-century skill development. It advocates for an inclusive approach to CT integration that ensures all students not just those with access to advanced technology can benefit from its transformative potential. As educators and policymakers seek to equip learners with the skills needed for future success, Computational Thinking emerges as a key enabler of innovation and problem-solving in an increasingly complex world.

## Rationale of the Study

The integration of Computational Thinking (CT) into education is crucial for developing analytical and problem-solving skills needed in our technology-driven world (Barr & Stephenson, 2011; Wing, 2006). These skills are essential for success in academics and future careers (Beyazsacli, 2016; Jonassen, 2011), yet traditional teaching methods often fall short (Csizmadia et al., 2015). CT offers a structured approach to problem-solving (Cuny et al., 2010) and can boost student engagement (Asigigan & Samur, 2021; Karan & Brown, 2022; Li et al., 2023) through interactive activities, making learning more enjoyable and relevant. Though, implementing CT faces hurdles, many educators lack the necessary training (Csizmadia et al., 2015; Ezeamuzie & Leung, 2021), and access to technology can be unequal (De Santo et al., 2022). To overcome these obstacles, comprehensive strategies involving teacher development, curriculum alignment, and resource allocation are required. This study seeks to investigate CT's impact on students analytical and problem-solving abilities, explore effective teaching methods, and identify implementation challenges. By providing evidence-based solutions, it aims to enhance 21st-century skill development and advocate for equitable CT education, ensuring all students can thrive in a complex, technology-dependent society.

## Research Objectives

1. To investigate the impact of Computational Thinking (CT) on students analytical and problem-solving skills.
2. To explore effective pedagogical approaches for integrating CT into educational curricula, particularly in STEM education.
3. To identify the challenges and barriers to implementing CT in schools and propose possible solutions.

## Research Questions

### Major Research Question:

1. How does Computational Thinking enhance students problem-solving and analytical abilities in education?

### Minor Research Questions:

1. What are the most effective pedagogical approaches for integrating Computational Thinking into STEM education?
2. What challenges hinder the successful implementation of Computational Thinking in schools, and how can they be addressed?

## Research Methodology

This study employed a systematic literature review to address the research questions. A comprehensive search was conducted in academic databases such as ERIC, Web of Science, and Scopus, focusing on peer-reviewed articles published within the last 20 years. Keywords used included "computational thinking," "problem-solving," "STEM education," and "pedagogical approaches." Articles were screened based on pre-defined inclusion/exclusion criteria, prioritizing empirical studies, intervention designs, and theoretical frameworks related to CT integration. Data extraction involved summarizing key findings, methodologies, and outcomes relevant to the research questions. The synthesis of findings followed a thematic analysis approach, identifying recurring themes related to effective pedagogical approaches, challenges to implementation, and the impact of CT on student abilities.

## Findings and Results

### Major Research Question: How does Computational Thinking enhance students problem-solving and analytical abilities in education?

The systematic literature review overwhelmingly supports the notion that Computational Thinking (CT) significantly enhances students problem-solving and analytical capabilities within educational contexts. The synthesized evidence reveals that CT provides a structured and systematic approach to problem-solving, enabling students to decompose complex problems into manageable components (decomposition), recognize patterns and make connections (pattern recognition), generalize solutions to different contexts (abstraction), and develop step-by-step instructions for solving problems (algorithmic thinking) (Angeli et al., 2016; Cuny et al., 2010; Dagienė & Sentance, 2016; Wing, 2006). This structured approach promotes a more organized and efficient problem-solving process (Allsop, 2019). The literature indicates that CT integration cultivates higher-order thinking skills, such as logical reasoning, critical thinking, and creativity (Denner et al., 2019; Durak, 2018; Lee et al., 2011). By engaging in CT activities, students develop the ability to analyze problems from multiple perspectives, evaluate potential solutions, and generate novel and innovative approaches to address complex challenges (Karan & Brown, 2022). CT fosters metacognitive skills, empowering students to reflect on their own thinking processes, monitor their progress, and adapt their approaches as needed (Allsop, 2019; Irgens et al., 2020). This self-regulated learning approach enhances students ability to transfer their problem-solving skills to new and unfamiliar situations (Denner et al., 2019; Li et al., 2023). A number of studies also suggest that enhanced problem-solving skills may have positive relationship with students self-efficacy (Curzon et al., 2009).

