

Sharing Opportunities, Taking Turns, and Counting Together: Educators' Perspectives on Social Participation in Congklak Play

Nurcaya¹, Nurpaisha², Duriani³, Masnur⁴

^{1,2,3,4} Universitas Muhammadiyah Palopo, Palopo, Indonesia

Abstract

Congklak combines access to play, interpretation of rules, and cooperative engagement, but these social processes need to be disentangled from presumed developmental benefits. This study analyzes how educators characterize sharing, turn-taking and teamwork at TK Islam Datok Sulaiman Putri Palopo, Indonesia. The qualitative case study draws on interview-response documents from three teachers and one principal, two brief incident records, and one reflective entry. Reflexive thematic analysis of 36 teacher responses and four principal responses includes coding, comparison of narratives among informants, and consideration of the contribution and limits of the incident recordings. Four themes were developed: access structured by materials, pairing, and schedules; turns conceptualized through game cues and explicit participation rights; cooperation characterized by sharing rule understanding and counting together; and mediation adapted to disputes, difficulties, and children's circumstances. Teacher accounts differed in emphasis, ranging from scheduled supervision to selective intervention and needs-based support. The incident reports did confirm that there were conflicts regarding seeds and first turns but they included little insight children's subsequent responses. The study analytically separates opportunities given, rules understood, and reported cooperative coordination. Teacher mediation is suggested to be a significant condition in educators' experiences of participation, rather than a confirmed source of developmental change. Sustained participation and independent issue resolution need to be examined using sequential observation and children's viewpoints.

Keywords: congklak; social interaction; sharing; turn-taking; teacher mediation

Corresponding Author
Nurcaya, Universitas
Muhammadiyah Palopo, Indonesia
Email: Balgista65chya@email.com

Article Information
Received: 18 September 2026
Accepted: 20 October 2026
Published: 31 October 2026

© 2027 Tunas Cendekia: Jurnal Program Studi Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini. This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0).
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0>



1. Introduction

Kindergarten play unites the wishes of children, the rules of the activity, the resources and the interactions with peers. Social engagement may involve invitations to play, sharing supplies, taking turns, and arguments about whether activities are permitted. The quality of interaction is therefore not to be judged only by the existence or absence of quarrels. Social involvement and meaningful experiences are identified as significant features in frameworks for learning via play and are dependent on how activities are organized (Parker et al., 2022). Aulia and Sudaryanti (2023) and Widjayatri et al. (2023) summarized the potential of play for social-emotional development in Indonesian early childhood education. This potential requires a more careful examination of the mechanisms that occur within particular activities.

Congklak is pertinent to this study because players meet common materials, sequences of moves, and choices about turn changes. Nurjani and Sopiarti (2022) conducted classroom action research to study social-emotional capacities. Kurnia et al. (2023) studied congklak using a quasi-experimental method. Sugiyanti et al. (2023) qualitatively described the social-emotional development in congklak play. Trisnadewi et al. (2024) assessed the potential of congklak in numerous developmental areas. These designs provide distinct sorts of evidence; changes in scores or findings from a review do not explain how specific players get access or resolve disputes over moves.

The link between play and prosociality is likewise equivocal. Differences in sharing were found after exposure to cooperative and competitive games in the settings of their study (Zhang et al., 2025). Eriksson et al. (2021) showed no variations in several evaluated social behaviors after cooperative and competitive board-game experiences. Similarly, Toppe et al. (2021) did not see any effect of game setting on later prosocial tendencies in their design. These different results point to the necessity to

investigate task context, interactions between players, types of assistance and behavioral measurement. The labeling of a game as traditional or cooperative does not explain the nature of interaction in itself.

Sharing, taking turns and cooperating are related, but they are not the same. Sharing is making resources or opportunities available. Turn-taking is arranging the right to act in a sequence. Cooperation is jointly regulated actions aimed toward shared interests. Paz et al. (2023) describe correlations between different subtypes of prosociality and differences between spontaneous and cued behavior. Diverse prosocial impulses matter in development (Grueneisen & Warneken, 2022). The situation in which a child relinquishes a turn at the behest of a teacher, thereby creating an opportunity for a peer, is different from a child-initiated offer.

