IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 3, October 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

The Pedagogy of Space: Linking Constructivism and Design Thinking in Learning Environments

Dr. S. B. Yadav[1] and Ms. Madhurima Chaudhury[2]
Professor, Head of Research Centre, C. K.T College, New Panvel (W), Raigad, Maharashtra, India[1]
Research Scholar, C.K.T College, New Panvel (W), Raigad, Maharashtra, India[2]

Abstract: *The spatial design of learning environments has emerged as a critical factor in shaping educational outcomes. This paper explores how constructivist pedagogy and design thinking principles can be synergised through spatial design to enhance collaboration, innovation, and active learning. First, theoretical foundations of constructivism and design thinking are reviewed. Then, features of learning spaces that support these pedagogies are examined. Drawing on empirical studies and design case examples, design guidelines are offered. Finally, implications for practitioners, limitations, and future research directions are discussed. The synthesis demonstrates that learning spaces designed with deliberate attention to physical layout, affordances for collaboration, zones for experimentation, and consultation spaces can foster deeper learning. To achieve this, educators and institutional designers must collaborate via consultation and iterative design. This alignment of spatial pedagogy with constructivism and design thinking enhances student agency, motivation, and creativity, thereby preparing learners for the complex challenges of the 21st century.*

Keywords*:* Learning spaces; Constructivism; Design thinking; Active learning; Spatial pedagogy

I. INTRODUCTION

Education in the 21st century demands more than content delivery. Learners must grapple with complexity, engage in problem-solving, collaborate with others, and be creative in unknown contexts. Traditional classroom configurations—with rows of desks, teacher-centered lecturing, and fixed schedules—are increasingly seen as limiting. In contrast, pedagogical approaches rooted in constructivism and design thinking emphasise discovery, iteration, collaboration, and empowerment. But these approaches do not occur in a vacuum: the space in which learning happens plays a vital role in enabling or constraining these pedagogies.

This paper seeks to explore how physical and virtual learning spaces can be designed in alignment with constructivist learning theory and the process of design thinking. Specifically, this paper addresses the following questions:

1. What are the theoretical foundations of constructivism and design thinking as they relate to learning environments?
2. What spatial features support learning environments that embody both constructivist and design-thinking pedagogies?
3. How have empirical studies and case examples applied such space designs, and with what results?
4. What design guidelines can be derived for practice, and what are limitations and directions for future research?

By answering these questions, the aim is to provide educators, designers, and institutions with a framework to reimagine learning spaces—not simply as containers for pedagogy, but as active enablers or "silent facilitators" of student-centred, creative, collaborative learning.

Theoretical Foundations

Constructivism

Constructivism refers to theories of learning that posit learners actively build their own knowledge rather than passively receiving information (Allen, 2022; SimplyPsychology, 2025). Rooted in the work of Piaget, Vygotsky, Dewey, Bruner and others, constructivist theory emphasises that:

- learning is an active, not passive, process;

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 3, October 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

- prior knowledge and experience shape new learning;
- social interaction and collaboration are central;
- authentic, contextualised tasks improve meaning and transferability;
- reflection and metacognition are important.

Constructivist learning environments are often contrasted with traditional "instructivist" settings. Essential features of constructivist classrooms include flexible seating, heterogeneous grouping, opportunities for students to reflect, voice in what and how they learn, scaffolded support from teachers, and tasks that are authentic and meaningful.

Design Thinking

Design thinking is a human-centred, iterative process of problem identification, ideation, prototyping, testing, and refinement. It has its origins in design professions but has been applied broadly in education to foster creativity, innovation, empathy, and problem-solving. The process encourages embracing ambiguity, failing fast, iterating, and learning from feedback.

While design thinking is not always explicitly grounded in constructivism, there are many points of convergence: both emphasize learning by doing, creation of artifacts, collaboration, reflection, and iteration. Integrating design thinking into learning pedagogy means not just asking students to solve defined problems but to explore, propose, prototype, test, re-design, and share.