**Minor Research Question 1: What are the most effective pedagogical approaches for integrating Computational Thinking into STEM education?**

The systematic literature review identified several pedagogical approaches that are particularly effective for integrating Computational Thinking (CT) into STEM education. Project-based learning (PBL) consistently emerged as a highly effective approach, providing a practical context for students to apply CT skills to real-world problems, thereby promoting deeper understanding and enhanced engagement (Karan & Brown, 2022; Lestari & Munahefi, 2023; Hmelo, 2004). PBL encourages students to work collaboratively, design solutions, test hypotheses, and iterate on their designs, fostering a more authentic and meaningful learning experience (Argaw et al., 2017). Gamification and game-based learning also emerged as promising approaches, leveraging the motivational power of games to enhance student interest and improve learning outcomes (Asigigan & Samur, 2021; De Santo et al., 2022). Games can provide a structured and engaging environment for students to practice CT skills, receive immediate feedback, and track their progress (Crat, 2021). Unplugged activities, which involve teaching CT concepts without the use of computers, were found to be particularly beneficial for introducing young learners to fundamental CT principles in a playful and accessible manner (Li et al., 2023; Curzon et al., 2009). These activities can involve puzzles, games, and hands-on activities that promote logical reasoning, pattern recognition, and algorithmic thinking (Agnihotri, 2015). Collaborative learning emerged as another effective strategy, promoting teamwork, communication skills, and peer learning (Babaee, 2024; Astra et al., 2015). Students working in groups can share their ideas, discuss different approaches to problem-solving, and learn from each other's experiences (Li et al., 2023). Inquiry-based learning, which encourages students to explore scientific phenomena through experimentation and analysis, was also found to foster critical thinking, problem-solving skills, and scientific reasoning (Ezeamuzie & Leung, 2021).

**Minor Research Question 2: What challenges hinder the successful implementation of Computational Thinking in schools, and how can they be addressed?**

The systematic literature review revealed several significant challenges that impede the successful implementation of Computational Thinking (CT) in schools. One of the most prominent barriers is the lack of adequate teacher preparedness (Csizmadia et al., 2015; Ezeamuzie & Leung, 2021). Many teachers lack the necessary training, knowledge, and confidence to effectively teach CT concepts and integrate them into their existing curricula (BCS, 2014). This can be addressed through comprehensive professional development programs that provide teachers with hands-on experience, practical approaches, and ongoing support (Catete et al., 2018; Heilporn et al., 2021). Such programs should focus on equipping teachers with the skills to design CT-integrated lessons, assess student learning, and address misconceptions (Ezeamuzie & Leung, 2021). Another significant challenge is the misalignment of CT with existing curriculum frameworks (Angeli et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2011). CT is often taught in isolation, rather than being integrated into core subjects, which limits its impact on student learning and transferability (Li et al., 2023; Crat, 2021). This can be addressed through the development of explicit curriculum frameworks that clearly articulate the connections between CT competencies and STEM learning standards (Irgens et al., 2020). These frameworks should provide teachers with concrete examples of how CT can be applied to solve real-world problems in different STEM disciplines (Heilporn et al., 2021).

Limited access to technology and other resources can also pose a significant challenge, particularly in underserved communities (De Santo et al., 2022). This can be addressed through equitable resource allocation, the use of low-cost or unplugged activities, and partnerships with local businesses and community organizations (Li et al., 2023; Crat, 2021). The development of open educational resources (OER) can also help to reduce the cost barrier to CT education (Lee et al., 2011).

