

# Unpacking Approaches to Learning and Teaching Machine Learning in K-12 Education: Transparency, Ethics, and Design Activities

Luis Morales-Navarro

Yasmin B. Kafai

luismn@upenn.edu

kafai@upenn.edu

University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

## ABSTRACT

In this conceptual paper, we review existing literature on artificial intelligence/machine learning (AI/ML) education to identify three approaches to how learning and teaching ML could be conceptualized. One of them, a data-driven approach, emphasizes providing young people with opportunities to create data sets, train, and test models. A second approach, learning algorithm-driven, prioritizes learning about how the learning algorithms or engines behind how ML models work. In addition, we identify efforts within a third approach that integrates the previous two. In our review, we focus on how the approaches: (1) glassbox and blackbox different aspects of ML, (2) build on learner interests and provide opportunities for designing applications, (3) integrate ethics and justice. In the discussion, we address the challenges and opportunities of current approaches and suggest future directions for the design of learning activities.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Social and professional topics** → **K-12 education**; *Computing literacy*.

## KEYWORDS

machine learning, computing education, artificial intelligence, k-12, algorithmic justice, ethics

### ACM Reference Format:

Luis Morales-Navarro and Yasmin B. Kafai. 2023. Unpacking Approaches to Learning and Teaching Machine Learning in K-12 Education: Transparency, Ethics, and Design Activities. In *Proceedings of The 18th WiPSCE Conference on Primary and Secondary Computing Education Research (WiPSCE '24)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

While researchers have been investigating how to introduce young people to Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning (AI/ML) ideas

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

WiPSCE '24, September 16 – 18, 2023, Munich, Germany

© 2023 Association for Computing Machinery.


ACM ISBN XXX-X-XXXX-XXXX-X/XX/XX...\$XX.XX

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

for decades [23, 37], it is only during the last few years that AI/ML education has gained momentum [38]. This momentum is a product of the comeback of machine learning methods, this time powered by increasing computing capacity and increasingly large datasets [85], the establishment of guidelines and principles [85], and the design of tools that enable novices to create models with small data sets [10, 16]. Today, in light of the popularization of large language models and generative models, young people interact with ML every day; governments call for increasing AI/ML education [13, 90], curriculum providers update their offerings [12], and teachers scramble to integrate AI/ML content in their classes.

While principles, guidelines, and considerations serve as guiding frameworks for the design and implementation of learning activities, in practice, these may not always be enacted. Designing ML learning activities requires making decisions about what to glassbox and blackbox, that is deciding on the concepts and practices to prioritize and how to scaffold learners to engage with such a complex topic. Amidst the flurry of activities it is unclear what learning and teaching ML actually looks like, which approaches are taken for different age groups, how learners engage and how critical and ethical issues about ML are being addressed. To address these issues, in this paper, we take a bottom up approach to study the ways in which ML is being introduced to novices. Like Grover [24], we focus on efforts that foster learning about ML in K-12 and not using ML applications for learning.

In this conceptual paper, we review the literature on ML education and identify three approaches for learning and teaching ML. A data-driven approach emphasizes facilitating opportunities for youth to produce and curate data sets, as well as to train and evaluate models. A second approach, learning algorithm-driven, places emphasis on fostering learners' understanding of the inner workings of commonly used learning algorithms. These two are not mutually exclusive, a third approach integrates them. We evaluate these approaches with the following research questions: How are current efforts in ML education in K-12 glassboxing and blackboxing ML content? How are ethics and justice issues integrated into different approaches to ML education? How do different approaches to ML education provide opportunities for designing applications? In the discussion, we address the challenges and opportunities of current approaches and suggest future directions for the design of learning activities.



**Figure 1: Diagram of the 5 big ideas in AI education proposed by Touretzky et al. [85] and (in green box) details about what ML learning activities should promote [86].**

## 2 BACKGROUND

### 2.1 ML Education in K-12

In their conceptualization of the five big ideas for AI education (see Figure 1), Touretzky et al. [85] highlight the importance of machine learning. Machine learning enables algorithmic systems to learn behaviors without explicit programming [82]. This functionality is achieved by a learning algorithm modifying the internal representations of a reasoning model (e.g., decision tree or neural network), allowing it to learn new behaviors. To effectively narrow the algorithm’s choices, the reasoning model requires a large amount of training data. Once the machine learning algorithm has created the reasoner, it can be used to solve problems and make decisions on new data [86]. As such, machine learning provides numerous opportunities for K-12 students to experiment with training data, learning algorithms, and the design of applications.

More recently, Touretzky and colleagues [86] emphasize that K-12 learners should have opportunities to learn to (1) define machine learning, (2) understand how machine learning algorithms work, (3) understand the role of training data in shaping model behaviors, and (4) differentiate between learning and application phases of development. To do so, they highlight the importance of designing learning activities that support students in building models, experimenting, and creating applications. For example, this may involve having learners train models, learn new concepts from labeled data, construct decision trees with labeled data, simulate how a neural network learns by adjusting its weights, explore historical datasets, and train models based on real-world datasets. Designing learning activities requires making important decisions on what aspects of ML to engage students with, how to scaffold learning about complex concepts and processes, and what tools to use in the classroom. As well as considering how to integrate ethical and critical considerations while learning technical and functional aspects of ML and how to make learning ML relevant to students interests and everyday lives.

Furthermore, as Tedre and colleagues [82] argue, the integration of machine learning into computing education poses challenges to computational thinking practices that have been adopted in the past decade. This is a product of the opacity of ML algorithms, the data driven and data intensive nature of ML. Similarly, Shapiro

and Tissenbaum highlight that in contrast to traditional paradigms in computing education, ML is much more empirical, involving learners in conducting experiments, formulating hypotheses, and evaluating models based on predictions [79]. As such, designing learning activities requires making important decisions on how to address the opacity of ML systems, how to engage students in training and evaluating models, and finding accessible entry points.

In reviewing the literature it becomes clear that students should have a conceptual understanding of ML systems in terms of how both data learning algorithms shape model behaviors. Furthermore, students should understand the potential harmful biases and societal implications of ML systems, as well as how to design and deploy them ethically. Finally, students should be able to apply ML to real-world problems in order to prepare for future careers that may involve working with ML technologies and leveraging them to address real-world challenges.

### 2.2 Blackboxing and Glassboxing

In the learning sciences, the question of what to make visible in learning computing has been widely discussed in relation to blackboxing and glassboxing [32, 72]. These concerns have been discussed since the early days of symbolic AI education [23, 66]. Goldstein and Papert [23], for instance, argued for a glassbox approach to enable learners to “look inside the box, to ask how it works.” In the case of contemporary ML education, this is particularly relevant because of the opacity and blackboxed nature of models and data discussed above [8, 29].

Hmelo and Guzdial [32] highlighted that when dealing with complexity in learning-by-doing tasks, blackbox and glassbox scaffoldings support students in different ways. Blackbox scaffoldings support learners to perform and complete tasks; without them, learners would otherwise be unable to complete a task. For instance, in ML education blackboxing can be productive to enable K-12 learners to train and test models without requiring them to have advanced math knowledge and programming experience. Glassbox scaffoldings, on the other hand, provide support that “allow the learner to look inside,” making processes explicit. In this sense, the scaffoldings are not permanent but are meant to fade. They discuss that the choice between blackbox and glassbox scaffoldings is a design decision that depends on the goals of learning activities. Furthermore, Resnick, Berg, and Eisenberg [72], discuss the importance of moving beyond blackboxes to bring back transparency to how computing technologies operate. Their discussion centers on how most computing tools used in education are blackboxed with “their inner workings often hidden and thus poorly understood by their users” and the importance of designing tools that make visible their inner workings and support learners to create personally relevant projects.

