Jyrki Reunamo
University of Helsinki
ECER 2006,Geneva

Children's adaptive and agentive knowledge

Transforming interpretation into knowledge is a delicate thing. Let us consider two children in the same situation, for example children try to draw a square but fail to finish it. One child adapts to the situation: 'ok I can't do it' or 'I quit'. Another child has agency in the situation: 'I will try again' or 'I'll get a better ruler'. The first child acquires knowledge from his/her experience: 'I can not draw a square'. The second child acquires different knowledge of the same situation: 'I'll draw a square'.

Transforming knowledge into action is also a delicate thing. A child, who knows that he/she fails to draw a square, adapts to that educational condition more easily. A child, who knows that he/she will complete the task eventually, has agency in the educational setting. The situation is the same for both children, but the first one adapts to the conditions and the second one tries to change the conditions of the situation. The first child has adaptive knowledge and the second child has agentive knowledge. As children's views transform into action, they have different consequences in the same situation. Children's knowledge transforms the educational environment differently for the two children. Thus different knowledge transforms the educational setting differently. Children with different knowledge encounter different educational situations and their knowledge differentiates further.

The main points of reference in the research are Piaget's epistemology and Fröbel's (Hegel's) idea of the conscience having a role in the evolution of things to come.

Methodology or methods/research instruments or sources used:
In the research the methods used were interviewing, systematic observation and teachers' evaluations. Fifteen educational situations were presented to children (n = 73) from three to seven years of age (for example 'you fail, what you do?', 'what to you do when somebody teases you?' or 'what do you do when teacher gets angry at you?'). The answers were categorized in two dichotomies (adaptive-agentive dichotomy and accommodative-assimilative dichotomy). The number of answers in each category was counted. Children's actions were observed during the day from eight to twelve hours with systematic observations. For example children's actions (play, work, wandering etc.), their nearest pal and adult's actions were observed. The evaluation of children's answers and observed actions were done separately to ensure the independence of the evaluations. Thus we can study in which way children's views (knowledge of the situation) affect their action and other children's and adults' actions. We can turn around the traditional way of researching education. The effect of children's age and gender were eliminated with partial correlations. Thus a view of children as the agents of change was acquired in contrast to the view of children changing (developing).

Conclusions or expected outcomes or findings:
Four types of children orientating in educational settings was extracted: The accommodative and adaptive child produces intimate, active and involved interaction, which is reflected in the actions of peers and adults. He/she has a lot of impact on the educational setting, which is synchronous and harmonizing. The accommodative and agentive child orientates further and they seek change. They produce a lot of new content for both other children and adults to process. The assimilative and agentive children are less socially interested although fearless. They concentrate on their own objectives; they do not seem to impact others' lives too much. The adaptive and assimilative children are more exclusive, passive and their peer relations seem to be tenuous. They find contact to peers often through rule play. The term agentive knowledge gets into new light as even

Jyrki Reunamo
University of Helsinki
ECER 2006,Geneva
the adaptive views have consequences for the educational settings. In this research only actions that alter each other can be perceived, which is interesting in the philosophical point of view.

References (including own publications):

Fröbel, F. 1995. Classics in German education. Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press

Piaget, J. 1972. The principles of genetic epistemology. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Reunamo, J. 2005. Also withdrawn children find agency in kindergarten. In Talts, L. & Vikat, M. (ed.) Lapse kasvukeskkond Eesti ja Soomes III. Tallinn: TallinnaÛlikooli kirjastus, 174-184.

Reunamo, j. & Nurmilaakso, M. 2006. Language objectives in the Finnish preschool curriculum. Education and Sustainable Development: First Steps Toward Changes Volume 1, 2006.

Reunamo, J. (In print).Agency in education for sustainable development. (article accepted for the next volume of Institute of Sustainable Education 2nd International collection 2007).