The assessment of CT skills can be challenging, as traditional assessment methods may not adequately capture the complex problem-solving processes involved (Allsop, 2019; Hansen & Hadjerrouit, 2022). This can be addressed through the use of authentic assessments, such as project-based assessments, portfolios, and performance-based tasks (Gemici & Lu, 2014). These assessments should focus on evaluating students ability to apply CT concepts to solve real-world problems, rather than simply memorizing definitions or procedures (Li et al., 2023).

**Suggestions and Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this systematic literature review, several suggestions and recommendations can be made to enhance the integration of Computational Thinking (CT) into educational settings.

1) Strengthen Teacher Professional Development: Given the significant challenge of teacher preparedness (Csizmadia et al., 2015; Ezeamuzie & Leung, 2021), there is a critical need for comprehensive and ongoing professional development programs for educators (Catete et al., 2018; Heilporn et al., 2021). These programs should equip teachers with a deep understanding of CT concepts, effective pedagogical approaches, and practical tools for integrating CT into their existing curricula (Angeli et al., 2016). Also, professional development should emphasize the importance of creating inclusive and engaging learning environments that cater to diverse student needs and learning styles. These programs should also consider teachers beliefs in their teaching efficacy, their beliefs around the nature of intelligence, their teaching styles, and how these attributes impact implementation (Denning & Martell, 2015).

2) Develop Aligned Curriculum Frameworks: To ensure that CT is seamlessly integrated into the curriculum, it is essential to develop explicit curriculum

frameworks that clearly articulate the connections between CT competencies and learning standards across different subjects (Irgens et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2011). These frameworks should provide teachers with concrete examples of how CT can be applied to solve real-world problems in various disciplines, fostering interdisciplinary learning and promoting the transfer of CT skills to new contexts.

3) Promote Equitable Access to Resources: Addressing the issue of unequal access to technology and resources is crucial for ensuring that all students have the opportunity to benefit from CT education (De Santo et al., 2022). This requires equitable allocation of funding, hardware, software, and other resources to schools and communities that are traditionally underserved (Crat, 2021). In addition, educators should explore the use of low-cost or unplugged activities that can effectively teach CT concepts without relying on expensive technology (Li et al., 2023).

4) Employ Authentic Assessment Methods: To accurately assess students CT skills, it is important to move beyond traditional assessments and embrace authentic methods that evaluate students ability to apply CT concepts to solve real-world problems (Allsop, 2019; Hansen & Hadjerrouit, 2022). This may include the use of project-based assessments, portfolios, performance-based tasks, and rubrics that specifically target CT competencies (Gemici & Lu, 2014). These assessments should emphasize the process of problem-solving, rather than simply focusing on the final answer (Li et al., 2023).

5) Foster Collaboration and Partnerships: Promoting collaboration and partnerships between schools, universities, industry, and community organizations can create a supportive ecosystem for CT education. Such partnerships can provide access to expertise, resources, and mentorship opportunities for both teachers and students, enriching the learning experience and promoting innovation (Babaee, 2024).

## Conclusion

This systematic literature review provides compelling evidence that Computational Thinking (CT) plays a significant role in enhancing students problem-solving and analytical abilities, and offers a range of strategies to promote implementation. The review highlights the effectiveness of various pedagogical approaches, such as project-based learning, gamification, and unplugged activities, for integrating CT into STEM education. The review also underscores the challenges that hinder the successful implementation of CT in schools, including a lack of teacher preparedness, misaligned curriculum frameworks, unequal access to resources, and inadequate assessment methods (Csizmadia et al., 2015; Ezeamuzie & Leung, 2021). By addressing these challenges and implementing the recommendations outlined above, educators and policymakers can create a more equitable and effective learning environment that empowers all students to develop the CT skills necessary to thrive in the 21st century (Wing, 2006). Further research is needed to explore the long-term impact of CT on students academic and career trajectories and to identify best practices for scaling up CT initiatives across diverse educational contexts. Ultimately, the successful integration of CT into education requires a sustained and collaborative effort from all stakeholders, guided by a shared vision of preparing students for the challenges and opportunities of the future.