**2.2.1 Designing Applications.** As Resnick and colleagues [72] argue, tools that glassbox the inner workings of computing can support learners in designing applications that would otherwise be inaccessible. Designing applications in computing education has a long history that goes back to studies on LOGO [26, 35]. This approach of having K-12 students create projects that relate to their interests, instead of completing pre-determined problem sets, has gained traction over the past decade [64, 97]. In ML education, for

instance, learning activities may blackbox and glassbox different aspects of the ML pipeline to support students to move beyond just training models in isolation to create models to be used in fully developed applications.

**2.2.2 Algorithmic Justice and Ethics.** More recently, Dixon, Hsi and Oh [15] revisited the ideas of providing black and glassbox scaffolds to propose that transparency should not be solely focused on technical disciplinary knowledge and practices; instead, it should also consider the histories, externalities, and possible futures of computing technologies. Here it is important for youth to engage with ideas of algorithmic justice. Algorithmic justice considers that ML systems have implications on individuals and communities that could perpetuate harm in unjust ways, disproportionately impacting vulnerable populations [7]. As such, making ML blackboxes transparent for learners involves providing scaffolds to think through how functional and critical issues are intertwined, consider the possible ways in which ML applications could be used, and take into account their ethical, social, and environmental implications.

### 3 METHODS

In this section we provide the reader with details about how we selected and analyzed existing studies to conceptualize the data-driven and learning algorithm-driven approaches. Since the goal of this paper is to conceptualize different ways in which ML education is enacted through learning and teaching we decided to conduct a narrative critical review of the literature [27]. Our analysis was guided by the following research questions: How are current efforts in ML education in K-12 glassboxing and blackboxing ML content? How are ethics and justice issues integrated into different approaches to ML education? How do different approaches to ML education build on learner interests and provide opportunities for designing applications?

We began our literature review by searching for papers on ML education in the K-12 context in proceedings and journals associated with or sponsored by ACM's Special Interest Group in Computer Science Education<sup>1</sup>, ACM's Special Interest Group in Computer-Human Interaction<sup>2</sup>, AAAI<sup>3</sup>, the International Society of the Learning Sciences<sup>4</sup>, Computers & Education journals<sup>5</sup>, IEEE education<sup>6</sup>, and other education, human-computer interaction, and AI/ML journals and conferences.<sup>7</sup> We also included papers mentioned in

<sup>1</sup>Australasian Computing Education, ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research, ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education, Koli Calling International Conference on Computing Education Research, ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education, Workshop in Primary and Secondary Computing Education, ACM Transactions of Computing Education

<sup>2</sup>Cognition & Creativity, CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Computer Supported Collaborative Work, Designing Interactive Systems, Interaction Design and Children, Conference on tangible, embedded, and embodied interaction, ACM symposium on User interface software and technology

<sup>3</sup>AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence

<sup>4</sup>Information and Learning Sciences, Journal of Learning Sciences, International Conference of the Learning Sciences, ISLS Rapid Reports

<sup>5</sup>Computer & Education, Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence, Computers & Education: Open

<sup>6</sup>IEEE Access, IEEE International Conference of Educational Innovation Through Technology, IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference, IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies, IEEE Integrated STEM Education Conference

<sup>7</sup>British Journal of Education Technology, AI Matters, International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction, Interactive Learning Environments, IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing, KI-Künstliche Intelligenz

other reviews of the literature [19, 50, 57, 69, 73, 77]. Initially, we identified 206 studies that were relevant to our study by reading their titles and abstracts. Following, we read through the full text of these 206 papers to determine their inclusion and identified 72 different studies that explicitly described ML learning activities or curricula for K-12 students to learn about ML models. We excluded studies that focused on supporting students to learn how to use ML applications (e.g., studies on the use of large language models in programming assignments), studies that focused solely on the discussion of ethical issues related to ML without providing opportunities for learners to engage with functional aspects of ML, and studies on teachers that did not explicitly describe the curriculum teachers implemented with students.

We then analyzed the papers in five steps. First we read the papers and kept track of how the interventions and learning activities described in the studies introduced ML, what the learning activities looked like and what and how concepts and ideas (including both technical and critical/ethics) were included. Second, we reviewed our notes and through iterative discussion grouped studies together depending on whether they prioritized data or learning algorithms. Third, we systematically coded all 72 studies using binary codes to apply the same criteria to all papers [27] by indicating if they approached ML from a data-driven perspective, a learning algorithm perspective, if the activities described in the studies involved students in creating applications, personally relevant projects, discussions about justice and ethics and evaluating ML models. We also noted if the studies introduced new tools and curricula. Fourth, we further analyzed papers that approached ML from both data and learning algorithm perspectives and grouped them into three categories: mix and match, data driven with algorithm sprinkles, and algorithmic-driven with data sprinkles. Finally we wrote memos describing what studies in each approach black and glassboxed, the curricula and tools presented, and how these involved students in making applications, addressing issues of justice and ethics. The literature review was carried out by the first author, who sought the second author's input and expertise during weekly meetings.

### 4 FINDINGS

Overall we identified 72 papers that deal with learning and teaching about ML in K-12 education. Based on our analysis we identified three distinct approaches to ML education in K-12 that, through the design of learning activities, blackbox and glassbox different aspects of ML (see Table 1). The most common approach, the data-driven approach, focuses on having students create datasets to train and test models (see Figure 2) but blackboxes the learning algorithms. The second approach engages students with learning algorithms and blackboxes the datawork involved in the ML pipeline. A third integrative approach involves a combination of data-driven and learning algorithm driven learning activities.


#### 4.1 Data-driven approach

The most common approach to AI/ML education in K-12 is data-driven, having students build datasets to train models. This approach glassboxes how data shapes model performance and blackboxes the role of learning algorithms in the ML pipeline. We reviewed 40 different studies that take a data-centric approach. Most

**Table 1: Approaches to learning and teaching ML**

| Approaches  | Studies  | Age groups*   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Data-driven:</b> glassboxes how data shapes model performance and blackboxes the role of learning algorithms in the ML pipeline.   | Agassi et al. [1], Arastoopour Irgens et al. [5], Bilstrup et al. [6], Castro et al. [11], Dietz et al. [14], Druga & Ko [18], Druga et al. [17], Dwivedi et al., [20], Henry et al. [28], Hitron et al. [29, 30], Hjorth [31], Jiang et al. [33], Jordan et al.[34], Kaspersen et al. [39], Katuka et al. [41, 42], Krakowski et al. [43], Lee et al. [46], Lin et al. [47], Martin et al. [58] Morales-Navarro et al.[60], Ng et al.[61], Park et al. [65], Rodríguez-García et al. [74], Sabuncuoglu [75], Song et al. [80], Toivonen et al. [83, 84], Tseng et al. [87–89], Vartiainen et al. [93–95], Williams et al. [100, 101], Zhu & Van Brummelen [103], Zimmermann-Niefeld et al. [104, 105] | Early childhood - K:<br>2 studies<br>Primary school:<br>21 studies<br>Middle school/early secondary:<br>17 studies<br>High school/late secondary:<br>10 studies |
| <b>Learning algorithm-driven:</b> glassboxes how learning algorithms work and blackboxes the datawork involved in the ML pipeline   | Akram et al. [2], Alvarez et al. [4], Ma et al. [54], Norouzi et al. [63], Priya et al.[67], Quiroz et al. [68], Sperling & Lickerman [81]   | Middle school/early secondary:<br>2 studies<br>High school/late secondary:<br>5 studies   |
| <b>Integrative</b>  |  |   |
| <b>Mix and Match:</b> integrates both approaches by having different learning activities that focus on either approach  | Broll et al. [8], Fernández-Martínez et al. [21], Lee et al., [44, 45], Long et al. [48, 49, 51–53], Mahipal et al. [55], Mariescu-Istodor & Jormanainen [56], Reddy et al. [71], Van Brummelen et al., [91, 92], Voulgari et al.[96]  | Primary school:<br>4 studies<br>Middle school/early secondary:<br>11 studies<br>High school/late secondary:<br>7 studies  |
| <b>Data-driven with learning algorithm sprinkles:</b> involves data-driven activities while also explaining the learning algorithms used in models through lectures, discussions and videos | Ali et al., [3], Buxton et al. [9], Guerreiro-Santalla et al. [25] Kaspersen et al. [40], Ng et al. [62], Shamir & Levin [78] Williams et al., [99]  | Primary school:<br>1 study<br>Middle school/early secondary:<br>4 studies<br>High school/late secondary:<br>4 studies   |
| <b>Learning algorithm-driven with data sprinkles:</b> focuses on learning algorithms and includes discussions about how data influences model behavior                                      | Reddy et al. [70], Wan et al.[98], Zhou et al. [102]   | Middle school/early secondary:<br>1 study<br>High school/late secondary:<br>2 studies   |

\*Some studies involved students in more than one age group.



