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Abstract

Rough-and-tumble play is one type of social play that emerges during the preschool years. The Developmental Research Sequence (Spradley, 1980) provided a framework for using participant observations and inductive analyses, in the current study, as a means to develop an understanding of how children negotiate a shared understanding within the structure of R&T play.

Results from the current study revealed that cooperative R&T episodes included effective and appropriate behavior and knowledge given a particular situation. Children involved in longer R&T episodes attended to the features of the social situation and others' actions. They constructed their behavioral responses, based on their negotiation personal understandings into shared understanding, across sequences of social exchange as a way to maintain R&T play. Additionally, the slight indication of an increase between younger and older children in the interaction length of R&T episodes offers some support for the idea that children's play becomes increasingly shared or cooperative with age.

Preschool children followed a particular pattern when they negotiated intersubjectivity during R&T play. They established intersubjectivity by responding to extensions with extensions, introductions, building on, and acceptances. This structure was both similar and different across longer and shorter R&T episodes. The structure of longer and shorter episodes was similar in that both contained a beginning, middle, and end. Shorter R&T episodes, however, were characterized by shorter negotiations between initiation and termination. Longer episodes, on the other hand, were
characterized by lengthier negotiations between initiations and terminations.

Both boys and girls, and younger and older preschoolers participated in R&T play. Type of participation in R&T play, however, appears to be more a function of general interaction style than of sex and age. Co-membership complete sociograms revealed a stable and consistent pattern of relationships from shorter to longer R&T episodes. Cliques included a more expansive group of children than were indicated by the connections appearing on each child’s egocentric sociogram based on positive nominations.
Chapter I

Introduction

Successful participation in the social world requires an ability to engage in constructive social interactions with one's peers. Researchers have found that social rejection by the peer group, a result of unsuccessful participation in the social world, is one of the best predictors of academic failure, school drop-out, adolescent delinquency, and psychological difficulties such as anxiety or depression (Kupersmidt, Coie, & Dodge, 1990; Parker & Asher, 1987). Investigating features of children's interactions during various forms of play could offer insight as to how a particular type of play promotes or inhibits children's participation in the social world.

Justification

For social interaction to be beneficial for children, it must have certain characteristics. Tudge and Rogoff (1989) suggested one of these characteristics is "shared thinking involving coordination of joint activity" (p. 17). Vygotsky (1978) referred to this as intersubjectivity. Scholars conducting research based on this concept propose, as did Tudge and Rogoff, that examining how participants coordinate their joint activity is very important for understanding social exchange (see Berk & Winsler, 1995). Goncu (1993a) used structural features and negotiations of social play to examine the development of intersubjectivity in preschoolers' dyadic play. He called for an examination of how different types of social play are negotiated.

Rough-and-tumble play (i.e., play fighting and play chasing) is one type of social play that emerges during the preschool years.
Researchers have hypothesized that rough-and-tumble play serves as a vehicle for social development as well as a reflection of that development (Smith, 1989; Smith & Boulton, 1990). A necessary component of rough-and-tumble play (hereafter referred to as R&T play) is that children agree that the fighting and/or chasing is pretend.

While researchers primarily have studied intersubjectivity as it relates to cognitive concepts and problem-solving (Tudge & Rogoff, 1989), more recently they are studying this concept in children's social play. With the current study, the researcher hopes to expand the literature by exploring how children negotiate a shared understanding, not only about the pretend nature of the fighting and chasing, but also about other features (e.g., themes, roles) of R&T play.

The playground offers a unique setting for exploring R&T play behavior (Hart, 1993). Researchers have recently begun to regard the playground as a meaningful context for development (see Hart, 1993; Pellegrini, 1987). Hart (1993) points out this may be due to the fact the playground enables researchers to explore child behavior as it naturally unfolds in a setting characterized by minimal adult supervision.

Contextual factors have an impact on how R&T play evolves over the course of children's play. Researchers have examined the relationship between playground characteristics (e.g., surface type and area, size and age of peer group) and frequency of R&T play (Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Smith & Connolly, 1980). Smith and Connolly (1976) reported a corresponding increase between R&T play and available square footage on playgrounds. Researchers have also
studied the connection between certain child characteristics (e.g., age, sex, popularity, rejection, acceptance) and the frequency and type of social behavior children exhibit (see Smith, 1989 for a review). However, little is known about how these contextual factors contribute to children's negotiation of intersubjectivity during R&T play.

The ability to engage in constructive social interactions is essential for children's successful participation in the social world. Currently, little is known about how preschool children negotiate intersubjectivity during R&T play and what contextual features contribute to this process. This study examined naturally occurring social behavior as a means of discovering details about children's R&T play.

Statement of the Problem

Researchers studying intersubjectivity suggest that examining how participants coordinate their joint activity is important for understanding social exchange (see Berk & Winsler, 1995). To date, this examination has focused on children's social pretend play. Goncu (1993a) recommends that researchers explore how different types of social play are negotiated. One category of social play that lends itself to this type of study is R&T play.

Standard observation systems often utilized in research are not designed to distinguish subtle aspects of social exchange (Whalen, 1989) or to extract the meaning of behavior in context (Smith, 1989). A group of researchers has suggested a need to examine children's social experiences from a sociocultural perspective. Within this perspective, a researcher's focus becomes trying to understand locally
constructed meanings of social interactions in a particular context from the viewpoints of the participants through systematic observation (Hatch, 1995; Kantor, Elgas, & Fernie, 1993). This approach was utilized in the current study as a means to gather information about children's negotiation of intersubjectivity during R&T play.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was two-fold. The first purpose was exploratory in nature and involved examining children's R&T play from a sociocultural perspective. Specifically, the researcher attempted to develop an understanding of how children negotiate intersubjectivity (i.e., shared understanding) during R&T play as well as what role contextual factors (i.e., playground characteristics; child characteristics, social network characteristics) played in this process.

The second purpose was confirmatory in nature. The researcher examined the relationship between child characteristics (i.e., age, sex, popularity, rejection, acceptance) and the proportion of R&T play episodes in which a child participated.

Objectives

The primary objective of the study was to understand how children negotiate intersubjectivity during R&T play. This included describing the context (i.e., playground and network of relationships) and the experiences of children as they jointly negotiated a shared understanding of R&T play. A secondary objective was to conduct confirmatory analyses on certain child characteristics (i.e., age, sex, popularity, rejection, acceptance) as they related to participation in R&T play episodes.
Research Questions and Hypotheses

For the exploratory component of the study, the researcher was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do preschool children negotiate intersubjectivity during R&T play?
2. What role do contextual factors play in this process? Contextual factors included playground characteristics (e.g., surfaces), child characteristics (i.e., age, sex, popularity, rejection, acceptance), and social networks.

As part of the confirmatory component of the study, the following null hypotheses were tested:

H1: There is no relationship between children's age and their involvement in R&T play.
H2: There is no relationship between children's sex and their involvement in R&T play.
H3: There is no relationship between children's level of popularity in peer group and their involvement in R&T play.
H4: There is no relationship between children's level of rejection by the peer group and their involvement in R&T play.
H5: There is no relationship between children's level of acceptance by the peer group and their involvement in R&T play.

Assumptions

Within the sociocultural perspective, childhood is viewed as a social construction. This view naturally leads to research based on the assumptions of the naturalist or constructivist paradigm (Hatch, 1995). Each of these assumptions has methodological implications.
Lincoln and Guba (1985) outline the assumptions of the naturalist paradigm along five dimensions: nature of reality, relationship of knower to known, possibility of generalization, possibility of cause and effect relationships, and the role of values. The first assumption within the naturalist paradigm is multiple realities are constructed from the environment in which they exist. These multiple realities are not to be broken down into parts and studied independently from one another, but rather as whole systems. The goal of research becomes understanding rather than control or prediction. Additionally, a human instrument (i.e., researcher conducting participant observation), and emergent research design are necessary to allow for adjustment to these different realities (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The second assumption is the knower and known are interactive and inseparable; the influence of one on the other is acknowledged. Therefore, the human instrument is necessary for comprehending the meaning of that interaction and determining the effect it may have on the quality of the research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The third assumption is rather than context-free generalizations, only time and context-bound "working hypotheses" are possible. Researchers use these "working hypotheses" to create a description of a unique case (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), such as how children negotiate a shared understanding during R&T play.

The fourth assumption is events are in a state of mutual, simultaneous shaping. Due to this continual interaction, cause and effect are difficult to differentiate. Because events or patterns are evolving, the research design must emerge over the course of the study.
and should not be determined ahead of time (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In the current study, the researcher developed a basic research design prior to entering the field. However, this design served more as a guide that could be adjusted in response to emerging patterns during course of study, rather than a rigid set of rules.

The fifth and final assumption is inquiry and analysis are assumed to be value-bound. Values abide in the researcher (choice and framing of problem), in the paradigm and theory guiding the research (data collection, analyses, interpretation), and in the context under study. For meaningful results to arise from the inquiry, the values from these various areas “must exhibit congruence” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 38). The human instrument is uniquely suited to recognize and consider the effect any biases emerging from various value systems may have on the inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

**Limitations**

The researcher’s presence in the setting may have an influence on the interactions of the children and adults. By becoming a participant in the setting during the observations, the researcher hopes to alleviate this condition. To address this, any interaction between knower and known was acknowledged and incorporated into analyses and interpretation of information gained from observations and interviews.

The influence of the researcher’s personal biases are always a concern with qualitative methodology. A diary was maintained during the course of the current study to record personal experiences, feelings, values, etc. In this way the researcher was more aware of
any influence these factors may have had on data collection and interpretation.

Definition of Terms

Terms for this study were defined as follows:

Intersubjectivity

Intersubjectivity is the joint negotiation of shared understanding by participants during a social interaction. Participants negotiated individual understandings into a shared understanding of play through the exchange of particular kinds of verbal and nonverbal acts during interaction. In the current study, the exchanges that occurred between the initiation of an R&T episode and the termination of an R&T episode were divided into turns and acts. Turns were everything one participant said and did before another participant responded. Acts were "dialogic units" a participant used to convey a thought or an idea to a fellow participant (Goncu, 1993a).

R&T Play Episode

Rough-and-tumble play is a category of behavior comprised of play fighting and play chasing (Boulton & Smith, 1989; Blurton Jones, 1967, 1972). In a recent review article, Pelligrini and Smith (1998) exclude play chasing from this definition. They contend that while chasing may or may not be social, the contact behaviors associated with play fighting require a social component, and thus distinguish them from physical activity play. This researcher disagrees with this characterization in light of the R&T play episodes observed in the current study. Within these R&T episodes, children linked chasing and play fighting together in a complex way. Therefore, the researcher
adopted the classic definition of R&T play for the purposes of the current study. She considered both play chasing and play fighting behaviors important components of R&T play.

The definition of a R&T play episode used in the current study came from several sources and evolved over time (see Chapter IV for discussion of this process). A R&T play episode was defined as two or more children participating in a sequence of boisterous behaviors (see Table 1) characterized by a high state of arousal and activity level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box</th>
<th>Collide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief blows/contact</td>
<td>Grapple or wrestle (i.e., holding on plus some or all of the following: pounce, poke, pile on, pull, push, shove, kick, swing, grab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit at, kick at or grab at</td>
<td>Karate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate</td>
<td>Playfully restrain another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playfully restrain another</td>
<td>Spin one another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spin one another</td>
<td>Sneak up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneak up</td>
<td>NOTE. These behaviors may be accompanied by verbal elements and/or pretend elements (Aldis, 1975; Blurton Jones, 1967, 1972, 1976; Boulton &amp; Smith, 1989; Fry, 1987).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These episodes were initiated by the acknowledged presence of two or more participants, with one participant engaging in overt acts communicating a desire to engage in R&T play, and the other participant(s) interpreting and responding to this exuberant, high activity level play as nonthreatening and harmless (Corsaro, 1985; Goncu, 1993a; Hart, 1997). The R&T play episodes were terminated when the nature of the ongoing episode was dramatically altered (Goncu, 1993a; Hart, 1997). Changes in group composition were acceptable as
long as the same activity continued and at least one of the original members remained in the group.

Social Network

A social network is a group of actors and the relations linking those actors (Knoke & Kuklinski, 1982; Wasserman & Faust, 1994). Social networks have a structure comprised of the arrangement of existent and nonexistent ties among network actors (Knoke & Kuklinski, 1982). In the current study, the researcher constructed sociograms (i.e., two-dimensional diagrams) to pictorially represent the structure of the social network of children involved in the study. Within these sociograms, a set of points represented the actors, and lines between points, or actors, denoted the links among those actors (Knoke & Kuklinski, 1982).

Social Status

Social status refers to a child's social position in a group of peers. It was operationally defined, in the current study, as the score obtained from a sociometric assessment in which "children made preferential responses to statements about peers in their social group" (McConnell & Odom, 1986, p. 217). The various sociometric assessments measure different dimensions of social status (McConnell & Odom, 1986). Peer nominations and peer ratings were the sociometric assessments used in the current study.

Popularity. Popularity refers to how well a child is liked by his/her peers. In the current study, popularity was measured by the total number of positive nominations received on peer nomination assessment (McConnell & Odom, 1986).
Rejection. Rejection refers to how much a child is disliked by his/her peers. In the current study, rejections was measured by the total number of negative nominations received on peer nomination assessments (McConnell & Odom, 1986).

Acceptance. Acceptance refers to a child’s acceptability in the peer group. In the current study, acceptance was measured by the score received on peer rating assessments. This score was an average of ratings a child received from his/her peers (McConnell & Odom, 1986).

Theoretical Framework

A theory provides a lens through which to view children’s development and influences the questions and methodology chosen for a particular research study. When looking at the world through the lens of symbolic interactionism one is interested in the “connection between symbols or shared meanings and interactions.” Therefore, symbolic interactionism is a useful framework for understanding how humans construct their world through social interaction and how their behavior is shaped by that world (LaRossa & Reitzes, 1993).

Numerous scholars have contributed to the development of symbolic interactionism. The following brief overview of symbolic interactionism is based primarily on the thought of George Herbert Mead as interpreted by Herbert Blumer (1969).

Three fundamental assumptions form the foundation of symbolic interactionism. The first assumption is that humans act toward objects based on the meanings that the objects have for them. Objects can be defined as anything that humans can refer to in their world such as physical objects (e.g., playground equipment or areas), other
Humans or categories of humans (e.g., peers), activities (e.g., R&T play), situations, and guiding concepts (e.g., cooperation). The character of a context is determined by the meaning the objects comprising it have for the people acting within the context. Therefore, to understand human behavior it is important to discover the meanings people attach to objects in a specific context (Blumer, 1969; Hewitt, 1989).

The source of meaning is the focus of the second assumption. Meanings for objects are constructed during the process of social interaction (Blumer, 1969). Basically, within interactions, objects are defined or given meaning for a person based on other persons' responses to those objects (Hewitt, 1989). This process is a dynamic one in which participants constantly create, maintain, and change the objects of their world as they jointly negotiate a shared understanding of the meaning of a particular situation (Berk & Winsler, 1995; Blumer, 1969). This shared understanding constructed as people interact with one another is referred to in Vygotskian and linguistic theory as intersubjectivity (Goncu, 1993a, 1993b; Rommetveit, 1979; Vygotsky, 1978).

Meanings constructed during interaction implies that humans are actors in their world. They are involved in activities (e.g., negotiation), comprised of actions (e.g., accepting or revising a play idea). As they interact with each other, humans must consider others' actions as they develop their behavior and expectations about the behavior of others (Blumer, 1969).

Humans must possess a "self" to be actors engaging in interactions with others and themselves. The "self," just as with
other objects, is constructed during social interaction as other people define the person to himself or herself. The spontaneous, acting self is the "I." This part of the "self" responds to events based on internal impulses (e.g., interests, needs, wishes) that may or may not be in line with expectations of society. The learned social self is the "Me." This part of the self includes various roles that are based on past experiences. The "Me" has an awareness of the self from the perspective of others (Hewitt, 1989; LaRossa & Reitzes, 1993).