The functions of the educators ought to be considered with the roles of the players. Skene et al. (2022) indicate that benefits of guidance during play differ depending on the developmental outcomes examined and comparator settings. Baker et al. (2023) emphasize the agency of children in playful learning, while Oen et al. (2026) map the diversity of educator activities that enable engagement. The study challenge is thus about how teachers grant access, explain rules, decide when to aid and how they protect children's opportunities to participate.

Most existing congklak studies have focused on developmental benefits. This study is based on processes described by teachers. This study compares accounts of three teachers and a principal at a site. It is about relationships among arranged opportunities, understanding turns, counting together, and changes to help. This research does not claim to be the first study of interaction during congklak. Its stated analytical utility is to identify whether an account supports inferences regarding access, rules, or joint coordination, and when it just conveys a pedagogical goal.

The research questions are as follows: (1) How do educators describe sharing, turn-taking, and cooperation during congklak activities? (2) How do teachers' accounts reveal similarities and variations in support? And (3) How do incident records support or limit these interpretations? The study aims to develop a contextual understanding of social participation in congklak at TK Islam Datok Sulaiman Putri Palopo. It focuses on reported practices and available documentary evidence rather than testing effectiveness or measuring children's development.

2. Methodology

2.1 Design and case boundaries

The study uses a qualitative case-study design and thematic analysis of interview-response papers and activity records. The data was collected by interviewed in Indonesia then translated to English. This research case is limited to congklak activities in TK Islam Datok Sulaiman Putri Palopo as detailed in the research materials. The units of analysis are the educator statements and incident summaries. The informants' explanations of the relationship between play conditions, rules and support are understood through a contextual approach. Teachers' utterances are interpreted as reports of experience and interpretations of practice, rather than direct transcripts of all children's behaviors.

The corpus comprises five files: three files of teacher responses, one file of principal responses, and one file of reflections and incident records. The three teacher documents have different source names but substantively similar responses. Teachers are labeled as G01, G02 and G03, and the principal as KS01. The teaching experience recorded for the three teachers was seven years, seven years and three years respectively. All the teachers are women. These details define the sources. They are not utilized to explain differences in tactics by teaching experience or gender.

Table 1
Sources and units of data analyzed

Code	Units	Characteristics and status
G01	12 responses	Teacher; 7 years of teaching experience.
G02	12 responses	Teacher; 7 years of experience; responses differ from G01 except Q08.
G03	12 responses	Teacher; 3 years of experience; Q11 appears outside the tables.
KS01	4 responses	Principal; copies in G01 and G02 counted once.
D01 and D02	2 records	Disputes over seeds and the initial turn; 21 and 28 September 2026.
R01	1 entry	Brief reflection dated 7 September 2026.

The KS01 file contains the four main answers once and they are copied into the G01 and G02 files. G01-Q08 and G02-Q08 are phrased identically. Both are preserved under their respective sources but not counted as independent confirmation in developing the theme. Hence the 40 response items are not 40 completely unique texts, but responses attributed to informants.

2.2 Theme development & cross-source comparison

Reflexive thematic analysis was conducted, involving reading, coding, creating themes, examining patterns and writing interpretations (Wutich et al., 2024). Braun and Clarke (2021a, 2021b) outlined how to align questions, interpretative orientation, and analytical practice, whereas Byrne (2022) offered an account of the application of the thematic phases. Initial sensitizing notions were cooperation, sharing and turn-taking. Coding was also left open to supervision, partner selection, clues for seed cessation, joint count, shyness, mood and simpler directions.

Each response was allocated a source code and question number, e.g. G02-Q06 or G03-Q05. Segments with more than one notion may be coded more than once. For example, G01-Q02 covers children's choice of peers and teacher-assigned matching. G03-Q05 is about counting along, G03-Q11 relates conduct with emotion. Initial codes were compared across teachers to look at common content, expansions of meaning and differences in emphasis.

Themes were developed as patterns of meaning about the structure of involvement. A cross-informant matrix distinguished patterns described by several sources from accounts appearing in only one source. G02-Q07 emphasizes responding when disputes occur; G01-Q07 describes considerations of escalation and allowing children space; G03-Q07 emphasizes assistance when children experience difficulties. These differences were retained as variations in accounts without assuming that the teachers were describing the same episode, class, or pair of children.

