Communication Patterns in Collaborative Peer Learning around Interactive Tables

Izdihar Jamil

Interaction & Graphics University of Bristol, UK jamil@cs.bris.ac.uk

Abhijit Karnik

Interaction & Graphics University of Bristol, UK karnik@cs.bris.ac.uk

Abstract

Despite many advances in technology, interaction and colocated collaboration, there is little knowledge of how children communicate around interactive tables. Key to the success of peer collaborations is the extent to which children communicate and the nature of the talk that contributes towards successful learning. Our work examines the communication patterns of children across various conditions of table-based interaction for different types of educational activities. We present two studies to investigate the communication patterns. Our findings provide insights into the design of interactive tables to support particular forms of social interaction towards understanding how the next generation of HCI will impact our children's education in the future.

Mark T. Marshall

Interaction & Graphics

mark@cs.bris.ac.uk

University of Bristol, UK

Sriram Subramanian

Interaction & Graphics

sriram@cs.bris.ac.uk

University of Bristol, UK

Copyright is held by the author/owner(s). CHI 2011, May 7–12, 2011, Vancouver, BC, Canada. ACM 978-1-4503-0268-5/11/05.

Keywords

Interaction techniques, tabletop, communication, collaborative learning and children.

ACM Classification Keywords

H5.3. Group and Organisation Interfaces

General Terms

Children, communication, learning, interaction techniques.

Introduction

With advancement in interactive tabletop technology and increased levels of affordability in recent years, there has been a growing interest in exploring their use within educational contexts. Central to this interest are arguments relating to demonstrated benefits of peer collaboration in children's learning that have led to such activities to becoming an increasing aspect of children's educational experience [6]. The aim of such experiences is to allow children to jointly explore particular areas, discussing and exchanging ideas and perspective and thereby facilitating their understanding. Key to the success of these peer collaborations from a learning perspective is the extent to which children participate in the collaboration [3]. In particular it is the extent to which peers talk and the nature of this talk that comprises this participation that is argued to be key to successful learning [4]. For example, successful collaborative learning has been



Figure 1a (top): Screen shot of the spider diagram task on the interactive table.

Figure 1b (bottom): Photograph of the spider diagram task on the non-digital table.

*Jamil, I, Alexander, J., Subramanian, S. and Barnes, S. Talking Teengaers and Tables: Communication around Interactive and Non-Interactive Surfaces. Technical Report, CSTR, University of Bristol. demonstrated to happen when accompanying talk contains more explanations [5].

Building on these findings, and the arguments that particular types of talk within peer based collaborative learning are important [4], our concerns in this paper are with the impact of particular tabletop interaction techniques on the type of talk during collaborative learning. Surprisingly there is little in the way of empirical research that specifically examines the effects of the tabletop interaction techniques seen in Nacenta et al. [2] on patterns of conversation in collaborative learning scenarios. In another study, Harris et al. looked at single versus multi touch for this scenario but did not explore different interaction techniques within this context [1]. Furthermore, studies of interaction techniques for tabletops in real-world settings with ecologically appropriate tasks and configurations are still guite rare. The challenge that we aim to meet in understanding this problem space is fourfold:

- 1. Producing a research framework to systematically analyse communication patterns between different interaction techniques.
- Producing a holistic coding scheme and analysis process based on existing literature to investigate the communication styles.
- Producing applications that foster learning and group communication that are ecologically appropriate tasks suitable for real-world settings.
- 4. Producing a guide for designers when using different interaction techniques to produce collaborative learning tasks for children.

In exploring this area, we will be better able to understand the impact of interaction techniques on communication during collaborative peer learning when using interactive tables.

Current research

We present two studies of 11-16 years old students performing collaborative learning activities with different tabletop interaction techniques. The activities were created in cooperation with teachers based on the class activities and curriculum. We then compare the effects of these techniques on patterns of conversational utterances.

First study

This study investigates the conversation styles of teenagers around interactive and non-digital tables*. We looked at five types of utterances: identification, proposals, responses, interdependence and instructions. We seek to examine the following points: 1) what type of conversation styles exist around these tables? 2) what are the different trends for proposal and response utterances? 3) do the participants identify themselves as individuals or as a group? 4) how are interdependence and instructions demonstrated? 5) what would be the topics of discussion?

To answer these questions, we performed a study that involved 39 teenagers (13 groups of three students) who worked in teams to produce a spider diagram. Figure 1 shows a snapshot of the spider diagram task. We recorded and analysed approximately 120 minutes of video of the participants completing the task. Teenagers working on the interactive and noninteractive tables exhibited different conversation styles. Overall, teenagers working on the interactive table talked longer and produced more utterances. This allows more time for latecomers to contribute their ideas and to be part of the decision-making process.