The impulses of the "I" are shaped by a person's identity or self meaning in a role. An identity provides a sense of continuity, integration, identification, and differentiation. As impulses become an organized set of deliberate actions recognized by others as meaningful because they are related to a particular activity, roles emerge. Roles are shared norms or systems of meaning related to a social position (e.g., friend). Interpersonal roles develop as the result of a history of interaction between humans. These roles contribute to the establishment of a shared framework of perspectives persons can use to guide behavior (Hewitt, 1989; LaRossa & Reitzes, 1993).

Cognitive functioning (e.g., interpretive process) forms the core of the third assumption. Meanings are used, managed, and revised through an interpretive process humans utilize as they respond to objects encountered in their world. This interpretive process is an internal one in which the person is communicating or interacting in social terms (e.g., language/symbols) with himself or herself (Blumer, 1969).
Blumer's characterization of meaning construction as a social, dynamic, interpretive process justifies the use of qualitative methods which are designed to uncover meanings constructed during social interaction. Researchers utilizing a quantitative method such as scan sampling record a single behavior (e.g., hit at) independent from the social interaction surrounding it, and calculate frequencies of behaviors to use in statistical analyses. Researchers employing a qualitative method such as participant observation record detailed field notes of social interactions in a particular setting. The following is an example of a field note entry from the current study:

A boy starts humming the "Darth Vader" tune from the movie Star Wars around a group of children (three girls and two boys). A girl in the group exclaims, "Look! It's Darth Vader!" and runs. The rest of her group runs also. The boy humming the Darth Vader tune, starts walking after them. The group of children running from "Darth Vader" stop and look back to see if he is still chasing them. "Darth Vader" lays down in the grass, closes his eyes, and "plays dead." The group of children creep (crouched over and on toes) up to "Darth Vader." He jumps up and chases the group. They run away screaming and laughing. "Darth Vader" lays down and "plays dead" again. The group creeps up on "Darth Vader." One girl says, "He's dead." This time, "Darth Vader" only opens his eyes and looks at them, and they run away screaming. "Darth Vader" walks the other way humming the "Darth Vader" tune. The group realizes they aren't being chased and stop running. A girl in the group says, "Y'all go hide in the house, and I'll see where he is." When she gets to "Darth Vader" he says, "Stay away from me." She asks, "Are you going to chase us?" "Darth Vader" responds, "I don't have my mask, and if I don't have my mask, I can't." They start picking flowers with a teacher.

The information gleaned from these expanded accounts of children's R&T play provides insight into the process of meaning construction.

The theoretical framework provided by the basic assumptions of symbolic interactionism served as the impetus for the types of
questions asked in this study and as a guide for methodological
decisions. The researcher observed children as they jointly
negotiated shared understandings of the physical setting (e.g.,
climber as a jail), their roles and relationships in that setting
(e.g., good guy versus bad guy), and the activities related to R&T
play. Ultimately, the researcher attempted to shed some light on one
aspect of the dynamic process of constructing meaning through
interaction.
Chapter II
Review of Literature

A review of current research creates an awareness of the available knowledge related to children’s R&T play and the concept of intersubjectivity. The importance of social interaction is discussed in the first section of this chapter. In the next section the focus becomes the concept of intersubjectivity. For the third section, the discussion turns to R&T play as a form of social interaction or play and is followed by a brief summary.

Importance of Social Interaction

Social interaction is an essential aspect of participation in the social world. During interactions, children experience the interpersonal exchange of ideas, perspectives, roles, and actions. From social negotiation, discussion, and conflict, children learn to understand thoughts, motives, and intentions of others. This understanding enables children to think about the consequences of their behavior for themselves and others which in turn leads to social behavior (Rubin & Rose-Krasnor, 1992; Rubin, Stewart, & Chen, 1995).

For social interaction to be beneficial for children, it must have certain characteristics. Successful social interactions have been characterized differently across and within theoretical orientations (Odom, McConnell, & McEvoy, 1992). Common features of these characterizations include effectiveness and appropriateness of behavior and knowledge given a specific setting, context, and/or culture. Children interacting successfully attend to the dynamic and
related features of a social situation and others’ behavior patterns. As they construct their own behavior as a response, they “integrate, synthesize, and organize their knowledge and skills across sequences of social exchanges” as a means of solving the multitude of social problems they face every day (Guralnick, 1992). Investigating characteristics of children’s interactions during various forms of play could offer insight as to how a particular type of play promotes or inhibits children’s participation in the social world.

**Intersubjectivity in Social Interaction**

Social interaction is more likely to be beneficial if it is characterized by shared thinking and coordinated activity of the participants (Tudge & Rogoff, 1989). During social interaction, participants jointly negotiate a shared understanding of the meaning of a situation (Berk & Winsler, 1995; Blumer, 1969). This shared understanding constructed during interaction is referred to in Vygotskian and linguistic theory as intersubjectivity (Goncu, 1993a, 1993b; Rommetveit, 1979; Vygotsky, 1978).

Rommetveit (1979) proposed that participants make two presuppositions related to intersubjectivity at the outset of an interaction. First, participants must presuppose a willingness to negotiate a shared understanding. Second, the speaker presumes the listener has some knowledge about the idea introduced, the listener’s knowledge is similar to his/her own, and the listener will react in an appropriate manner (e.g., with behaviors congruent to a particular role). As the listener responds, the speaker tests these presuppositions. All participants are both speaker and listener at
some point in the interaction. Through negotiation of different personal understandings to a shared understanding, participants are able to interact in a way that is acceptable to everyone. These negotiations are not static, but rather evolve during the course of interaction (Goncu, 1987, 1993a, 1993b).

There has been a plethora of research on intersubjectivity as it relates to learning cognitive concepts and problem-solving (see Tudge & Rogoff, 1989). More recently, researchers are studying this concept in children's social play. Scholars concerned with intersubjectivity propose that it is a requirement for social play (Goncu, 1993a, 1993b). Therefore, examining how participants negotiate intersubjectivity is important for understanding social exchange (see Berk & Winsler, 1995).

During social play children negotiate themes and ideas for play, roles adopted during play and rules for behavior associated with a particular role, and scripts. These plans, which are jointly negotiated by children, can and often do change as play evolves. This process involves give-and-take and cooperation (Garvey, 1974; Howes, Unger, & Matheson, 1992; Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987).

Goncu (1993a) examined how preschool children negotiated intersubjectivity during dyadic play. He classified children's negotiation acts, as observed in same-gender, same-age dyads during 20 minute free play sessions in a laboratory playroom, into four categories: expansions, agreements, emphases, and irrelevant acts. Expansions were acts in which children elaborated upon play ideas. This category was broken down further into introductions (i.e.,
expressing how much one assumes a partner knows about an idea), extensions (i.e., adding information to a partner's idea), and building-on (i.e., adding information to one's own idea as a way to connect it to a partner's idea).

Agreements were acts that showed the degree of congruence between partners' ideas. This category was divided further into acceptances, rejections, revisions, and conciliations. These acts do not all represent an agreement among partners about how play should continue. However, the acts do represent a shared understanding of the original ideas presented for consideration (Goncu, 1993a).

The emphases category included acts in which one child focused on his/her own idea or what was important to him/her. These acts were illustrations of an inability to consider another's point of view.

Irrelevant acts, did not relate to a partner's idea in any fashion. Children utilize these acts when they are not interested in or do not understand a partner's idea (Goncu, 1993a).

Preschool children follow a particular pattern when they negotiate intersubjectivity during social play. They establish shared understanding by responding to extensions with extensions, introductions, or acceptances instead of disagreement or irrelevant acts, with an extension-extension sequence being the most common response sequence (Goncu, 1993a; Goncu & Kessel, 1988).

Children's social play becomes more intersubjective with age. Goncu (1993a) found that older children (i.e., 4 1/2 years of age) maintain longer bouts of joint activity than younger children (three
years of age) and do so by extending their partner's ideas or building-on to their own (i.e., adding new information). Also, as children get older, they are more likely to extend a partner's play idea and less likely to emphasize their own idea (Goncu, 1993a).

Children who have a habit of disagreeing with the group are commonly excluded from play. Conversely, cooperative children are often included (Garvey, 1974; Johnson, et al., 1987). Howes, Unger, and Matheson (1992) suggest that friends might have more synchronized social play because they share a history of interacting with one another. Therefore, they have a base of common experiences and knowledge from which to draw play ideas thus making constructing intersubjectivity a more manageable task than if they did not have this base.

The negotiation of shared understanding is an essential component of children's social play. Goncu (1993a) called for an examination of how different types of social play are negotiated. Rough-and-tumble play is one category of social play that lends itself to this type of study.

Rough-and-Tumble Play

At the beginning of this century, Groos (1901) reported on the occurrence of play fighting and play chasing in children's behavior. However, researchers practically ignored these aspects of children's behavior for decades (Humphreys & Smith, 1984). In fact, play fighting and play chasing were not studied systematically until the late 1960's and early 1970's when Blurton Jones (1967; 1972) applied ethological methodology, often used in studying animal behavior, to
the study of nursery school children's behavior in both outdoor and indoor settings. Using this methodology, Blurton Jones (1967, 1972) constructed "behavioral inventories" by delineating children's micro-level behaviors, such as a smile, that then became the foundation for comprehensive macro-level categories, such as social behavior (Pellegrini, 1987, 1989c).

Originally, researchers interested in children's play fighting and play chasing, focused on preschool children (e.g., Blurton Jones, 1967; 1972; DiPietro, 1981; Smith & Lewis, 1985). More recently, researchers have focused on this type of behavior in older children - middle school (e.g., Boulton, 1991a, 1991b; Costabile, Smith, Matheson, Aston, Hunter, & Boulton, 1991; Humphreys & Smith, 1987) and adolescents (e.g., Neill, 1976).

What Is R&T Play?

The term R&T play (R&T), first used in research on rhesus monkeys (Harlow & Harlow, 1965), basically refers to a category of play comprised of play fighting and play chasing (Blurton Jones, 1967, 1972). According to Pellegrini and Smith (1998), the developmental curve for R&T play is in the shape of an inverted-U. It emerges in the preschool years, peaks during middle childhood, and tapers off during adolescence. Researchers have consistently found that the contact form of R&T play, pretend fighting, occurs more frequently among males than females (Blurton Jones, 1967; 1972; Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Pellegrini, 1989). However, this sex difference is not so obvious for the non-contact form of R&T play, chasing. In other words, both boys and girls engage in play chasing.
with similar frequency (Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Smith & Connolly, 1972).

In a recent review article, Pelligrini and Smith (1998) exclude play chasing from their definition of rough-and-tumble play. They contend that while chasing may or may not be social, the contact behaviors associated with play fighting require a social component, and thus distinguish them from physical activity play.

Boulton and Smith (1992) suggest that R&T play may be a human universal. Indeed, both male and female, preschool to adolescent children participate in R&T play in one form or another (Smith, 1989). Also, researchers have observed R&T play in various cultures in countries such as England (Blurton Jones, 1967, 1972; Boulton, 1991a, 1991b; Humphreys & Smith, 1984, 1987), the United States (Aldis, 1975; Pellegrini, 1987, 1989a, 1989b), Italy (Caravalho, Smith, Hunter, & Costabile, 1990; Costabile, et al., 1991), Africa (Blurton Jones & Konner, 1973; Whiting & Whiting, 1975), Mexico (Fry, 1987; Whiting & Whiting, 1975), Japan, the Philippines, and India (Whiting & Whiting, 1975).

During the process of defining R&T play, researchers have delineated specific characteristics that one can use to distinguish R&T play from other forms of behavior, especially aggression. Boulton (1991a), in his discussion of the structural and contextual features of children’s playful fighting, categorized these characteristics in the following manner: (a) proximity prior to interaction, (b) initiation and response, (c) types of action patterns or behavior, (d) facial and vocal expressions, (e) outcome,
(f) role reversals and self-handicapping, (g) proportion of time spent in R&T play, and (h) number of participants. These were used as a guide for the following review.

Proximity prior to interaction. Boulton (1991a) hypothesized that if R&T is a friendly form of play, it should transpire primarily between children who spend time together. Therefore, he argued, it would stand to reason that children who participate in R&T play would be more likely to be together rather than apart prior to the onset of an R&T play bout.

Boulton (1991a) found some support for this hypothesis in his study of the structural and contextual features of 8- to 11-year old children's playful and aggressive fighting. Children who participated in R&T play tended to be together for at least 10 seconds before the initiation of an episode of R&T play rather than to be physically apart during this period. The sex of the participants mediated this finding with children significantly more likely to have been together prior to same-sex interactions and to be apart prior to mixed sex interaction. Rough-and-tumble play and aggression did not differ significantly on this particular characteristic.

In the Boulton (1991a) study, there were R&T play episodes where the participants were apart prior to the beginning of the interaction. When this was the case, there was a propensity for the eventual initiator of the R&T play bout to be the one who made the initial approach. Only a few R&T play episodes ensued because of a chance meeting in the playground, or after the recipient of a bid for
R&T play approached the initiator. Based on these findings, Boulton (1991a) suggested that some children might use R&T play as a means of gaining peer group entry.

**Initiation and response.** Using qualitative methodology, researchers have discovered children initiate real fights with a verbal challenge that must be accepted or refused (Opie & Opie, 1959). Conversely, children initiate games with some type of invitation or negotiation whereby the respondent has a choice about whether or not to join the game (Sluckin, 1981). When responses to initiation attempts were categorized, Humphreys & Smith (1987) found that the majority of initiations either received a sociable response or no response at all. Only about a third of the initiations received a R&T response. Boulton (1991a) reported similar findings. Therefore, the quantitative data provided by these studies generally support the earlier claim that R&T play initiations more closely resemble an invitation rather than a challenge that has to be accepted or refused. Additionally, Boulton (1991a) also found that it was very rare (less than 1% of episodes) for R&T play to receive an aggressive response, suggesting that R&T play is indeed a friendly activity.

**Types of action patterns or behaviors.** Researchers have identified action patterns that are commonly observed in varying degrees in the R&T play of preschool to adolescent children. These include wrestle, hit (i.e., beating at each other with an open hand without actually hitting), karate chop, push, pull, grab at, roll, punch, slap, kick, collide, run or run past, chase and flee, jump up
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and down with both feet together, and fall (Aldis, 1975; Blurton Jones, 1967, 1972, 1976; Boulton & Smith, 1989; Fry, 1987). Boulton and Smith (1989) point out, it is not enough to use these behaviors as the only criteria on which to base decisions about whether or not a particular episode is R&T play. They must be used in combination with other criteria (e.g., facial expression).

Rough-and-tumble play involves a more varied group of behaviors than does aggression which typically only includes beats, punches, pushes, kicks. Additionally, R&T play is more likely to involve wrestling and chasing/fleeing than is aggression (Boulton 1991a; Fry, 1987).

Humphreys and Smith (1987) point out that some of the action patterns associated with R&T play overlap with vigorous activity play (i.e., large-scale muscular and bodily exercise behaviors such as running, climbing, swinging, sliding, jumping, pushing and pulling). However, these two types of play are distinct from each other. Vigorous activity play is not play fighting and play chasing. More specifically, the general R&T play characteristics of role reversal and self-handicapping (to be discussed later) are absent from vigorous activity play.

