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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A survey of elementary guidance texts shows that experts in the elementary guidance field suggest greater use of play or play media. Van Hoose (1968) comments that play activity with the normal child is an area still in need of much research. He suggests that since it is not always a simple matter for the young child to discuss his problem with an adult, some additional procedures must be used in an effort to adapt to the child's world of response. Play activity is one procedure that can be effectively used by the elementary school counselor, according to Van Hoose.

Nelson (1967) is a strong advocate of the use of play. He points out that any activity that occupies so much of the child's time and through which he tests his abilities, interests, and skills so extensively in a role play sense must be considered grist for the counseling mill. Nelson maintains that limiting the child to strictly verbal communication is taking away his tools.

Also stressing the importance of play in guidance and counseling, Peters (1965) remarks:
Play activity has been and continues to be a topic of thoughtful study. Analysis of play in historical times and in other cultures continues to present spirited challenge for research. Educators of note—Froebel, Pestalozzi, Rousseau and Herbart—reveal the importance of the area of play. Play is an expression of the self.

Although experts in the field of elementary guidance suggest using play or play media, there is not a clear attempt to define either term. Does play mean dramatic play, block play, or games with rules? What does play media include? The ambiguity with which the experts treat the concept, play, does little to provide direction for the practicing counselor.

Even though experts in the field are proposing that elementary counselors attend to the uses of play and play media, a perusal of journals which reflect research in guidance and counseling such as the Elementary School Guidance and Counseling and the Personnel and Guidance Journal demonstrates that research using play or play media is sparse. The play research available deals primarily with emotional and/or social development (Muro, 1968; Myrick and Haldin, 1971).

In the area of emotional development, however, counselors are cautioned not to view themselves as specialists in play therapy for that is not their domain (Peters, 1965). Peters does suggest that the elementary school counselor may learn much about a child through observing him in a play situation either in an informal school
situation or in a play situation in the counseling room. Unfortunately, the opportunities for learning about the child are not detailed.

While some research using play or play media in emotional and social development is available, little attention has been directed toward possible contributions of play in the academic domain; e.g., school achievement or cognitive development. It seems obvious, however, that improving school achievement or enhancing cognitive development through the use of play would be of legitimate interest to the counselor since one of the goals of school guidance is the encouragement of the student to achieve to his capacity.

It is difficult for counselors in the field to accept the challenge of using play and play media when guidance experts are vague about defining the terms and vague about their use. In addition, the lack of research, reflected in the journals, contributes further to the confusion of the practicing counselor.

Therefore, counselors interested in possible uses of play, particularly in the academic domain, will find it necessary to examine relevant studies in other fields; e.g., child development. One such study, (Smilansky, 1968), hypothesizes that sociodramatic play can be used to enhance school achievement. Smilansky believes three main areas in a child are developed by sociodramatic play—creativity, intellectual growth, and social skills. She
maintains these elements are not only essential facets of play, but also of the game of school and the game of life.

Smilansky's work generated the research to be reported herein. While a visiting professor at The Ohio State University, Smilansky conducted a seminar for students interested in play. This seminar gave rise to extensive research involving sociodramatic play and its relationship to several variables; e.g., socioeconomic status, creativity, categorization, race, age, locus of control, play setting, and language development. In the near future, Smilansky will be compiling for publication this research about sociodramatic play and its uses.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this investigation was to study the relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement of second grade, low socioeconomic status, black children. Specifically, the relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement was examined along with other possible variables that may have contributed to this relationship. These other possible influencing variables were IQ, sex, and age of the subjects. Further, this study attempted to answer the following subquestions:

1. Do the low socioeconomic status children
studied in this research participate in sociodramatic play?

2. What implications can be drawn for intervention with low socioeconomic status children?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are offered for terms used throughout this study:

A. Sociodramatic play: a form of voluntary social activity in which preschool children participate. The child takes on a role and elaborates it in cooperation with at least one other player.

Smilansky (1968, p. 9) has identified six components which she considers essential parts of any well-developed sociodramatic play:

1. Imitative role play. The child undertakes a make-believe role and expresses it in imitative action and/or verbalization.

2. Make-believe in regard to objects. Movements or verbal declarations are substituted for real objects.

3. Make-believe in regard to actions and situations. Verbal descriptions are substituted for actions and situations.

4. Persistence. The child persists in a play episode for at least ten minutes.

5. Interaction. There are at least two players interacting in the framework of the play.

6. Verbal communication. There is some verbal interaction related to the play episode.
B. **Dramatic play**: The child takes on a role but does not elaborate it in cooperation with other children.

C. **Intelligence quotient**: Intelligence quotient is operationally defined as the score on the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity.

D. **Achievement**: There were two measures of achievement for this study.

1. Standardized test achievement was operationally defined as the score on the Reading Section of the California Achievement Test.

2. Grade point average, as a measure of achievement, was operationally defined as the average of ratings teachers assigned in the following subjects: arithmetic, reading, language, and spelling.

E. **Low socioeconomic status**: A rating of I on the Deutsch Index of Socioeconomic Status that has been obtained by rating the occupation of the main support of the family.

F. **Level of Sociodramatic Play**: Level of sociodramatic play was operationally defined as the rating the child received from an observer during a 30 minute play period based on the rating scale described later in instrumentation.

**Limitations of the Study**

The following limitations of the study can be identified:

1. Generalizations about the relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement can be made only about the second grade, black children from the school populations being
sampled.

2. The determination of the socioeconomic status of the children was limited by lack of information concerning the parents' education.

3. The California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity and the California Achievement Test may have measured the same variable.

4. Standardized tests were employed to measure the intelligence and achievement of low socioeconomic children.

5. Teacher ratings consist of one individual's perception of achievement.

6. The scope of the study is limited to the conceptualization of sociodramatic play as seen by Smilansky.

Importance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in the possibility of using sociodramatic play to intervene with culturally disadvantaged children to enhance their school achievement.

The success of the culturally disadvantaged in the present educational system has been limited (Lynds, 1929; Davis, 1948). Various hypotheses are presented
to explain this situation. Brittain (1966) cites several characteristics of culturally disadvantaged children which he believes underlies their inferior academic performance. From the middle-class point of view, these deficit characteristics occur in both cognitive and affective areas and include poor language facility, constriction in dealing with symbolic and abstract ideas, narrowness of outlook and lack of curiosity, low self-esteem, and lack of motivation for achievement.

Getzels (1966), in discussing the "dilemma of discontinuity," describes the problems this way: The values, language, information, and method of learning acquired by the lower class child are discontinuous with what will be required of him in school. It is as if one group, the advantaged, learns a set of tools applicable to the school situation and the other group, the disadvantaged, learns a set not applicable to the situation; but the school expects the two groups to perform equally well. There is a crucial need for change in educational approaches for the lower class or culturally different child if that child is to succeed in the middle-class school.

Smilansky (1968) observes that the behavior pattern of the culturally disadvantaged child reveals rigid, monotonous repetition of brief, isolated spasms of
concentrated effort. Their knowledge, experiences, and abilities are not wholly utilized in their activities and thought because these are not connected by meaningful relationships. Their experiences remain separate and unrelated and this prevents the child from molding existing concepts into new ones, from elaborating a theme, and from seeing things from different points of view.

Smilansky regards the differences in elaboration of concepts between "privileged" and "underprivileged" children as a result of environmental influences. The privileged child is taught how to collect scattered facts and form concepts which he then utilizes in problem-solving while the underprivileged child is on his own completing the above tasks only accidentally.

Smilansky suggests the prevailing tendency to date has been to develop in the culturally disadvantaged child specific ability areas and knowledge contents separately. In some way this duplicates the unfavorable home environment which undoubtedly has provided the child with a fair amount of facts, experiences, and vocabulary but has failed in providing means of integration. She notes that our efforts should be directed toward finding ways that will assist the child in using these scattered experiences and concepts he already possesses and convert them into new conceptual
schemes.

During research in Israel, Smilansky observed great similarity between patterns of behavior that advance successful participation of children in sociodramatic play and patterns of behavior necessary for successful integration into the school situation. Sociodramatic play seems to be one of the means that naturally meets the needs of culturally disadvantaged children. It demands from the child that he utilizes his potential abilities and knowledge and combines his scattered experiences. While playing a role, the child must draw from his knowledge acquired by observing situations and people. He must express those experiences in action and verbalization. He must interact socially with his peers.

Several advantages are inherent in a sociodramatic play situation according to Smilansky:

1. A child participating in sociodramatic play benefits from being actor, observer, and interactor at the same time. As an actor, he is motivated to utilize his resources and create. Yet he learns intellectual discipline and self-control because he does this within the limiting framework of the role and the theme. The play causes him to observe his coactors and real-life persons, and these observations widen his conceptual world. Finally, the interaction with his peers requires tolerance and sensitivity to demands, and this prepares him for positive social interaction.

2. Learning takes place in an activity that is in itself rewarding.
Language has an important role when the child is engaging in sociodramatic play.

If the elements in successful sociodramatic play and successful participation in school are similar, intervention with children through sociodramatic play may well be a method of improving school achievement of youngsters with normal ability. Moreover, it may be a vehicle for intervention with the culturally disadvantaged.

In fact, if the results of the study indicated the feasibility of intervention to enhance school achievement, the counselor might well be the school person to perform such a task. His knowledge of child development, his observation skills, and his familiarity with small group techniques would seem to qualify him. Using a child's natural activity, the counselor might be able to assist students in gaining skills necessary for improved school achievement.

Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation

This chapter has included an introduction, statement of the problem, definition of terms, limitations of the study, and importance of the study. Chapter II presents a review of the literature pertinent to the study. Chapter III contains a description of the procedures and statistical methods used in the study.
and in Chapter IV is found a discussion of the findings of the study. Chapter V contains a summary, implications, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will present a review of literature related to the study. This review will be presented in three sections. The first includes play theories. Considered in this section are the classical and infantile dynamics theories. The second section discusses dramatic play. This includes a description of the functions of dramatic play. The final section considers sociodramatic play. Research relating sociodramatic play to school achievement is reviewed.

Play is a natural medium of expression for the child (Axline, 1947). A child's play is a serious business (Jersild, 1954). It is through play that much of the work of childhood is accomplished. Play becomes any activity which the child attempts because he wants to, because it is rewarding in itself. In play a child tries himself out; he travels from the known into the untried and the unknown.

**Play Theories**

Different theories of play have been proposed over the years. There are two main categories which deal with the causes and effects of play (Gilmore, 1966).
According to Gilmore, theories prevalent before World War I are referred to as the classical theories and those of more recent origin are termed the infantile dynamics theories. The classical theories are concerned with the causes and purposes of play while disregarding the content of play. On the other hand, Gilmore maintains that the infantile dynamics theories view the form that play takes as being crucial for indicating the causes and effects of play.

Classical Theories. One of the earliest statements regarding the importance of play is attributed to both Schiller and Spencer (Millar, 1968). According to this theory, play is the result of a surplus of energy which exists because the young are freed from the activities of self-preservation which occupy their parents (Spencer, 1873). This energy surplus finds its release in the aimless, exuberant activities that are termed "play." Play, then, is a goalless or meaningless behavior.

In contrast to the surplus energy theory, the relaxation theory of play views play as a method by which spent energy can be replenished (Gilmore, 1966). According to Gilmore, proponents of this theory, Lazarus and Patrick, saw play as a means of dissipating the inhibition built up from fatigue caused by performing tasks that are relatively new to the organism. Therefore, play occurs most often in childhood and serves to replenish the energy
of the child.

Several theorists describe play as a form of instinctive behavior. One of the better-known of the theorists, Karl Groos (1901), sees play as pre-exercise—a kind of preparation toward work. Play has its roots in the instincts. It exercises those instincts in preparation for their maturation.

Looking at play as a reliving of the past rather than as a preparation for the future, G. Stanley Hall (1916) proposed the recapitulation theory of play. Hall, the first to suggest play stages, hypothesized that each child passes through a series of play stages re-enacting the cultural stages in the development of the races.

According to Gilmore (1966), Appleton studied play in primitive cultures and in children and decided that play is a response to a generalized drive for growth in an organism. The desire to grow to a stage at which the instinct can operate is the basis for play. Play facilitates the mastery of skills necessary for the functioning of adult instincts according to Gilmore's explanation of this growth theory.

Gilmore suggests that the ego-expanding theories, proposed by Lange and later by Claparede, are somewhat similar to the growth theories. In addition, Gilmore states that Lange views play as nature's way of completing the ego while Claparede looks at play as an expressive
exercising of the ego and the rest of the personality. This exercising strengthens developing cognitive skills.

In summary, the classical theories of Spencer, Groos, Hall, and Appleton are more concerned with the causes and effects of play than with the content of the play behaviors. Although certainly capable of being tested, the classical theories have generated little research. Recent research attacking these theories is that of Smilansky (1968). She maintains that her observations in Israel show that culturally disadvantaged children do not participate in sociodramatic play. Therefore, Smilansky doubts the efficacy of such classical theories as the surplus energy theory, the pre-exercise theory, and the recapitulation theory of play.

**Infantile Dynamics Theories.** Theories in this category see the form play takes as the key to its causes and effects. According to Gilmore (1966), Lewin and Buhtendijk postulated two of this category's earliest theories. Lewin (1951) believed play occurs because the child's unstructured cognitive life-space results in a failure to discriminate between the real and the unreal. The child can move into the unreal world with ease.

Gilmore reports that Buhtendijk maintained a child plays because he is a child, because his cognitive "dynamics" do not permit any other way of behaving. A child's uncoordinated approach to his environment is
reflected in his play.

Another infantile dynamics theory is that of Piaget (1967). His theory of play is closely tied to his account of the growth of intelligence. He proposes two processes which he believes to be fundamental to all organic development: assimilation and accommodation. In assimilation, the organism changes the information it receives— it digests it, so to speak. Accommodation means any adjustment the organism has to make to the external world in order to assimilate information. Intellectual development is the interaction between these two forces. When these two processes of assimilation and accommodation balance each other, intelligent adaptation occurs. However, one of these processes can predominate. Imitation results when accommodation predominates over assimilation. On the other hand, assimilation—fitting the impression in with previous experience and adapting it to the individual's needs—may predominate. When it does, play occurs. Play is an integral part of the development of intelligence.

Even with the recent popularity of Piaget, the Freudian theoretical interpretation has dominated since the 1930's and 1940's (Herron & Sutton-Smith, 1971). Freud (1959) sees play in the child as the first traces of imaginative activity. He compares a child at play to an imaginative writer, in that the child rearranges the things
of his world to please him. Play is to the child what
daydreaming is to the adult. To Freud, the play of
children is determined by the child's wish to be grown-up.
Freud maintains the child always plays at being grown-up.
The child imitates adult behavior. In the psychoanalytic
theory of play, the most frequently cited effect of play
is "a sense of mastery," generally mastery of anxiety.
This mastery of anxiety offers the subject some compensatory
value.

Erikson (1950), an advocate of the psychoanalytic
school of play, offers an elaboration of the theory by
attributing a growth function to play: "I propose the
theory that the child's play is the infantile form of
the human ability to deal with experience by creating
model situations and to master reality by experiment
and planning" (p. 186).

The preceding paragraphs have constituted a brief
survey of the theoretical interpretations of play. As
previously mentioned, the validity of many of the classical
theories has been questioned by Smilansky. The infantile
dynamics theories of play have not generated any more
research than the classical theories. Where research does
exist (Smilansky, 1968; Eifermann, 1968), it casts doubt
upon the universality of dramatic play and questions
Piaget's descriptions of games beyond the age of five.

A review of the literature treating play reflects
the number of activities that seem to be included in the concept "play". Moreover, there is not one agreed-upon definition of play. Part of the ambiguity surrounding the concept may stem from the existence of various stages of play that do, to some extent, overlap.

Smilansky (1968) cites four stages of play through which a normal child moves automatically, graduating from one stage to the next as he develops biologically. A brief description of the four stages follows:

1. Functional play includes simple muscular activities based on a child's need to activate his physical organism. This play permits the child to practice and test his physical capabilities and to explore and experience his immediate environment.

2. Constructive play introduces the child to creative activity and thus to the personal joy of creation. He learns the various uses of play materials and engages in a "creation". For example, he goes from simple handling of the bricks to building something.

3. Dramatic play is symbolic play. Through
dramatic play the child can exhibit his physical prowess, his creative ability, and his developing social ability.

4. Games-with-rules is the highest stage in play development. In this situation the child has to accept prearranged rules and adjust to them. He learns to control his behavior, actions, and reactions, within limits.

Dramatic Play

Dramatic play has received some attention in the literature. Because dramatic and sociodramatic play are closely related, the treatment dramatic play receives in the literature will be presented.

Theoretically, dramatic play is seen serving various functions primarily in social and emotional areas of development. Hartley, Frank, and Goldenson (1952) discuss the functions of dramatic play concluding that observation of dramatic play does reveal significant information about a child. In addition, it may be an instrument for growth by reflecting and encouraging changes in attitude and adjustment and supplying a laboratory in which the child may experiment with possible solutions to his problems.

Psychoanalysts view dramatic play as helping the child cope with the frustrations, the fears, the
unfulfilled hopes, the disappointments, and the envy rooted in the child's situation in the family (Herron & Sutton-Smith, 1971). Isaacs (1933), also of the psychoanalytic school, looks at dramatic play as not only encouraging social development of children, but also as fostering their intellectual development by placing them in situations that force them to think, investigate, and achieve at a higher intellectual level than chronological age would indicate.

According to Millar (1968) and Furth (1969), Piaget regards symbolic and make-believe play as having the same function in the development of representational thinking as Piaget's practice play had in the sensory-motor period. Symbolic play is "pure" assimilation and repeats and organizes the child's thinking in terms of images and symbols that he has already mastered. For example, a child tells stories just for the fun of telling them. Further, Millar states that, to Piaget, symbolic play also functions to assimilate and consolidate the child's emotional experiences. The important events in the child's life are reproduced in play.

Also suggesting a relationship between dramatic play and intellectual growth or cognition, Sutton-Smith (Herron & Sutton-Smith, 1971) notes that beginning with the representational play of two-year-olds, there develops a deliberate adoption of an "as if" attitude towards play
objects and events. The child having such an attitude continues to "conserve" imaginative identities in play in spite of contraindicative stimuli. This cognitive competence can be observed in solitary play, social games, and in children's appreciation of imaginative stories. Yet, not until they are five or seven years of age can children conserve the class identities of such phenomena as number, quantity, space, and the like, despite contraindicative stimuli. The factor which prevents children from conservation of class identities appears to be the stimulus they are able to ignore in their play. The question can be raised as to whether the ability to adopt a representational set in play has anything to do with the ability to adopt representative categories on a conceptual level.