D01 and D02 were compared with the interviews for the topics of disputes and types of support. Topical correspondence was not accepted as proof that all the sources were referring to the same incident. The reflective content was examined using R01. Themes were explored for alternative meanings, such as demarcations between organized opportunities and spontaneous sharing, simultaneous counting and reciprocal coordination, and nonparticipation and situational barriers to engagement.

3. Results

3.1 Congklak activities context

G01-Q01 and G02-Q01 position congklak in playtime and number learning. G03-Q01 is about taking turns and collecting up seeds. This difference in focus exposes the educational setting in two sources

and the play processes in the other. It does not say whether all teachers helped the same class, or classes. Thus the findings compare the accounts of the two within one case of a school without collapsing them into an artificial sequence of events. KS01-Q01 and KS01-Q02 are related to the provision of congklak, bakiak (wooden clogs used in traditional games) and jump ropes. KS01-Q03 includes an orientation to support for children's various needs, supervision and authorization to document. KS01-Q04 mentions praying before learning. This information provides organizational context and describes school routines. The availability of materials, commitment to inclusion, and religious routines are not used to infer the quality of interaction in every episode.

Table 2
Comparison of emphases across teachers

Dimension	G01	G02	G03
Access	Choice of friends, ability-based pairing, materials, schedules, and alternative games.	Pairing by ability and character; schedules and support.	Rotation of players; sufficient and safe materials.
Turns	Each child's rights; disputes over the last seed's position.	Supervision, schedules, and wanting to continue playing.	Seeds stopping as a cue for changing turns; competing for turns.
Cooperation	Understanding rules and sportsmanship; reminding peers.	Mutual understanding after teacher action.	Counting seeds together.
Support	Considering escalation and sometimes allowing space.	Responding to disputes; developmentally appropriate language.	Helping with difficulties, simplifying instructions, and attending to shyness and mood.

3.2 Access structured by materials, pairing, and schedules

All three teachers describe access as something that needs to be organized. G01-Q03 mentions providing materials and scheduling in response to disputes. G02-Q03 links quarrels to wanting to play first, while G02-Q12 again emphasizes scheduling and support. G03-Q12 adds the sufficiency and safety of materials: "The teacher provides enough materials that are safe for children." These accounts form a pattern in which opportunities to play are prepared through material conditions and the organization of activities.

Partner selection reveals variation. G01-Q02 explains that children can choose friends during ordinary play, while the teacher sometimes assigns partners according to ability. G02-Q02 identifies ability and character as considerations when pairing children. G03-Q02 emphasizes changes in partners or players so that both children have an opportunity. There are no data on ability-assessment criteria, actual rotation, or the experiences of children who are not chosen. The findings support the existence of organized pairing, with children's scope for choice most explicit in G01's account.

Access is also managed before or after children have had a turn. G01-Q12 proposes alternative games, including outdoor activities, so that all children have opportunities. Meanwhile, G02-Q06 reports children who want to continue playing and do not give their peers an opportunity. Together, these accounts show that making opportunities available differs from children's willingness to relinquish them. Schedules may open access administratively, but acceptance of turn changes remains an interactional matter.

When asked to describe sharing, G03-Q03 explains teachers' reminders to take turns. G01 and G02 likewise emphasize teachers' actions in organizing play conditions. Thus, sharing in this corpus is

more strongly evidenced as the facilitation of opportunities than as episodes of child-initiated giving. There is no basis for claiming that spontaneous sharing did not occur; the defensible conclusion is that informants did not describe such evidence in detail.

3.3 Turns conceptualized through game cues and explicit participation rights

G03-Q04 finds a clue for taking turns: “When the congklak seeds stop and they have to take turns.” This answer means that the play sequence is interpreted by the state of the game and not solely by the schedules established by the teacher. But the account doesn't provide the full set of local regulations, such as the option of extra turns. This is maintained as a rule reported by the informants in the analysis, not as a universal rule of congklak.