In a recent review article, Pelligrini and Smith (1998) use the overlap between vigorous activity play and running as one basis to exclude play chasing from their definition of R&T play. They contend running from or after someone may or may not include the social components of role reversal and self-handicapping which are characteristic of R&T play, and not vigorous activity play.
Facial and vocal expressions. Researchers commonly use facial and vocal expressions as a method to distinguish R&T play from aggression. In ethological studies of British preschool children's behavior, Blurton Jones (1967, 1972) utilized factor analysis to determine which facial and vocal expressions loaded together on reliable factors. He found that "laugh" and "playface" (i.e., mischievous, open-mouthed smile) had loaded highy on the R&T play factor, whereas "frown" and "fixate" loaded highly on the aggression factor. Researchers have observed that children in other cultures utilize similar facial and vocal expressions as signals for R&T play and aggressive bouts, respectively (Aldis, 1975; DiPietro, 1981; Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Konner, 1972).

Fry (1987) noted a neutral facial expression (neither playful or aggressive in nature) also could indicate non-serious intent regarding a particular interaction. Boulton (1991a) provided support for this observation. He found that both positive and neutral facial expressions commonly occurred in conjunction with R&T play. However, Boulton also observed some instances of neutral facial expressions occurring with aggression. For this reason, he suggested that facial expressions be used with an additional criteria (e.g., outcome) to distinguish R&T play from aggression.

Outcome. A criteria often used in conjunction with facial expressions to distinguish between R&T play and aggression is outcome (i.e., what happens at the conclusion of a bout of play). In his descriptive study, Aldis (1975) referred to an interaction as playful if the participants stayed together afterwards or as aggressive if
they separated. Smith & Lewis (1985) found that with preschool children, R&T play could be reliably distinguished from aggression using both outcome and facial expressions as defining criteria.

In their study of 7-, 9-, and 11-year-old children, Humphreys & Smith (1987) reported that at the end of a R&T play bout, the participants remained together 76%, 64%, and 80% of the time respectively. However, this still leaves some of the R&T play episodes that ended with the participants separating. The sex of the participants was a factor in the outcome of R&T play bouts for the 9-year-old children. Specifically, mixed sex groups were significantly more inclined to separate than same sex groups.

Boulton (1991a) attempted to replicate the Humphreys & Smith (1987) study. He found for 8- and 11-year-old children, that while the participants stayed together at the conclusion of most R&T play bouts, about one-third of the bouts resulted in separation. He suggested that outcome should therefore be used in combination with other criteria (e.g. facial and vocal expressions) to make the distinction between R&T play and aggression. Congruent with the Humphreys & Smith (1987) study, Boulton (1991a) found that mixed sex groups were more inclined to separate than same sex groups. Based on this finding, and the observation that same sex participants were together before the start of R&T but opposite sex participants were apart (discussed earlier), Boulton points out that R&T play could give members of the opposite sex a chance to interact with each other.
In the same study, Boulton (1991a) also found that when children remained together, they either continued social interaction, stayed near to each other without interacting, or started another form of R&T play. These outcomes occurred in similar numbers (i.e., 20%-25%). Less than 1% of bouts changed into aggression. When children separated, the initiators of the R&T play episode were just as likely as the recipients to move away. According to Boulton (1991a), respecting each participant’s wishes about ending a bout of R&T play is a requirement of participation.

Blurton Jones (1976) reported that R&T play develops into formalized games. Pellegrini (1989a, 1989b) reported different outcomes for the R&T play of popular and rejected elementary children. He found that both rejected and popular children participate in R&T play. However, for rejected children, R&T play often turns into aggression whereas, for popular children, R&T play often turns into games with rules. Thus, the outcome of R&T play bouts may be a function of children’s social status in the peer group as measured by sociometric assessments (e.g., peer nominations, peer ratings).

Role reversal and self-handicapping. Researchers have utilized role reversal and self-handicapping as distinguishing characteristics of children’s R&T play (Aldis, 1975; Boulton, 1991a; Boulton & Smith, 1992; Blurton Jones, 1976; Fry, 1987; Smith & Boulton, 1990). Role reversal is the alternating of roles from offense to defense (e.g., chaser to chassee in play chasing; attacked to attacker in play fighting) or vice versa (Boulton, 1991a). In research conducted by
Pellegrini (1987, 1992, 1993), role reversal serves as a defining feature of R&T play. A closely related characteristic, self-handicapping, is when a child intentionally lessens the intensity of their actions (e.g., refraining from actually making contact with a punch) to allow their peer a chance to change roles (Boulton, 1991a). Boulton & Smith (1992) have proposed that these behavioral strategies create an environment for the compromise and cooperation essential to successful episodes of R&T play. Both Aldis (1975) and Fry (1975), in their descriptive studies, reported that role reversal and self-handicapping were common in R&T play. In contrast, these features were rare in aggression.

Boulton (1991a) provided empirical evidence regarding role reversal and self-handicapping in middle school children’s R&T play. Immediate role reversals were observed in only three episodes of play chases, and none were observed in aggressive episodes. However, Boulton (1991a) noted that role reversals with longer delays (e.g., the next day) appeared to be somewhat common during the play chases he observed.

Self-handicapping is apparent in the fact that R&T play is separate from aggression (Boulton & Smith, 1992). In one study (Boulton & Smith, 1991), researchers measured self-handicapping as the proportion of play bouts in which a hit, kick, etc., did not make contact. Self-handicapping occurred proportionally more frequently during R&T play than during aggression in only two of the four middle school classes observed. The researchers suggested that for certain
groups of children, self-handicapping also may be a characteristic of aggression as well as of R&T play (Boulton & Smith, 1991).

In another study, Boulton & Smith (1992), measured self-handicapping as the proportion of play chases in which the pursuing child was determined by the observer to intentionally resist catching the fleeing child. The observers judged this to be the case in less than 3% of the chases. It is possible that this type of self-handicapping is more a characteristic of play fighting than for play chasing (Boulton & Smith, 1992).

Proportion of time spent in R&T play. An extremely consistent finding in the literature is that R&T play occurs more frequently than aggressive fighting. During more than 30 hours of observing preschool children, DiPietro (1981) noted only five cases of aggression. Rough-and-tumble play, on the other hand, occupied around 14% of males' and 5% of females' activity. Smith and Lewis (1985) reported that only 4% of 597 observed episodes of preschool children's "fighting" behaviors were aggressive. The remaining episodes were generally playful.

Humphreys and Smith (1987) and Boulton (1991a) offer comparable findings for middle school children. Proportionately more of children's playground time was spent in R&T play than was spent in aggression, 10% and .2%, respectively (Humphreys & Smith, 1987). There is evidence that the proportion of time spent in R&T play may decrease with age. When studying this variable in 7-, 9-, and 11-year-old children, Humphreys and Smith (1984) found that 7-year-old children spent about 13% of their playground time in R&T play,
compared to approximately 9% for 9-year-old children, and nearly 4% for 11-year old children.

When examining rates of occurrence, Fry (1987) found a significant difference in the average number of R&T versus aggressive episodes. He observed an average of 5.3 bouts of R&T play per hour and only .6 bouts of aggression per hour. Fry (1987) also reported that R&T play episodes (15.9 seconds) lasted significantly longer than aggressive episodes (4.1 seconds). Conversely, Boulton (1991a) did not find a significant difference between the duration of R&T play and aggressive bouts. However, it is difficult to compare the findings of Fry and Boulton because Fry did not define a "bout."

**Number of participants.** Smith and Lewis (1985) found that for R&T play among preschool children, the number of participants ranged from 2 to 10 with a mean of 3.3 children. This was significantly different from aggression where the number of participants ranged from two to four with a mean of 2.6 children. Fry (1987) reported similar findings in a study of 3- to 8-year-old Zapotec children (Mexico). He also found that significantly more bouts of R&T play than aggression involved more than two children. This makes sense, according to Fry, because more children would be likely to join playful interactions such as R&T play rather than serious interactions such as aggression.

Boulton (1991a) reported comparable findings for middle school children. Most of the episodes observed, whether they were R&T play or aggression, involved two children. However, a significantly larger proportion of the R&T play interactions than aggressive
interactions involved three or more participants. Pellegrini (1992, 1993) reported similar results for 11-year-old boys. In general, the dyad is a typical unit of interaction for school-age children. However, R&T play is more likely to involve larger groups of children than aggression, regardless of age (Boulton, 1991a; Fry, 1987; Pellegrini, 1992, 1993; Smith & Lewis, 1985).

Criteria Used by Children and Adults to Distinguish R&T Play from Aggression

Even though the micro-level behaviors associated with R&T play may resemble real fighting behaviors, researchers have provided evidence that R&T play is distinct from aggressive fighting and serious chasing (Aldis, 1975; Blurton Jones, 1972; Boulton, 1991a; Fry, 1987; Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Pellegrini, 1989a; Smith & Boulton, 1990; Smith & Lewis, 1985). More recently, researchers have begun to seek answers to questions such as: "What cues do children use to distinguish R&T play from aggression?"; "How does this compare with the cues used by adults (i.e., teachers; caregivers)?"

There are two approaches commonly used for determining how individuals make a distinction between R&T play and aggression. One method involves showing a videotape of both types of episodes to individuals and then asking them to categorize each as either R&T play or aggression. The individuals are also asked why they made a particular judgement. Another method involves interviewing or having individuals complete a questionnaire about how they can tell when children are play fighting or serious fighting (Smith & Boulton, 1990).
Smith and Lewis (1985) found that 4-year-olds’ judgements were consistent with adults’ judgements about how to categorize videotaped episodes of children’s play. These children did use physical characteristics of actions to discern a R&T play bout from an aggressive one, but they were more likely (i.e., 58% of the time) to be unable to give reasons for their judgements.

Older children (8- and 11-year-olds) also could discriminate between videotaped episodes of R&T play and aggression. They primarily used characteristics of actions and inference about intent as cues to make these judgements (Boulton, 1993a; Costabile, et al., 1991). Eleven-year-old children also incorporated outcome, actions of other peers, crowd around, and inference about affect as criteria for their categorization process (Costabile, et al., 1991). A developmental progression for competence in utilizing certain criteria for discriminating R&T play from aggression is apparent from the results of these studies.

When children in the Costabile et al. (1991) study responded to a questionnaire, facial and verbal expressions emerged as cues frequently used to distinguish real and play fighting. Conversely, facial expression was rarely reported as a cue in the videotape portion of the study. The researchers stated that this discrepancy was probably the result of unclear facial expressions on the videotape (Costabile, et al., 1991; Smith & Boulton, 1990).

Children’s social status, as measured by sociometric assessments (e.g., peer nominations, peer ratings), is related to the variety of cues they use as well as their accuracy in making
judgements about R&T play and aggressive episodes. Pellegrini (1989a, 1989b) found that rejected children used less varied criteria for judging episodes as R&T play or aggression than did popular children. Rejected children also were less successful at making judgements that agreed with adults’ judgements.

Smith, Hunter, Carvalho, and Costabile (1992) utilized a questionnaire to explore play fighting and chasing from the perspective of 8- and 11-year-old English and Italian children and 5-year-old English children. The results were basically the same for English and Italian children. The majority of children stated that they could distinguish play fighting from serious fighting. Five-year-old children were more skilled in this ability if they reported liking and taking part in play fights. Younger children used physical characteristics of actions, and facial or verbal expressions as criteria for making judgements about whether a particular bout was play fighting or serious fighting. Older children used expressive behavior (e.g., facial expression, verbal expressions - laughter or crying), physical characteristics of actions, and intention of behavior (e.g., infliction of pain).

Some researchers have compared directly the accuracy of adults versus children in judging videotaped episodes of R&T play and aggression as well as the cues used in making those judgements (Boulton, 1993b; Schafer & Smith, 1996). Boulton (1993b) reported agreement between college students and children (more so with the 11-year-olds than with the 8-year-olds) about categorizing the episodes as either R&T play or aggression. The college students used
characteristics of physical actions, inference about intent/action, and facial expression as distinguishing cues (Boulton, 1993b). Children used physical characteristics of actions and inference about intent/action (Boulton, 1993a).

Schafer & Smith (1996) asked teachers to complete a questionnaire about play fighting and real fighting. Additionally, along with 5- to 7-year old children, they were asked to make judgements about videotaped interaction bouts. The teachers and children tended to agree about the nature of episodes. However, the teachers verbally reported using a greater variety of criteria in making their judgements than did children. From greater to lesser frequency, teachers used the cues physical characteristics of actions, facial expressions, crowd around, stay together/separate, infer action/intent, and length of episode, while children primarily relied on the cues infer action/intent and physical characteristics of actions. Schafer and Smith (1996) suggested that an increased awareness of more specialized characteristics (e.g., crowd around, stay together/separate, length of episode) is probably due to experience. Indeed, the teachers in this study utilized these cues to a greater extent than did the college students in Boulton’s (1993b) study.

Thus, both children and adults are able to distinguish R&T play from aggression. However, it is a skill which develops with age for children and with experience for adults.
Contextual Factors Influencing R&T Play

Many contextual factors have an impact on how R&T play bouts evolve over the course of children's play. The ones examined in the following sections include playground characteristics and child characteristics.

Playground characteristics. The playground offers a unique setting for exploring R&T play (Hart, 1993). Researchers have recently begun to regard the playground as a meaningful context for development (see Hart, 1993; Pellegrini, 1987). Hart (1993) points out that in comparison to other contexts, playgrounds are environments where children have more freedom to interact primarily free from adult-imposed rules. This enables researchers to explore child behavior as it naturally unfolds in a setting characterized by minimal adult supervision (Hart, 1993).

The characteristics of the playground influence the R&T play of children. R&T play is more likely to occur when there are soft surfaces, such as steep grassy banks (Humphreys & Smith, 1987), a large area, few small toys, large (more than ten children) same-age peer group, caregivers or teachers have a permissive 'free play' attitude (Smith & Connolly, 1980), or when there is windy weather (Humphreys & Smith, 1987). Smith and Connolly (1976) reported a corresponding increase between R&T play and available square footage on the playground.

Child characteristics. Children do not come to play situations unencumbered by personal attributes and histories. They bring different characteristics that contribute to how and why they
Interact as they do. Child characteristics, reviewed below as they are related to R&T play, include age, sex, and social status.

Researchers have observed R&T play in the behavior of children from preschool to adolescence (Humphreys & Smith, 1984, 1987; Smith, 1989). Play chasing appears in children's interactions before play fighting (Blurton Jones, 1972; Groos, 1901; Smith, 1973). Both play fighting and play chasing are a common part of children's behavioral repertoires by the time they are three and four years old (Blurton Jones, 1967, 1972; DiPietro, 1981; McGrew, 1972; Smith, 1974; Smith & Connolly, 1972).

Pellegrini and Smith (1998) suggest the developmental curve for the frequency of R&T play is an inverted-U shape. This type of play emerges in the preschool years, peaks during middle childhood, and tapers off during adolescence. Rough-and-tumble play accounts for 3% to 5% of preschool children’s play behavior (Pellegrini, 1984). There is evidence that older preschoolers engage in more R&T play than younger preschoolers (Hart, DeWolf, Wozniak, & Burts, 1992). Rough-and-tumble play accounts for 7% to 8% of 6- to 10-year-old children's recess behavior (Boulton, 1992; Pellegrini, 1988), 10% for 7- to 11-year-old children’s behavior (Humphreys & Smith, 1987), 5% of 11- to 13-year-old children’s behavior (Boulton, 1992; Pellegrini, 1995a), and only 3% of 14-year-old children’s behavior (Pellegrini, 1995b).

On the surface, preschoolers' R&T play may appear to only be wrestling and chasing. However, upon closer examination, pretend
aspects are evident with children assuming various roles (e.g., monsters, super heroes) as part of their play (Smith, 1977).

Rough-and-tumble play is generally a friendly, sociable behavior, that is primarily cooperative in nature and relatively easy to distinguish from aggression during preschool and up to early middle childhood - approximately nine years of age (Blurton Jones, 1972; Humphreys & Smith, 1987, 1989; Smith & Lewis, 1985). Researchers studying R&T play in school-age children have provided evidence that R&T play may change, with elements of dominance and competition appearing, as children get older - around 11 years of age (Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Neill, 1976).