Sociodramatic Play

Smilansky's (1968) study is the only comprehensive research on sociodramatic play to date. As reported previously, she hypothesizes that successful participation in sociodramatic play advances patterns of behavior necessary for successful integration into the school situation. Specifically, sociodramatic play behaviors develop three main areas in the child: creativity, intellectual growth, and social skills.

Smilansky has formulated fifteen generalizations
on actions and reactions that operate in the sociodramatic play situation and through which the above behaviors are developed:

1. The child learns to gather scattered experiences and to create out of them a new combination. The things the child does and says while playing his role are an imaginative combination of many details and not an exact imitation of any single behavior observed.

2. The child learns to draw on his experiences and knowledge selectively according to some fixed frame of reference. The playing of a role demands intellectual discipline. He can include only the behavior that characterizes the role he is enacting. He must judge and select.

3. The child learns to discern and enact the central characteristics of the role behavior (its major features, its main theme). If the child does not project the essence of his role, he is criticized by his peers and the role may be taken from him. When a child is given the role of kindergarten teacher, for example, it is not enough that he imitate the activities of the teacher, but he must also project the "teacher attitude" as broadly as possible. Detail, as such, is not insisted on, but the main feeling of the theme is definitely required. This means that the child must (a) thoroughly understand the theme, (b) imagine the role as he intends to perform it, (c) compare the role as he imagines it with the role as he has observed it performed by adults in the real world, and (d) limit and select his actions in order to portray clearly the main characteristics of his role. He cannot let it become vaguely cluttered with detail or distorted through irrelevant excursions.

4. Through his participation in sociodramatic play the child learns to concentrate around a given theme. This means to keep himself "centered in the togetherness" offered by the given limits of the play episode. When a child loses his concentration, he loses his grip on and his
relation to the play episode; the other children then demand his ejection on the grounds of his deviation from the agreed play presumptions. Concentration is enforced by the child's peers, not by a parent, teacher, or other adult. Because other children seem to be able to concentrate in this way, the child has cause to believe that he can do the same. Discipline is therefore "natural" in sociodramatic play. Concentration is essential to sociodramatic play, which in turn encourages the development of concentration.

5. Through his participation in sociodramatic play, the child learns to control himself in relation to his own internalized sense of evolving order. Playing a role means receiving clues from the environment, reforming them into his own vision of action, then acting. By performing within this feedback system the child senses himself as central to the ordering of his own world, and his ability to control his behavior develops accordingly.

6. Through his participation in sociodramatic play, the child learns to control himself and to discipline his own actions in relation to a context. A child, for example, playing at being a pilot, may fall and hurt himself. He wants to cry but he knows that a pilot would not cry, so he controls his impulsive reaction in order to remain inside the role and thereby sustain the play episode. This self-discipline grows out of his own understanding and is of his own choice. It is also a social discipline; he is learning to adjust himself to the requirements of a social setting.

7. Through his participation in sociodramatic play, the child learns flexibility in his approach to various situations. The other children tend to use approaches that are different from his but still prove fruitfully relevant to the play situation. Sociodramatic play channels attention to the inner world of others who form their actions from their own frame of reference within the limits of the play episode. Each child, actor himself,
needs to learn to respond to the various forms of experiencing of the other actors. This is basic to sociodramatic play; flexibility is a requirement.

8. Through his participation in sociodramatic play, the child learns that he sets his own standards for his actions, that other children do the same, and that satisfaction comes when each uses his own standards, which subsequently re-enforce the standards of others. In other words, the individuality of each is to be respected, and individual fulfillment depends both on a sensitive respect for the individuality of others and on a common operation in which all can participate and be rewarded. Sociodramatic play as a psychological form is an effort to blend into a mutual meaning both the individual, as individual, and society, as a systematic form of individual responsiveness.

9. Through his participation in sociodramatic play the child learns how it feels to be a creator. He experiences himself as a creative being, forming his personal response to the world from his position in it and experiencing the world as a place responsive to, and inviting of, his creation. He gets both the intrinsic satisfactions and the extrinsic reward for being creative.

10. Sociodramatic play helps the child develop from a predominantly egocentric being into a being capable of cooperation and interaction. When several children play together, their interaction and mutual help promote constant progress in their work; thus they do not remain at the same level of self-expression but are constantly learning to expand and exploit their individual possibilities.

11. Through his participation in sociodramatic play, the child learns to observe reality (his surroundings) with a view to the future utilization of these observations in relation to himself. The environment has active value for him. Successful sociodramatic play calls for meaningful interaction with the environment,
both as an observer of it and as an actor affecting it. This heightened perception continues as a need even when the socio-dramatic play is at an end, for the child knows that he must be able to draw on his observations of the adult world as his source of authority when he wants to convince others of the validity of his performance.

12. Through his participation in sociodramatic play the child learns new concepts (as well as new approaches). He soon realizes that the concept of "father," for example, can include behavior patterns not necessarily part of his own father's behavior pattern. The concept of "father," therefore, expands and reforms. The role is generously enough proportioned to invite many inclusions, reformations, and enrichment.

13. Through his participation in sociodramatic play the child learns to develop toward advanced stages of abstract thought. He may begin with a toy and be wholly dependent on it to relate him securely to his role. After a while (because the rapidity of spontaneous play and its growing complexity requires it) he is able to pretend that he has the toy in hand and acts accordingly. Still later he is able to use the word in the place of both action and toy.

14. Through his participation in sociodramatic play the child learns to generalize. We mean here the particular thought process of movement from the particular and limited to the general and more inclusive. It is one of the familiar aims of education and is clearly present as an intrinsic requisite of sociodramatic play.

15. Through the participation in sociodramatic play the child learns vicariously from the experience and knowledge of other children. A "policeman" refuses to help a "mother" cross the road on the grounds that he is a prison policeman whose job is at a jail and not on the street as a traffic policeman. The girl had not previously known that policemen also worked in jails!

(Smilansky, 1968)
Smilansky, testing her theory in Israel, found that children from low socioeconomic status homes play very little and do not participate in sociodramatic play at all. Although her research was conducted with three-year-olds, Smilansky reports that her observations indicated that culturally deprived children do not engage in sociodramatic play at a significantly higher level as they grow older. She notes that some improvement appears in the elaboration of the imitative activities, and in cooperation with other players, but this cooperation is not really related to the theme and appears only in some play-related construction.

Smilansky looked for a relationship between IQ and quality of sociodramatic play. Even though the low socioeconomic status children covered a broad intelligence range, only a few engaged in sociodramatic play. Yet all of the high socioeconomic status children did engage in sociodramatic play despite the great differences in their measured intelligence. Probably intelligence, as measured by a standardized test, is not a main variable affecting the sociodramatic play of children. Smilansky reported that her findings in regard to age and IQ were limited by the lack of a valid evaluation for measuring sociodramatic play.

Smilansky's findings that low socioeconomic status children do not participate in sociodramatic play, raised the question: Can low socioeconomic status children be
taught to engage in sociodramatic play as a first step toward intervention to enhance school achievement? Attempting to answer this question, Smilansky intervened with children to develop the ability for sociodramatic play. The intervention consisted of three treatments—one each for three different groups. The first group was provided with more thorough observations and better understanding of their daily experiences. The next group was taught how to exploit their previous experiences by converting the experiences into the raw material of sociodramatic play. In other words, they were taught how to play. The final group was introduced to a combination of the treatments used in the first two groups. Play in the third group improved significantly permitting the conclusion that culturally disadvantaged children can learn to participate in sociodramatic play.

Summary

Literature related to play theories, dramatic play, and sociodramatic play has been reviewed in this chapter. Classical and infantile dynamics theories of play attach great importance to play but little research is available to substantiate or refute this importance. Dramatic play, because of its similarity to sociodramatic play, was considered. Dramatic play was seen to serve various functions, particularly, in the social and emotional development of the child. In addition, a relationship
between dramatic play and intellectual growth or cognition was suggested. Sociodramatic play was discussed and the rationale for using it as a vehicle for intervention to enhance the school achievement of culturally disadvantaged children was examined.

The focus of this study was the relationship existing between sociodramatic play and school achievement. Smilansky's hypothesis that sociodramatic play could be used as a vehicle for intervention to improve school achievement has not been supported or refuted in the literature. If, in fact, the behaviors necessary for success in each area are similar, it might be hypothesized that the level of sociodramatic play exhibited by a child would predict his school achievement. If play ability does predict school achievement, this would give support to Smilansky's thesis that elements in the two areas are similar and sociodramatic play might well provide a means for intervention with low socioeconomic status children.

Chapter III will discuss the procedures utilized in this study.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Chapter III presents a description of the methods and procedures used in this study. A discussion of the setting, population, instruments, and statistical processes is offered.

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement in low socioeconomic status, black second-graders. The variables were level of sociodramatic play, school achievement, age, sex, and IQ. Age, sex, and IQ were examined because of their suspected influence on school achievement.

Setting

Locale. This research was conducted in Columbus, Ohio, which ranks twenty-first among the cities of the United States in the 1970 census. The population of Columbus has been growing faster than the population of Ohio and the East North-Central states, and more rapidly than that of the United States. Several important industries have large plants and/or home offices in the city. In addition, the
educational opportunities found in Columbus are many and
diverse with universities, technical schools, and business
schools available. Columbus, as most large cities, has a
central city area populated mainly by low socioeconomic
status citizens. Four schools from this central city area
provided the research context for this study.

Research context. The Columbus Public School System
has constructed one hundred new schools since 1945. Over
half of the schools in the system are less than fifteen
years old. This system, with one hundred seventy-six
schools, provides educational opportunities for 109,000
students and positions for 5,000 teachers. Four schools,
located in predominately black, low socioeconomic status
neighborhoods, provided the research context for this
study. All four schools receive federal and state funds
for their predominately culturally disadvantaged students.