G01-Q04 emphasizes personal explanations so children understand that each has a turn. The example “It is your turn, dear” in G01-Q10 illustrates how the teacher affirms the right to act. G02-Q04 adds supervision by an assistant teacher and schedules for children. Mention of an assistant teacher indicates a reported distribution of support responsibilities; this person is not counted as an additional informant because no interview is available.

Disputes have different triggers. G02-Q03 and G03-Q06 mention competing for the first opportunity or for a turn. G02-Q06 highlights wanting to continue playing. G01-Q06 discusses where the last seed lands. These differences direct the analysis toward two issues: distributing the right to play and interpreting moves. A solution that determines who starts first may not resolve differing interpretations of seed positions during the game.

D01 records a dispute over seeds and assistance in mediating it on 21 September 2026. Repetition appears as an alternative in the provisional-meaning column and therefore cannot be described as an action successfully implemented. D02 records a dispute over the initial turn and assistance through drawing lots on 28 September 2026. The outcome of the draw and children's responses are not detailed. These records support the presence of rule and turn-taking issues but do not provide complete sequences of action after mediation.

G01-Q11 mentions children wanting to play twice. This does not automatically indicate a rule violation because the version of the rules is unavailable. By contrast, G02-Q06 explicitly describes not giving a peer an opportunity. Distinguishing these accounts prevents the analysis from treating every additional turn as noncompliance. The second theme shows that understanding turns involves game cues, explanations of rights, and procedures for handling disputes.

3.4 Cooperation characterized by sharing rule understanding and counting together

Cooperation is not described uniformly. G01-Q05 associates it with mutual understanding of rules and sportsmanship. G02-Q05 states, *“Usually, children will understand one another and be able to cooperate once the teacher has dealt with the situation.”* G02's account places teacher action before cooperation, but it does not establish that the intervention caused the change. Both responses primarily describe normative orientations and the management of relationships.

The comment “Very much together in counting the congklak seeds” in G03-Q05 gives more clear action material. The Indonesian wording is awkward; the reference to counting seeds together can nevertheless be read as a report of joint activity. It changes the analysis from knowing the rules to dealing with the same object. The narrative does not, however, include details about who counted, if one youngster reviewed the other's total, or how errors were remedied.

Therefore, three levels of evidence can be distinguished: expected common understanding of the norms, reported collaborative engagement in an activity, and reciprocal coordination documented within an episode. The first two levels are attested in the corpus, the third level is under-attested.

Counting together is a relevant indicator of cooperation but not a division of duties or a shared purpose devised by the players.

G01-Q10 and G02-Q10 mention inviting children to remind their peers gently. Cooperation, mutual understanding, sharing and mutual forgiveness are the values to be nurtured. G03-Q10 also points to the need of understanding rules. These accounts together show that cooperation is regarded as a mix of activity, norms of interaction, and the capacity to play the game. The values being taught are still not the same as the behaviors youngsters have shown on their own.

3.5 Mediation adapted to disputes, difficulties, and children's circumstances

In G01-Q07, the teacher manages arguments when they seem to have the potential for more conflict, but in other cases offer space for children who are known to be able to adjust. G02-Q07 covers what to do when there are disputes. G03-Q07 links help to children's needs or problems. These narratives might be interpreted in terms of a number of emphases: of escalation, of responding to disagreements, and of offering needs-based support. The data do not permit an assessment of the relative effectiveness of these approaches.

The forms of help also vary. G01-Q04 emphasizes a personal approach, G02-Q06 relates to developmentally appropriate language, and G03-Q08 reads, "The teacher gives positive guidance and simpler instructions." The simplification of instructions extends the domain of mediation beyond moral reminders to understandability of instructions. G03-Q08, however, does not explicitly address the question of whether aid was ever refused or interrupted children's talk, and is therefore not taken as evidence that all assistance was received.

G03-Q09 points to the necessity of help and support in the shy children. G03-Q11 The informant says: "Children's mood has influence on their behavior." This allows for situational interpretation of engagement differences. G01-Q11 and G02-Q11 also point to less interested children in playing. The analysis does not keep the negative labels as characteristics of the children, but the disparities in interest or engagement are considered as experiences to be further explored.