**Figure 2: Distribution of studies by approach**

studies within the past five years have focused on having young people create and label datasets for classification tasks (e.g., [5, 17, 31, 34, 61]. This commonly has young people engage with what Fiebrink [22] calls the Interactive Machine Learning approach which involves iteratively ideating a system and its desired behavior, implementing it, observing its behavior, and comparing the observed behavior with the desired behaviors. Here users create small data sets that can be easily and quickly refined and edited to retrain

models and improve their performance [105]. However, Hitron et al. [29] show that to build basic conceptual understanding of machine learning through a data-driven approach, solely labeling data or just evaluating models is not enough. In a study with children they found that engaging with the full pipeline of creating a dataset, training and testing a model can lead to significant improvements in conceptual understanding when compared with just labeling data or evaluating outcomes. More recently, researchers have articulated data design practices for novices building ML models based on expert practices [87]. These include 1) incorporating dataset diversity, 2) evaluating model performance and its relationship to data, 3) balancing datasets, and 4) inspecting for data quality. The data-driven approach promotes what Vartiainen and colleagues [95] call “data-driven reasoning and design” which involves thinking about decisions made in the design of datasets to explain the behavior of machine learning systems. As such in this approach model behaviors are ascribed to the design of datasets.

This approach has been used in diverse contexts: in and out of school, with very young children [93, 101] and adolescents (e.g., [75, 87]), in computing classes and workshops [5] and in other disciplines such as social studies [31] or chemistry [58]. For example Lin and colleagues [47] involved young children in designing a conversational agent by providing data related to specific animals.

Sabuncouglu and colleagues [75], on the other hand, designed and implemented a year-long curriculum to introduce adolescents to machine learning, in which they designed data sets for rock, paper, scissors classifiers, and a personal project to address environmental issues. One study goes beyond classification tasks by having children provide data (melodies) for a generative music model [101]. Other studies build on unplugged computing activities, using a card game for young people to reflect on the context of data, data inputs and data ethics [6].

In the following subsections we describe how studies in the data-driven approach engage learners in making models in the context of designing applications, propose different tools and curricula, involve learners in testing, and address algorithmic justice issues.

**4.1.1 Tools & Curricula.** Studies that approach ML education from a data-driven perspective introduced new tools to support learners in building models and presented curricular interventions.

Twenty six studies introduced new tools that enable learners to build and create models. These go from extensions of Scratch to support face, body, and hand recognition and the possibility of including Teachable Machine models [34, 74] to novel tools for using natural language processing in social studies classrooms [31, 33], to gesture classification tools. One tool involves a physical tangible artifact that can be used by children to create datasets using drawings, train models and test them [39]. Hjorth [31] presented Text Tagging, an application for learners to use NLP techniques on social media posts in their social studies classes. Gesture classification tools include Gest [30], PlushPal [89] and AlpacaML [105] which all support learners in building and testing ML models that use accelerometer sensor data. Despite their similarities, each of these tools supports different kinds of engagement with gesture classification from engaging young children in telling stories about their plushies [89] to teenagers in creating sports related projects [105]. More advanced tools, such as StoryQ [33], also support learners to visualize and explore patterns in data. Unplugged tools included a card game about data for ML models with cards that determine the context of data, data inputs, and prompts about how data is collected and its ethics [6].

Nineteen studies presented curricular activities to engage students with data-driven ML topics in distinct ways. Ng et al. [61] for example present a curriculum on storytelling and ML and Hjorth [31] introduce ML activities for social studies. Other curricula take a problem-based approach to have youth address socio-technical problems using ML [43]. Some efforts include curricular activities for at-home learning with families [17, 88]. Other scaffolds for learners included activity cards, sample projects and worksheets [34]. While some efforts are short after school activities [5] others involve year long curricula [74].

**4.1.2 Making models in the context of designing applications.** Of the 40 studies we reviewed, 19 studies had students train models in the context of building applications and 24 centered on building models in isolation. Building applications in this context involves creating datasets and training models and using those models in applications usually designed by learners themselves. As such, learners have to engage both with machine learning as well as traditional computing education practices and concepts (see [82] for a discussion of the difference between traditional computing and ML education).

Sixteen of these studies involved students in model building in the context of creating personally relevant projects. Poseblocks [34] for example, involved students in creating AR filters related to their personal interests. Several studies have k-12 students build models to use in personally relevant Scratch projects [34, 61, 104]. Examples here include children making a project to help their siblings learn their ABCs [34]. However, as Zimmermann-Niefield and colleagues [104] note sometimes the projects and models can be incoherent with, in the case of their study, gestures being classified that had little relationship to narratives and characters of Scratch projects.

Other studies involved learners in building data sets, training and testing models and brainstorming applications in which these could be used [17, 83, 93, 95]. Here learners created paper prototypes of applications that could use their models. In a few of these studies the prototypes were then developed by software engineers to have learners test them [94, 95]. While this is not scalable and applicable in most k-12 classrooms, it provided a rich opportunity for students to see how the models they trained could be used in real applications.

**4.1.3 Testing.** Most studies focus on having learners prepare training datasets for models with little attention paid to creating testing datasets and testing. Indeed, most testing efforts presented in current research involve live-testing, that is using a trained model to classify new inputs in real time [18, 83, 95]. Studies show that live-testing can be beneficial for youth to take perspective on their models, build hypotheses, and iteratively improve model performance [18, 60, 95]; yet testing activities seem to work better when scaffolded by the learning activities [104]. Engaging with testing data sets is only present in a few studies. In Popbots [101], for example, young children experimented with different training datasets to see their impact on accuracy in classifying a testing set. In studies by Tseng et al. [87, 88] youth created testing data sets and determined the accuracy of their models by class or label. Other studies mention evaluation more broadly. Krakowski et al. [43], for instance, frame evaluation as involving the following: determining if ML is appropriate for the task at hand, reviewing and questioning the data used to train a model, considering the affordances and limitations of the design of ML systems, and taking into account the foreseeable impact of ML decisions.

**4.1.4 Algorithmic justice and ethics.** Few studies that take on a data-driven approach (only 12 out of 40) addressed issues of algorithmic justice. At the same time, while the studies acknowledged the importance of learning about ethics and reducing algorithmic harms, these topics were often presented as something that should be learned separate from skills and concepts. Here, ethics are discussed in relation to commercial applications instead of being applied to learner-designed applications. For example, some studies use ethical matrices for children to redesign YouTube [75] or foster discussions of ethics while redesigning voice assistants [17]. A common activity several studies involves watching videos of Joy Buolamwini [5, 34]).