## References

*Adeyemo, S. A. (2012). The relationship among school environment, student approaches to learning, and their academic achievement in senior secondary school physics. International Journal of Educational Research and Technology, 3(1), 21-26.*

*Agnihotri, A. K. (2015). Problem-solving ability among senior secondary school students of Himachal Pradesh. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development, 2(2), 511-517.*

*Allsop, Y. (2019). Assessing computational thinking process using a multiple evaluation approach. International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction, 19, 30–55.*

*Angeli, C., Voogt, J., Fluck, A., Webb, M., Cox, M., Malyn-Smith, J., & Zagami, J. (2016). A K-6 computational thinking curriculum framework: Implications for teacher knowledge. Educational Technology & Society, 19(3), 47–57. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/jeductechsoci.19.3.47.pdf*

*Argaw, A. S., Haile, B. B., Ayalew, B. T., & Kuma, S. G. (2017). The effect of problem-based learning (PBL) instruction on students motivation and problem-solving skills in physics. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 13, 857-871.*

*Asigigan, S. I., & Samur, Y. (2021). The effect of gamified STEM practices on students intrinsic motivation, critical thinking disposition levels, and perception of problem-solving skills. International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science, and Technology, 9(2), 332-352. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijemst.1157*

*Astra, I. M., Wahyuni, C., & Nasbey, H. (2015). Improvement of learning process and learning outcomes in science learning by using collaborative learning model of group investigation at high school (Grade X, SMAN 14 Jakarta). Journal of Education and Practice, 6(11), 75-80.*

*Babaee, M. (2024). Exploring the effects of collaboration in technology-infused settings on K–12 students computational thinking: A systematic review. Proceedings of the 2024 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.*

*Barr, V., & Stephenson, C. (2011). Bringing computational thinking to K-12: What is involved and what is the role of the computer science education community? ACM Inroads, 2, 48-54. https://doi.org/10.1145/1929887.1929905*

*Beyazsacli, M. (2016). Relationship between problem-solving skills and academic achievement. The Anthropologist, 25(3), 288–293. https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2016.11892118*

*Bond, M., & Bedenlier, S. (2019). Facilitating student engagement through educational technology: Towards a conceptual framework. Journal of Interactive Media in Education, 2019(1), 1-14.*

*Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki-Richter, O., & Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: A systematic evidence map. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17(2), 1-30.*

*Catete, V., Mott, W. B., Boyer, K., Lytle, N., Dong, Y., Boulden, D., Akram, B., Houchins, J., Barnes, T., Wiebe, E., & Lester, J. (2018). Infusing computational thinking into middle-grade science classrooms: Lessons learned. Proceedings of the 13th Workshop in Primary and Secondary Computing Education, 1-6.*

*Corso, M. J., Bundick, M. J., Quaglia, R. J., & Haywood, D. E. (2013). Where student, teacher, and content meet: Student engagement in the secondary school classroom. American Secondary Education, 41(3), 50–61.*

*Crat, C. (2021). Thoughts on computational thinking. Academia Letters*

*Csizmadia, A., Curzon, P., Dorling, M., Humphreys, S., Ng, T., Selby, C., & Woollard, J. (2015). Computational thinking: A guide for teachers. Computing at School, UK. http://computingatschool.org.uk/computational-thinking*

*Cuny, J., Snyder, L., & Wing, J. M. (2010). Demystifying computational thinking for non-computer scientists. Unpublished manuscript in progress. Retrieved from http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~CompThink/resources/TheLinkWing.pdf*

*Curzon, P., Black, J., Meagher, L. R., & McOwan, P. (2009). Enthusing students about computer science. Proceedings of Informatics Education Europe IV, (pp. 73-80).*

*Dagienė, V., & Sentance, S. (2016). It's computational thinking! Bebras tasks in the curriculum. International Conference on Informatics in Secondary Schools (Netherlands), 9973, 28-39. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46747-4_3*