Restoring relationships is prominent in G01 and G02. Both mention mutual understanding and forgiveness when disagreements occur. However, the identical wording in Q08 is not used to increase the apparent frequency of support for the theme. Moreover, Q08 presents two possibilities—assistance not being followed or conversation stopping—and the brief responses do not distinguish them. The support theme therefore encompasses both teachers' positive orientations and limited information about children's acceptance.

Table 3
Findings and limits of the evidence

Finding	Support in the corpus	Limits of interpretation
Organizing access	All three teachers describe arranging materials, partners, or schedules.	Actual equity of access and spontaneous sharing are undocumented.
Turn procedures	All three describe turn changes or disputes; D01–D02 provide related records.	Topical correspondence does not establish the same episode or successful assistance.
Joint activity	G03-Q05 reports counting seeds together.	No details of role distribution, checking counts, or joint correction.

Finding	Support in the corpus	Limits of interpretation
Adjusting assistance	G01 allows space; G02 organizes supervision; G03 emphasizes needs and simple instructions.	Comparison conditions differ or are unknown; the best strategy cannot be determined.

4. Discussion

4.1 From opportunity distribution to participation quality

Findings reveal teachers often describe sharing as the organizing of materials, timetables, and partners. These dimensions matter because a youngster cannot take advantage of a social opportunity that is not materially available. But quality of involvement also includes the capacity to express preferences, to restore a move, and to feel involved. Türkmen et al. (2026) indicate that play settings, peer interactions and meanings generated by youngsters might explain non-sharing experiences. Here, evidence on the spread of opportunities is more robust than evidence on the subjective experiences of receivers.

Katerkamp and Horn (2025) show the importance of friendship for prosocial conduct in peer groups. In this perspective we should read G01 and G02 reports of matching and friendships. Choosing a partner may give a sense of stability and rotation may broaden play interactions. However, distributing partners according to ability or character should be examined in an effort to avoid set grouping. The corpus gives no evidence of deleterious categorization; this is an implication for practice evaluation.

The analytical contribution of the case is to distinguish between access and the use of access in a reciprocal manner. A schedule is an organizing tool. Giving a peer a chance is a relational act. This distinction corresponds to the focus of Paz et al. (2023) on the spontaneous and cued conditions of prosocial conduct. The next concern is not just whether a child has a turn, but how that opportunity is carried out and whether the child is able to continue the activity without continued instruction.

4.2 Material cues and social practices in turn-taking

G03's description of the seeds stopping provides the importance of game resources to the knowledge of turns. It is not just that teachers organize sequences outside the game, the state of the seeds informs the players. But material conditions have to be interpreted in common. G01's telling of the arguments for the last seed's place indicates that seeing the same thing does not mean the same interpretation of the rules. Teacher explanations may help to integrate players' interpretations, but the conversations through which this happens are not available in the data. Myrttil et al. (2021) emphasize the significance of separating the roles of teachers while handling disagreements among students. Here, scheduling, explaining rights, settling conflicts, and drawing lots for the first turn fulfill diverse functions. A way to establish order is to draw lots, and a debate over a move needs attention to the rule in question. In D02, since there is no child reaction, we cannot yet conclude that drawing lots has successfully created a sense of fairness. Procedural clarity and procedural acceptance must be evaluated separately.

The language of support links regulations to the experiences of players. Tan and G (2024) in their research of social stories talk about language and classroom scenarios in terms of prosocial conduct. The present data include terminology concerning turns, repetition and easier instructions, demonstrating multiple approaches of making rules accessible. Both youngsters may be asked to point to where the seed was and to describe their stance. This would provide practice. The idea behind this suggestion is to enable shared reasoning and it is not portrayed as a process already in use in this institution.

4.3 Counting together as a sign of social cohesion

G03's account transfers the focus of collaboration from assumed dispositions to actual activity. Counting seeds together can bring together attention to an object, number sequences and checking consequences. He and Chen (2024) differentiate between shared understanding and collaborative action in studies on collaborative problem solving. Although the setting of their project is not the same as congklak, this difference enables us to specify what proof is needed: joint engagement needs to be shown by modifications in action and not just by being present in the same work. The corpus does not reveal if the youngsters took turns naming numbers, dispersed seeds, reviewed results or agreed on a total. In this way counting together is viewed as a reported indicator of coordination, the processes of which are left open. This result provides a precise direction for observation. The recording can focus on who is starting, what the partner does, how mistakes are treated, and whether the resulting count is used together while playing.