Neill (1976), after observing the fighting behavior of 12- to 13-year-old boys, discovered a considerable overlap between play and aggression. He described two types of fighting - "vigorous fighting" (playful, but may cause distress for the victim) and "playful fighting" (low in intensity). During his observations, Neill noted some instances where the boys took advantage of a playful bout to inflict hurt on a partner. He concluded that as children get older, play and aggression may merge together. Other scholars argue that even though R&T play may become rougher as children get older, it is still different from aggression (Humphreys & Smith, 1984, 1987).

Another way to learn about the nature of older children's R&T play is to examine the outcomes of episodes characterized by fighting behavior. In their study of 7-, 9-, and 11-year-old children, Humphreys & Smith (1987) reported that at the end of a R&T play bout,
the participants remained together 76%, 64%, and 80% of the time respectively. Boulton (1991a) found similar results with 8- and 11-year-old children. Therefore, the older children did not interpret fighting behavior as serious more often than younger children did.

Taken together, the results of the Neill (1976) and Humphreys & Smith (1987) studies offer evidence that although the content of older boys' R&T play is rougher, there is not a comparable rise in the proportion of R&T play bouts which are perceived as hostile aggression. Older boys tolerate this increased roughness without viewing it as a serious attack (Smith & Humphreys, 1987).

Age differences also exist for the number of participants involved in a R&T play bout and the reasons underlying partner choice. Even though Smith and Lewis (1985) observed R&T play bouts involving five or more preschool children approximately 20% of the time, Boulton (1991a) reported that it was rare for R&T play bouts of older middle school children to involve more than two children. While 7-, 9-, and 11-year-old children all used liking as a criteria when choosing partners for R&T play, 11-year-old children were the only ones to utilize strength as a criteria for this selection (Humphreys & Smith, 1987).

Another child characteristic related to R&T play is sex. In general, boys engage in more R&T play than girls (Hart, DeWolf, Wozniak, & Burts, 1992). More specifically, researchers have consistently found that play fighting occurs more frequently among males than females (Blurton Jones, 1967, 1972; DiPietro, 1981; Humphreys & Smith, 1987). However, this sex difference is not so
obvious for play chasing (Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Smith & Connolly, 1972). In fact, both boys and girls have reported liking and participating in play chasing. However, boys were more likely than girls to report liking and participating in play fighting (Smith, et al., 1992).

DiPietro (1981) studied gender differences in the components involved in the active and R&T play of preschool children. She observed the play of same sex triads during 12 minute sessions in a "playroom on wheels" (i.e., unfurnished Winnebago with a thickly carpeted play area, 4-foot inflated Bobo punching doll, a canvas mat stretched across a large inner tube serving as a "jump-o-leen," a medium sized plastic ball, and a small stuffed pillow). She reported that girls and boys exhibited distinct patterns of play and social interaction. Boys were more likely to engage in exuberant roughhousing in physical contact with each other and with the available toys, and less likely to verbally structure their interactions. Conversely, girls were more likely to engage in original interactions with the toys and to try to structure their interactions by using self-generated rules and suggestions.

Boulton (1991a) reported that middle school children were significantly more likely to have been together prior to same-sex interactions and to be apart prior to mixed-sex interactions. The sex of the participants was also a factor in the outcome of R&T play bouts for the 9-year-old children. Specifically, mixed-sex groups were significantly more inclined to separate than same-sex groups (Boulton, 1991a; Humphreys & Smith, 1987). Based on these findings,
Boulton (1991a) proposed that, even though children usually prefer same-sex peers as R&T play partners, some instances of R&T play could give members of the opposite sex a chance to interact with each other.

Schwartzmann (1978) suggests researchers view children’s play from a “sideways perspective.” In this way, the “system of ongoing relationships” that exists in the social world of children is acknowledged as an important contextual factor and included for study (Goncu & Kessel, 1984). These ideas echo the earlier work of Jacob Moreno (1934) who originally coined the term sociometry and developed sociometric methods. Bukowski and Cillessen (1998) highlighted one of Moreno’s basic points, “people cannot be understood apart from the social and personal contexts in which they function” (p. 2).

Social status (i.e., social position in a peer group) is a child characteristic that can impact children’s play. Social status is the score obtained from a sociometric assessment in which “children make preferential responses to statements about peers in their social group” (McConnell & Odom, 1986, p. 217). The various sociometric assessments measure different dimensions of social status. Peer nomination scores provide an assessment of a child’s popularity (i.e., how well a child is liked) in the peer group. For this assessment the interviewer asks each child to choose, by pointing to classmates’ pictures, classmates with whom they like play and classmates with whom they do not like to play (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982; McConnell & Odom, 1986).
Peer rating scores, on the other hand, provide an assessment of children’s acceptance in the peer group. For peer ratings, the interviewer asks each child to rate classmates according to how much he/she likes playing or dislikes playing with a particular classmate. The child sorts each classmates' picture into one of three boxes. Each box is labeled with either a happy face, neutral face, or sad face representing “likes to play with a lot,” “kind of likes to play with,” and “doesn’t like to play with very much,” respectively (Asher, Singleton, Tinsley, & Hymel, 1979; McConnell & Odom, 1986).

Researchers have found a relationship between children’s social status and their playground behaviors during preschool and elementary school (Ladd & Price, 1993; Pellegrini, 1987). In general, Ladd & Price (1993) point out, “... play patterns of rejected children do differ in important ways from their better-accepted counterparts” (p. 144). These play patterns may, in turn, influence the way these children are perceived by their peers. The play styles of popular children are typically characterized by cooperation and prosocial behaviors that act as social reinforcement and therefore, promote positive peer perceptions. The play styles of rejected children, on the other hand, are characterized by argumentative and disruptive behaviors that are unpleasant to other children and interrupt play, thus creating negative peer perceptions (Ladd & Price, 1993).

These varying play patterns for popular and rejected children also emerge for R&T play. For preschool children, Smith & Lewis (1985) found that R&T play partners were liked above average and tended to be nominated as “best friends” on sociometric measures.
Conversely, R&T play partners are not usually nominated as "argued with a lot" or "least liked." Humphreys and Smith (1987) reported similar results for older children. Seven-, nine-, and eleven-year-old R&T play partners were liked above average. This was true from the perspective of either the initiator or the recipient. The findings from these studies offer support for the belief that R&T play is a social activity that children primarily engage in with friends (Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Smith & Lewis, 1985).

Pellegrini (1989a, 1989b) conducted behavioral observations of kindergarten, second, and fourth grade children. He reported a positive relation between boys' popularity and R&T play. Aggression, on the other hand, was negatively related to popularity.

However, popular children's R&T play was qualitatively different in form and outcome from rejected children's R&T play. The R&T play of popular children typically included a "playful provocation factor" (i.e., kick, push, play fight, chase) and a nonaggressive physical factor. Playful provocation is one way popular children attempt to get play partners to respond in a playful manner. Indeed, their playful teasing was usually reciprocated. Additionally, the R&T play bouts of popular children often turn into games with rules. The R&T play of rejected children, on the other hand, was characterized by the co-occurrence of aggressive behavior (e.g., hit with closed hand) and play behavior (e.g., pounce on, hit at, chase). Also, these bouts of R&T play often turn into aggression (Pellegrini, 1989a, 1989b).
Based on his findings, Pellegrini (1989a, 1989b) concluded that the R&T play of popular elementary school children appears to be playful, social interaction. Also, R&T play and aggression, while distinct categories for popular children, may not be separate categories for rejected children.

Pellegrini (1989a, 1989b) also asked children to provide their reasons for categorizing videotaped play episodes as either R&T play or aggression. Popular children gave a greater variety of criteria for judging a bout as R&T play or aggression than did rejected children. Therefore, popular children had more elaborate categories of R&T play and aggression, but rejected children's categories lacked this elaboration. Additionally, rejected children were not as successful as popular children in discriminating between R&T play and aggressive episodes. Rough-and-tumble play may have more positive outcomes for popular children, but less positive outcomes for rejected children (Pellegrini, 1989a, 1989b).

In a later study, Pellegrini (1992) reported evidence for the importance of flexibility in R&T play as it relates to social status. He found a positive relationship between popular elementary boys flexibility in R&T play (i.e., number of different R&T play behaviors exhibited) and their ability to provide a variety of prosocial responses to social problems.

It is important to note that some researchers have reported a negative relationship between children's R&T play and popularity (Ladd, 1983; Hart, DeWolf, Wozniak, & Burts, 1992). Pellegrini (1987) suggested that these contradictory findings may be the result
of including R&T play and aggression in the same category of behavior (Ladd, 1983) and thus confounding any relationships that may exist for these behaviors individually.

Conversely, these conflicting findings may be due to a difference in how popular and rejected children read situational cues. Socially competent children behave in a "relevant" and "responsive" manner during social interactions. They are effective at reading situational cues and then responding and/or adjusting behavior accordingly (Asher, 1983). Rejected children are less effective at this task. Indeed, R&T play often intensifies into aggression for rejected children (Pellegrini, 1989a, 1989b). Rejected children may mistakenly perceive playful initiations of R&T play as aggression and react with aggression (Ladd & Price, 1993). Therefore, the negative relations between R&T play and social status may be the result of the escalation of R&T play into aggression for rejected children.

The above research, examining the relationship between children's social status and R&T play, was conducted in the style of the individually focused "applied sociometry" (McConnell & Odom, 1986). In "applied sociometry," researchers use sociometric methods (i.e., individuals make preferential choices about fellow group members) to classify children into groups (e.g., popular, rejected) and then explore behaviors related to that classification (McConnell & Odom, 1986). According to Bukowski and Cillessen (1998), recently there has been renewed interest in "pure sociometry." In "pure sociometry" researchers focus on group structure (McConnell & Odom,
One area of research influenced by "pure sociometry" is the study of social networks. A social network is a group of actors and the relations linking those actors (Knoke & Kuklinski, 1982; Wasserman & Faust, 1994). Social networks have a structure comprised of the arrangement of existent and nonexistent ties among network actors (Knoke & Kuklinski, 1982). Despite the potential of social networks for uncovering the role group structure may have on R&T play, scholars conducting R&T play research have not included social networks as integral components of their work.

**Developmental Significance of R&T Play**

Humphreys and Smith (1987) pointed out that the "frequency and distinctiveness" of R&T play in a variety of species suggests a "functional benefit" of this type of behavior for the individual participating in it. Scholars interested in R&T play have proposed several hypotheses regarding the developmental significance of this type of play for children. Most of these hypotheses are based on those suggested by researchers examining R&T play in non-human species (Fagen, 1981).

The most common hypothesis discussed in the literature regarding the functional benefits of R&T play in humans are practice for fighting and hunting skills, establishing social rank or dominance, and development of social affiliation (Boulton & Smith, 1992; Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Smith, 1989). Each has received varying levels of support in the literature. Because the focus of this study was on children's negotiations in R&T play, the following
discussion will concentrate on the possible social affiliative functions of R&T play.

Social play, in general, has affiliation benefits such as providing opportunities for social interaction in which children utilize skills such as cooperation and perspective taking (Boulton, 1991b; Hart, 1993; Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987). Rough-and-tumble play, specifically, is one type of social play that occurs between agreeable partners and requires some level of cooperation (DiPietro, 1981).

Researchers offer support for the social affiliative function of R&T play based on findings that preschool and school-age partners in bouts of R&T play liked each other significantly more than chance would predict (Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Smith & Lewis, 1985). Boulton (1991b) disputed this conclusion in his study of middle school children's partner preferences for play fighting and chasing. While both initiators and recipients of R&T play bouts liked each other more than chance would predict, this was also the case for activities that were not R&T play. Boulton (1991b) suggested that choice of partners in R&T play, and other activities, is probably more an indication of existing friendships/affiliations rather than a context for the formation of those friendships. Perhaps R&T play is one context, not necessarily for forming friends per se, but rather for maintaining these relationships (Boulton & Smith, 1992; Smith, 1989).

Pellegrini's research on the relationship between children's participation in R&T play and their popularity in the peer group...
provides additional support for a social affiliative function of R&T play. In one study, he reported a positive relation between elementary boys' popularity and R&T play. Additionally, both popular and rejected children participated in R&T play with similar frequency. However, popular children's R&T play was qualitatively different in form and outcome from rejected children's R&T play. The R&T play of popular children was basically nonaggressive, physical, and playful in nature and often turned into games with rules. The R&T play of rejected children, on the other hand, was characterized by the co-occurrence of aggressive and play behavior and often turned into real fighting.

Additionally, popular children were more successful at discriminating R&T play from aggression and gave a greater variety of criteria for making that judgment than rejected children (Pellegrini, 1989a, 1989b). In a later study, he found a positive relationship between popular elementary boys' flexibility in R&T (i.e., number of different R&T play behaviors exhibited) and their ability to provide a variety of prosocial responses to social problems (Pellegrini, 1992).

While not offering direct support, Pellegrini's findings do lend credence to Smith's (1989) suggestion that rejected children, rather than participating in less R&T play, participate in less cooperative R&T play - not adequately regulated for affect (MacDonald, 1987) that often turns into aggression (Pellegrini, 1989b). Smith (1989) applied the terms "honest mistakes" and "cheating," originally used by Fagen (1981) in his work with
animals, to delineate possible reasons for noncooperative R&T play in children.

Younger children, usually preschool through early elementary, may engage in noncooperative R&T play as the result of making "honest mistakes" (Smith, 1989). They have deficiencies in certain social skills such as interpreting the meaning of R&T play invitations or regulating affect (Smith, 1989; Smith & Boulton, 1990). Sluckin (1981) observed this type of uncooperative R&T play in an ethnographic study of 5- to 9-year old children's playground behavior. Also, rejected children are less successful at discriminating R&T play from aggression and may respond to playful initiations as if they were hostile (MacDonald, 1987; Pellegrini, 1989b).

Older children, usually older elementary and early adolescents, may engage in uncooperative R&T play due to "cheating" (Smith, 1989). These children have advanced social skills, but use them as a means of achieving uncooperative goals such as, deception, intimidation, or manipulation (Smith, 1989; Smith & Boulton, 1990). Except for Neill's (1976) report that some 12- and 13-year-old boys take advantage of play fighting to hurt a partner, empirical evidence to support the existence of this type of uncooperative R&T play is lacking. However, in ethnographic work, Sluckin (1981) reported instances when children used, or attempted to use, R&T play for deceitful, intimidating, or manipulative purposes.

Closely related to the concept of social affiliation is the idea that R&T play facilitates the continuing development, or at the
very least the practice, of social skills (Smith, 1989). Abilities, such as decoding a partner's social signals, and communicating with affective signals as a means to regulate a partner's behavior, may first be learned during children's physical play with skillful parents (MacDonald & Parke, 1984). These abilities are then seen again as skills, such as distinguishing R&T play from aggression or self-handicapping, children use as they participate in R&T play (Pellegrini, 1987).

Summary

Rough-and-tumble play is a common type of social play during the preschool years. Researchers have hypothesized that R&T play serves as a vehicle for social development as well as a reflection of that development (Smith, 1989; Smith & Boulton, 1990). As with social interaction in general, R&T play is more likely to serve a social affiliative function for children when it is cooperative in nature. Indeed, a necessary component of R&T play is that children agree, or come to a shared understanding, that the fighting and/or chasing is pretend. It is important to examine how children negotiate a shared understanding, not only about the pretend nature of the fighting and chasing, but also about other features (e.g., themes, roles) of R&T play.

