

# Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Defeyter, Margaret Anne (Greta), Hearing, Jill and German, Tamsin (2011) Young children's reasoning about artifact function: an action-protest paradigm. In: British Psychological Society Developmental Section Annual Conference, 7-9 September 2011, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

URL:

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/33225/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>


This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



**Northumbria  
University**  
NEWCASTLE



**UniversityLibrary**



# Young children's reasoning about artifact function: an action-protest paradigm

Greta Defeyter; Jill Hearing & Tamsin C. German

Greta.defeyter@northumbria.ac.uk

# Artifacts



# Intended Design

Intended design function



Alternative function



Bloom (1996); Keleman (1999)  
Callanan & Siegel (2007);  
German, Truxaw & Defeyter et al., (2007)

# Design Stance

- An object's identity is explained in terms of it having been intentionally designed to serve a particular purpose (Dennett, 1987).
- Adult's reasoning about artifacts appears to reflect the adoption of a '**design stance**' (e.g. Keleman, 1999; German & Johnson, 2002; Matan & Carey, 2001).
- An object's designed function is central to children's artifact representation, (see Kelemen & Carey, 2007; Kemler Nelson et al., 2002; Gelman & Bloom, 2000)




Developmental changes within the core of  
artifact concepts

Adee Matan<sup>a</sup>, Susan Carey<sup>1</sup>

*Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology,  
Cambridge, MA, USA*

Received 27 August 1999; received in revised form 26 January 2000; accepted 8 June 2000



Participants told a story about a person who made an object to water flowers (the original intended function) and about another person who was using the object for making tea (the current function).

Adults: Design Stance ✓

6 year-olds: Design Stance ✓


4 Year-olds: Design Stance ✗

The scope of teleological thinking in preschool children


Deborah Kelemen\*

*Department of Psychology, 441 Moore Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, PA 16802, USA*

Received 20 November 1998; accepted 2 February 1999



Design Function



Current Function:  
Accidental or  
Deliberate

Adults: Design Stance ✓

5 Year-olds: Design Stance ✓

4 Year-olds: Design Stance ✓

# Shared Convention



- In the majority of cases the design function and the conventional use usually match (Callanan et al., 2007).
- The way communities use artifacts is just as important as design intentions in children's artifact conceptualisation (Diesendruck et al., 2010; German, Truxaw & Defeyter, 2007).
- Children learn about artifacts through observations of how “we” use them (Tomasello et al., 2005).



# Violating conventional function



Do young children view atypical functions of artifacts as plain wrong?



# Young children's normative awareness of artifact function

(Casler, Terziyan & Greene, 2009)

- Action-protest paradigm (Rakoczy, Warneken & Tomasello, 2008).
- Demonstration phase –Adult demonstrated the conventional function of familiar and novel artifacts.
- Test Phase – Puppet demonstrated an alternate atypical function.



# Toddlers view artifact function normatively


- 2- and 3-year-olds demonstrated normative protests towards a puppet using artifacts in ways that violated conventional function.

***“No! It’s not for that!”***

- Toddlers strongly believe that there are ‘proper’ ways to use objects and any other use is simply ‘wrong’.

# Research question

Do young children believe that artifacts embody their conventional function across different contexts rendering other plausible uses as completely wrong?



# Hypothesis



Conventional function = No protest



Violation of conventional function = Protest

# Method

Participants = 80 children

## **Three year olds**

N = 39, mean age = 3.7, range 3.1 - 3.9

20 females and 19 males.

## **Four year olds**

N = 41, mean age = 4.8, range 4.3 – 4.10

20 females and 21 males

Children were tested individually.

Sessions were videotaped and lasted 25 minutes.

# Conditions

1. Conventional function -




Idiosyncratic function



2. Conventional function -



Non-violation function



Order Function Counterbalanced →

3. Idiosyncratic function - Conventional function

4. Non-violation function - Conventional function

# Materials

Three familiar objects were used:



Stirring liquid  
Tapping



Rolling Play Doh  
Drawing circles



Brushing doll's hair  
Turning 180 degrees



# Procedure

- Warm up phase – To make child feel at ease with the experimental setting



- First function - Demonstration phase by ‘Sam’ the bear.
- Second function - Test phase by ‘Sally’ the pig.
- Control question - “What is ‘X’ for?”

# Condition 3 - Idiosyncratic - Conventional


Sequence 01.mpg

# Results: Overall

- **Test phase:** No significant main effect of function:  $F(3, 72) = 0.178; p = .905$
- No significant main effect of age  $F(1,72)=0.48, p = .540$
- No significant Function x Age interaction ( $F(3,72) = 0.80, p = .496$ )

In all conditions both groups of children protested towards **any** second function demonstrated.

# Figure 1: Mean number of protests in the Conventional-idiosyncratic condition



# Figure 2: Mean number of protests in the Conventional- Non-violation condition






Fig. 3: Mean number of protests in the 'idiosyncratic-conventional' condition.



# Figure 4: Mean number of protests in the Non-violation-Conventional condition



# Results: Control question

## What's X for?

92% of children generated the conventional function of the three test objects.



To draw



To feed



To brush teeth



# One week later

- The same children were tested again one week later under the same conditions.
- 86% children spontaneously generated the first function demonstrated.
- No effect of condition.

# Discussion



- Young children did not view violations of conventional function as wrong *per se*.
- 3- and 4-year-olds understood the first function of each artifact to be the correct one in this context.
- The action-protest paradigm measured protest against the first function or rule provided (Rakoczy et al., 2008).



# Discussion



- Young children understand that objects have a stable conventional function.
- Non-conventional functions are not necessarily viewed as mistakes but perfectly feasible alternatives within specific contexts (Rakoczy et al., 2009; Callanan et al., 2007).
- Within rule-governed contexts young children understand that everyday artifacts can serve different functions which may deviate considerably from their conventional use.