Some approaches to issues of justice may be problematic. One study, for example, showed that some children's concerns may align with long termist sci-fi-inspired ideas [61]. This shows that it is important to scaffold conversations about justice and ethics to ensure learners can have informed discussions. Another issue that

may be problematic is the idea of unbiased ML systems, which a teacher in one study voiced [61]. Some studies foster AI4SocialGood ideas (e.g., [5, 43], here it is important to avoid falling into the trap of technosolutionism and to ask if ML is necessary to address the problems at hand.

Some promising studies integrate discussion of justice into the design of applications. Here, Jordan et al. [34] had children create ethical matrices for their teachable machine classifiers, and Bilstrup et al. [6] prompted youth to discuss the ethics of their projects with a card game that poses questions such as: “Are users aware that data is collected about them?” and “Is the use of ML visible in your system?” Lin and colleagues [47] had young children discuss issues of misinformation in relation to a learner-trained conversational agent.

## 4.2 Learning algorithm-driven approach

A different approach centers on glassboxing how learning algorithms work and blackboxing the datawork involved in the ML pipeline. We only identified seven different studies that take a learning algorithm-driven approach. In these studies, learners were introduced to neural networks, nearest neighbor, k closest neighbors, NLP methods, and search algorithms, among others, using off-the-shelf datasets (e.g., datasets from Kaggle). These studies were all conducted with secondary school students in [81] and out of school [63].

While some studies involved students learning about ML in computing settings such as CS classes and summer camps [4, 63, 81], others integrated ML into science curriculum [2]. For students in computing contexts ML learning activities required some pre-existing knowledge of programming. As such, camps included python bootcamps [63] or introductory python activities [4] and classroom interventions involving students with more than 2 years of traditional computing education and knowledge of python [81]. On the other hand, more introductory activities in non-computing contexts used block programming environments or no programming at all. Akram et al. [2], for instance, presented curricular modules that integrate ML using a block programming environment into early secondary school (grades 6-8) science. Each module involves a science topic, a core ML algorithm, and an algorithmic justice topic. For example one module involves using the bread-first search algorithm, uniform cost search and adversarial search for contact tracing in the context of Covid19 while discussing issues of privacy. Other algorithms include knowledge-based systems, clustering with K-means, decision trees, NLP methods (feature extraction, information retrieval, feature selection, classification). Priya and colleagues [67], on the other hand, created a game that provides a conceptual overview of supervised learning, gradient descent, and K-Nearest Neighbor classification without opportunities to build and experiment with models.

**4.2.1 Tools & Curricula.** Studies involved curricular activities of different length from 90 minutes [2] to 450 hours [81]. Akram and colleagues' [2] ML modules for science classrooms are short by design so that they can be integrated when learning about epidemics, natural disasters, and gravity. Norouzi et al. [63] presented a four week curriculum that included one week of coding exercises with python, one week on NLP techniques, and one week for working

on projects and guest lectures and field trips. Sperling's [81] 450 hour course introduced theoretical ideas of algorithms, machine learning, ML algorithms and provided opportunities for students to create full-fledged final projects. Two of the studies we reviewed introduced novel extensions to the Snap programming environment that enable students to use and explore ML algorithms [2, 4].

**4.2.2 Making models in the context of designing applications.** Studies in the algorithm-driven approach involved students in using different ML algorithms and techniques to analyze data and sometimes create applications. Because most studies use off-the-shelf datasets, many of the projects and applications that students worked on were predetermined by curricular designers and researchers [2, 63]. These involved having students detect breast cancer or malaria [63], or build covid contact tracing and disaster risk prevention applications [2]. Alvarez et al., on the contrary, provided students with open-ended activities in which they could use NLP to analyze any data of their choice from Genius Lyrics, Twitter, and the New York Times APIs. In Sperling [81] as part of a 450 hours curriculum students created their own application of their choice using an ML algorithm, built a user interface, and examined the performance of their project.

**4.2.3 Testing.** Only one of the studies reviewed reported involving students in testing models. In Norouzi et al. [63] on the last day of a workshop, students tested their projects with their classmates with an emphasis on accuracy and identifying ways to increase the accuracy of the models.

**4.2.4 Algorithmic justice and ethics.** Three studies addressed issues of algorithmic justice through discussions and conversation and not in relation to the projects that students created. Alvarez and colleagues [4] had students discuss how ML is used in the criminal justice system. In Akram et al. [2] at the end of each module, students had an ethics in AI discussion; the topics covered included privacy, bias, fairness, and automation. Norouzi et al. [63] included a guest lecture on AI ethics in which they discussed how ML systems can replicate biases present in training data.

## 4.3 Integrative approach

Finally, we identified three different ways in which data and algorithmic driven approaches were integrated. Some studies involved students in learning about how data and learning algorithms together shape model behaviors. Other studies focused on having students complete data-driven activities (such as creating data sets to train and then test models) and provided some explanation or discussion of the learning algorithms used (in the form of lectures and videos). A third group of studies centered on learning algorithms while including discussions and activities about how data influences model behaviors.

**4.3.1 Mix & match .** We identified 15 different studies that integrated both approaches often involving having different hands-on learning activities that focus on either approach. Long and Magerko [48, 49], for example, involved youth in learning about ML with unplugged activities in museum settings. They integrated both approaches by creating distinct exhibit experiences focused on ML competencies. For example, some exhibits centered on explaining

how neural networks work and their ways of representing knowledge while others prioritized engaging youth with data and how data shapes system behaviors.

In formal school settings, Lee and colleagues [45] present an ML methods in data science curriculum in which high school students first engage with a unit focused on data, exploring datasets, considering ethical issues of data production, and analyzing data, build datasets for image classification and later participate in activities designed to learn about perceptrons, neural networks, back propagation, transfer learning, and K nearest networks. Of note data design issues are also integrated in the activities related to learning algorithms as the curriculum focuses on the whole ML pipeline. In a different curriculum Lee and colleagues [46] offer a comprehensive 30 hour introduction to ML for middle schoolers that involves both data-driven units and algorithm-driven units. From creating data sets to train classifiers to exploring the structure of neural networks to an introduction to general adversarial networks. Here every unit also includes an ethics component.

Researchers have also designed tools to support sensemaking of how data and learning algorithms work together in classification tasks. Mahipal et al. [55] present a curriculum for middle schoolers that integrates both data and algorithmic driven approaches. In this curriculum students use DoodleIt, a tool that supports students to explore and visualize how data is processed by a neural network. This tool, while classifying drawings in real time, visualizes the application of the kernels of a convolutional neural network to the data by creating feature maps.

**4.3.2 Data-driven with algorithm sprinkles.** Eight studies involved students in data-driven activities (such as creating data sets to train and then test models) while also explaining the learning algorithms used in such models through lectures and videos. In *How To Train Your Robot* [99], for example, hands-on learning activities involve creating classifiers for images and text which are accompanied by explanations of the k-nearest neighbor algorithm and how it is used. Shamir and Levin [78] had students train and test classifiers and later design a logic gate to simulate a (single) artificial neuron. Kaspersen et al. [40] introduced *VotestratesML*, a tool that supports students in processing and creating datasets to train models in the context of social studies classes. This data-driven tool enables learners to choose if they want to train their models using k-nearest neighbors or feedforward neural networks, as well as the parameters used in each algorithm (the value of k, the number of training iterations). As such, students can compare the performance of models trained with both algorithms.

**4.3.3 Algorithm-driven with data sprinkles.** Three studies focused on learning algorithms and included discussions and activities about how data influences model behavior. Here for instance, Wan et al. [98] and Zhou et al. [102] had students interact with *SmileyCluster*, a tool that supports students to make sense of the k-means clustering algorithm. Here, while students interacted with data, the goal of the activities was to support learners in understanding the k-means clustering method. In another study, Reddy et al. [70] engaged students with a curriculum that emphasized word embeddings, the k-nearest neighbors algorithm and classification bias. Here students built datasets for the programming activity of their final project, but datasets were not the focus of the intervention.