The ability to engage in constructive social interactions is essential for children's successful participation in the social world. Currently, little is known about how preschool children negotiate intersubjectivity in R&T play. In general, the current study examined naturally occurring social behavior as a means of
uncovering details about children's R&T play. Specifically, the exploratory component of the present study involved developing an understanding of how children negotiate intersubjectivity (i.e., shared understanding) during R&T play as well as what role contextual factors play in this process. Additionally, the confirmatory component of the current study involved examining the relationship between child characteristics and the proportion of R&T play episodes in which a child participates.
Chapter III

Methodology

Naturalist or constructivist assumptions (see Chapter I) serve as the foundation for the methodology utilized for the current study. These assumptions, along with the theoretical framework presented earlier, naturally lead to the use of qualitative methods as a way to discover how participants in a particular social situation experience and construct their realities (Hatch, 1995). At the heart of qualitative methodology is emergent design. Therefore, the procedures described below served as a guideline for the researcher and were subject to adjustment during the course of the research.

Procedure

The researcher utilized the Developmental Research Sequence outlined by Spradley (1980) for this study because it is based on the assumptions of naturalist science as well as the assumptions of symbolic interactionism. Within the Developmental Research Sequence, Spradley (1980) provided a framework for using participant observations and inductive analyses as a means to develop an understanding of how children negotiate shared meaning during rough and tumble play.

The entire Developmental Research Sequence involves 12 steps. The researcher begins with a broad focus in the first step of the Developmental Research Sequence (Spradley, 1980) by choosing a social situation where he or she would like to discover the cultural knowledge people use to "interpret experience and generate behavior" (Spradley, 1980, p. 6). This broad focus is maintained
throughout the next four steps of the discovery process which include, participant observation, creating an ethnographic record, descriptive observations, and domain analysis. It is at this point that the researcher’s focus narrows into the “in-depth investigation” (Spradley, 1980, p. 102) characteristic of the next four steps, focused observations, taxonomic analysis, selective observations, and componental analysis. In the final three steps, the focus widens again into making a theme analysis, taking a cultural inventory, and writing an ethnography, thus enabling the researcher to provide a “holistic description of the cultural scene” (Spradley, 1980, p. 102).

Choosing a Social Situation

The first step in Spradley’s (1980) Developmental Research Sequence involved choosing a social situation. The researcher chose a large southeastern university’s laboratory preschool. This social situation met criteria delineated by Spradley (1980). The scene was easily accessible to the researcher due to location (i.e., researcher was a research associate in the school where the preschool was located), and purpose (i.e., teaching and research laboratory). Because the preschool is a laboratory, college students enrolled in various curricula are often conducting observations on the playground. The children are accustomed to observers and therefore, the researcher believed her presence on the playground would be relatively unobtrusive. The desire to remain unobtrusive, however, lead the researcher to adjust one aspect of the study design. This adjustment is discussed in the section on interview procedures.
The laboratory preschool was a "limited-entry" social situation. First, the researcher obtained approval from the university's Human Subjects Committee (see Appendix A). Then she obtained verbal permission from the Director of the school in which the preschool was located, and the Director of the laboratory preschool itself. Finally, she obtained written informed consent from parents of children attending the preschool during the study and teachers participating in interviews. Parents and teachers received an information packet containing a description of the project and a consent form. Interested parents and teachers signed and returned the permission forms within designated time frame (see Appendix B).

The researcher chose a preschool playground as the social situation because R&T play, the primary focus of the study, occurs on the playground. Specific sampling procedure is discussed in the next section.

**Sampling.** Purposive sampling is used in qualitative research to acquire information-rich cases that can be studied in depth. For this study, the researcher employed theory-based purposive sampling. Patton (1990) describes a sample drawn in this manner as representative of the phenomenon of interest, in this case, preschool children's negotiation of individual understandings to reach a shared understanding (i.e., intersubjectivity) of R&T play. This negotiation process is dialogical in nature and can best be studied by examining an interaction in terms of conversational turns. The researcher is then able to distinguish each participants' contribution to the creation of intersubjectivity (Goncu, 1996). Therefore, the R&T play
episode, which is made up of turns and acts, became the unit of analysis for the current study.

One type of social play that occurs during the preschool years is R&T play (Smith, 1989; Smith & Boulton, 1990). Pellegrini and Smith (1998) suggest the developmental curve for the frequency of R&T play is an inverted-U shape. This type of play emerges in the preschool years, peaks during middle childhood, and tapers off during adolescence.

Rough-and-tumble play requires some level of intersubjectivity in that children must agree that the fighting and/or chasing are pretend. According to Goncu (1993a), children negotiate this intersubjectivity through certain verbal and nonverbal acts (i.e., dialogic units a participant uses to convey a thought or an idea to a fellow participant) exchanged during play. In this study the researcher focused on how children negotiated a shared understanding regarding the pretend nature of R&T play episodes as well as other features (e.g., themes, roles) of these episodes by observing and recording the acts children used during R&T play.

An additional consideration is the role contextual factors (i.e., playground characteristics, child characteristics) have in the process of negotiating this intersubjectivity. Outdoor play is an integral part of the program at the laboratory preschool studied. The children spend 30 to 45 minutes per day on the playground. Rough-and-tumble play is more likely to occur when there is a large same-age peer group (Smith & Connolly, 1976), such as the group of three- and four-year-old children enrolled at the preschool. The playground also
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has features (e.g., adequate amount of space, grassy areas) documented in the literature to be conducive to R&T play (Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Smith & Connolly, 1976).

Furthermore, over the course of the school year, children develop a history of interacting with one another. The researcher conducted social network analyses based on children’s positive and negative peer nominations, peer ratings, and playmate choices for R&T play. She also interviewed teachers about children’s interaction history. The researcher then used this information to explore the role played by the pattern of relationships in children’s negotiation of intersubjectivity during R&T play.

Data Collection

The researcher conducted participant observation and interviews during the Spring semester at the laboratory preschool. She observed on the playground every Monday through Thursday during outdoor play time, 30 to 45 minutes, from the beginning of March to the end of April. She interviewed teachers (i.e., one male and one female graduate assistant) about children’s social interactions on the playground at the end of March. These interviews required two sessions with each teacher. One of the children’s regular preschool teachers (i.e., male graduate assistant) conducted sociometric interviews with the children during April.

Participant observation. Standard observation systems often used in research are not designed to distinguish subtle aspects of social exchange (Whalen, 1989). Participant observation, on the other hand, is a method that enables the researcher to examine naturally
occurring behavior from the perspectives of participants. Because it was not possible for the researcher to experience R&T play as a child, the primary role of the researcher in this study was that of onlooker or spectator (Patton, 1990; Spradley, 1980). This role required minimal interaction with the children. Spradley (1980) refers to this type of participation as passive.

The researcher served as an informant by asking herself ethnographic questions about the social situation. These questions emerged from the social situation and guided or directed the various types of participant observations. More specifically, she based these questions on Spradley's (1980) typology of question content in which descriptive, structural, and contrast questions guide descriptive, focused, and selective observations, respectively. This methodology provided for the systematic examination of the social interactions of participants within the context of interest.

The purpose of descriptive observations was to provide a picture of the social situation under study (Spradley, 1980). Descriptive grand tour questions were developed to enable the researcher to identify the major features of the playground, children's behavior on the playground, and children's relationships. Examples of grand tour questions included: "Can you describe the playground?" ; "Can you describe the children?" ; "Can you describe the playground behavior of the children?" Mini-tour questions were formed to acquire more specific information. Examples of mini-tour questions included: "Who is involved in R&T play?" ; "Where does R&T play occur on the
playground?"; "What strategies do children use to negotiate R&T play?"

Observations became narrower over the course of the study. Focused observations required asking repeatable structured questions (Spradley, 1980). Examples of these types of questions included: "What are all of the ways to initiate R&T play?"; "What are all the strategies children use to negotiate R&T play?"; What are all the ways to terminate R&T play?"

Selected observations required an even more restricted lens than focused observations. During selected observations, the researcher looked for differences among terms within a domain (Spradley, 1980). Examples of possible contrast questions included: "How are R&T play initiation strategies different?"; "How are R&T play negotiation acts different?"

Interviews. It is difficult to learn how participants in a particular context construct social knowledge through observation alone. The participants themselves should be asked questions. According to Patton (1990), "qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit." Interviews are one way of gaining access to data representing the perspective or meanings of the individual being interviewed (Patton, 1990). Preschool children and teachers were interviewed for this study.

Formal sociometric interviews (i.e., peer nominations and peer ratings) provided a source of information about children's social position in the peer group (Asher, Singleton, Tinsley, & Hymel, 1979).
Bell-Dolan and Wessler (1994) outlined several procedures researchers should use to ensure the ethical administration of sociometric measures. Researchers should: (a) obtain active written parental consent, (b) give children a choice about whether or not to participate in the task, (c) administer sociometric tasks individually whenever possible, (d) not administer sociometric tasks right before unstructured periods, (e) help children put the task in perspective by discussing topics such as the importance of friendships or being sensitive to others' feelings, and (f) provide confidentiality instructions. The researcher followed these procedures closely in the current study.

One of the regular preschool teachers conducted the sociometric interviews and thus provided a comfortable environment for the children. All of the children in the study chose to participate in the interview when asked. The interviewer followed procedures for conducting peer nominations (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982, McConnell & Odom, 1986) and peer ratings (Asher, Singleton, Tinsley, & Hymel, 1979; McConnell & Odom, 1986).

Before each individual interview began, the interviewer showed the child a picture board containing the photographs of classmates in the study. The interviewer asked the child to name the peer shown in each picture to make sure that the child could recognize his/her classmates in the pictures (Asher, Singleton, Tinsley, & Hymel, 1979).

The interviewer obtained peer nominations (see Appendix C) by asking the child to name up to three classmates that he/she liked to play with very much and three classmates that he/she did not like to
play with very much. The child referred to the picture board before each nomination and indicated his/her choices by naming and pointing to the individual photographs (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982).

Prior to asking about peer ratings (see Appendix C), the interviewer conducted a brief training session with each child to teach him/her how to use a rating scale and sort procedure. The interviewer showed each child three boxes on which there was either a happy face (i.e., something you like a lot), a neutral face (i.e., something you sort of like), or a sad face (i.e., something you do not like very much). The interviewer presented the child with pictures of various items (e.g., snakes balloons, ice cream) and asked the child to indicate how much he/she likes the items by sorting them into one of the three marked boxes (Asher, Singleton, Tinsley, & Hymel, 1979).

When it was clear that the child understood the rating system, the interviewer presented him/her with color photographs of each of his or her own classmates in the study and asked the child to place each picture in one of the three boxes. If the child put a picture of a classmate in the happy face box, then that was a classmate they liked to play with a lot. A picture placed in the neutral face box was a classmate they sort of liked to play with, and a picture placed in the sad face box was a classmate they did not like to play with very much. When the child completed the sorting process, the interviewer reminded the child we should all be friends, and encouraged the child not to discuss who went into the happy, neutral, and sad boxes (Asher, Singleton, Tinsley, & Hymel, 1979).
The original research design included informal conversational interviews aimed at providing information about the negotiation of shared understanding in R&T play from the children’s perspective. Questions were to arise from the context of the R&T play episodes (e.g., “What did ‘Matthew’ do or say to let you know he wanted to play dinosaurs?”).

The researcher’s desire to remain as unobtrusive as possible, however, hampered the development of the types of personal relationships Hatch (1990) explains are important for quality interviews with children. After the researcher talked to children about their play, she noticed the children had a distinct awareness of her during later interactions. For example, the children would glance at the researcher, seemingly to check for a reaction. The researcher had observed other adults in this particular social situation discourage R&T play, especially play-fighting. She did not want the children to lump her into the same category as the other adults, and felt this categorization could possibly contribute to some adjustment in their play when she was around. Therefore, the researcher chose to focus on what children said and did during R&T play episodes and refrained from interacting with them.

The researcher conducted standardized open-ended interviews with the preschool teachers (i.e., one male and one female graduate assistant) about children’s playmate choices as well as children’s history of social interaction on the playground (see Appendix D). The wording and order of the questions were established in advance (Patton, 1990). The researcher audio-taped these interviews.
Data Preparation

The process of data preparation included expanding field notes, calculating scores from peer nominations and peer ratings, creating matrices based on peer nominations, peer ratings and co-membership in R&T episodes, and transcribing interview tapes. The procedures associated with preparing the observational and interview data are discussed in the following sections.

Field notes. The researcher kept an ethnographic record in the form of detailed field notes throughout participant observation. She maintained confidentiality of participants through the use of pseudo names. During the actual observation time on the playground, the researcher wrote down a "condensed version" of what was happening on the playground (Spradley, 1980). She noted all types of play, but focused on R&T play. When R&T play occurred, she documented such things as behavior, gestures, expressions, verbalizations, location, and participants. As soon as she left the scene, she spent time expanding her notes, filling in the gaps around important words and phrases. The following are excerpts from the expanded field notes. The researcher included four field note excerpts for the reader to compare to the examples of segmented R&T episodes appearing at a later point in the document. From this comparison, the reader can see how the researcher made boundary decisions. Quotation marks within excerpts denote children's native language.

Excerpt 1: Lindsey, Joyce, Troy, and Roy are at the "climber." Lindsey and Joyce are sitting on the lowest bars of the "climber." Troy is standing on ground in the middle of "climber." Roy is standing on ground along outside edge of "climber." Lindsey says, "Pretend you want to marry me Troy." Troy climbs out of middle of "climber" and runs. Lindsey hollers, "Oh no, Roy! He's
Excerpt 2: Ellen and Bob are sitting on the floor of the house playing with the sand. Roger, Cain, and Roy walk up and look in door of house. Ellen says, “You can’t come in here.” Kara and Miller ride up on tricycles. Cain starts pretending to shoot at Miller (i.e., using hands as guns and making shooting sounds). Kara says, “Don’t shoot him. He is at school – at day care.” She rides off on her tricycle. Miller just stands in front of house. He doesn’t shoot back at Cain. Roger, Cain, and Roy go inside the house. Roy goes directly to a corner and stands there. Roger steps on the sand Ellen and Bob were playing in. Ellen, “Bob, let’s go to the slide!” Roger, “We’re cowboys.” Cain, “We’re cowboys.” Ellen and Bob get up, walk out of the house, and go to slide. Roy asks Roger and Cain, “Do you want me to be the bad cowboy? I’ll be the bad guy.” Roger and Cain leave the house and join Bob and Ellen on slide. Roy joins them there also.

Excerpt 3: Troy, Roger, and Cain are in the house. Troy starts to hum the Darth Vader tune. Roger pushes Troy. Troy pushes back. Roger and Troy wrestle. Cain grabs Troy and joins the wrestling. Troy breaks free from the group and leaves the “house.” Roger stands in a window. Cain stands in a window. Troy walks back into “house” humming Darth Vader tune. Roger jumps on Troy from behind. Roger and Troy spin around a couple of times. Roger lets go of Troy and gets back “on the wall” (in the window). Cain then jumps out of the window. Cain punches Troy in the rear end. Troy runs out of “house” and starts to look in the windows. Cain hollers, “He’s right there.” All three boys are hollering and laughing. Lindsey comes over to the door of the “house” and says, “Roger, I want to get in. I really want to get in!” She walks into the house. Roy walks in the “house” and hollers to Lindsey, “They’re scaredy cats!” (referring to Cain and Roger) Cain responds, “No, we’re not!” Lindsey says, “No, Roy and Troy are!” Troy leaves. Roy is standing on floor of house and says, “Lindsey, let’s go catch Darth Vader (Troy), O.K.?” Lindsey stays “on the wall” with Roger and Cain. Roy tries again from the middle of the grassy area, “Y’all come on! There’s Darth Vader!” Roy gets a hula hoop and catches Darth Vader (Troy) under the porch. Roger runs out of the house with a handful of sand to the porch where Roy has caught Troy with his hula hoop. Roy and Troy run back to the “house.” Roger chases them. When they get back to the house, Roger finally throws sand at Roy and Troy. Ms. Perron intervenes and says, “Roger, you need to find an
activity where you don’t throw sand. Let’s get some chalk to decorate the house.” Troy, Roy, Lindsey, Cain, and Roger are in the house decorating it with chalk.