Intersection: Constructivism & Design Thinking

The linkage between constructivism and design thinking lies in their mutual orientation toward active learning, social interaction, authenticity, and reflection. In a constructivist framework, students are creators of knowledge; design thinking offers tools and structures to enable that creation in a systematic, iterative manner.

Recent literature has explored their synergy. For example, Do et al. (2023) studied a constructivist learning environment augmented via design science, finding that such environments enhanced student motivation (both intrinsic and extrinsic) and learning strategy (elaboration, critical thinking, metacognitive self-regulation). Another work, Design Thinking with Constructivist Learning, explains how integrating design thinking principles into constructivist settings improves students' capabilities to deal with "wicked problems"—problems without clear definitions and with many interacting constraints.

Spatial Features that Support Constructivist and Design Thinking Learning Environments

To enable pedagogy that is consistent with constructivism and design thinking, the spatial design must afford certain functions. Below are key spatial features, along with how they map to pedagogical needs.

Spatial Feature Pedagogical Need / Function

Flexible spaces (movable furniture, modular partitions) Allow reconfiguration for different modes: individual, small group, whole class; support ideation, prototyping, discussion.

Zones for ideation and prototyping-Areas with materials/tools (makerspace, lab, whiteboards, shared technology) where students can build, test, iterate.

Collaboration zones-Spaces designed for group work: break-out rooms, shared tables, cluster seating; supports peer interaction, social construction of knowledge.

Quiet/reflection-spaces-Spaces for reflection, metacognitive thinking, individual processing; also needed for switching cognitive modes.

Consultation or mentoring spaces, Spaces where teacher/facilitator can engage with small groups or individuals outside or adjacent to collaborative zones; increases personalization, guidance.

Transparent / open designs-Visual connection, view into other groups; encourages sharing of ideas; promotes a culture of openness and cross-pollination.

Access to resources & materials Physical tools, digital tools, prototypes; easy access reduces friction in design thinking.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 3, October 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Technology-enabled spaces-Interactive screens, collaborative software, virtual reality / simulation tools; especially important when hybrid or remote contexts are included.
Authentic/contextual features Use of real-world contexts, natural light, outdoor access, environmental cues; helps make learning meaningful.

Empirical and Case Evidence

Study: Constructivist Learning Environment & Design Science (Do et al., 2023)
Do et al. (2023) investigated outcomes of implementing a learning environment based on constructivism and design science in a project management course. After a three-month intervention involving workshops, real projects, and active modes, students reported increased motivation (intrinsic & extrinsic) and improved learning strategies (critical thinking, elaboration, metacognitive regulation). Their work underscores that merely being aware of pedagogy is insufficient; actual design of space/environment to facilitate these modes matters.
Study: Design Thinking Embedded in Constructivist Environments (Tsai, 2023)
Tsai's (2023) work showed that embedding design thinking in a constructivist learning environment enhances students' capabilities in handling complex "wicked problems" — tasks with ambiguous or conflicting requirements. Students in such settings performed better in ideation, solution iteration, testing, and were more resilient to ambiguity.
Practice Example: Lego Serious Play & Management Education
Gkogkidis & Dacre (2021) used Lego Serious Play in a business school module focusing on responsible management education. Their framework combined constructivist learning theories with creative, physical artifacts to help students explore, express, reflect, and collaborate. The learning environment (both the physical artifacts and the group interactions) enabled ideation, prototyping (metaphorical), feedback and understanding of complex social, ethical, and organizational problems.