## 5 DISCUSSION

Through our review of the literature we identified and conceptualized three approaches to learning and teaching ML in K-12. Here we discuss the implications of what we observed in each approach. First, we observed that the majority of efforts in ML education have focused on data driven approaches with much less attention given to the role that learning algorithms play in ML model performance. The data driven approach glassboxes the role of training data in shaping model behaviors, current efforts within this approach include learning activities for K-12 students of all ages. On the other hand, all studies in the learning algorithm-driven approach, which glassboxes how machine learning algorithms work, centered on secondary school students with previous experience with programming and more advanced knowledge of mathematics. This disparity highlights the need to develop learning activities and curricula that make learning algorithms accessible to younger students.

Second, as Touretzky and colleagues [86] argue it is important for students to have opportunities to understand ML systems from both data and learning algorithm perspectives, from our analysis we see great potential for further developing the integrative approach beyond mix and matching activities and adding sprinkles here and there. As we saw in our analysis, when learning activities include sprinkles of data or learning algorithm issues, engagement is often limited to discussion and lectures. Mixing and matching by alternating short activities that address how both data and learning algorithms shape model behavior is a good starting point, but we must strive to create activities where students can design datasets and explore how the learning algorithms used to train models shape performance. Here we see the need for better tools that can support both creating training and testing datasets, modifying model parameters and visualizing how learning algorithms work. At the same time, we recognize integrative approaches may be better suited for longer interventions (such as [45]) throughout the school year and not one off workshops.

Third, we know that, in computing education, creating applications, particularly personally relevant applications, can provide a context that motivates students to learn computing [64, 97]. Yet many efforts in ML education prioritize learning about and creating models in isolation without incorporating them into applications. Almost half of the studies in the data driven approach involve having students build applications, providing opportunities for learning both ML and traditional computing education practices and concepts. In the algorithm-driven approach, while some efforts supported students to use learning algorithms with data sets of their own interest, others involved using datasets selected by researchers and instructors, limiting the opportunities to create personally relevant applications.

Fourth, we were not surprised to see that the majority of ML education efforts we reviewed did not include any algorithmic justice or ethics content, as this is also the case in undergraduate education [76]. Oftentimes, when ethics or issues of justice were mentioned in learning activities these were disconnected from the technical and functional aspects of ML, for example simply showing the trailer of a documentary or having a discussion about the ethics of self-driving cars in a workshop where nothing else had to do with self-driving cars. We argue that issues of justice and ethics

should be addressed in conjunction with technical issues and in the context of the models that students are working with. Here we see great potential for furthering efforts that involve students in evaluating each others' models and then analyzing any potential harmful biases [59].

Finally, the popularization of large language models and generative models at-large challenges us to think about what to glass-box and blackbox in ways that are appropriate for k-12 students. Williams [101], has experimented with generative models in music, taking a data-driven approach. It is particularly important to develop tools that can help students visualize and explore the training data used by generative models and to visualize how their learning algorithms work so that we can design learning activities that enable youth to explore, modify and create with generative models.

## 6 CONCLUSION

Our goal in this conceptual paper is not pit approaches against one another. The approaches, in fact, offer partial but complimentary ways for introducing novices to ML. Glassboxing data, learning algorithms or both provides valuable ways to engage learners in creating ML-powered applications. In conceptualizing these approaches we are reminded that learning and teaching ML must involve attending to functional (the how models work), personal (the how learners can create applications that relate to their interests) and critical (the how learners engage with algorithmic justice) aspects of computing literacies [36]. Regardless of whether we take a data-driven, learning algorithm-driven, or integrative approach we must strive to support these three aspects. We hope that our conceptualization of three emerging approaches contributes to advance our common understanding of ML education in K-12.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Adam Agassi, Hadas Erel, Iddo Yehoshua Wald, and Oren Zuckerman. 2019. Scratch Nodes ML: A Playful System for Children to Create Gesture Recognition Classifiers. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Glasgow Scotland Uk, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290607.3312894>
- [2] Bitá Akram, Spencer Yoder, Cansu Tatar, Sankalp Boorugu, Ifeoluwa Aderemi, and Shiyang Jiang. 2022. Towards an AI-Infused Interdisciplinary Curriculum for Middle-Grade Classrooms. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 36, 11 (June 2022), 12681–12688. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v36i11.21544>
- [3] Safinah Ali, Daniella DiPaola, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2021. What are GANs?: Introducing Generative Adversarial Networks to Middle School Students. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 35, 17 (May 2021), 15472–15479. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i17.17821>
- [4] Lauren Alvarez, Isabella Gransbury, Veronica Catet, Tiffany Barnes, Ákos Ledécz, and Shuchi Grover. 2022. A Socially Relevant Focused AI Curriculum Designed for Female High School Students. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 36, 11 (June 2022), 12698–12705. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v36i11.21546>