Excerpt 4: Roger, Cain, and Allen are in the house. They are discussing “good guys” and “bad guys.” Cain, Roger and Cain are standing in the windows. We are the good guys. You say cowabunga when the bad guy comes.” Kelly walks into the house.” Cain repeats, “You say cowabunga when the bad guy comes.” Kelly, “Who is the bad guy?” Cain, “They have to come in, right?” Troy tries to get in the door of the house.” Kelly blocks the door and won’t let Troy come in the house.” Roger, “He (Troy) has to come in so we can fight him.” Troy finally slips in through window. Roger and Cain jump off the windows onto Troy. Roger and Cain knock Troy to the floor. Roger and Cain let go of Troy, get up and run out of the house to the porch.” Kelly runs with Roger and Cain. Troy gets up and runs over to porch.” Roger runs up to Troy and asks, “Who are you?” Troy says, “Darth Vader!” Roger hollers as he runs to the rabbit cage. Troy chases after Roger. Troy gets distracted by feeding the rabbit. Roger is telling a teacher about their play, “Mr. Ford, Darth Vader has molten lava for skin and a volcano on his head that explodes and kills everyone!!”

The researcher, following the guidelines set forth by Goncu (1993a), used these expanded notes to identify boundaries of R&T play episodes, segment the episodes into turns (i.e., everything a player said or did before another participant responded) and acts (i.e., dialogic units that expressed a thought or an idea to another participant), and then sort the acts into different categories. The categories of play acts were a primary focus during analyses because preschoolers negotiate social play through the exchange of these acts as they try to reach shared understanding or intersubjectivity (Goncu, 1993a).

The researcher based boundary decisions (i.e., initiation and termination points) on a definition of a rough-and-tumble play episode which came from several sources and evolved over time. She began with definitions developed by researchers (see Boulton & Smith, 1989) using
various methods (e.g., scan sampling, event sampling) to study children's R&T play. The behaviors identified in this early work proved useful in distinguishing R&T play from other types of play. However, the previous researchers' use of the cessation of these behaviors (e.g., karate movements) for a specified time period (e.g., five seconds) to determine the termination point of an R&T bout often resulted in the exclusion of negotiation strategies because they were viewed as the end of play rather than as a means to maintain R&T play. As these negotiation strategies were the primary focus of the present study, the current researcher needed to develop a definition of a R&T play episode that incorporated children's dialogue as well as their behaviors. Goncu's (1993a) and Corsaro's (1985) definitions of a "social play episode" and "interactive episode," respectively, were sensitive to the dialogue of social interactions and thus served as the basis for the definition of a R&T play episode used in the current study.

A R&T play episode was defined as two or more children participating in a sequence of boisterous behaviors characterized by a high state of arousal and activity level (see Table 1 in Chapter I). These episodes were initiated by the acknowledged presence of two or more participants, with one participant engaging in overt acts communicating a desire to engage in R&T play, and the other participant(s) interpreting and responding to this exuberant, high activity level play as non-threatening and harmless (Corsaro, 1985; Goncu, 1993a; C.H. Hart, personal communication, October 10, 1997). Goncu (1993a) referred to these acts as invitations. In the present study, they are also referred to as initiations. Table 2 contains a
list of the five types of invitations delineated by Goncu (1993a) along with examples from the current study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal approaches</td>
<td>Sneak up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stomp up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>start to chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enticing acts</td>
<td>hum Darth Vader tune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I'm going to get you!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>run from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests for action</td>
<td>&quot;Na! Na! Boo! Boo!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;You can't catch me!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit invitations</td>
<td>&quot;Do you want me to be the bad guy?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of assumed jointness</td>
<td>&quot;You're the X-man! I'm T-Rex!&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The R&T play episodes were terminated when certain acts dramatically altered the of the ongoing episode (Goncu, 1993a; C.H. Hart, personal communication, October 10, 1997). Changes in group composition were acceptable as long as the same activity continued and at least one of the original members remained in the group.

As shown in Table 3, the researcher adapted the first four types of termination acts from Goncu's (1993a) study in which he observed same-age, same-sex dyads of preschool children as they interacted in a laboratory setting. Because the current study involved observations...
of a group of children on the playground, the researcher added the last two types (i.e., interruption by child; interruption by teacher) to take into consideration the naturalistic setting and the possibility of interruptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Types of Termination Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal departure from R&amp;T play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing disinterest in R&amp;T play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing interest in non-R&amp;T play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruption by a child not involved in R&amp;T play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruption by a teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interactions that occurred between initiations and terminations were then divided or segmented into turns and acts. Turns were everything one participant said and did before another participant responded. Acts were "dialogic units" a participant used to convey a thought or an idea to a fellow participant (Goncu, 1993a).

Following a procedure similar to the constant comparative method outlined by Lincoln and Guba (1985), the researcher then went through the segmented episodes, over and over again, and sorted the acts into one of four categories. The researcher placed acts into categories...
based on the fact that they were related in content (see Table 4 for examples). She developed new rules or adjusted Goncu's (1993a) existing rules describing category properties. These rules were then used to justify inclusion of an act in a particular category (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The first category, expansions, included acts used to maintain play by elaborating upon the present play ideas. This category was broken down further into subcategories: introductions, extensions, building on, check status, and regulate intensity. Introductions were acts used to incorporate a new component into play that previously has not been part of play (e.g., new character, new theme). Extensions were acts used to contribute "new information or new expectations" to a fellow participant's idea. When using these acts, participants either "implicitly assume or explicitly express agreements with partner" (Goncu, 1993a, p. 105). Building on referred to acts used to contribute new information to one's own idea as a way to connect it to a fellow participant's idea (Goncu, 1993a). The researcher discovered two new subcategories related specifically to the nature of R&T play. Check status refers to acts used to investigate the situation to gain information on how to continue play. These acts may involve asking for role clarification. Regulate intensity referred to acts used to adjust intensity level of play. They required recognition of an inappropriate intensity level (e.g., holding someone too tight) which could hamper continuation of play.

The second category, degrees of agreement, included acts used to show the degree of congruence among participant's ideas. These acts did not all represent an agreement among participants about how play
Table 4. Types of Negotiation Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPANSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>&quot;Power Turtle change to T-Rex.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td>A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the &quot;house.&quot; A girl chases him through sand to grass by the &quot;turtle climber.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building On</td>
<td>A boy says, &quot;I'm going to get you! I'm the police!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Status</td>
<td>A boy says, &quot;You say cowabunga when bad guy comes.&quot; A girl asks, &quot;Who is bad guy?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate Intensity</td>
<td>A boy being held down by a girl, whimpers and struggles to get away. The girl lets the boy get up, but still has hold of his shirt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREES OF AGREEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptances</td>
<td>A girl runs. A boy chase after her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejections</td>
<td>A boy catches a girl in a hug. The girl says, &quot;Stop it!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>A boy says, &quot;I'm Darth Vader.&quot; A girl responds, &quot;No, I'm Darth Vader.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation</td>
<td>A boy tries to pull away from the girl holding him, &quot;Get me away. I'll be good.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPHASES</td>
<td>A girl shouts, &quot;I want to get in. I really want to get in!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRELEVANT ACTS</td>
<td>A girl and boy are holding another boy in &quot;jail.&quot; The boy being held says, &quot;Don’t get my shoes sandy.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The italicized part of each example is the act of interest. The non-italicized part of each example is what preceded the act of interest. Quotation marks within the table denote children's native language.

should continue. However, the acts did represent a shared understanding of the original ideas presented for consideration. This category was broken down further into acceptances, rejections, revisions, and conciliation. Acceptances were acts used to express...
agreement with a fellow participant’s idea, either explicitly (e.g., approval of an idea; imitation) or implicitly (e.g., show interest by following). Rejections were acts used to express disagreement with a fellow participant’s idea (i.e., refusals; ignoring partner). Revisions were acts used to “reject” a fellow participant’s idea and then alter or improve the idea. Conciliation referred to acts used to resolve disagreements. These acts created an opportunity for participants to reach an agreement or work through a conflict (Goncu, 1993a). As analyses began, the researcher identified a fifth subcategory, leave-taking or exiting. Later, she decided these acts could logically be subsumed under rejections because they involved one participant rejecting further participation in the R&T episode by leaving the situation.

The third category, emphases, included acts used to focus attention on one’s own idea or what is important to him/her. These acts were usually repetitions of a prior act. The fourth category, irrelevant acts, included acts that do not relate to a fellow participant’s idea in any fashion. The point of reference for these acts was something other than play (Goncu, 1993a).

The researcher first examined expanded field notes to mark boundaries (i.e., initiations and terminations) of R&T episodes. She then segmented these R&T episodes into turns and acts. During the process of segmenting R&T episodes, turns and acts, the researcher became aware of the various lengths of the episodes. As a way to set up contrasts, she divided the R&T episodes into shorter and longer episodes. Short episodes contain 5 turns or less (e.g., Episodes 1, 2, 3 below), and long episodes contain 6 turns or more (e.g., Episodes 70...
4, 5, 6 below). The longer episodes allowed more complex negotiations among participants to develop. The shorter episodes typically included only invitations/initiations and terminations. Some shorter episodes did include expansions or agreements, but no opportunity for these to evolve into complex negotiations.

The following are examples of segmented R&T episodes. The acts are on the left side of the page and the corresponding categories are on the right side of the page. The reader is referred to expanded field note excerpts (pp. 62-64) to see how researcher pulled R&T episodes from these notes.

In R&T Episode 1, Lindsey, Joyce, Troy, and Roy are at the "climber." Lindsey and Joyce are sitting on the lowest bars of the "climber." Troy is standing on the ground in the middle of "climber." Roy is standing on ground along outside edge of "climber." Lindsey says, "Pretend you want to marry me Troy."

Troy climbs out of middle of "climber" and runs. Invitation: Nonverbal Enticing Act
Lindsey hollers, "Oh no, Roy! He's (Troy) getting out!" Extension
Lindsey chases Troy to the "porch." Building On
Joyce and Roy join Lindsey and chase Troy to the "porch." Acceptance (Joyce, Roy)
Roy stops to pick flowers. Termination: Interest Non-R&T Play

Ellen and Bob, in R&T Episode 2, are sitting on the floor of the house playing with the sand. Roger, Cain and Roy walk up and look in door of house. Ellen says, "You can't come in here." Kara and Miller ride up on tricycles.
Cain starts pretending to shoot at Miller (i.e., using hands as guns and making shooting sounds).

Kara says, "Don’t shoot him. He is at school, at day care." She rides rides off on her tricycle.

Miller just stands in front of house.

R&T Episode 3 was preceded by Roger, Cain, and Roy going inside the house. Roy goes directly to a corner and stands there. Roger steps on the sand Ellen and Bob were playing in. Ellen, "Bob, let’s go to the slide!" Roger, "We’re cowboys." Cain, "We’re cowboys."

Ellen and Bob get up, walk out of the house, and go to slide.

Roy asks Roger and Cain, "Do you want me to be the bad cowboy?"

Roy, "I’ll be the bad guy."

Roger and Cain leave the house and join Bob and Ellen on slide.

In R&T Episode 4, Troy, Roger, and Cain are all inside the house. They are standing around and talking.

Troy starts to hum the Darth Vader tune.

Roger pushes Troy.

Troy pushes back.

Roger and Troy wrestle.

Cain grabs Troy and joins the wrestling.

Troy breaks free and leaves the house.
Roger and Cain are in the "house" just before R&T Episode 5 begins. Roger is standing in one window, and Cain is standing in the other window of the "house."

Troy walks into "house" humming Darth Vader tune. Invitation: Verbal Enticing Act

Roger jumps on Troy from behind. Extension

Roger and Troy spin around a couple of times. Acceptance (Roger, Troy)

Roger lets go of Troy and gets back "on the wall" (in the window). Extension

Cain then jumps out of the window. Extension

Cain punches Troy in the rear end. Building On

Troy runs out of "house" and starts to look in the windows. Extension

Cain hollers, "He's right there." All are hollering and laughing. Extension

Lindsey comes over to the door of the "house" and says, "Roger, I want to get in." Introduction

Lindsey - "I really want to get in!" Emphases

She walks into the house. Building On

Roy walks in the "house" and hollers to Lindsey, "They're scaredy cats!" (referring to Cain and Roger). Introduction

Cain responds, "No, we're not!" Rejection
Lindsey says, "No, Roy and Troy are!"

Troy leaves.

Roy, standing on door of "house," and says, "Lindsey, let's go catch Darth Vader (Troy), O.K."

Lindsey stays "on the wall" with Roger and Cain.

Roy tries again from the middle of the grassy area, "Y'all come on! "There's Darth Vader!"

Roy gets a hula hoop and catches Darth Vader (Troy) under the "porch."

Roger runs out of the "house" with a handful of sand to the "porch" where Roy has caught Troy with his hula hoop.

Roy runs back to the "house."

Troy runs back to the "house."

Roger chases them.

When they get back to the "house," Roger throws sand at Roy and Troy.

Ms. Perron intervenes, "Roger, you need to find an activity where you don't throw sand. Let's get some chalk to decorate the house."

In R&T Episode 6, Roger, Cain, and Allen are in the "house."

Roger and Cain are standing in the windows. They are discussing "good guys" and "bad guys."

Cain, "We are the good guys."
Cain, "You say cowabunga when the bad guy comes."

Kelly walks into the "house."

Cain repeats, "You say cowabunga when the bad guy comes."

Kelly, "Who is the bad guy?"

Cain, "They have to come in, right?"

Troy tries to get in the door of the "house."

Kelly blocks the door and won't let Troy come in the "house."

Roger, "He (Troy) has to come in so we can fight him."

Troy finally slips in through window.

Roger and Cain jump off the windows onto Troy.

Roger and Cain knock Troy to the floor.

They wrestle on the floor.

Roger and Cain let go of Troy, and run out of the house to the "porch."

Kelly runs with Roger and Cain.

Troy gets up and runs over to "porch."

Roger runs up to Troy and asks, "Who are you?"
Troy says, "Darth Vader!"

Roger hollers as he runs to the rabbit cage.

Troy chases after Roger.

Troy gets distracted by feeding the rabbit.

A total of 126 R&T episodes, 72 shorter episodes and 54 longer episodes, were used for analyses. The researcher calculated a proportional score to create a measure of children's amount of participation in R&T episodes. She used this score in later statistical analyses examining the relationship between certain child characteristics and their participation in R&T episodes.

In addition to field notes, the researcher kept a fieldwork journal as a record of personal experiences, ideas, mistakes, breakthroughs, and initial interpretations. This introspective record proved useful in accounting for personal biases and understanding their influences on the research process and subsequent analyses (Spradley, 1980).

Interviews. The various sociometric assessments measure different dimensions of social status. Peer nominations and peer ratings were the sociometric assessments used in the current study. According to McConnell and Odom (1986, p. 239), ratings and nominations used in combination "provide a more reliable and finer discrimination of unpopular and popular children."

Initially, the interviewer (i.e., teacher) recorded individual children's responses during sociometric interviews (i.e., nominations and ratings) on separate code sheets. The researcher then transferred
the nominations and ratings to consolidated tabulation sheets, thus simplifying final calculations.

Based on sociometric interviews, the researcher formulated a separate positive and negative nomination score by summing the "votes" children received for each criterion. Previously, researchers followed the guidelines established by Coie, Dodge, and Coppotelli (1982), to create a measure of peer preference (i.e., subtracting each child's negative nomination score from his/her positive nomination score). More recently, researchers have discovered this method masks findings regarding relationships between peer preference and other variables (Bukowski & Hoza, 1989). The current trend, and the method used in this study, is to simply use the positive nomination score and negative nomination score separately as indicators of popularity and rejection, respectively.