One must also be cautious in relating play to social skills. Smits-van der Nat and colleagues (2024) carried out a meta-analysis to assess the association between pretend play and social skills. Their relevance here is to identify associations from the direction of impact, not to equate congklak with pretend play. Likewise, the results of Eriksson et al. (2021), Toppe et al. (2021) and Zhang et al. (2025) suggest that play forms cannot be universally connected to prosocial effects. This study investigates stated processes, not score changes or transfer of behavior to other circumstances.

4.4 Mediation as an aid to adjustment and as an opportunity to act

The comparison between teachers shows that the help is not only aimed at stopping arguments. G03 raises difficulty, shyness and the need for basic instructions; G01 stresses decisions, to enable space; G02 emphasizes timetables and supervision. These narratives together demonstrate several dimensions of support that may coexist. As the context of each response is not elaborated, the disparities are best viewed as distinctions in instructional repertoires rather than set teacher personality types.

Masoumi et al. (2024) highlight children's behaviors in understanding scaffolding processes. Therefore, one cannot identify responsive mediation just based on teachers' intentions or styles of education. We need to see if help allows children to make choices, to understand moves, to take over actions. This concept corresponds to the focus on agency in fun learning by Baker et al. (2023). The case data do not support the existence of balance between too much aid, which may restrict prospects for bargaining, and too little assistance, which may leave children struggling.

The multiplicity of behaviors of educators that foster engagement in play is mapped out by Oen et al. (2026). Findings regarding the supply of resources, guidance and supervision and decisions about intervention show the value of thinking about these acts in relation to each other. Arifiyanti et al. (2025) also highlight norms, modeling, and collaborative activities in the kindergarten teachers' techniques in fostering prosociality in Indonesia. These investigations set the informants' reports in a broader discussion but do not verify the success of each technique in this example.

The account concerning mood offers a counterbalance to labeling children as unwilling to play. Nonparticipation may relate to interest, discomfort, difficulty understanding rules, or temporary circumstances; these possibilities have not been tested here. Situating behavior within its circumstances makes support more responsive to needs. Teachers can explore whether children want assistance, prefer another activity, or need time without equating all withdrawal with a social deficit.

4.5 Rebuilding ties and institutional support

Support in play is connected to an orientation toward social interactions through encouragement of mutual forgiveness. However, saying sorry is not the only evidence of reconciliation. The level of

repair of the connection depends upon the opportunity for each participant to communicate his or her experience, to reply to a proposed resolution, and to determine whether or not to continue playing. Grueneisen and Warneken (2022) describe the variety of reasons that are the basis of prosocial action. Here the children's motives are not derived from moral language used or reported by teachers.

School help gives the context of providing aid. Asmila, Pajariantio, and Sari (2026) explore the management of child-centered pedagogy in the use of digital technology in early childhood education, which includes resources, scheduling, and responses to classroom conditions. Their relevance to congklak is not the equivalent impacts of the media used, but the relation between organization and educator practice. The report of materials, supervision and support in KS01 emphasizes this organizational environment but still needs to document the application of this for particular children.

4.6 Contributions, implications and limitations

The study maps three layers of participation: opportunities offered, rules understood and coordinated cooperative action. In the informants' stories teacher mediation is cutting across these layers. This mapping is an analytical synthesis of the situation, not a validated causal model. The value is in the choice of evidence: turn schedules explain the access; tales of seeds stopping explain rule cues; reports of counting together focus attention to coordination. The findings imply simple records of who gets in, how turns alter and how youngsters respond after help to practice in the classroom. When suggesting alternate activities, it is important to verify that the children are selecting such activities and if there is still the chance to play congklak. In cases when the goal is cooperation, teachers might observe how actions are divided during group counting or seed checking. Simple instructions and personal help can be modified. Children can provide solutions. These ideas are consequences, not further actions that are believed to have been taken.