*De Santo, A., Farah, J., Martínez, M. L., Moro, A., Bergram, K., Purohit, A., Felber, P., Gillet, D., & Holzer, A. (2022). Promoting computational thinking skills in non-computer-science students: Gamifying computational notebooks to increase student engagement. IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies, 15(3), 392-405. https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2021.3062342*

*Denner, J., Campe, S., & Werner, L. (2019). Does computer game design and programming benefit children? A meta-synthesis of research. ACM Transactions on Computing Education, 19(3), 1–35. https://doi.org/10.1145/3277565*

*Denning, P. J. & Martell, H, C. (2015). Great principles of computing. MIT Press.*

*Doyan, A., Wardiawan, Z., Hakim, S., & Muliyadi, L. (2020). The development of a science module oriented generative learning to increase the cognitive learning outcomes and science process skills of the students. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1521(2), 022059.*

*Durak, H. Y. (2018). The effects of using different tools in programming teaching of secondary school students on engagement, computational thinking, and reflective thinking skills for problem-solving. Technology, Knowledge and Learning, 25, 179-195.*

*Ernita, N., Muin, A., Verawati, N. N. S. P., & Prayogi, S. (2021). The effect of inquiry learning model based on laboratory and achievement motivation toward students' physics learning outcomes. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1816(1), 012090.*

*Ezeamuzie, N. O., & Leung, J. S. (2021). Computational thinking through an empirical lens: A systematic review of literature. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 60, 481-511. https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331211033158*

*Gemici, T., & Lu, S. (2014). Do schools influence student engagement in the high school years? Longitudinal surveys of Australian youth research report 69, 1-48.*

*Hansen, N. K., & Hadjerrouit, S. (2022). Analyzing students' computational thinking and programming skills for mathematical problem solving. In D. Ifenthaler, D. G. Sampson, & P. Isaías (Eds.), Open and inclusive educational practice in the digital world: Cognition and exploratory learning in the digital age (pp. 155-173). Springer.*

*Heilporn, G., Lakhal, S., & Bélisle, M. (2021). An examination of teachers' strategies to foster student engagement in blended learning in higher education. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 18(1), 1-25.*

*Irgens, G. A., Dabholkar, S., Bain, C., Woods, P., Hall, K., Swanson, H., Horn, M., & Wilensky, U. (2020). Modeling and measuring high school students computational thinking practices in science. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 29, 136–160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-020-09811-1*

*Indriyani, M.D., Sitompul, S.S., & Habellia, R.C. (2023). Flipped classroom meta-analysis of critical thinking skills and learning outcomes in high school physics learning. Scientific Journal of Physics Education.*

*Jonassen, D. H. (2011). Learning to solve problems: A handbook for designing problem-solving learning environments. Routledge*

*Karan, E., & Brown, L. (2022). Enhancing students problem-solving skills through project-based learning. Journal of Problem-Based Learning in Higher Education, 10(1), 74-87. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1361504*

*Lee, I.A., Martin, F.G., Denner, J., Coulter, B., Allan, W., Erickson, J., Malyn-Smith, J., & Werner, L.L. (2011). Computational thinking for youth in practice. Inroads, 2, 32-37.*

*Lestari, F. & Munahefi, D. (2023). Problem-solving skills viewed from students learning style in problem-based learning assisted by assemblr based javanese culture augmented reality. Indonesian Journal of Mathematics Education, 6(1), 23-34.*

*Li, Q., Jiang, Q., Liang, J. C., Xiong, W., Liang, Y., & Zhao, W. (2023). Effects of interactive unplugged programming activities on computational thinking skills and student engagement in elementary education. Education Information Technology, 28, 12293–12318. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11634-7*

*Wing, J. M. (2006). Computational thinking. Communications of the ACM, 49(3), 33-35. https://doi.org/10.1145/1118178.1118215*