When calculating a peer rating score, the researcher first assigned weights according to which box a child's picture was sorted into by another child (i.e., happy face=3; neutral face=2; sad face=1). She then took an average of all the ratings a child received from his/her peers to create a rating score. This score is a measure of peer acceptance (Asher, Singleton, Tinsley, & Hymel, 1979; McConnell & Odom, 1986).

For social network analyses, the researcher created a square matrix (i.e., nominators' code numbers listed in the same order down left side and across top of page) comprised of an individual child's choices entered across the row and corresponding to the chosen individual's column. She constructed these matrices for positive nominations and negative nominations. The researcher also created a
separate event matrix for children’s participation in long and short R&T episodes (i.e., R&T episode code numbers were listed down left side of page and participants’ code numbers listed across top of page). These matrices were then used to develop co-membership matrices for long and short R&T episodes.

Analysis of Data

The researcher used qualitative methods to analyze data related to the exploratory component of the study — developing an understanding of how children negotiate a shared understanding during R&T play. These analyses included domain, taxonomic, and componential analyses. A discussion of these analyses is provided in the following section.

The researcher utilized quantitative methods to analyze data related to the confirmatory component of study — examining the relationship between child characteristics and their participation in R&T play. She conducted separate t-tests to examine the relationship between the categorical independent variables child age and sex, and the continuous dependent variable proportion of R&T episodes in which a child participated. She used correlations to examine relationship between the continuous independent variables of popularity, rejection and acceptance, and the continuous dependent variable, proportion of R&T episodes in which a child participated.

Social network analyses involved constructing sociograms. The matrices for positive and negative nominations, and co-membership in long and short R&T episodes were run through the computer program Krackplot 3.0 (Krackhardt, Blythe, & McGrath, 1994, 1995) to construct sociograms. Complete network sociograms (i.e., complete picture of
connections among all actors) for positive and negative nominations were constructed with dichotomus, directional data based on the choices of each individual on nomination assessments. Additionally, the researcher constructed egocentric sociograms which portrays each individual actor, all other actors with whom he/she has connections, and the connections among those actors (Knoke & Kuklinski, 1982).

Complete network sociograms for co-membership in long and short R&T episodes were constructed with affiliative data based on children’s participation in each type of R&T episode. These sociograms, in turn, were used to determine cliques or strongly connected subsets of network members (Knoke & Kuklinski, 1982).

Field notes. Data analysis in qualitative research is continuous and is related to the idea of an emergent design. Each subsequent step in the research process is influenced by what has come before. Inductive data analysis allows for the emergence of categories, patterns, and themes from the data. Embedded information is discovered in the raw data and made explicit (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The researcher analyzed field notes throughout the observation period. She followed procedures outlined by Spradley (1980) for conducting a search for the parts of a culture, relationships among parts, and relationships of the parts to the whole.

During domain analysis, the researcher identified categories (domains) of cultural meaning based on descriptive observations of what participants do, what they say, and what artifacts they use. Each cultural domain has a name or cover term, included terms, and a
semantic relationship (e.g., is a kind of) that connects these terms (Spradley, 1980).

The researcher used information gathered during focused observations to conduct taxonomic analysis. As she searched for the way cultural domains were organized, the researcher developed taxonomies of terms. These taxonomies illustrated relationships or similarities among the included terms of a cultural domain (Spradley, 1980).

For componential analysis, the researcher utilized data from selected observations. She identified attributes of terms within each domain, the relationships among domains, and how they relate to the cultural scene as a whole. This step, which included searching for contrasts and similarities, sorting them and creating groupings, continued until the meanings of such things as children's actions or verbalizations were interpreted (Spradley, 1980).

Interviews. Peer nomination and peer rating scores were used in subsequent statistical analyses for testing the hypotheses of the confirmatory component of the study. The nominations also were used as the basis for creating the sociograms from social network analyses.

The researcher developed a profile of children's playground interaction history from the transcripts and field notes of the teacher interviews. She used these profiles to help inform her interpretation of observations of children's R&T play.

Establishing Trustworthiness

Internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity are commonly used to determine the trustworthiness of findings from quantitative research. Lincoln and Guba (1985)
suggested that researchers can establish trustworthiness of findings from qualitative research by using the corresponding criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

Credibility is related to the truth value of the researcher's representations of the participants' multiple constructions of reality. The researcher's reconstruction of a particular reality must be credible to the original constructors of that reality (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

For the current study, the researcher established credibility through persistent observation and triangulation (i.e., techniques that increase the likelihood of generating credible findings and interpretations), peer debriefing (i.e., external check on research process), and member checking (i.e., reviewing findings and interpretations with original constructors). The researcher triangulated data by comparing sociograms based on peer nominations with teacher reports of children's playmate choices, comparing information gleaned from children's profiles based on teacher interviews with information from field notes based on participant observation, and determining reliability of coding.

The researcher used Cohen's (1983) kappa to determine reliability of coding R&T episode boundaries, segmentation of turns and acts, and categorization of acts. After reviewing the first 10 R&T episodes for training purposes, the researcher and a colleague independently identified episode boundaries (i.e., initiations and terminations) for the remaining 116 episodes. The kappa coefficients for distinguishing the beginning and ending of R&T episodes were .89 and .86, respectively.
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The researcher enlisted the help of another colleague to determine reliabilities related to segmentation of turns and acts and categorization of acts. She and the colleague independently segmented 124 of the 126 R&T episodes into turns and acts. The reliabilities associated with the segmentation of turns and acts were 100% and 99%, respectively. The researcher and the same colleague then categorized the acts in the first 10 episodes (125 acts) for training purposes, and the acts in the remaining 116 episodes (1069 acts) for reliability purposes. Table 5 contains the kappa coefficients for each type of play act.

Table 5. Reliability of Categorizing Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Cohens kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPANSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building On</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate Intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE OF AGREEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPHASSES</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRELEVANT ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher attended a debriefing session with her major professor at least once a week to discuss the research process. The researcher constructed profiles of children's interaction history on
the playground from interviews with the teachers. She checked these constructions with the teachers themselves.

The transferability of working hypotheses depends on the degree of similarity between sending and receiving contexts. The original researcher is responsible for supplying sufficient descriptive data to make such judgements possible (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). For the current study, "thick descriptions" of contextual factors, including information about playground characteristics and child characteristics were included when discussing results.

Dependability is related to the inquiry process (e.g., how information is gathered and recorded). Rather than trying to control change with this process, naturalist researchers take into account the instability and change inherent in a human instrument, an evolving social situation, or an emerging research design. In this way, the researcher is more likely to obtain a fair representation of participants' worlds (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Confirmability is related to the product of the inquiry (e.g., data, findings, interpretations). The concern here is that this product not be based on any biases of the researcher, but rather on the features of participants and the context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

In this study, the researcher used an inquiry audit to determine dependability and confirmability. The doctoral dissertation examining committee served as inquiry auditors. They inspected both the process (e.g., appropriateness of methodology) and product (e.g., findings came from the data) of the current inquiry.

Finally, the researcher kept a journal as a record of personal experiences, ideas, mistakes, breakthroughs, and initial
interpretations. This introspective record proved useful in accounting for personal biases and understanding their influence on the research process and subsequent analyses (Spradley, 1980).
Chapter IV

Results

The purpose of the current study was two-fold. The first purpose was exploratory in nature and involved developing an understanding of how children negotiate intersubjectivity during R&T play as well as what role contextual factors played in this process. The second purpose was confirmatory in nature. The researcher examined the relationship between child characteristics and the proportion of R&T play episodes in which a child participated.

Results related to the exploratory component of the study are presented in the following sections: description of the social situation (i.e., playground, children), and preschool children's negotiation of intersubjectivity during R&T play. Results obtained from statistical analyses conducted for the confirmatory component of study are featured in the final section: relationships between participation in R&T play and selected child characteristics.

Description of the Social Situation

The physical setting which served as the social situation in the current study was the playground of a laboratory preschool. The researcher chose a preschool playground as the social situation because R&T play, the primary focus of the study, occurs on the playground.

The Playground

The playground was part of a laboratory preschool. The younger and older children were together for most activities (i.e., centers, playground time, rest, lunch) during the half day program. The two
age groups were separated for group time only. The children were on the playground every day from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. In addition to the children, there were two graduate assistants, one lead teacher, and four student teachers. The playground is a 60’ x 90’ fenced area (see Figure 1). The fence is made of wood, and the children are unable to see over or through it. As you exit the classroom part of the preschool and face the back fence of the playground, you first come to a 20’ x 48’ porch, or covered patio. Located to your immediate right is a white counter and sink. The teachers use this area to place materials brought from inside to be used outside, prepare art materials (e.g., mix paint), and lay out children’s finished projects. Also located to the right is a water fountain, a water table (also filled at various times with other substances such as grass seed, bubbles, etc.), easel, and three storage closets (for tricycles, sand toys, toys for the water table, dramatic play props, balls, etc.). The water table is only stored here. When in use, it is moved out onto the grass. Blue foam blocks are also stored in this area, and children may use them for various activities.

Almost directly in front of you is a blue child-sized table and chairs of various colors (i.e., blue, yellow, green). The teachers always have some type of activity for this table (i.e., play-dough, drawing, making collages, marble painting, etc.). Located to the left is a set of green wooden steps about 2’ high, a blue wooden kiddy car (children ride by rocking back and forth), and a stack of tires. The children use the tires for stacking, and the teachers use
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1. Kiddy cayuse
2. See-saw
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   blue mat is moved to
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    sometimes.
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13. Turtle climber
14. Semi-covered
15. Tire horse swing
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20. Sand box
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22. Tricycle path
23. Climber
24. Slide
25. House
26. Bench
27. Garden
28. Bench
29. Swings
30. Sandy area

Figure 1. Diagram of Playground
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them to set up obstacle courses. A blue gymnastic mat and a wooden house climber are also located in this area.

As you walk toward the cement tricycle path (4’ wide) on the right, you come to a semi-covered area. The ground here is mostly grass, except for the circular tricycle path. The lattice roof provides adequate shade to keep the children cool as they play. This is where the water table is usually placed when in use (and occasionally the easel). When the portable basketball goal, balance beam, or bean bag game are brought outside, they are set up in this area.

As you proceed along the tricycle path, you move out into the open area. The open area is mostly grass. Located on the right and next to the fence is Brandy’s pen. Brandy is the pet rabbit. He is allowed to run around during outside time, and the children are often seen petting him or chasing him. The children are really gentle with him once they finally catch him. Right next to Brandy’s pen is a small 5’x10’ garden.

Following the tricycle path toward the back fence, you come to a small (5’ high, 4’ wide, 6’ long) wood house resembling a log cabin. The children play house here or use it to hide in or behind. Located to the left of the house is a combination slide/climbing structure. The house is still on grass, but the slide is in sand.

Continuing along the tricycle path, you walk past a cement pool on the left (12’ wide, 6’ deep). The pool is empty during the fall and spring and is only used as a wading pool during the summer. A metal climber is located directly across from the cement pool to the
right of the tricycle path. The climber is approximately 8' high and 6' high at the base. A swing set with four swings is located in the far left corner of the playground. Next you come to a sandbox (10' wide). The teachers take toys (e.g., buckets, shovels, trucks, pots, pans, etc.) from the storage closets in the mornings and place them in the sandbox. You have now walked around the tricycle path and are almost back to the porch. The final piece of equipment, located in a grassy area, is a climbing structure shaped like a turtle and made of reddish cement. It is approximately 3' high, 4' wide, and 6' long with grooves or footholds along its back.

Profiles of the Children

A description of the preschool children involved in negotiating R&T play is important for providing a complete picture of the social situation. Using field notes from observations and transcripts from interviews with the two graduate assistant teachers (one male and one female), the researcher compiled a profile of each child. Only the profiles of those children who were involved in R&T at a moderate or high level are included in the chapter. The reader is referred to Appendix E for the remaining profiles. The children's profiles are arranged in order from youngest child to oldest child. The first three children were considered younger children, and the last six children were considered older children in the analyses.

Profiles of the children include information about playmate choices, activity choices, and interaction style on the playground. Additionally, the teachers responded to questions concerning changes in these areas. The teachers were generally very descriptive when
answering questions about the children. However, sometimes they would
categorize the children. In these situations, the teachers provided
examples of the child’s behavior that led them to categorize a child
in a particular way. At the end of each profile, the researcher
provided a description of each child’s interaction style during R&T
play.

The children ranged in age from 42 to 62 months (Mean=51
months). They were relatively diverse in regards to ethnicity (Asian-
American, Hispanic-American, East Indian, Nigerian, European-
American). The families of the children were less diverse, however,
in relation to socioeconomic status. The majority of children came
from families where at least one parent was a doctor, lawyer,
professor, engineer, business owner, coach, flight officer, etc.
Parents of two of the children in the study were students at the
university. Two sets of twins attended the preschool during the study
- one fraternal set (boy and girl); one identical set (boys).

Joyce. According to both Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron, Joyce (twin
to Allen) plays with Glen and her twin brother, Allen. There was some
incongruity in the teachers’ perceptions of additional playmate
choices. Mr. Ford added Aimee and Jill to the list. Ms. Perron added
Kelly and Lindsey to the list. Mr. Ford pointed out the circle of
friends may have increased since the beginning of the year. Mr. Ford
also noticed that Joyce tended to not play with the older children.
He was not sure if it was because she did not like them or she could
not get into their games.
When asked about Joyce’s activity choices, Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron listed riding tricycles, playing in the sandbox or house, and running. Ms. Perron expanded this list to include, wagons, painting, sliding and playing at the water table. Mr. Ford added swinging as one of Joyce’s common choices and noted that she rarely, if ever, goes on the climber. When asked about changes in Joyce’s activity choices, Ms. Perron commented on Joyce’s decreased interest in painting. Mr. Ford pointed out that Joyce’s swinging and running around with other children had increased since the beginning of the year.

The teachers made similar comments about Joyce’s interaction style. Mr. Ford portrayed Joyce as quiet with both children and teachers. He stated, “She doesn’t express a lot conversationally. It’s difficult even for me to engage her in a conversation. But she’ll play together with and laugh with and or play side by side with or run around with children . . ., but it’s not really a conversational interaction.” Ms. Perron described Joyce’s interaction style as “easy-going” and “matter-of-fact.” While Mr. Ford still viewed Joyce’s interaction style as quiet, he did notice she had become somewhat bolder with the children and the teachers. He attributed this increased boldness to her ability to use words more effectively now than at the beginning of the year. Ms. Perron pointed out that Joyce interacted with more children than she did earlier in the year. She stated, “Joyce started out . . . playing exclusively with Glen. Immediately they became these big best buddies . . . and I don’t think she plays with Glen as exclusively as she used to.”
The researcher documented Joyce’s involvement in play fighting as well as chasing. She often teamed up with Glen and or Allen, making karate movements toward or growling and stomping after other children. In one episode, Joyce and Glen were against Kara and Miller. Joyce fell on top of the boys and wrestled, ran from and after Kara and Miller, grabbed Miller from behind and rolled around ground with Kara. She attempted to initiate R&T play (e.g., “Hey Roger, lets’ play football!”), but usually to no avail. She was more successful at contributing to ongoing play.

Glen. Both teachers mentioned Roger as one of Glen’s playmate choices. Mr. Ford gave the impression this relationship may be one-sided when he said, “He (Glen) likes to try to follow Roger.” Glen also likes to play with Kara and Allen, as reported by Mr. Ford, and Joyce and Wayne as reported by Ms. Perron. The teachers were not consistent when listing additional playmates. However, they both acknowledged these playmate choices may be based more on the fact these children choose the same games/activities as Glen chooses rather than on any real preference for those particular children. The teachers agreed that these choices had been consistent since the beginning of the year. Neither teacher mentioned children with whom Glen did not like to play.

