

4. When two hands are not enough: spontaneous cooperation between children when constructing automata¹



Introduction

This case study focuses on the analysis of spontaneous cooperation between children who participated in four **AutoSTEM** project workshops. Since one of the transversal competences that were intended to be developed with the activities of the project consists of cooperation, although cooperative learning strategies have not been introduced, we tried to observe how spontaneous cooperation forms emerge and how they can be suggested by the dynamics of the proposed activities, the habitus (habits), culture and classroom arrangement, guidance of the educators and the children's age.

¹ This case study is part of the article:

Bidarra, G., Santos, A., Vaz-Rebelo, P., Thiel, O., Barreira, C., Alferes, V., Almeida, J., Machado, I., Bartoletti, C, Ferrini, F., Hanssen, S., Lundheim, R., Moe, J., Josephson, J., Velkova, V., Kostova, N. (2020). Spontaneous cooperation between children in automata construction workshops. In Pixel (Ed.). *Conference Proceedings. 10th International Conference The Future of Education Virtual Edition* (pp. 525-528). Filodiritto Publisher. ISBN 978-88-85813-87-8 ISSN 2384-9509. DOI: 10.26352/E618_2384-9509

Cooperation is a form of interaction between two or more individuals. What distinguishes cooperation from other forms of interaction is the fact that it takes place according to an objective common to these two or more individuals. In this way, cooperation emerges as a way to achieve a goal that individually could not be achieved (Warneken & Tomasello, 2007). Indeed, cooperative learning is now advocated as a form of high-impact instruction (Knight, 2013), which refers to various strategies used in the classroom, designed to create active learning and involvement among students. These strategies are based on principles and procedures, which are different from ordinary group work, constituting an alternative to competitive and individualistic structures, contributing to better cognitive learning and the development of social skills. Assuming different structures and syntaxes, which individualize them, they have different designations as jigsaw, cooperative scripting, learning together, and group investigation, among others.

Hargreaves (1994), a defender of these strategies, considers that these should be included in the repertoire of teachers, however they should be used with flexibility and discretion, recognizing that their introduction in schools and classrooms constitutes a safe simulation of the forms of collaboration more spontaneous that are possible among students, which have been somehow eradicated by the school and teachers, through discipline control and assessment practices. These forms of spontaneous cooperation are of great value and unpredictability since the locus of control of cooperation is in the student.

One of the components of cooperative learning consists of positive interdependence, which assumes several modalities, namely, the interdependence of purposes, when group members work towards a common purpose, of the task, when “two hands are not enough”, of resources, (scissors, paper, glue,

etc.), and the environment/space where the group works, which can become a unifying element (Johnson & Jonhson,1999). Therefore, the objective of this case study is to describe spontaneous forms of cooperation among children who participated in the automata construction workshops, without having been instructed in this type of learning.

Context, approach, and implementation

In this case study four workshops are included. The general pedagogical method followed in all the workshops involved the presentation of automata and children being challenged to plan and construct their own automata. Workshop 1 and 2 had a very similar structure, each had 22 2nd grade students from a elementary School, the children were between 7 and 8 years old. Each workshop's sessions lasted two hours. In both sessions a friction drive mechanism was used, with different narrative parts. Workshop 3 took place in a classroom with 24, 1st grade children ages 6 and 7 years old. This workshop was about linkages and the lever automata. Each child built two automata. The workshop lasted three hours.

Workshop 4 had two sessions, for a total of three hours. There were 21 children in the first session and 19 children in the second one. These children were between 9 and 10 years old. In this workshop different automata were presented including ones with a friction drive mechanism, with a lever and linkages.

However, there were some differences between the workshops, in three of them, a poem about the earth was read; one of the workshops took place in a library, while the others where in a classroom. The classroom arrangements changed according to the workshop, with children seated in pairs, at round tables or in a presentation format. In addition, in the classroom workshops the teachers scaffolded the process by offering instructions,

while in the library workshop there was a minimum of instruction. The class teacher was not present at the library workshop. In all the workshops, from the instructions about how to construct the mechanism to the final product, several processes took place where spontaneous cooperation between the children emerged.

Data was gathered through participant observation, registering field notes, photos and videos. At the end of the workshop, children answered a short questionnaire about motivational issues and perception of learning. At the end, a report was completed for each of these sessions, which accounted for all the data collected and analysed.



Challenges

Being that cooperation was one of the transversal skills that the project intended to develop; the principal challenge was to recognize the forms of cooperation that emerged among children during the activity, although no instructions have been given in this regard. During the different workshops, spontaneously various forms of cooperation appeared among children, so it was a challenge to understand what could have led to this situation and which factors have enhanced and allowed this cooperation.

Results

Content analysis of different types of data identified four categories of spontaneous cooperation: Modality, Dimensions, Influencing factors and Outcomes,

Modality of spontaneous cooperation points to different ways of organizing this cooperation:

-  One: where there is a decision to construct a unique automaton for the whole group;
-  Two: where each child constructs its own automata but developed strategies of cooperation.

One: where children spontaneously decided to cooperate and build a group automaton, there is a type of cooperation with a common goal and task that could be considered a modality more similar to formal cooperative learning with convergent involvement between pairs (Figures 1, 2 & 3).



Figures 1, 2 & 3. Children cooperating to develop an automaton for the whole group.

Two: When each children develops their own prototype while cooperating in an informal way with colleagues. In this case, there were no properly shared goals or tasks, so the cooperation that emerged can be considered as a divergent or not convergent cooperation (Figures 4, 5 & 6).