The investigator set up a partially structured
playroom in each school and provided child-size replicas
of housekeeping equipment, dress-up clothes, grocery store
equipment, and doctor's equipment. Also some relatively
unstructured materials, e.g., blocks and cardboard boxes
were placed in the room.

Specifically, the partially structured playroom
contained the following equipment:
2 dolls, black
1 doll bed, mattress, blanket, pillow
1 stove
1 refrigerator
1 cupboard
1 set dishes
4 tables
3 chairs for housekeeping table
cash register
2 telephones
shelf for grocery supplies
empty cans and cartons for grocery store
workman's tool case
dress-up clothes
  hats, purses for mother
  jacket for father
  hats for father
  hat for nurse
  white coat for nurse or doctor
doctor's kit
unstructured materials
  cardboard boxes
  wheel
  blocks
  rubber tubing
  a piece of rope
  cardboard cylinders

Population

The students enrolled in the second grades of four schools located in predominately black, low socioeconomic status neighborhoods provided the population for this study.

Sample. The sample of this study consisted of seventy low socioeconomic status, black children from four Columbus Public School second grades. Thirty-four girls and thirty-six boys were included. Children who had been retained in the second grade were excluded from the sample. The ages of the subjects ranged from six years, ten months, to eight years, six months.
Socioeconomic status was determined by rating the occupation of the main support of the family according to the Index of Socioeconomic Status developed at the Institute for Developmental Studies. No parents of subjects in the study had an occupational rating above I. The parent and/or parents of forty-six subjects were receiving public assistance, (e.g., aid for dependent children or social security) while the parent and/or parents of twenty-four subjects were employed.

Sample Selection. Groups of four, comprised of two boys and two girls, were chosen from each class until this combination of four had been exhausted. The members of each group always were members of the same classroom.

Instruments

To accomplish the purposes of this study, five variables were examined. Two of the five were operationally defined in terms of scores in data from two separate instruments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement 1</td>
<td>California Achievement Test-Reading Achievement Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement 2</td>
<td>Average of ratings in arithmetic, reading, language, and spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociodramatic Play</td>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collected by these instruments were used to examine
the relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement.

**California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity 1963 Revision (Level 1).** The California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity is a concise adaptation of the California Test of Mental Maturity and provides information about the functional capacities that are basic to learning, problem-solving, and responding to new situations.

The California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity consists of seven test units, each a different mental exercise. Tests 1 through 4 comprise the Non-Language Section. These four units require a minimum use of language by the pupil, both in comprehending directions and in determining correct responses. Items in the Non-Language Section measure primarily those mental abilities involving recognition or logical analysis of particular concepts and relationships. The Language Section, Tests 5 through 7, sample the ability to comprehend verbal and numerical concepts of various types and test the extent and accuracy of recall. Each section contains fifty items.

The 1963 Revision of the Short-Form includes completely new scaling and norming. A basic change is the use of a deviation IQ in place of the ratio IQ employed in previous editions. All normative data of the 1963 Revision are based on chronological age groups.
All derived scores, except mental age, are obtained directly from raw scores and are based on deviation units. Stanley (1965) reviews the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity stating that it is unfortunate that the Examiner's Manual does not include even the simplest statistical evidence of reliability or validity. Overall, the reviewer feels that the CTMMS-Form is most useful at kindergarten through the third grade.

The Technical Report published by the California Test Bureau reports reliability at .90 for the Language Section and .89 for the Non-Language Section.

California Achievement Test, 1970 Edition, (Level 1, Form A)—The Reading Section. The California Achievement Test was designed for the measurement, evaluation, and analysis of school achievement. The battery covers grades 1.5 and 2. Although this battery consists of tests in three basic areas—reading, mathematics, and language, it is the policy of the Columbus Public Schools to administer only the Reading Achievement Test at the second grade level. Since these scores were obtained in cooperation with the Columbus Public Schools, only the Reading Test score was considered.

The Reading Test is divided into two categories—Reading Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension. A brief description from the Test Coordinator's Handbook follows:

The focus of the Reading Test is on ability to perform in fundamental content areas and on achievement of basic curricular
objectives. The Vocabulary section in all levels is composed of new items. The Comprehension sections contain some new material and some from the 1957 edition. Passages and items were chosen for their curricular content. A study of reading program objectives of school districts in all parts of the country resulted in a design to include, to the extent possible, the aims of widely diverse curriculums. The test is intended to measure progress in reading gained from various methods of instruction. The vocabulary word skills sections at Levels 1 and 2 are designed to measure the students' base reading skills. The purpose of the vocabulary words in context sections at these levels is to measure the students' command of words as they occur in everyday usage. The comprehension sections are planned to measure the students' ability to derive meaning from written material. A review of the most widely used, current texts was made to determine content areas and to aid in the development of a format that visually resembles the material used by the student in his reading.

A Kuder-Richardson formula 20 estimate of reliability at .950 is reported in the Bulletin of Technical Data Number 1. No additional reliability or validity information is available in any of the publications of the California Test Bureau. Neither the 1965 nor the 1970 edition of E.uro's Mental Measurement Yearbook reviews the 1970 edition of CAT. The investigator's personal communication with the California Test Bureau reveals that this edition is yet to be reviewed.

Grade Point Average. Grade point average was operationally defined as the average of the ratings given by the teachers of the second grade children in the following subjects: arithmetic, reading, language, and spelling. The Columbus Public Schools use the following
rating system in the second grade:

R is used when a child is making very rapid progress. This is clearly a child who demonstrates outstanding achievement.

S is used for a child who is progressing at a normal rate.

I is used for a child who is making slow progress.

For purposes of grade point average, "two" designated R, "one" denoted S, and "zero" represented I.

Ratings in the above subjects were secured for each child studied as a second measure of achievement. An additional measure of achievement was sought because of the bias involved in the use of standardized tests to evaluate culturally disadvantaged students (Davis, 1948).

Level of Sociodramatic Play. Level of sociodramatic play was operationally defined as the rating a child received during an observed thirty minute play period. Three observers plus the investigator observed and took a specimen record (See Appendix B) of a particular child's behavior. The observer was primarily concerned with recording the presence or absence of the six elements that comprise sociodramatic play: imitative role play, make-believe with actions, make-believe with situations, persistence, interaction, and verbal communication.

Observer Reliability. Before the study was begun, the experimenter and other observers were engaged in taking
specimen records of the sociodramatic play of five-year-old, low socioeconomic status, white, kindergarten school children. Therefore, all observers had previous experience in observation of play before this study was undertaken.

Effect of Observers Upon Children. During exploratory work, Griffing (personal communication, January, 1970) found that the presence of two observers seemed to have little effect upon children's play. Special care was exercised to see that four observers were unobtrusive. The presence of observers did not appear to interfere with the children's play.

Suggestions for Rating. Smilansky's (1968) observations of sociodramatic play in Israel simply rated the presence or absence of six criteria: imitative role play, make-believe with actions, make-believe with situations, persistence, interaction, and verbal communication. The members of the seminar, conducted by Smilansky at The Ohio State University, attempted a finer discrimination of sociodramatic play by developing a numerical scale (See Appendix D) to measure the degree to which the six criteria were present. The scale ranged from "little" indicated by number one to "much" indicated by number three. This investigator, studying second grade rather than kindergarten children, did not find the "one" to "three" range broad enough to cover the play behaviors of the older children. Therefore, the range was increased by one point (1-4) to permit a finer discrimination and also to obtain more information about the
subjects' degree of sociodramatic play.

Time was recorded systematically every one to five minutes on the specimen record. A rating of 1-4 was given to each of the six elements during each five minute period to indicate the degree to which the six criteria were present. The scores for each five minute segment were combined to arrive at a total sociodramatic play score. To qualify as a sociodramatic player, a child would have to score at least six points during one five minute segment. The highest possible raw score a child could receive was 144. The seventy total scores were divided at quartiles in an attempt to specify levels of play achievement. The following levels resulted and were designated by numbers 1-4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Level of Play Achievement</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lowest Level</td>
<td>1-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Second Level</td>
<td>34-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third Level</td>
<td>58-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highest Level</td>
<td>77-119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two raters, acquainted with both the concept of sociodramatic play and the rating scale, rated the level of sociodramatic play of the subjects. Inter-rater reliability was determined by a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. An r of .99 was found. The value of r would strongly suggest that the two raters were in substantial agreement relative to the level of sociodramatic play observed.
Data Analysis

The method used to analyze the data, stepwise multiple regression, is a direct extension of the linear (or curvilinear) regression model. For purpose of explanation for the person in school psychology or counseling, it might be helpful to understand that in linear regression, each subject or member of the sample under study is represented by a single coordinate or point in two dimensional space. With many individuals, an array of coordinates or points in two-dimensional space is represented. This array of points is best summarized by fitting a line (or curve) to the data. The process of fitting, the least squares procedure, gives the line (or curve) of best fit, that is, the unique line for which the sum of the distance of the coordinates to the line is at a minimum when compared to a similar sum for any other line. This line of best fit, the regression equation for the two variable case, is utilized to predict one variable from the other, that is, to predict \( x \) from \( y \) or vice versa.