Strengths of the corpus are three different instructor views, contextual information from the principal and two incident reports to be compared. Its shortcomings are short responses, the adult perspective dominates, one instructor response is worded the same, there are no conversational sequences and there are no children's comments after mediation. Counting together is only mentioned in G03's narrative. Differences in intervention thresholds have not been associated with similar scenarios. There is no way to connect tactics to years of teaching, compute percentages of success, or deduce developmental gain.

Transferability needs a detailed description of the classroom, the local rules, the pupils included, and the actual schedules. Future research might compare events with and without help, follow the continuity of turns after diversion to other activities and include voluntary accounts from children. Records of denial, independently formed agreements or youngsters who do not regain an opportunity would help in reconsidering the themes. Unexpected events need as much attention as apparently successful ones.

5. Conclusion

The description of social interaction in congklak based on the accounts of three teachers and the principal includes organized access, interpretation of turns, cooperative activities, and adjustment to support. Pairing, schedules and materials are the main support of sharing. The condition of the game, confirmation of rights, and dispute-resolution procedures explain turns. Cooperation includes reports of collaborative seed counting and shared comprehension of rules, although details of coordination are few. Support ranges from timetabled supervision to discretionary decisions and help when children have problems.

This case distinguishes between criteria for participation and reciprocal acts requiring episode-level evidence. Educators' perspectives highlight the role of teacher mediation but do not illustrate

causal impacts of congklak or developmental change. Sequential documentation and children's perspectives will be required to assess the help as supportive for more independent issue solving, play experiences that children feel are fair, and maintained engagement.

6. References

- Arifiyanti, N., Dwiningrum, S. I. A., & Syamsudin, A. (2025). Strategies of Indonesian kindergarten teachers for developing children's prosocial behaviour. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, 16(1), 57–75. <https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs2025.2.57.75>
- Asmila, Pajarianto, H., & Sari, H. (2026). Orchestrating digital technology and child-centered pedagogy: Management strategies for mindful, meaningful, and joyful learning in early childhood education. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran, dan Pembelajaran*, 12(2), 948–959. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v12i2.20679>
- Aulia, D., & Sudaryanti. (2023). Peran permainan tradisional dalam meningkatkan sosial emosional anak usia dini. *Jurnal Obsesi: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 7(4), 4565–4574. <https://doi.org/10.31004/obsesi.v7i4.4056>
- Baker, S. T., Le Courtois, S., & Eberhart, J. (2023). Making space for children's agency with playful learning. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 31(2), 372–384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2021.1997726>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021a). Can I use TA? Should I use TA? Should I not use TA? Comparing reflexive thematic analysis and other pattern-based qualitative analytic approaches. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 21(1), 37–47. <https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12360>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021b). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021c). To saturate or not to saturate? Questioning data saturation as a useful concept for thematic analysis and sample-size rationales. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 13(2), 201–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1704846>
- Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality & Quantity*, 56(3), 1391–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y>
- Eriani, E., Pratiwi, N., Mastuinda, & Siswanto, I. (2025). Fostering deep learning in early childhood education through traditional games: Joyful, meaningful, and mindful learning. *JOYCED: Journal of Early Childhood Education*, 5(2), 160–173. <https://doi.org/10.14421/joyced.2025.52-01>
- Eriksson, M., Kenward, B., Poom, L., & Stenberg, G. (2021). The behavioral effects of cooperative and competitive board games in preschoolers. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 62(3), 355–364. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12708>
- Grueneisen, S., & Warneken, F. (2022). The development of prosocial behavior—from sympathy to strategy. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 43, 323–328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2021.08.005>
- He, S., & Chen, S. (2024). The characteristics of preschool children's collaborative problem solving: A discourse analysis in project-based learning. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 19(2), 152–173. <https://doi.org/10.3868/s110-010-024-0009-8>
- Katerkamp, A., & Horn, L. (2025). Preschoolers' prosocial behavior in groups—Testing effects of dominance, popularity, and friendship. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, Article 1478493. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1478493>
- Kurnia, F. D., Ali, M., & Lukmanulhakim. (2023). Pengaruh permainan tradisional congklak terhadap