- [5] Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens, Hazel Vega, Ibrahim Adisa, and Cinamon Bailey. 2022. Characterizing children's conceptual knowledge and computational practices in a critical machine learning educational program. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction* 34 (Dec. 2022), 100541. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2022.100541>
- [6] Karl-Emil Kjær Bilstrup, Magnus H. Kaspersen, and Marianne Graves Petersen. 2020. Staging Reflections on Ethical Dilemmas in Machine Learning: A Card-Based Design Workshop for High School Students. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference*. ACM, Eindhoven Netherlands, 1211–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3357236.3395558>
- [7] Abeba Birhane. 2021. Algorithmic injustice: a relational ethics approach. *Patterns* 2, 2 (2021).
- [8] Brian Broll, Shuchi Grover, and Derek Babb. 2022. Beyond Black-Boxing: Building Intuitions of Complex Machine Learning Ideas Through Interactives and Levels of Abstraction. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research - Volume 2*. ACM, Lugano and Virtual Event Switzerland, 21–23. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3501709.3544273>
- [9] Elham Buxton, Elahe Javadi, and Matthew Hagaman. 2024. Foundations of Autonomous Vehicles: A Curriculum Model for Developing Competencies in Artificial Intelligence and the Internet of Things for Grades 7–10. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 23276–23284.
- [10] Michelle Carney, Barron Webster, Irene Alvarado, Kyle Phillips, Noura Howell, Jordan Griffith, Jonas Jongejan, Amit Pitaru, and Alexander Chen. 2020. Teachable Machine: Approachable Web-Based Tool for Exploring Machine Learning Classification. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Honolulu HI USA, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3334480.3382839>
- [11] Francisco Enrique Vicente Castro, Kayla DesPortes, William Payne, Yoav Bergner, and Kathleen McDermott. 2022. AI + Dance: Co-Designing Culturally Sustaining Curricular Resources for AI and Ethics Education Through Artistic Computing. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research - Volume 2*. ACM, Lugano and Virtual Event Switzerland, 26–27. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3501709.3544275>
- [12] Code.org. 2023. Coming soon: AI-specific curriculum and teacher training, plus AI-enhanced learning platform. (2023).
- [13] European Commission. 2020. Digital Education Action Plan (2021-2027). (2020).
- [14] Griffin Dietz, Jennifer King Chen, Jazbo Beason, Matthew Tarrow, Adriana Hilliard, and R. Benjamin Shapiro. 2022. ARtonomous: Introducing Middle School Students to Reinforcement Learning Through Virtual Robotics. In *Interaction Design and Children*. ACM, Braga Portugal, 430–441. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3501712.3529736>
- [15] Colin Dixon, Sherry Hsi, and HyunJoo Oh. 2022. From Unblackboxing to Deblackboxing: Questions about what to make visible in computational making.. In *ACM CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing-CHI 22 Workshop: CHI'22 Workshop: Reimagining Systems for Learning Hands-on Creative and Maker Skills*.
- [16] Stefania Druga. 2018. *Growing up with AI: Cognimates: from coding to teaching machines*. Master's thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- [17] Stefania Druga, Fee Lia Christoph, and Amy J Ko. 2022. Family as a Third Space for AI Literacies: How do children and parents learn about AI together?. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, New Orleans LA USA, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3502031>
- [18] Stefania Druga and Amy J Ko. 2021. How do children's perceptions of machine intelligence change when training and coding smart programs?. In *Interaction Design and Children*. ACM, Athens Greece, 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3459990.3460712>
- [19] Stefania Druga, Nancy Otero, and Amy J. Ko. 2022. The Landscape of Teaching Resources for AI Education. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education Vol. 1*. ACM, Dublin Ireland, 96–102. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3502718.3524782>
- [20] Utkarsh Dwivedi, Jaina Gandhi, Raj Parikh, Merijke Coenraad, Elizabeth Bon-signore, and Hernisa Kacorri. 2021. Exploring Machine Teaching with Children. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC)*. IEEE, St Louis, MO, USA, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VL/HCC51201.2021.9576171>
- [21] Carmen Fernández-Martínez, Isidoro Hernán-Losada, and Alberto Fernández. 2021. Early Introduction of AI in Spanish Middle Schools. A Motivational Study. *KI - Künstliche Intelligenz* 35, 2 (June 2021), 163–170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13218-021-00735-5>
- [22] Rebecca Fiebrink. 2019. Machine learning education for artists, musicians, and other creative practitioners. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE)* 19, 4 (2019), 1–32.
- [23] Ira Goldstein and Seymour Papert. 1977. Artificial intelligence, language, and the study of knowledge. *Cognitive science* 1, 1 (1977), 84–123.
- [24] Shuchi Grover. 2024. Teaching AI to K-12 Learners: Lessons, Issues, and Guidance. In *Proceedings of the 55th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1*. 422–428.
- [25] Sara Guerreiro-Santalla, Alma Mallo, Tamara Baamonde, and Francisco Bellas. 2022. Smartphone-Based Game Development to Introduce K12 Students in Applied Artificial Intelligence. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 36, 11 (June 2022), 12758–12765. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v36i11.21554>
- [26] Idit Harel. 1991. *Children designers: Interdisciplinary constructions for learning and knowing mathematics in a computer-rich school*. Ablex Publishing.
- [27] Susanne Hempel. 2020. *Conducting your literature review*. American Psychological Association.
- [28] Julie Henry, Alyson Hernalesteen, and Anne-Sophie Collard. 2021. Teaching Artificial Intelligence to K-12 Through a Role-Playing Game Questioning the Intelligence Concept. *KI - Künstliche Intelligenz* 35, 2 (June 2021), 171–179. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13218-021-00733-7>
- [29] Tom Hitron, Yoav Orlev, Iddo Wald, Ariel Shamir, Hadas Erel, and Oren Zuckerman. 2019. Can Children Understand Machine Learning Concepts?: The Effect of Uncovering Black Boxes. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference*