One speaks not of two - but of three- dimensional space in the three variable case of predicting one variable from two others taken together. Instead of fitting a line or curve to the array, the best fit solution is represented by a plane. With more than two predictors of a single variable the terminology consists of n-dimensional space or hyperspaces and hyperplanes or surfaces.
This study is an example of the situation where there are more than two predictors of a single variable. The Wherry Test Selection program employed in this analysis selects that combination of predictors which, when taken together, gives the best prediction of the single variable. Specifically, it yields a multiple correlation coefficient which indicates the strength between one variable and two or more other variables taken together, and the equation of the surface or hyperplane best fitting the data (Guilford, 1965).

The first step in the Wherry Test Selection program is the generation of a matrix containing the zero order inter-correlations for all the possible variable combinations. Next, the variable having the highest correlation with the criterion is entered first into the prediction equation; for example, the variable most predictive of success in school achievement is entered first. A significance test is computed (see following paragraph) to determine if this predictor variable is explaining a significant portion of the variance of the criterion variable. If it is, the question next posed is: "Which of the remaining variables when taken in conjunction with the first predictor increases the prediction most?" To ascertain this, a modified Doolittle procedure is used to solve the correlation matrix.

---

1The Doolittle procedure is a method of solving simultaneous equations, the correlation matrix is a series of simultaneous equations in matrix form. See McNemar, 1966, for the computational steps necessary to analyze the matrix.
After selecting the second predictor variable, a multiple correlation coefficient, $R$ is calculated. This $R$ (two predictors) is compared with the previous one\(^2\) and a significance test is made (see following paragraph). This test of significance determines whether or not the prediction has been significantly increased by the inclusion of a second predictor. The question then becomes: "Does the inclusion of this second independent variable significantly increase the amount of criterion variance that is explained or accounted for?" The Program continues this step-wise process of adding one variable at a time and computes a significance test comparing the previous $R$ to the subsequent one until the point of no significant difference is reached. In other words, adding further variables is stopped when they no longer help explain the criterion variance.

The general formula for the test of significance between two $R$'s is:

\[
F = \frac{R_1^2 - R_2^2}{1 - R_1^2} \cdot \frac{N-m_1-1}{m_1-}
\]

Where $R_1$ is the multiple $R$ with larger number of predictor variables, and $R_2$ is the multiple $R$ with one less predictor variable than $R_1$.

\(^2\)The Pearson $r$ which expresses the relationship between two variables can be thought of as a multiple $R$ with one predictor.
In the case where there is only one predictor variable and no possible prior multiple correlation, the formula is:

\[
F = \frac{R_1^2}{N-2} \cdot \frac{1}{1-R_1^2}
\]

This formula is used to test whether or not the correlation between the first variable entering the prediction equation and the criterion is significantly different from zero. In the case where \(m_1\) is one unit larger than \(m_2\) such as in the comparison of subsequent multiple R's in the Wherry Test Selection program, the formula becomes:

\[
F = \frac{R_1^2 - R_2^2}{N-m_1-1} \cdot \frac{1}{1-R_1^2}
\]

This formula is used to test whether or not the one extra variable in \(R_1\) is adding a significant contribution to the explanation of criterion variance.

In Wherry's program, the level of significance for these F tests is always set at \(p = .50\). The choice of this level greatly simplifies computer operations (any F of 1.0
or greater would be significant so therefore it would not be necessary to place an F table in computer storage).

Again it might be helpful to understand that the multiple correlation coefficient generated from procedures described above is a biased estimator of the population parameter. As the number of selected predictor variables approaches the size of the sample, R becomes inflated, that is, R will over-estimate the true population coefficient (Garrett, 1966 and Guilford, 1965). It is therefore necessary to reduce (or shrink) the original coefficient so that it more accurately reflects the population value. The adjusted coefficient, the shrunken $\bar{R}$, is obtained by the use of the following formula:

$$\bar{R} = 1 - \frac{(1-R^2)(N-1)}{(N-n)}$$

Where
- $\bar{R}$  shrunken multiple correlation coefficient
- $R$  the original R
- $N$  the sample size
- $n$  the number of predictors included in the prediction equation

To fully interpret multiple regression, it is important to consider, in addition to the shrunken $R$, the order in which variables are selected into the prediction equation. The variable that enters first will reduce the apparent predictive power of other variables which are correlated with it. When two predictor variables are correlated, both may be explaining the same portion of the criterion variance. The one that
explains best (that is, the variable having the higher zero order correlation with the criterion) enters the prediction equation first. The predictor variable correlated with it is then prevented, or at least hindered, from entering the prediction equation because its contribution to the explanation of criterion variance has already been accounted for.

Summary

Chapter III was a detailed discussion of the procedures employed in this investigation. The population, sample, instrumentation, and data analysis utilized in the study were discussed. The next chapter presents the findings of the study.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The problem of this study was to examine the relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement. Answers to specific questions were sought by examining the findings of the investigation. Fundamentally, the study made three inquiries: (1) Do the low socioeconomic status children in this research engage in sociodramatic play? (2) What is the relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement? and (3) What implications can be drawn for intervention with low socioeconomic status children?

An underlying assumption in an examination of the relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement is that children can and will engage in sociodramatic play. As reported previously, Smilansky found that culturally disadvantaged children in Israel did not participate in sociodramatic play. Therefore, the first major research question to be answered in this study was

Question #1: Do the low socioeconomic status children in this research participate in sociodramatic play?

An examination of the individual specimen records of play reveals that four of the seventy children studied did not
engage in sociodramatic play as defined by Smilansky (1968). The remaining sixty-six children did participate ranging from a rather low level of sociodramatic play to a greatly elaborated level (See Appendices B and C for an example of a good and a poor player). The average raw score for play was fifty-nine. As explained in Chapter 3, raw scores were divided into four levels with one designating the lowest level of play achievement and four, the highest level. A raw score of fifty-nine fell into the third level of play achievement. In other words, the average player engaged in sociodramatic play at a relatively high level.

With this question answered, the relationship between play and school achievement could be examined.

Question #2: What is the relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement?

The relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement was examined along with other possible variables that may have contributed to this relationship. These other possible influencing variables were IQ, sex, and age of the subjects. Means and standard deviations of all the variables used in this study are deemed important to such an investigation and are included in this chapter. The means and standard deviations for the IQ, sex, and age variables are presented in Table 1. Sex is interpreted as follows: one designates male and two designates female subjects. Age is indicated in months. Sociodramatic play is reported in levels of play achievement—one denoting the lowest level of play achievement and four the highest level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>96.343</td>
<td>4.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language IQ</td>
<td>90.286</td>
<td>12.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-language IQ</td>
<td>93.671</td>
<td>13.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociodramatic play</td>
<td>2.614</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n 70

Table 2 contains the means and standard deviations for the criterion measures I and II. The mean of the Reading Section of the California Achievement Test translated into grade equivalency is first grade, first month. Grade point average reflects a numerical scale from 0 to 2 with zero indicating "slow progress", one denoting "satisfactory progress", and two designating "rapid progress".
TABLE 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
OF CRITERION MEASURES I AND II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. California Achievement Test--Reading Section</td>
<td>64.486</td>
<td>17.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Grade Point Average</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n 70

The first step in the Wherry Test Selection Program is the generation of a matrix containing the zero order intercorrelations for all the possible variable combinations, including the criterion--independent variable combinations. This intercorrelation matrix is presented in Table 3.

Table 3 indicates that sociodramatic play did not correlate with the California Achievement Test or with grade point average at the 0.01 or the 0.05 level of significance. Alternatively stated, sociodramatic play did not correlate significantly with either measure of achievement employed in this research study.

A further examination of Table 3 reveals that sociodramatic play does not correlate at the 0.01 or the 0.05 level of significance with any of the other variables studied--sex, age, and IQ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Language IQ</th>
<th>Non-language IQ</th>
<th>Crit. I</th>
<th>Crit. II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0289</td>
<td>0.1872</td>
<td>-0.0972</td>
<td>-0.0537</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
<td>0.2806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0289</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2062</td>
<td>-0.0529</td>
<td>0.0235</td>
<td>0.3201</td>
<td>0.1676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>0.1872</td>
<td>0.2062</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.1873</td>
<td>0.0317</td>
<td>0.1610</td>
<td>0.2206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language IQ</td>
<td>-0.0972</td>
<td>-0.0529</td>
<td>0.1873</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.4058*</td>
<td>0.5310**</td>
<td>0.4840**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-language IQ</td>
<td>-0.0537</td>
<td>0.0235</td>
<td>0.0317</td>
<td>0.4058*</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.3592</td>
<td>0.4148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion I</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
<td>0.3201</td>
<td>0.1610</td>
<td>0.5301**</td>
<td>0.3592</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.4746**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion II</td>
<td>0.2806</td>
<td>0.1676</td>
<td>0.2206</td>
<td>0.4840**</td>
<td>0.4148</td>
<td>0.4746*</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( r(p .05) = 0.401 \)

** \( r(p .01) = 0.456 \)

df 68
After the generation of this intercorrelational matrix, the Wherry Program selects the variable having the highest correlation with the criterion and enters it, first, into the prediction equation. The Program continues this stepwise process of adding one variable at a time and computes a significance test comparing the previous $R$ to the subsequent one until the point of no significant difference is reached. In other words, further variables are not added if they do not contribute to an explanation of the criterion variance.

The variables selected for their efficiency in predicting school achievement as measured by the California Reading Test are summarized in Table 4. The first variable selected was the language IQ score on the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity which showed a correlation of 0.520 ($R$) with Criterion I, the California Reading Test. This correlation was both significant and substantial. The above $R$ attained significance at the 0.01 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$\bar{R}$</th>
<th>$\bar{R}^2$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language IQ</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.2704</td>
<td>26.578</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.3844</td>
<td>13.634</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-language IQ</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.3956</td>
<td>2.261</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language IQ accounts for approximately twenty-seven per cent of the criterion variance in the present sample as indicated by the square of the above correlation.