Figures 4, 5 & 6. Children cooperating while developing their own prototype.

Another category identified was Dimensions of spontaneous cooperation, that includes dimensions that appear in both the modalities identified or only in one of them

Some dimensions, transversal to both working modalities, can be: informal distribution of tasks, sharing materials, mutual observation of the work and the assistance in the construction. These can then be considered the core dimensions of spontaneous cooperation. There are then transversal indicators that appear in the workshops analysed that can be considered core dimensions of spontaneous cooperation (Figures 7, 8 & 9).



Figures 7, 8 & 9. Core dimensions of spontaneous cooperation: observing and learning from each other and sharing materials.

Working on the same project involves interdependence of purposes, coordinating actions, shared tasks and all ideas of the participants are considered and included in the automaton. Specially the interdependence of purposes and coordinated actions are characteristics of cooperative learning. This group of dimensions characterize convergent spontaneous cooperation.

Working on separate projects includes the indicators: imitating and being inspired by the colleague's work, and the selfless willingness to help a colleague (Figure 10). These indicators can be considered as dimensions of divergent spontaneous cooperation.




Figure 10. Selfless willingness to help a colleague.

Influencing factors were related to workshops characteristics as: children's age, guidance, teacher's class presence, seating arrangement. In fact, 6-7 years old cooperated while developing their own project and 9 years old decided to work on the same project. When a teacher or educator guided the workshop, children cooperated while developing their own project, but

when they had more autonomy, the class teacher was not present and the children were seated at round tables, the children decided to work on the same project. The, seating arrangement, in pairs or presentation, was associated with children cooperating while developed their own project.

The Automata produced were analysed as outcomes and had the following types: similar to the one presented, automata 'in pairs', predominance of an idea.

These types of automata are associated with the workshops above. In fact, in all the workshops analysed some of the automata were very similar to the ones presented. However, there were also instances where children sat next to each other produced similar automate, this was interpreted as a typical class working routine (Figures 11, 12 & 13).



Figures 11, 12. & 13. Examples of automata that are similar to the ones produced by the colleague seated at the same table.

In one of the workshops, the children produced automata very similar to each others, although each children worked on their own construction (Figure 14).



Figure 14. Similar automatas built in one session.

When children decided to work on the same project, the automata produced included differences from the automata initially presented. This was interpreted as evidence of creativity.

To the question 'What did you learn in this workshop?', There is evidence that most of the children learnt how to construct a simple mechanism, how to make a moving toy and also about the topic of the narrative initially presented. Children also referred to other competances including how to cooperate or to solve problems.

Several emotions were also registered. In general, children expressed joy and satisfaction with the work that they developed, some said they felt proud of their work. These emotions could be observed both when a child developed their own automata (Figure 15) or when they developed a 'shared automata' (Figures 16 & 17).



Figure 15. Children were influenced by each other while developing their own automata







Figures 16 & 17 Happiness and pride when developing unique automata.






Evaluation

In summary, data analysis indicated that despite the characteristics of cooperative work not being formally established, spontaneous cooperation between the children emerged. This spontaneous cooperation can take different forms

including deciding to work on the same automata or to develop their own automata while cooperating in an informal way with colleagues. In this case, cooperation can be seen in:

-  Observing each other work,
-  Sharing materials,
-  Helping with the construction,
-  Imitating and being inspired by a colleague's work.

Spontaneous cooperation also varied according to:

-  The children's age,
-  The dynamics of the workshop, e.g. the seating arrangement,
-  The context where it took place,
-  The presence of class teacher,
-  The guidance of the educators.

The automata mechanism used did not seem to be associated with the characteristics of the cooperation.

References

Anderson, B. (2018) Young Children playing together: A choice of engagement, *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 26:1, 142-155, DOI: 10.1080/1350293X.2018.1412053

AutoSTEM Erasmus+ project (2019). Website. **AutoSTEM** Erasmus+ project nr. 2018-1-PT01-KA201-047499. retrieved 2 August 2020 from <https://www.autostem.info/resources/>

Bidarra, G., Santos, A., Vaz-Rebelo, P., Thiel, O., Barreira, C., Alferes, V., Almeida, J., Machado, I., Bartoletti, C, Ferrini, F., Hanssen, S., Lundheim, R., Moe, J., Josephson, J., Velkova, V., Kostova, N. (2020). Spontaneous cooperation between children in automata construction workshops. In Pixel (Ed.). *Conference Proceedings. 10th International Conference The Future of*



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Education Virtual Edition (pp. 525-528). Filodiritto Publisher. ISBN 978-88-85813-87-8 ISSN 2384-9509. DOI: 10.26352/E618_2384-9509

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers changing times*. London: Cassell PLC

Johnson, D.W. & Jonhson, R. T. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning* (5th ed). Boston, MS: Allyin and Bacon.

Knight, J. (2013). *High impact Instruction: A framework for great teaching*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Stipek, D., Feiler, R., Daniels, D. & Milburn, S. (1995). Effects of different instructional approaches on young children's achievement and motivation. *Child Development*, 66(1), 209-223. DOI:10.2307/1131201.

Thiel, O., Josephson, J. & Vaz-Rebelo, P. (2020). *AutoSTEM step-by-step teacher guide*.

Warneken, F., & Tomasello, M. (2007). Helping and cooperation at 14 months of age. *Infancy*, 11(3), 271-294.