- on *Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Glasgow Scotland Uk, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300645>
- [30] Tom Hitron, Iddo Wald, Hadas Erel, and Oren Zuckerman. 2018. Introducing children to machine learning concepts through hands-on experience. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Interaction Design and Children*. ACM, Trondheim Norway, 563–568. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3202185.3210776>
- [31] Arthur Hjorth. 2021. NaturalLanguageProcessing4All: - A Constructionist NLP tool for Scaffolding Students' Exploration of Text. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research*. ACM, Virtual Event USA, 347–354. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3446871.3469749>
- [32] Cindy E Hmelo and Mark Guzdial. 1996. Of black and glass boxes: Scaffolding for doing and learning. (1996).
- [33] Shiyang Jiang, Amato Nocera, Cansu Tatar, Michael Miller Yoder, Jie Chao, Kenia Wiedemann, William Finzer, and Carolyn P. Rosé. 2022. An empirical analysis of high school students' practices of modelling with unstructured data. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 53, 5 (Sept. 2022), 1114–1133. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13253>
- [34] Brian Jordan, Nisha Devasia, Jenna Hong, Randi Williams, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2021. PoseBlocks: A Toolkit for Creating (and Dancing) with AI. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 35, 17 (May 2021), 15551–15559. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i17.17831>
- [35] Yasmin B Kafai. 1995. *Minds in play: Computer game design as a context for children's learning*. Routledge.
- [36] Yasmin B Kafai and Chris Proctor. 2022. A reevaluation of computational thinking in K–12 education: Moving toward computational literacies. *Educational Researcher* 51, 2 (2022), 146–151.
- [37] Kenneth Kahn. 1977. Three interactions between AI and education. *Machine intelligence* 8 (1977), 422–429.
- [38] Ken Kahn and Niall Winters. 2021. Constructionism and AI: A history and possible futures. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 52, 3 (May 2021), 1130–1142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13088>
- [39] Magnus Høholt Kaspersen, Karl-Emil Kjær Bilstrup, and Marianne Graves Petersen. 2021. The Machine Learning Machine: A Tangible User Interface for Teaching Machine Learning. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference on Tangible, Embedded, and Embodied Interaction*. ACM, Salzburg Austria, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3430524.3440638>
- [40] Magnus Høholt Kaspersen, Karl-Emil Kjær Bilstrup, Maarten Van Mechelen, Arthur Hjort, Niels Olof Bouvin, and Marianne Graves Petersen. 2022. High school students exploring machine learning and its societal implications: Opportunities and challenges. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction* 34 (Dec. 2022), 100539. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2022.100539>
- [41] Gloria Ashiya Katuka, Yvonika Auguste, Yukyeong Song, Xiaoyi Tian, Amit Kumar, Mehmet Celepkolu, Kristy Elizabeth Boyer, Joanne Barrett, Maya Israel, and Tom McKlin. 2023. A Summer Camp Experience to Engage Middle School Learners in AI through Conversational App Development. In *Proceedings of the 54th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1*. 813–819.
- [42] Gloria Ashiya Katuka, Srijita Chakraborty, Hyejeong Lee, Sunny Dhama, Toni Earle-Randell, Mehmet Celepkolu, Kristy Elizabeth Boyer, Krista Glazewski, Cindy Hmelo-Silver, and Tom Mcklin. 2024. Integrating Natural Language Processing in Middle School Science Classrooms: An Experience Report. In *Proceedings of the 55th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1*. 639–645.
- [43] Ari Krakowski, Eric Greenwald, Timothy Hurt, Brandie Nonnecke, and Matthew Cannady. 2022. Authentic Integration of Ethics and AI through Sociotechnical, Problem-Based Learning. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 36, 11 (June 2022), 12774–12782. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v36i11.21556>
- [44] Irene Lee, Safinah Ali, Helen Zhang, Daniella DiPaola, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2021. Developing Middle School Students' AI Literacy. In *Proceedings of the 52nd ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*. ACM, Virtual Event USA, 191–197. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3408877.3432513>
- [45] Irene Lee and Beatriz Perret. 2022. Preparing High School Teachers to Integrate AI Methods into STEM Classrooms. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 36, 11 (June 2022), 12783–12791. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v36i11.21557>
- [46] Seung Lee, Bradford Mott, Anne Ottenbreit-Leftwich, Adam Scribner, Sandra Taylor, Kyungjin Park, Jonathan Rowe, Krista Glazewski, Cindy E. Hmelo-Silver, and James Lester. 2021. AI-Infused Collaborative Inquiry in Upper Elementary School: A Game-Based Learning Approach. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 35, 17 (May 2021), 15591–15599. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i17.17836>
- [47] Phoebe Lin, Jessica Van Brummelen, Galit Lukin, Randi Williams, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2020. Zhorai: Designing a Conversational Agent for Children to Explore Machine Learning Concepts. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 34, 09 (April 2020), 13381–13388. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v34i09.7061>
- [48] Duri Long, Takeria Blunt, and Brian Magerko. 2021. Co-Designing AI Literacy Exhibits for Informal Learning Spaces. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 5, CSCW2 (Oct. 2021), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3476034>
- [49] Duri Long, Mikhail Jacob, and Brian Magerko. 2019. Designing Co-Creative AI for Public Spaces. In *Proceedings of the 2019 on Creativity and Cognition*. ACM, San Diego CA USA, 271–284. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3325480.3325504>
- [50] Duri Long and Brian Magerko. 2020. What is AI Literacy? Competencies and Design Considerations. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Honolulu HI USA, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727>
- [51] Duri Long, Aadarsh Padiyath, Anthony Teachey, and Brian Magerko. 2021. The Role of Collaboration, Creativity, and Embodiment in AI Learning Experiences. In *Creativity and Cognition*. ACM, Virtual Event Italy, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3450741.3465264>
- [52] Duri Long, Sophie Rollins, Jasmin Ali-Diaz, Katherine Hancock, Samnang Nuonsinoeun, Jessica Roberts, and Brian Magerko. 2023. Fostering AI Literacy with Embodiment & Creativity: From Activity Boxes to Museum Exhibits. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM Interaction Design and Children Conference*. 727–731.
- [53] Duri Long, Anthony Teachey, and Brian Magerko. 2022. Family Learning Talk in AI Literacy Learning Activities. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, New Orleans LA USA, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3502091>
- [54] Ruizhe Ma, Ismaila Temitayo Sanusi, Vaishali Mahipal, Joseph E Gonzales, and Fred G Martin. 2023. Developing machine learning algorithm literacy with novel plugged and unplugged approaches. In *Proceedings of the 54th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1*. 298–304.
- [55] Vaishali Mahipal, Srija Ghosh, Ismaila Temitayo Sanusi, Ruizhe Ma, Joseph E. Gonzales, and Fred G. Martin. 2023. DoodleIt: A Novel Tool and Approach for Teaching How CNNs Perform Image Recognition. In *Australasian Computing Education Conference*. ACM, Melbourne VIC Australia, 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3576123.3576127>
- [56] Radu Marinescu-Istodor and Ilkka Jormanainen. 2019. Machine Learning for High School Students. In *Proceedings of the 19th Koli Calling International Conference on Computing Education Research*. ACM, Koli Finland, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3364510.3364520>
- [57] Livia S Marques, Christiane Gresse von Wangenheim, and Jean CR Hauck. 2020. Teaching machine learning in school: A systematic mapping of the state of the art. *Informatics in Education* 19, 2 (2020), 283–321.
- [58] Fred Martin, Vaishali Mahipal, Garima Jain, Srija Ghosh, and Ismaila Temitayo Sanusi. 2024. ChemAlstry: A Novel Software Tool for Teaching Model Training in K-8 Education. In *Proceedings of the 55th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1*. 792–798.
- [59] Luis Morales-Navarro, Yasmin B Kafai, Vedyha Konda, and Danae Metaxa. 2024. Youth as Peer Auditors: Engaging Teenagers with Algorithm Auditing of Machine Learning Applications. *Interaction Design and Children* (2024).
- [60] Luis Morales-Navarro, Meghan Shah, and Yasmin B Kafai. 2024. Not Just Training, Also Testing: High School Youths' Perspective-Taking through Peer Testing Machine Learning-Powered Applications. In *Proceedings of the 55th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1*. 881–887.
- [61] Davy Tsz Kit Ng, Wanying Luo, Helen Man Yi Chan, and Samuel Kai Wah Chu. 2022. Using digital story writing as a pedagogy to develop AI literacy among primary students. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* 3 (2022), 100054. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100054>
- [62] Tsz Kit Ng and Kai Wa Chu. 2021. Motivating Students to Learn AI Through Social Networking Sites: A Case Study in Hong Kong. *Online Learning* 25, 1 (March 2021). <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v25i1.2454>
- [63] Narges Norouzi, Snigdha Chaturvedi, and Matthew Rutledge. 2020. Lessons Learned from Teaching Machine Learning and Natural Language Processing to High School Students. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 34, 09 (April 2020), 13397–13403. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v34i09.7063>
- [64] Alannah Oleson, Brett Wortzman, and Amy J Ko. 2020. On the role of design in K-12 computing education. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE)* 21, 1 (2020), 1–34.
- [65] Kyungjin Park, Bradford Mott, Seung Lee, Krista Glazewski, J. Adam Scribner, Anne Ottenbreit-Leftwich, Cindy E. Hmelo-Silver, and James Lester. 2021. Designing a Visual Interface for Elementary Students to Formulate AI Planning Tasks. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC)*. IEEE, St Louis, MO, USA, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VL/HCC51201.2021.9576163>
- [66] Howard A Peelle. 1974. Computer Glass Boxes: Teaching Children Concepts with "A Programming Language (APL)". *Educational Technology* 14, 4 (1974), 9–16.
- [67] Shruti Priya, Shubhankar Bhadra, Sridhar Chimalakonda, and Akhila Sri Manasa Venigalla. 2022. *ML-Quest*: a game for introducing machine learning concepts to K-12 students. *Interactive Learning Environments* (June 2022), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2084115>
- [68] Patricio Quiroz and Francisco J Gutierrez. 2024. Scratch-NB: A Scratch Extension for Introducing K-12 Learners to Supervised Machine Learning. In *Proceedings*