The selection of language IQ as the first predictor of Criterion I, the California Reading Test, is not unexpected since successful performance on a reading test would require language skills.

Age, the second variable chosen, resulted in increments in $R^2$ which attained significance beyond the 0.01 level. The increment in $R$ after shrinkage, shown in Table 4, indicates that the variable age substantially increases prediction of criterion performance. The obtained $R$ of .62 reveals that language IQ, in conjunction with age, might be expected to account for thirty-eight per cent of the criterion variance.

The third variable selected in the stepwise regression procedure was non-language IQ. The resulting increment in $R$ did not attain significance at the 0.05 level.

Table 5 contains the standard score (beta) weights, bee (raw score) weights, associated $t$-values, and $A$-weights (constants) for the three variables included in the final regression equation obtained from the Wherry Test Selection Program. This regression equation indicates that language IQ is the most effective single predictor of performance on the California Reading Test. The addition of age improves the prediction substantially while the presence of non-language IQ improves the prediction of performance slightly. The three
TABLE 5

OBTAINED REGRESSION EQUATION FOR CRITERION I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta-Weight</th>
<th>Bee-Weight</th>
<th>T for Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language IQ</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>4.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>3.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-language IQ</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1.504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A weight: -154.810

variables included in the final regression equation have an \( R \) of .629 (\( R^2 \) .395) indicating that one might reasonably expect this equation to account for approximately 39.5 percent of the variance on the California Reading Test.

No further variables were added to this equation. Alternatively stated, the variable sociodramatic play was not added to the prediction equation because it did not contribute to an explanation of the criterion variance.

Table 6 lists the four variables in order of their relative predictive efficiency, using grade point average as the criterion. The first variable selected was the language IQ score on the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity which showed a correlation of 0.472 (\( R \)) with Criterion II, grade point average. This correlation was both significant and substantial. The above R attained significance at the
TABLE 6
STEPWISE REGRESSION PROCEDURES FOR CRITERION II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>\bar{R}</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language IQ</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.2217</td>
<td>20.801</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.3226</td>
<td>11.041</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-language IQ</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.3745</td>
<td>6.582</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.3969</td>
<td>3.458</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0.01 level. Squaring the above correlation reveals that language IQ accounts for approximately 22 per cent of the criterion variance in the present sample. The selection of language IQ as the first predictor of grade point average demonstrates the importance of language skills in academic success.

Sex, the second variable selected, resulted in increments in R^2 which attained significance beyond the 0.01 level. The increment in R after shrinkage, shown in Table 6, reveals that the variable age substantially increases prediction of criterion performance. The obtained \bar{R} of .568 indicates that language IQ, in conjunction with sex, might be expected to account for thirty-two per cent of the criterion variance.

Non-language IQ was the third variable chosen in the stepwise regression procedure. The increment in R attained
significance at the 0.01 level. The obtained \( R \) of .612 indicates that a combination of language IQ, sex, and non-language IQ might be expected to account for thirty-seven per cent of the variance of grade point average.

Age, the fourth variable selected, resulted in only slight improvement in predictive efficiency. The increment in \( R \) attained significance at the 0.05 level.

Table 7 contains the standard score (beta) weights, bee (raw score) weights, associated t-values, and A-weights (constants) for the four variables included in the final regression equation. This regression equation indicates that language IQ is the most effective single predictor of grade point average. The addition of sex improves the prediction substantially while the inclusion of non-language IQ improves prediction significantly. Inclusion of age results in only a slight improvement in predictive efficiency. Language IQ,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta-Weight</th>
<th>Bee-Weight</th>
<th>T for Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language IQ</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>4.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>11.771</td>
<td>3.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-language IQ</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>2.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>1.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A weight #</td>
<td>-109.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sex, non-language IQ, and age might be expected to account for approximately thirty-nine per cent of the criterion variance.

The variable sociodramatic play was not added to the prediction equation because it did not contribute to an explanation of the criterion variance.

**Summary**

Research reveals that low socioeconomic status, black, second-graders in this study do engage in sociodramatic play at various levels of ability. Sociodramatic play did not correlate significantly with school achievement as measured by the California Reading Test or grade point average. Further, sociodramatic play did not correlate significantly with any of the other variables studied. Therefore, the variable sociodramatic play was not included in either regression equation. It would not have contributed to an explanation of either criterion variance.

This chapter dealt with two of the three questions raised in the study. The third question involving the implications to be drawn for intervention with the culturally disadvantaged will be treated in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter I of this study provided the concepts involved in the investigation, a statement of the problem which included a presentation of three pertinent questions, the importance of such a study, and the limitations and organization of the study. Chapter II reviewed play theories and literature related to dramatic and sociodramatic play. Chapter III enters into the methodology and procedures of the study. It includes a description of the setting, sample, population, the instrumentation, and description of the treatment of the data. Chapter IV provided the findings from the statistical analysis of the data. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the investigation, respond to question three, and present the conclusions and recommendations.

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement in low socioeconomic status, black second-graders. The variables were level of sociodramatic play, school achievement, age, sex, and IQ. Age, sex, and IQ were examined because of their suspected influence on school
achievement. Two measures of school achievement were employed in this study: the score on the Reading Section of the California Achievement Test and grade point average. Level of sociodramatic play was determined by the rating a child received during an observed thirty minute play period in a partially structured playroom.

Stepwise regression was the data analysis utilized. This multiple analysis technique computes a sequence of linear regression equations in a stepwise equation. Intercorrelations and multiple correlations were performed in the data analysis.

The following conclusions can be drawn from a survey of the findings as they relate to the questions posed in the study:

**Question #1**: Do the low socioeconomic status children in this research participate in sociodramatic play?

It was found that four of the seventy children studied did not engage in sociodramatic play as defined by Smilansky (1968). The remaining sixty-six did participate ranging from a rather low level of sociodramatic play to a greatly elaborated level. These findings are not the same as those of Smilansky who studied sociodramatic play among three-year-olds. Although her findings were limited by lack of a valid evaluation instrument, Smilansky reported that culturally disadvantaged children in Israel do not engage in sociodramatic play at a significantly higher level as
they grow older. The difference in the research findings may be a reflection of different cultural patterns regarding sociodramatic play. Sociodramatic play ability may emerge at different ages in various cultures or may never attain a highly developed stage in some. Further, low socioeconomic status children comprised the sample for this study. All low socioeconomic status children are not automatically culturally disadvantaged. Basic differences between the low socioeconomic status children of this research and the culturally disadvantaged of Smilansky's research probably exist.

Question #2: What is the relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement?

The relationship between sociodramatic play and school achievement was examined along with other possible variables that may have contributed to this relationship. Sociodramatic play did not correlate significantly with either measure of achievement employed in this research. Sociodramatic play was not included in the regression equation since variables are not added to the equation if they do not contribute to an explanation of the criterion variance.

Question #3: What implications can be drawn for intervention with low socioeconomic status children?

Participation in sociodramatic play demands that the child utilize his potential abilities and knowledge and combine his scattered experiences. The successful sociodramatic player can categorize, generalize, discipline
himself, concentrate around a theme, create, cooperate, think abstractly, and communicate effectively. Therefore, to engage in sociodramatic play is a significant accomplishment.

Results of this research demonstrate that low socioeconomic status students, of this sample at least, do have the skills to engage in sociodramatic play at a relatively high level. Yet, the possession of these skills is not being reflected in current school achievement even though skills necessary for sociodramatic play are ones generally deemed necessary for successful school achievement. The fact that the school is not utilizing these skills is certainly a major failure. Play is a natural activity of the child. Child development literature attests to its importance in the child's life. The question arises: Why not use sociodramatic play in the classroom to evoke the aforementioned skills, to improve them through practice, and/or to teach for their transfer to other situations? Play is valid. To ignore what may be a fertile area for cultivation seems foolish.

Moreover, the utilization of sociodramatic play in the classroom offers a further advantage. Through observation of play, the teacher may well learn more about the emotional and social needs of her students. Attending to these newly discovered needs may facilitate cognitive development also.
Conclusions

Cross-cultural generalizations about the culturally disadvantaged should not be assumed without supporting studies.

No significant correlation between measured IQ and sociodramatic play was found. This would imply that measured IQ is not the crucial factor in successful sociodramatic play. These findings would agree with those of Smilansky (1968). On the other hand, the fact that IQ and sociodramatic play do not correlate in this study may demonstrate the narrow range of the IQ test used. Perhaps it does not measure factors of intelligence that are reflected in successful sociodramatic play.

No significant correlation between sex and sociodramatic play was found. This would imply that the skills necessary for successful sociodramatic play can be possessed and utilized by both boys and girls.

Low socioeconomic status children are assumed to have restricted verbal skills. An examination of the specimen records of play demonstrates that successful players were able to verbalize effectively in the play situation. Yet, this ability to use oral language effectively did not correlate with the ability to master written language as measured by the California Reading Test or by grade point average. It would seem that opportunities exist to translate the oral language skills of the play situation into improved written language skills.
Recommendations for Further Study

The following section provides a list of recommendations in the event that future study is prompted by this endeavor.