Figure 2a (top): Spider diagram task using a direct touch technique Figure 2b (bottom): Pantograph interaction technique on a classification task (the blue dots in the green pantograph area represent the touch points of the user's fingers

[†]Jamil, I., O'Hara, K., Perry, M., Karnik, A. and Subramanian, S. The Effects of Interaction Techniques on Talk Patterns in Collaborative Peer Learning around Interactive Tables. *To appear in CHI 2011.* The participants perceived themselves more as individuals, leading to command-like utterances that show their dominant role during the task. The noninteractive table on the other hand, promotes a different conversation style. This style is more intense during the first four minutes of the task. The number of responses is higher when working around the noninteractive table, suggesting more participation, collaboration and decision making processes. Participants on the non-interactive table are more focused towards task-related issues as they do not need to consider specialised methods for manipulating objects (e.g. drawing line can be done simultaneously using pens).

Based on our observations and the fact that the task, objectives, actions and methods on both tables are similar, we believe that the differences in the conversations generated are due to the methods of interaction between the two tables. This result motivated us to look further into how interaction techniques of various tabletops configurations affected the communication patterns during collaborative learning.

Second Study

This study presents the findings of a user study investigating conversational patterns across three conditions of table-based interaction (direct touch interactive table, pantograph interactive table and nondigital table) for different types of educational activities[†]. In this study, we had 28 students, aged between 11-13 years performing two collaborative learning activities (spider diagram and classification) with different tabletop interaction techniques and compare the effects of these techniques on patterns of conversational utterances. In particular, we compare interactive tables using pantograph and direct touch techniques (as used in Nacenta et al. [2]) with an equivalent non-digital table where the objects are physical and moveable. In exploring the effects of these interaction techniques on utterance patterns, we will be able to understand better their impact on collaborative peer learning. Figure 2 shows snapshots of the applications using the direct touch and pantograph techniques on two collaborative tasks.

Our findings demonstrate that communication style is significantly affected by interaction techniques. Our main finding is that direct touch is almost good as the non-digital table with respect to interdependence, topic-orientation and reflective form of conversation. Such features are desirable for collaborative peer learning tasks. Meanwhile, the pantograph technique encourages playfulness and directives but is not very good at promoting interdependence, topic-orientated and reflective form of conversation in support of small group communication for classroom-based activities. Prior to this work, designers of interactive table had access to few findings, methodologies and stimulating points of reference that can be used to motivate communication around interactive tables. Our findings provide insights into the design of interactive tables to support particular forms of social interaction and communication during collaborative learning.

The Next Challenge

Both of these studies highlighted that communication style is significantly affected by interaction techniques. An interesting topic for investigation is the communication patterns of the various tabletop configurations in other continents outside the western world. Perhaps culture might play a role in the outcome of the conversations of the children. Hence in May 2010, we deployed the interactive tables in two schools in Delhi, India.

Our initial analysis suggests a very different group communication and dynamics between the children in the UK and India. For example the children in India are very protective of their personal territory. They will physically remove any unwelcomed hands or fingers that enter into their space. In terms of manipulating objects, the children are comfortable working with objects that are close to them. For objects that are further away, they will move and repositioned themselves so that they are closer and within arm's reach. There is little conversation about passing objects between children. Meanwhile, children in the UK stayed at the same seating place throughout the task and asked for objects to be passed or manipulated for them if they are non-reachable. There are very little gestures or hand contact between them and very rarely do they physically move other children's hands away.

We also observed contrasting behaviours between the children at the two schools. This could be due to the differences is the demographics of the students that went to the two schools. We are currently investigating where the differences lie- whether this is an artefact of the culture or the combination of the culture, technique and task (due to the educational system). This provides us with the opportunity to study the communication patterns not only cross-continent, but also cross-culture and demographics. For this study, we are looking at a more holistic approach of the analysis to provide us with greater insights by looking at various aspects of communication (conversation, gestures and participation). By understanding this, it would assist us in assessing the practicality of the tabletop configurations, techniques and tasks when this technology is deployed in other countries.

Conclusion

The classroom is a challenging environment for evaluation, thus new we believe that our current and future findings in deducing the communication patterns of collaborative peer learning tasks can be a valuable asset towards understanding how the next generation of how HCI will impact education in the future not only in the UK, but also in other continents.

References

[1] Harris, A., Rick, J., Bonnett, V., Yuill, N., Fleck, R., Marshall, P., and Rogers, Y. Around the table: are multiple-touch surfaces better than single-touch for children's collaborative interactions? In *Proc. of CSCL* 2009, pp: 335-344.

[2] Nacenta, M.A., Pinelle, D., Stuckel, D., and Gutwin, C. The effects of interaction technique on coordination in tabletop groupware. In *Proc. of GI* 2007. ACM Press, pp: 191-198.

[3] Rogoff, B. *Apprentinces in thinking: Cognitive development in a Social Context*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990.

[4] Teasley, S. The Role of Talk in Children's Peer Collaborations. In *Developmental Psychology*, 1995. **31**(2).

[5] Webb, N. Group composition, group interaction and achievement in cooperative small groups. In *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1982. **74**(4): pp. 475-484.

[6] Webb, N. and Palincsar, A. *Group processes in the classroom*. In D.C. Berliner & R.C Calfee (Eds), Handbook of educational psychology. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.