- of the 55th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1. 1077–1083.
- [69] Marcelo Fernando Rauber and Christiane Gresse von Wangenheim. 2022. Assessing the learning of machine learning in K-12: A ten-year systematic mapping. *Informatics in Education* 22, 2 (2022), 295–328.
- [70] Tejal Reddy, Randi Williams, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2021. Text Classification for AI Education. In *Proceedings of the 52nd ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*. ACM, Virtual Event USA, 1381–1381. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3408877.3439689>
- [71] Tejal Reddy, Randi Williams, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2022. LevelUp – Automatic Assessment of Block-Based Machine Learning Projects for AI Education. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC)*. IEEE, Roma, Italy, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VL/HCC53370.2022.9833130>
- [72] Mitchel Resnick, Robbie Berg, and Michael Eisenberg. 1999. Beyond black boxes. *Journal of the Learning Sciences* (1999).
- [73] Saman Rizvi, Jane Waite, and Sue Sentence. 2023. Artificial Intelligence teaching and learning in K-12 from 2019 to 2022: A systematic literature review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* (2023), 100145.
- [74] Juan David Rodriguez-García, Jesús Moreno-León, Marcos Román-González, and Gregorio Robles. 2021. Evaluation of an Online Intervention to Teach Artificial Intelligence with LearningML to 10-16-Year-Old Students. In *Proceedings of the 52nd ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*. ACM, Virtual Event USA, 177–183. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3408877.3432393>
- [75] Alpay Sabuncuoğlu. 2020. Designing One Year Curriculum to Teach Artificial Intelligence for Middle School. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education*. ACM, Trondheim Norway, 96–102. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341525.3387364>
- [76] Jeffrey Saltz, Michael Skirpan, Casey Fiesler, Micha Gorelick, Tom Yeh, Robert Heckman, Neil Dewar, and Nathan Beard. 2019. Integrating ethics within machine learning courses. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE)* 19, 4 (2019), 1–26.
- [77] Ismaila Temitayo Sanusi, Solomon Sunday Oyelere, Henriikka Vartiainen, Jarkko Suhonen, and Markku Tukiainen. 2023. A systematic review of teaching and learning machine learning in K-12 education. *Education and Information Technologies* 28, 5 (2023), 5967–5997.
- [78] Gilad Shamir and Ilya Levin. 2022. Teaching machine learning in elementary school. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction* 31 (March 2022), 100415. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2021.100415>
- [79] R Benjamin Shapiro and Mike Tissenbaum. 2019. New programming paradigms. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Computing Education Research*. Cambridge University Press, 606–636.
- [80] Jiachen Song, Linan Zhang, Jinglei Yu, Yan Peng, Anyao Ma, and Yu Lu. 2022. Paving the Way for Novices: How to Teach AI for K-12 Education in China. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 36, 11 (June 2022), 12852–12857. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v36i11.21565>
- [81] Ahuva Sperling and Dorit Lickerman. 2012. Integrating AI and machine learning in software engineering course for high school students. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM annual conference on Innovation and technology in computer science education*. ACM, Haifa Israel, 244–249. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2325296.2325354>
- [82] Matti Tedre, Peter Denning, and Tapani Toivonen. 2021. CT 2.0. In *Proceedings of the 21st Koli Calling International Conference on Computing Education Research*. ACM, Joensuu Finland, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3488042.3488053>
- [83] Tapani Toivonen, Ilkka Jormanainen, Juho Kahila, Matti Tedre, Teemu Valtonen, and Henriikka Vartiainen. 2020. Co-Designing Machine Learning Apps in K-12 With Primary School Children. In *2020 IEEE 20th International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT)*. IEEE, Tartu, Estonia, 308–310. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICALT49669.2020.00099>
- [84] Tapani Toivonen, Ilkka Jormanainen, Matti Tedre, Radu Marinescu-Istodor, Teemu Valtonen, Henriikka Vartiainen, and Juho Kahila. 2022. Interacting By Drawing: Introducing Machine Learning Ideas to Children at a K-9 Science Fair. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts*. ACM, New Orleans LA USA, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3503574>
- [85] David Touretzky, Christina Gardner-McCune, Fred Martin, and Deborah Seehorn. 2019. Envisioning AI for K-12: What Should Every Child Know about AI? *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 33, 01 (July 2019), 9795–9799. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33019795>
- [86] David Touretzky, Christina Gardner-McCune, and Deborah Seehorn. 2023. Machine learning and the five big ideas in AI. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education* 33, 2 (2023), 233–266.
- [87] Tiffany Tseng, Matt J Davidson, Luis Morales-Navarro, Jennifer King Chen, Victoria Delaney, Mark Leibowitz, Jazbo Beason, and R Benjamin Shapiro. 2024. Co-ML: Collaborative Machine Learning Model Building for Developing Dataset Design Practices. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education* (2024).
- [88] Tiffany Tseng, Jennifer King Chen, Mona Abdelrahman, Mary Beth Kery, Fred Hohman, Adriana Hilliard, and R Benjamin Shapiro. 2023. Collaborative Machine Learning Model Building with Families Using Co-ML. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM Interaction Design and Children Conference*. 40–51.
- [89] Tiffany Tseng, Yumiko Murai, Natalie Freed, Deanna Gelosi, Tung D. Ta, and Yoshihiro Kawahara. 2021. PlushPal: Storytelling with Interactive Plush Toys and Machine Learning. In *Interaction Design and Children*. ACM, Athens Greece, 236–245. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3459990.3460694>
- [90] Office of Educational Technology U.S. Department of Education. 2023. Artificial intelligence and the future of teaching and learning: Insights and recommendations. (2023).
- [91] Jessica Van Brummelen, Tommy Heng, and Viktoriya Tabunshchik. 2021. Teaching Tech to Talk: K-12 Conversational Artificial Intelligence Literacy Curriculum and Development Tools. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 35, 17 (May 2021), 15655–15663. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i17.17844>
- [92] Jessica Van Brummelen, Viktoriya Tabunshchik, and Tommy Heng. 2021. “Alexa, Can I Program You?”: Student Perceptions of Conversational Artificial Intelligence Before and After Programming Alexa. In *Interaction Design and Children*. ACM, Athens Greece, 305–313. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3459990.3460730>
- [93] Henriikka Vartiainen, Matti Tedre, and Teemu Valtonen. 2020. Learning machine learning with very young children: Who is teaching whom? *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction* 25 (Sept. 2020), 100182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2020.100182>
- [94] Henriikka Vartiainen, Tapani Toivonen, Ilkka Jormanainen, Juho Kahila, Matti Tedre, and Teemu Valtonen. 2020. Machine learning for middle-schoolers: Children as designers of machine-learning apps. In *2020 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE)*. IEEE, Uppsala, Sweden, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE44824.2020.9273981>
- [95] Henriikka Vartiainen, Tapani Toivonen, Ilkka Jormanainen, Juho Kahila, Matti Tedre, and Teemu Valtonen. 2021. Machine learning for middle schoolers: Learning through data-driven design. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction* 29 (Sept. 2021), 100281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2021.100281>
- [96] Iro Voulgaris, Marvin Zammit, Elias Stouraitis, Antonios Liapis, and Georgios Yannakakis. 2021. Learn to Machine Learn: Designing a Game Based Approach for Teaching Machine Learning to Primary and Secondary Education Students. In *Interaction Design and Children*. ACM, Athens Greece, 593–598. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3459990.3465176>
- [97] Jane Waite and Sue Sentence. 2021. Teaching programming in schools: A review of approaches and strategies. *Raspberry Pi Foundation* (2021).
- [98] Xiaoyu Wan, Xiaofei Zhou, Zaiqiao Ye, Chase K. Mortensen, and Zhen Bai. 2020. SmileyCluster: supporting accessible machine learning in K-12 scientific discovery. In *Proceedings of the Interaction Design and Children Conference*. ACM, London United Kingdom, 23–35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3392063.3394440>
- [99] Randi Williams, Stephen P. Kaputso, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2021. Teacher Perspectives on How To Train Your Robot: A Middle School AI and Ethics Curriculum. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 35, 17 (May 2021), 15678–15686. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i17.17847>
- [100] Randi Williams, Hae Won Park, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2019. A is for Artificial Intelligence: The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Activities on Young Children’s Perceptions of Robots. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Glasgow Scotland Uk, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300677>
- [101] Randi Williams, Hae Won Park, Lauren Oh, and Cynthia Breazeal. 2019. PopBots: Designing an Artificial Intelligence Curriculum for Early Childhood Education. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 33, 01 (July 2019), 9729–9736. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33019729>
- [102] Xiaofei Zhou, Kaixin Li, Abdul Moid Munawar, and Zhen Bai. 2021. Scaffolding Design to Bridge the Gaps between Machine Learning and Scientific Discovery for K-12 STEM Education. In *Interaction Design and Children*. ACM, Athens Greece, 604–609. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3459990.3465194>
- [103] Jessica Zhu and Jessica Van Brummelen. 2021. Teaching Students About Conversational AI Using Convo, a Conversational Programming Agent. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC)*. IEEE, St Louis, MO, USA, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VL/HCC51201.2021.9576290>
- [104] Abigail Zimmermann-Niefield, Shawn Polson, Celeste Moreno, and R. Benjamin Shapiro. 2020. Youth making machine learning models for gesture-controlled interactive media. In *Proceedings of the Interaction Design and Children Conference*. ACM, London United Kingdom, 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3392063.3394438>
- [105] Abigail Zimmermann-Niefield, Makenna Turner, Bridget Murphy, Shaun K. Kane, and R. Benjamin Shapiro. 2019. Youth Learning Machine Learning through Building Models of Athletic Moves. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*. ACM, Boise ID USA, 121–132. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3311927.3323139>