1. Choice of another sample to examine the play of subjects from different socioeconomic levels is highly recommended.
2. Replication of this study should include factor analysis of the six elements comprising Smilansky's definition of sociodramatic play.
3. Future studies should employ some other measure of academic achievement.
4. Future studies might attempt to measure success in social areas rather than in academic areas.
5. Future studies ought to employ individual measures of intelligence rather than group measures.
6. A follow-up study is urged to investigate the relationship between age and sociodramatic play.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES
Department of Psychiatry
New York Medical College

Instructions in Use of the
Index of Socioeconomic Status*

The index of socioeconomic status (SES) developed at the Institute for Developmental Studies in New York City utilizes two factors to estimate the relative social positioning of individuals in a given community. These factors are identified as:

1. occupation of main support of the family
2. education of main support of the family

Implicit assumptions in the use of the scale are that:

1. within any family unit, the social status of an individual can be derived from certain characteristics of the head of that family, and
2. within a community certain individuals are accorded more prestige than others on the basis of their occupation, education, and/or income.

The following instructions outline the steps in obtaining an SES rating for children who are to be tested. The procedure involved is simple and the rating can be

*Original, 1961; revised, 1965.
obtained in a few short steps.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Find the occupation of the specified head of the family in the occupational classification given in the following pages:
## OCCUPATIONAL RATING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Supreme Court Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Diplomat or Foreign Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Governor, Mayor of large city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Cabinet Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator, Congressman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College President or Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist (Government or other)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Broker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain of ocean-going vessel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head, State Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion Picture Actor, (not &quot;extra&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaster, City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Physicist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio entertainer (except announcer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Large Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Executive, Advertising Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airplane Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Editor-Owner newspaper
Psychologist
Veterinarian
Historian, Economist
Sociologist
Medical Researcher, Biologist
Author
Accountant, C.P.A.
Registered Nurse
Justice of the Peace
Government Investigator (FBI, Justice Dept., etc.)
Artist, performing artist
Professional Athlete
Interior Decorator, Industrial Designer, Fashion Designer
Factory, Department Store Owner
High School Teacher
Building Contractor
Radio Operator

Mine owner-operator
Owner of logging camp
Musician in symphony orchestra
Small Retail Owner
Sheriff-County
Army-Captain or above
Elementary School Teacher
Railroad-Supervisor
Real Estate Agent
Agricultural Agent-County
Laboratory Technician
Detective of Police
Fire Lt. or above

Private Secretary
Undertaker
Social, Welfare Worker
Foreman or Supervisor; Factory
Labor Union official-National only
Radio Announcer
Farm owner-operator
Hotel Manager
Newspaper Columnist
Owner-operator print shop
Railroad Engineer
Electrician
Watchmaker, factory
Trained Machinist
Mason
Dental Technician
Auto Salesman
Office Manager

Owner-operator dry cleaning
Linotype operator, printer
Newspaper reporter, proofreader
Oil well driller (not engineer)
Manager small store
Policeman, private investigator
Mail clerk, carrier
Bookkeeper
Insurance Agent
Traveling Salesman
Receptionist, typist secretary
Bank Clerk
Railroad Conductor, ticket agent
Practical Nurse
I.B.M. Keypunch operator

Playground worker
Teachers Aid
Structural Iron worker
Carpenter
Pawnbroker
Tenant farmer
Auto mechanic
Dressmaker
Beautician
Plumber
Telephone operator, lineman
Labor union official - Local only
Lunch stand operator
Painter, house and/or non factory
Salesclerk, grocery clerk
Musician - popular, dance, singer
Furniture finisher
T.V. repairman
Fireman
Welder, offset pressman
Machinist-Factory
Barber
Shoe repairman
Railroad baggage handler
Other semi-skilled
Cook - restaurant or hotel, short order 3
Chauffeur - private
Fisherman
Motorman, bus driver, conductor
Milk route man
Shipping clerk
Cashier
Merchant seaman
Truck driver

Gas station attendant
Quarry worker
Night club singer
Porter-railroad
Taxi driver
Waiter - Bartender
Farm worker
All unskilled laborers 2
Coal miner
Night watchman
Janitorial - Building superintendent
Elevator operator
Freight handler
Nurse's Aide

Laundry worker
Newsboy
Soda clerk
Peddler
Grinder - tool, etc.
Odd job worker
Share cropper - migratory worker 1
Scrub woman
Garbage collector
Street sweeper
Shoe shiner

2. Occupational categories have been grouped into clusters; each has a prestige rating. Assign a rating to
each child based on the occupation of main support of his family. For example, U.S. Supreme Court Justice is rated "10," Milk Route Man is rated "3." This number will be the occupation rating of each child.

3. Similarly, the education level of the head of the child's family is to be rated.

4. The following table specifies the ratings to be assigned for level of education of the main support in the child's family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate or professional training</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. You now have two (2) ratings for each child. On the basis of these two ratings (occupation and education), you can now derive an estimated SES rating for each child as follows:

6. Referring to the table on the following page:
### SES CONVERSION TABLE

**Education of Main Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Locate the occupation rating of main support for a given child on the left hand side of the figure;
2. Locate the education of main support for a given child across the top of the figure;
3. Find the coordinate of these two by bringing your finger down to the point where they both meet. You will find that they meet in a box numbered I, II or III. This numerical value is the overall SES rating for the child.
7. Enter this number in the space marked "SES-A" in the lower right hand corner of the child's Background Information Sheet.

8. In the space marked "SES-B" enter your own judgmental estimate of the child's relative social status based on any familiarity that you may have with the child or his family. Use the numerals I, II or III where I will represent "Low" and III will represent "High".
### APPENDIX B

**OBSERVER** Farley  
**DATE** 5-12-72  
**SESSION** P.m.  

**TEACHER** Howard  
**SCHOOL** Kennedy Elementary  

**CHILDREN**: (Circle subject of this observation.)

1. Lisa Brown  
2. Reginald Jones  
3. Davida Smith  
4. Charles Chaplin  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Pres ( )</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>OBSERVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Abs ( )</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Tries on jacket and hat, laughs--others snicker. Goes to store--takes off jacket and hat--puts them back--sits at cash register, opens c.r., puts blocks in drawer, closes. Opens drawer again. Looks at girls. No talking. Keeps playing with c.r. Beckons to Charles. Asks if he'd like to buy something for lunch, &quot;Now what do you want?&quot; as Charles approaches store. Rings up cocoa, puts it in a bag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>Girls come to store, shop, ask him for coffee. He looks, &quot;No, I don't have any coffee.&quot; Looks for prices on boxes, rings up each. Puts hand out for money, accepts and puts in c.r. Pretends to give change to Davida. Helps Lisa: &quot;We have some soup over here.&quot; Rings it up: &quot;Fifty dollars.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Pres ( )</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>OBSERVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Abs ( )</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Puts on jacket again, and hat. Picks up steering wheel and sits at table pretending to drive. He steers, has feet doing things with pedals. Puts wheel down, takes off jacket and hat and says, &quot;I'm home, darling.&quot; Sits at table. No response. Sees dr. corner. Puts on headpiece, picks up bag. Pretends to knock at kitchen door. &quot;Knock, knock, knock. It's the dr.&quot; &quot;I hear one of your babies is sick.&quot; &quot;I want you to show me where they are.&quot; Puts on stethoscope; listens to doll's heart. &quot;She's very sick. I'll come back Friday afternoon.&quot; Puts things back in dr. bag and leaves. Takes off headpiece and jacket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Picks up tool case and lunchbox. Puts on table. Takes out flashlight and hammer. Hammers while holding flashlight on something. Uses screwdriver and pliers similarly. Picks up lunchbox and goes to store. Buys orange juice and tuna, looks around. Speaks to Charles, telling him what he wants. Waits to be checked through. Has lunchbox still</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Pres ( )</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>OBSERVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Abs ( )</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>under his arm. Takes money from pocket to pay grocer. Waits while purchases are bagged. Says &quot;thank you.&quot; Takes groceries to table with lunchbox and tools. Opens lunchbox, takes out thermos. Unpacks grocery bag. Pretends to make and eat imaginary tuna sandwich and drink from thermos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:55</td>
<td>Calls Davida this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Pres ( )</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>OBSERVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Abs ( )</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I'm getting ready to go home. I want dinner ready when I get there.&quot; Gets wheel and Pretends to drive home. &quot;Can't wait 'till I get home, I can taste that good supper.&quot; Puts down wheel. &quot;Gotta get my keys out. I'm home.&quot; Takes off hat and jacket. &quot;What you got for supper?&quot; &quot;That's my favorite food. I'll wait here at the table.&quot; &quot;What's for dessert?&quot; &quot;Got any ice cream?&quot; Gets 'no' response. &quot;I'm going to the store to see if they have some.&quot; Puts on hat and jacket again, goes to store. &quot;Do you have any ice cream?&quot; No. &quot;Well, I'll buy some jello. I better get ready 'cause my wife is expecting me.&quot; &quot;Only 40 cents?&quot; &quot;I thought it was more than that.&quot; (to Charles). Back to kitchen, takes off jacket and hat. &quot;I'm home. The store didn't have ice cream, so I bought jello.&quot; Puts in refrigerator. &quot;This is for dessert.&quot; Picks up phone. &quot;I'm going to call Charlie.&quot; &quot;Hello, Charlie, What you been doing?&quot; &quot;Monday I want you to send me some cereal and some Ajax and some cottage cheese.&quot; Davida announces dinner. Reginald Pretends to eat. Gets up to get a spoon, sits down again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF SESSION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Pres ( )</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>OBSERVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Abs ( )</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>Dennis goes to doctor's corner and dresses up like doctor. Wayne comes over and listens to his heart. Now (after 3 minutes) Dennis takes doctor's apron off and goes to cash register. He sits there manipulating keys. He picks up items and looks for prices. Then he hits keys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>Using blocks as money (mbo) he puts money in and out of cash register. Now girls start to buy from him. He looks for prices and charges them $9.85. Michelle gives him the money. Girls bag groceries. Others laugh at Wayne who is dressing up. Now Dennis puts man's coat and hat on and carries tool basket to kitchen area. Now boys are both repairmen. Dennis pounds screwdriver as if it were a nail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Pres ( )</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>OBSERVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Abs ( )</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>Dennis is still pounding screwdriver into wood block. Wayne gives Dennis some of his beverage to drink (Wayne doesn't drink it though and he doesn't respond). Dennis is still hammering. Now he gives it to Wayne. Dennis takes coat and hat off and goes to kitchen. He starts putting food in the refrigerator. Wayne starts helping him. The refrigerator begins to fall and the children laugh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>Boys are still arranging food in the refrigerator. Dennis now takes pots from stove. Wayne says, &quot;We're cookin.&quot; Dennis, &quot;How many eggs do you want?&quot; &quot;One?&quot; &quot;Two?&quot; He is sitting on chair and moving place to place. Dennis is changing food around in the refrigerator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Dennis is still arranging the food in refrigerator. Now he leaves kitchen and goes to doctor's office. &quot;Hello, doctor&quot; Michelle says, Dennis puts glasses on and uses stethoscope to listen to Wayne's heart. Tanya starts pounding and this catches everyone's attention. Dennis dresses up but then decides to become a patient. He says to Wayne &quot;I hurt in my chest.&quot; Wayne listens to Dennis'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Pres ()</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>OBSERVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Abs ()</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