Guidelines for Spatial Pedagogical Design

Based on both theory and empirical findings, the following guidelines can help educators, architects, and institutions design or redesign learning spaces that manifest the pedagogy of space.
1. Engage stakeholders via consultation and co-design
Involve students, faculty, staff, and possibly designers/architects in the design process. This ensures that spaces respond to actual needs, preserve flexibility, and foster ownership.
2. Ensure flexibility and modularity
Furniture, partitions, technology should be movable. Spaces should adapt to different teaching modes: discussion, lecture, group work, prototyping.
3. Provide zones with distinct affordances
Ideation/prototyping labs
Collaboration clusters
Quiet / reflection areas
Mentoring / consultation nooks
4. Incorporate authentic, real-world tools and materials
Make available prototyping tools, maker labs, digital fabrication, and appropriate technologies. Also, allow students to bring and use diverse materials during projects.
5. Integrate technology thoughtfully
Use interactive surfaces, collaboration software, virtual/augmented reality where relevant. Blend physical and virtual spaces—hybrid spaces can extend reach and provide richer modalities.
6. Design for visibility and inspiration
Open sightlines, display student work, enable transparency between groups. Visual artifacts of learning (prototypes, posters) can act as inspiration, provoke questions, and reinforce culture of creation.
7. Foster reflection and feedback loops

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 3, October 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Provide spaces for students to pause and reflect—journals, reflective corners, or formal debriefing zones. Encourage iterative cycles: prototype → test → iterate.

8. Provide adequate support for facilitators/mentors

Teachers/facilitators need space and time for consultation, moving among groups, observing, giving feedback. Spatial design should allow ease of movement and visibility.

Implications, Limitations, and Future Research

Implications for Practice

Educational institutions should consider infrastructure investment not merely as furnishing, but as pedagogical transformation. Space design becomes part of curriculum design.

Faculty development: Teachers need training to use space effectively—how to facilitate in design thinking modes, scaffold students, manage group dynamics in flexible spaces.

Policy and budgeting: Administrators must recognize that building new or retrofitting existing spaces has costs (moving furniture, installing technology), but these are investments in learning outcomes and innovation culture.

Limitations

Many studies to date, including those referenced, are context-specific (e.g., certain universities or courses), so generalizability is limited.

The cost and logistics of redesigning space are sometimes prohibitive, especially in older institutions or under resource constraints.

Measuring the impact of spatial design on learning outcomes is challenging: many mediating variables (teacher competence, student motivation, course design) intervene.

Hybrid or remote learners may not benefit equally from physical space redesign, so virtual spaces need equal attention.

Future Research Directions

Longitudinal studies that track learners over time to see whether spatial designs lead to sustained improvement in innovation, collaboration, critical thinking.

Comparative studies across cultures, disciplines (science, arts, commerce) to see how design thinking + constructivism in space works differently.

Research into virtual / augmented reality spaces: how do they mirror or diverge from physical space affordances?

Studies on cost-effectiveness: which spatial features yield highest return in terms of learner outcomes?

Investigations into inclusive design: ensuring that spaces work for learners with diverse needs (physical, sensory, cognitive).

II. CONCLUSION

Learning spaces are more than neutral containers; they are powerful pedagogical agents. When space is designed with intention—rooted in constructivism and enlivened by design thinking—learning becomes more democratic, active, creative, and contextually grounded. The pedagogy of space thereby links how we teach and how learning happens through physical and virtual affordances. Through stakeholder consultation, flexible design, affordances for collaboration and innovation, and reflective practices, institutions can transform classrooms, labs, maker spaces, and even online-physical hybrids into ecosystems of learning. Such transformation holds promise not only for improved academic outcomes but deeper preparation of learners to navigate complexity, change, and uncertainty in their personal, professional, and civic lives.

REFERENCES

[1]. Allen, A. (2022). An introduction to constructivism: Its theoretical roots and impact on contemporary education. Journal of Learning Design and Leadership, 1(1), 1-11.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 3, October 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

[2]. Do, H. N., et al. (2023). How do constructivism learning environments generate intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and improve learning strategies: A design science approach. PMC. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10730747/

[3]. Gkogkidis, V., & Dacre, N. (2021). Exploratory learning environments for responsible management education using Lego Serious Play. arXiv.

[4]. SimplyPsychology. (2025). Constructivism teaching philosophy. Retrieved from https://www.simplypsychology.org/constructivism.html

[5]. Tam, M. (2000). Designing learning with constructivism: Key techniques. Distance Learning Institute.

[6]. Tsai, C. A. (2023). Design thinking embedded in a constructivist learning environment enhances students' wicked problem-solving capabilities. ScienceDirect.