- perkembangan sosial emosional anak usia 5–6 tahun di TK Pontianak. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, 12(2), 579–586. <https://doi.org/10.26418/jppk.v12i2.62900>
- Masoumi, D., Bourbour, M., & Lindqvist, G. (2024). Mapping children's actions in the scaffolding process using interactive whiteboard. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 52, 1209–1220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-023-01510-x>
- Myrttil, M. J., Lin, T.-J., Chen, J., Purtell, K. M., Justice, L., Logan, J., & Hamilton, A. (2021). Pros and (con)flict: Using head-mounted cameras to identify teachers' roles in intervening in conflict among preschool children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 55, 230–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2020.11.011>
- Nurjani, Y. Y., & Sopianti, S. (2022). Pengaruh permainan congklak terhadap kemampuan sosial emosional anak usia dini (5–6 tahun) di PAUD Al Falah. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Anak Usia Dini (Anaking)*, 1(2), 17–24. <https://doi.org/10.37968/anaking.v1i2.296>
- Oen, M., Ødegaard, E. E., & Sadownik, A. R. (2026). Early childhood educators' doings to facilitate children's participation in play: A scoping review and thematic analysis of research literature. *International Journal of Early Childhood*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-026-00528-7>
- Parker, R., Thomsen, B. S., & Berry, A. (2022). Learning through play at school—A framework for policy and practice. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, Article 751801. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.751801>
- Paz, Y., Davidov, M., Orlitsky, T., Hayut, M., Roth-Hanania, R., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (2023). Prosocial behavior in toddlerhood and early childhood: Consistency across subtypes and over time. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 950160. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.950160>
- Skene, K., O'Farrelly, C. M., Byrne, E. M., Kirby, N., Stevens, E. C., & Ramchandani, P. G. (2022). Can guidance during play enhance children's learning and development in educational contexts? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 93(4), 1162–1180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13730>
- Smits-van der Nat, M., van der Wilt, F., Meeter, M., & van der Veen, C. (2024). The value of pretend play for social competence in early childhood: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 36, Article 46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09884-z>
- Sugiyanti, Buchori, A., & Sulianto, J. (2023). Analisis perkembangan sosial emosional anak usia dini pada permainan tradisional congklak di kelompok B TK Al Ikhlas 01 Sambong Batang. *Media Penelitian Pendidikan: Jurnal Penelitian dalam Bidang Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 17(2), 266–276. <https://doi.org/10.26877/mpp.v17i2.15181>
- Tan, E., & G, K. (2024). Building prosocial behaviours: Examining the possibilities of social stories in early childhood classroom settings. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 22(3), 458–470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X241227044>
- Toppe, T., Hardecker, S., Zerres, F., & Haun, D. B. M. (2021). The influence of cooperation and competition on preschoolers' prosociality toward in-group and out-group members. *Royal Society Open Science*, 8(5), Article 202171. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.202171>
- Trisnadewi, B. A. P., Kumalasari, E., & Tobing, E. R. (2024). Meningkatkan aspek-aspek perkembangan anak usia dini melalui permainan congklak: Studi literatur. *Jurnal Jendela Pendidikan*, 4(1), 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.57008/jjp.v4i01.688>
- Türkmen, S., Türkmen, Ş., Soysal, S., & Soysal, Y. (2026). Children's perspectives on non-sharing during play: Meaning-making and solution strategies of five-year-olds in preschool classrooms. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 54, 6081–6098. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-026-02285-7>
- Widayatri, R. D., Hasanah, I., Syairahma, D., Nugraha, A., Islamiyah, S. A., & Sadin, I. (2023). A systematic review of play activities to optimize children's social-emotional development.

Atfālunā: Journal of Islamic Early Childhood Education, 6(1), 50–60.
<https://doi.org/10.32505/atfaluna.v6i1.5906>

Wutich, A., Beresford, M., & Bernard, H. R. (2024). Sample sizes for 10 types of qualitative data analysis: An integrative review, empirical guidance, and next steps. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 23, Article 16094069241296206.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241296206>

Zhang, Q., Ruan, J., & Xiong, D. (2025). Differential effects of exposure to cooperative versus competitive games on sharing behavior in young children. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 16, Article 1545932. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2025.1545932>