heart. Dennis gets into doctor's kit. "I'm the doctor," says Wayne. Dennis says he is going to grocery store. Takes all the products from the refrigerator and puts them in the store.

11:35 Dennis continues to put all items in the store. Wayne is cashier and Dennis is bagger. Dennis continues to bag groceries. He does it carefully. Dennis still bags groceries. Girls get very rambunctious.

END OF SESSION
APPENDIX D
EVALUATING SOCIODRAMATIC PLAY
Suggestions for Raters

I. IMITATIVE ROLE PLAY: The child undertakes a make-believe role and expresses it in imitative action and/or verbalization. He enacts the character of a person (or animal) other than self or self in another context.

A. Guidelines for Ratings (All scales are from 1-4)

4 - Exceptional elaboration of role play: Organizing events to lead to an opportunity for a particular role and enhancement of that role. Child uses versatility when facing obstacles.

3 - Role play highly elaborated: Many different ideas carried out. Voices, gestures, posture may be imitated.

2 - Role play in moderate degree: Child enacts one or more roles in 5-minute period with some elaboration.

1 - Role play present. Little or no elaboration.

B. Notes:

The dimensions of role play we are considering here are primarily elaboration, involvement, and amount of role play. A child who does a lot of role play in five minutes can get 2 though he may not be persistent in any one role.

Role play begins when there is a brief sequence of acts indicating enactment of a theme; i.e., child does one or more of the following:

a. Announces role and carries out at least one act associated with role.
b. Wears garment or carries equipment associated with a role and carries out at least one action associated with the role; i.e., puts on steth and doctor's hat, listens to own or doll's or other child's heart.

c. Carries out at least two role associated actions other than role announcement or wearing garments; i.e., picks up wheel, turns it, says "car."

d. Observer interpretation of behavior as role play is inserted in body of protocol. (Give strong consideration.)

Role announcement alone, wearing a garment alone, and single imitative acts such as pretending to listen or call on the telephone or pretending to hammer two blocks together or listening to doll's heart with steth, are not considered role play for our purposes.

In order to rate role play as 1 or more, there must be some involvement or real intention to play, i.e., "Sits at cash register, asks the other boy if he wants groceries. They laugh, get up, start to chase each other around." Not role play. However, if children really carry out a sequence, they can be silly and still get 1 or 2 for role play.

II. MAKE BELIEVE WITH OBJECTS: Toys, unstructured materials, movements, verbal declarations are substituted for real objects. A toy being used in a way other than intended (cash register is used as typewriter or screwdriver is used as a nail) is also M.B.O.

A. Guidelines for Ratings

4 - Sound effects used while engaging in make believe with toys, unstructured materials, and movements. Creative use of dress-up clothes to further elaborate role.

3 - Some combination of the above is extensively employed to enact roles. Words, actions referring to or substituting for objects is extensive. Use of toys alone, no matter how extensive, cannot be 3.

2 - Some use of gestures, words as substitution with or without toys (usually in addition to). Use of
toys and one pretend action is usually 1. Use of toys and a few actions is 2.

1 - Slight use of one or more of the above. Need not be in role sequence, i.e., child makes imaginary telephone call to some present (or not present) person.

B. Notes:

Simple labeling of objects (store items, for example) is not M.B.O. But if child takes groceries to cash register to check out or otherwise uses them in enacting a theme, it is M.B.O. Use of clothes is not M.B.O.

III. MAKE BELIEVE WITH ACTIONS AND SITUATIONS: Verbal descriptions are substituted for actions and situations. (Refers to verbal behavior only.)

A. Guidelines for Ratings

4 - More than four instances of make-believe with situations shown by either of the following methods: (1) verbal declaration and not carrying it out, (2) verbal declaration and carrying through with action, and (3) make-believe with situations carried through with action but not verbally declared.

3 - Extensive - very imaginative, "Let's have a picnic. You pack the lunch. We have to go in the car. Be careful, the eggs will break."

2 - Moderate. Two or three different situations referred to verbally.

1 - Present only or slight. One statement or two related statements.

Examples: All of these alone would count 1 --

"I'm going to the doctor."
"I'm going to cook dinner."
"Let's go to the store."

Negative response: "I ain't going to church."

Negative response: "I ain't going to church."

is not in itself M.B.S.

B. Notes:

Role announcement and assigning of roles does count
here but not if that is all that happens.

Statements primarily object centered are scored as M.B.O. ("I'm drinking coffee." "I am driving the car.") "I'm driving my car to work." is both M.B.O. and M.B.S.

M.B.S. applies to all speech - whether interaction or not. (It should be written M.B.A. & S, since it also refers to actions.) However, most of our M.B.S. refers to situations: sick baby, broken arm, picnic, going to work, robbing the bank, saving drowning child, visiting grandma, going to market or store, cooking breakfast or dinner, fixing (broken) stove. M.B.S. is the verbalization of these situations and often, as in "I'm driving to work" involves reference to actions also. The action thus verbalized may or may not be actually carried out.

IV. PERSISTENCE IN ROLE PLAY:

A. Guidelines for Ratings

4 - Interacts in role (or related roles) for longer than a five minute period.

3 - Extensive - child stays with a single role or related roles for most of 5-minute period. Can be repetitious or elaborated play. May be brief interruption, if child returns to main theme. Child can get low score on role play and high score on persistence. Role involvement is considered. If he stays with role but is not involved, cannot get more than 2.

2 - Moderate - child undertakes one or a few roles with some elaboration or repeats activities of the roles to moderate extent. Some interruption activity can occur. (Child definitely leaves a theme.)

1 - Slight elaboration or repetition - child follows through on something, i.e., goes to store, gets groceries, takes groceries "home."
V. INTERACTION: There are at least two players interacting in the framework of sociodramatic play episode. Interaction means child directs an action or words to other child. Intends for other child to respond at least by listening. Child waiting to check out at cash register is interaction whether or not other child responds.

A. Guidelines for Ratings

4 - Reciprocal role play involving more than two persons in a five minute period or interacts with the same child for ten or more minutes.

3 - Truly reciprocal role play (doctor, nurse; husband, wife; workman, boss) as an integral feature of the play for most of five-minute period. Also two mothers who interact with each other as two mothers ("We need groceries," "Your baby is sick," etc.)

2 - Moderate degree of interaction. Child does interact but his play does not require, or evidence presence of partner to same extent as that rated 3. As soon as play during the five minute period is predominantly interaction with another child, rate at least 2. A 2 means interaction is more than minimal, but not necessarily integral.

1 - Interaction present verbally or non-verbally, but slight. We would not consider a child with interaction scores of 1 to be a sociodramatic player. To receive 2 or more, child must evidence some reciprocal cooperative role play. A 1 means interaction is present, but play is predominantly solitary.

B. Notes:

A child merely submitting to doctor examination is not considered to be role playing. If he opens mouth, groans, etc., it is role play.
VI. VERBAL COMMUNICATION: There is some verbal interaction related to a sociodramatic play episode.

A. Guidelines for Ratings

4 - Verbal communication used to elaborate a role in an imaginative fashion. Extensive use of nouns and adjectives to create situations.

3 - Extensive; integral to play.

2 - Moderate verbal interaction.

1 - Present or slight. Verbal interaction exists, but only just.

B. Notes:

Role announcement alone is not verbal communication.

Be careful to distinguish monologue from communication addressed to another.

Child reported as talking with another child during sociodramatic play episode is counted communication related to episode unless otherwise specified.

"Give me," "That's mine," etc. is not verbal interaction in framework of sociodramatic play episode. Talking about toys is not verbal communication in framework of sociodramatic play episode.

Discussion of roles alone is not usually counted as verbal interaction - depends on whether related to an episode which follows or precedes. If it occurs in last five minutes should count 1 or possibly, if very good and extensive, 2.

If child is scored for verbal interaction, must also be scored for interaction. A child may receive higher score for interaction than for verbal interaction, but not vice versa.
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