According to Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron, Glen primarily chooses to play either in the sand box or to participate in an activity that requires a high level of energy. Mr. Ford commented, “He (Glen) likes . . . growling, yelling, laughing, running with other children.” Ms. Perron reported, “He (Glen) likes to get down on his
hands and knees and pretend he’s an animal.” However, she felt there had been a decline in this type of pretend play since the beginning of the year. The teachers cited the climber, house, and slide as locations for these high energy activities.

When the teachers were asked about activities Glen chooses infrequently, it was not surprising for them to reveal how Glen seldom participates in a sit-down activity. As Mr. Ford explained, “He’ll rarely be up on the porch, sitting down, working with play-doh or water colors.” Ms. Perron pointed out easel painting as being too low key for Glen.

According to Mr. Ford, Glen’s interactions with other children on the playground revolve around the kind of activity in which he engages (i.e., growl, chase). Mr. Ford suggested, “He (Glen) will interact with other children by growling at them, or pretending to be a monster, or pretending to play fight with them. There is not a lot of real dialogue interaction, but a kind of . . . sharing of roles. For example, ‘Let’s both be dinosaurs.’ or ‘We’re tigers.’ But, it is still more parallel because he’s going to growl just like somebody else is growling.” Ms. Perron described Glen as being very easy-going and involved in his play interactions.

Ms. Perron reported Glen’s current easy-going interaction style as being consistent with her perception of his interaction style at the beginning of the year. Although Mr. Ford characterized Glen’s style a little differently (i.e., more of a follower) from Ms. Perron, he generally agreed that it was consistent from the beginning of the year. However, Mr. Ford believed Glen’s interactions with other
children had increased, he had become somewhat bolder in those interactions, and his playing alone and seeking out a teacher for attention had decreased since the beginning of the year.

The researcher recorded many R&T episodes Glen had a hand in initiating. Either alone or with Joyce, he would sneak up and growl at, stomp up and growl at, claw at, or make karate movements toward other children (i.e., boys and girls). Besides initiating R&T play, Glen also contributed to play. These contributions were rarely verbal in nature as he would respond with actions instead of words. For example, a child asked him, “Who are you? A monster?” Glen responded by hunching his back, hanging out his tongue and chasing the other child. The one verbalization he made occurred in an R&T episode in which he and Joyce were on one team and Kara and Miller were on another team. After several rounds of chasing and wrestling, Glen was caught by Miller. Glen hollered at Joyce, “Somebody help me!”

Miller. Both Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron reported Miller, almost exclusively, likes to play with Kara. Mr. Ford did add, “He’ll play with Glen or Allen some if she’s not there or if they are in the same game.”

When asked about children with whom Miller does not like to play, Mr. Ford commented, “He won’t play as much with some of the older children.” Mr. Ford did not believe this was due to any dislike of the older children by Miller, but rather, his perception was that the verbal level of the games the older children played were over Miller’s head. This inability to keep up verbally would get
frustrating, and so Miller chose other activities and therefore, other
playmates.

According to both teachers, Miller enjoys pulling Kara in the
wagon, riding a tricycle, and playing in the sandbox. He also likes
getting involved in a chase game with Kara or Mr. Ford. Ms. Perron
and Mr. Ford reported Miller never paints and rarely swings.
Additionally, Mr. Ford stated, "He doesn't go on the climber very
much, even though he can." Neither teacher reported changes in
Miller's activity choices from the beginning of the year.

According to Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron, Miller's interactions
typically involve a low level of conversation (e.g., running,
laughing, parallel play, acknowledging nonverbally). This is
primarily due to the fact he was nonverbal when he started the
program. However, both teachers agreed Miller's interactions are
becoming increasingly conversational in nature.

Both teachers commented on how much more interactive Miller has
become since the beginning of the year, and they agreed on the
reasoning behind that increase - he talks more. According to Mr.
Ford, Miller was nonverbal when his parents applied at the preschool.
By the time Miller actually entered the program, he was only beginning
to make sounds and form some words. Ms. Perron recalled Miller's only
phrase, "Me three." Mr. Ford observed, "His conversational
interaction was zero, and even his physical interaction was extremely
limited. He was more reserved. He would stand by himself and watch
other children, but he wouldn't be able to go up and break into a game
... other children had planned. A teacher ... would have to
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facilitate him getting engaged in any activity. Now he never needs a teacher to engage him." Now he can speak in phrases or short sentences and use them in various contexts. Ms. Perron commented, "I think he has potential to be a leader, but he is inhibited because of his language right now and so he stays more as a follower and maybe a contributor."

The researcher noted Miller rarely used verbalizations during R&T play. However, he managed to contribute to these episodes. In one episode, Miller held Joyce and Glen around the waist. He relaxed his hold enough for them to get away and chasing began. Miller ran after, ran from, caught and pulled down, held onto, or wrestled his way through many R&T episodes. He was usually on the same team as Kara. In the last episode he finally talked. As he and Cain were doing karate movements, Miller commented, "You know what? We’re the Power Rangers.”

Troy. Both teachers were in agreement regarding Troy’s playmate choices. They reported Troy (twin to Roy) typically enjoys playing with large groups of children. When Troy does make a specific choice, he likes to play with his twin brother Roy, Cain, Glen, Lindsey, and Ellen. Neither teacher had noticed changes in Troy’s playmate choices from the beginning of the year.

Ms. Perron began her response to the question about Troy’s activity choices, "He likes to do everything.” She finally mentioned one activity, in particular, Troy enjoys, "He really likes to draw or paint on the house.” Mr. Ford agreed and also mentioned Troy’s affinity for “role-playing chase activities and play-fighting,” He
pointed out, "Troy likes to pretend he’s a monster or Darth Vader to get the other children to chase after him." Both teachers reported Troy rarely chooses to swing.

Mr. Ford portrayed Troy as an “instigator.” He supported this contention by stating, "Troy enjoys getting the attention of the other children by doing some kind of monster or Darth Vader role and having them chase him. He definitely ... plays games in which children have roles." Mr. Ford mentioned one exception. When Troy is in the sand box, he will do his own thing and rarely interacts with others.

Ms. Perron referred to Troy as a “contributor.” She defined this term as “a step up from being a follower, but a step down from being a leader.” As an example of Troy contributing to play, Ms. Perron offered the following, "Like the time that he got handcuffed in front of the house. He had his hands behind his back. He was like, ‘Help! Help!, just waiting for someone to come rescue him. I think of that as contributing because it’s continuing the story line, but more of following an example of what was going on rather than an original thing.”

According to Mr. Ford, Troy’s interaction style has become more outgoing since the beginning of the year. He stated, “Now he’s more inclined to be the leader, ... one of the children that are chasing than just one of the guys following. He’s more likely to have a main role.” Ms. Perron briefly concluded, "Troy has become more involved with the other kids.”
The researcher noted Troy initiated many R&T play episodes. His initiation strategies included humming the Darth Vader tune, chasing someone, stomping, and shooting at other children. He also contributed to play by adding to it (e.g., getting out of jail and running) or resolving disagreements (e.g., "Get me away. I'll be good."). When Troy's brother was the only other participant in a R&T episode, the two boys wrestled. Rough-and-tumble episodes involving Troy and a group of children included a combination of play fighting and chasing. Troy frequently volunteered to be the bad guy. However, the other children sometimes inaccurately identified Troy as the bad guy, possibly because of his history in assuming the Darth Vader role. He pointed out to other children when he was not the bad guy (e.g., "No, I'm not the bad guy. See, I have this good guy stick.").

Roy. Mr. Ford listed several children as Roy's playmate choices including, his twin brother Troy, Roger, Cain, Lindsey, Allen, and Suzy. Ms. Perron on the other hand only mentioned Troy as one of Roy's playmate choices. She commented, "He doesn't have a lot of play buddies." Neither teacher could recall a particular child with whom Roy did not like to play.

Mr. Ford identified chasing, pretend battles or pretend animal attacks, role-playing (e.g., pretend battles; pretend animal attacks), and building sand castles or designing roads in the sand box as Roy's common activity choices. He commented that while the choices themselves had not changed much from the beginning of the year, the frequency with which he chose them had shifted. "He would do more playing by himself earlier in the year. He does more . . . running,
chasing, interacting play than he did at the beginning." Ms. Perron also listed the sand box and monster play as activity choices Roy frequently makes. She added playing with the wagon and riding tricycles to this list. The teachers did agree on an activity in which Roy rarely chooses to participate - swinging.

The teachers indicated that Roy’s interaction style may vary depending on the activity in which he is engaged. When referring to group play, Mr. Ford commented, "Roy seems to like the energy . . . of being around a large group of children. Running, chasing, taking a role, doing something like growling or pretending to be Darth Vader - something that is going to incite them to chase him." Ms. Perron simply stated, "Roy does join the whole group when they go adventuring or start monster play." Mr. Ford seemed to think Roy participated in more group play than did Ms. Perron. When describing Roy’s play in the sand box, Mr. Ford stated Roy “focused on his activity,” and Ms. Perron called it “parallel play.” These descriptions connote a somewhat less interactive style when involved in sand box play.

Ms. Perron provided no information regarding changes in Roy’s interaction style. Mr. Ford, on the other hand, had some insight to offer. He explained, "Roy’s a little more outgoing, more inclined to interact with the other children than he was at the beginning of the year. He was quieter. Now he’s bolder, louder, more energetic, confident, and comfortable."

The researcher documented many instances of R&T play Roy initiated. His initiation strategies mimicked those of his brother,
Troy, and included, humming Darth Vader tune, growling, roaring, and shooting at other children. Sometimes he had to be persistent in his initiations attempts. For example, on one day he was rejected by four different children before his growling resulted in a longer R&T episode.

He also contributed to play by following the direction of a fellow participant (e.g., Lindsey requests, “Put his hands behind his back. Roy responds by kneeling down to help Lindsey) or adding his own ideas. In one episode, Roy, as Darth Vader, pretended to be dead by lying in the grass. When the children he was chasing (i.e., Kara, Miller, Kelly) crept up on him, Roy jumped up and ran after them. If Roy’s brother was the only other participant in a R&T episode, the two boys wrestled. Rough-and-tumble episodes involving Roy and a group of children included a combination of play fighting and chasing. Roy often explicitly took on the bad guy role either by humming the Darth Vader tune, or asking, “Do you want me to be the bad cowboy?” However, the other children sometimes mistakenly identified Roy as the bad guy, possibly because of his history in assuming the Darth Vader role. Roy pointed out to other children when he was not the bad guy (e.g., “I don’t have my mask and if I don’t have my mask, I can’t chase you.”).

Cain. Mr. Ford referred to Roger as Cain’s “number one best buddy.” Ms. Perron agreed, “I think they’ve been buddies the whole year.” She noted Cain, at times, does not want to play with Roger. This is usually after a disagreement.
The teachers agreed Cain chooses active things (e.g., running, climbing, jumping, riding tricycles) in which to participate on the playground. These activities often take the form of pretend play - Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles, Power Rangers, or police. Mr. Ford noted Cain will slow down to play at the work bench. According to Mr. Ford, “He didn’t play very much on the climber at the beginning of the year. He still wasn’t that good at climbing.”

Both teachers reported Cain rarely or never goes to the easel to paint. Mr. Ford added, “... He doesn’t care much for slowing down to be the rabbit helper.”

According to Mr. Ford, Cain seeks out Roger and talks to him and he interacts with Roger a lot. Cain will say, “Roger, we’re friends,” or “Roger we’ll play this or we’ll play that.” Ms. Perron referred to Cain’s interaction style as “accepting.” She also commented that Cain is very inclusive when role-playing. Mr. Ford offered an example, “He does a lot of interacting with other children besides Roger when he’s pretending to be the Ninja. He’s telling them what the Ninja’s are doing to them. For example, ‘Cause I’m the Ninja, I do this - P-yah, P-yah, P-yah!’” Ms. Perron noted, “... he has a lot of pride, and when he feels like he’s being insulted, that’s when conflict arises.”

Mr. Ford reported Cain was much less verbal at the beginning of the year. He commented, “Now Cain tells them more about his ideas, more about what he is doing, and he does more role-playing in an activity than he used to.” Ms. Perron was unable to think of any differences between now and earlier in the year.
The researcher recorded many R&T episodes in which Cain was a participant. Cain contributes to R&T play by announcing roles (e.g., power turtle cat, Power Ranger, Superman, dinosaur) and adding to play ideas. In one episode, Cain explained, "We are the good guys. You say cowabunga when the bad guy comes." He also asked to be part of play, "Can I play Power Rangers?" Cain teamed up with Roger in many of the R&T episodes. For example, in one episode, Roger wrestled with Troy first, then Cain wrestled Troy. However, Cain expressed disagreement with Roger in some R&T episodes. Roger said, "Let's play Ninja Turtles!" Cain replied, "No, I'm playing Superman."

**Kara.** Both Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron identified Miller as Kara's primary playmate choice. Mr. Ford noted, "After Miller, there are a few other girls that she'll play with now and then, or she'll get in with Roger, Cain, and Lindsey, or Megan."

Both teachers reported that Kara rarely chooses quieter "porch activities" such as painting or playing with play-doh. Rather, Kara is more likely to participate in pretend play (e.g., growling, being a dog, barking), chasing, riding in the wagon or on a tricycle, climbing, or playing in the sand. Ms. Perron pointed out Kara also enjoys watching and petting Brandi, the rabbit. The climber is a new activity choice for Kara. According to Mr. Ford, Kara only gained the muscle strength to climb on the climber this semester. He added, "Now she goes to the top of the climber."

Mr. Ford explained, "Kara talks conversationally in her interactions with Miller when they make plans for an activity." Due to Miller's verbal deficits, one might conclude these conversation may
have been one-sided in nature. Mr. Ford was not clear on that point. He added, "Kara seeks out other children for pretend play." She also has a strong tendency to politely correct someone if he/she is not taking care of equipment or not doing something safe. Mr. Ford provided the following example, "You know, if they are going too fast on a tricycle she'll say, 'Hey! You are going too fast on that tricycle.' She's seems comfortable interacting in this manner."

Ms. Perron described Kara's and Miller's interactions as parallel play. Kara "looks out" for Miller. Ms. Perron offered the following account, "They were doing the same thing which was putting grass on the sidewalk, making something, then Miller kind of wandered away, not too far, and she was 'Where is Miller? Oh, there he is. O.K. Just kind of making sure he was around.' When referring to Kara's interactions with other children, Ms. Perron commented, "I think she just kind of does what she wants to do. But she also will join in and agree to do what other people want to do."

Mr. Ford reported a positive change in Kara's interaction style. He explained Kara was timid in her interactions at the beginning of the year and was inclined to require a teacher's help to get involved in a game. This timidity is not evident this semester. Ms. Perron echoed Mr. Ford conclusions when she commented, "I just think she has really become . . . less shy. She's just stronger, . . . emotionally."

The researcher documented Kara's involvement in play fighting and chasing components of R&T play. In one episode, she ran after Troy, caught him, pulled him to the ground and wrestled with him. She
got involved in the group chase games, usually in the role of being chased (e.g., Kara, Miller, and Kelly, or Kara and Aimee run from Roy - Darth Vader). She and Miller often were involved in R&T episodes together, either on same team (e.g., Miller and Kara versus Glen and Joyce) or on opposing sides (e.g., Miller chased Kara and tried to get the beach ball). Kara contributed to play with challenges (e.g., "I have a beach ball! You can’t get it!") , warnings (e.g., Oh no! He’s out! Watch out! It’s Darth Vader!), or comments about play direction (e.g., "Darth Vader’s dead."); "Not me. He is the bad monster.").

Lindsey. According to Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron, Lindsey likes to play with Ellen, Roger, Cain, Troy, and Roy. Ms. Perron indicated the circle of playmate choices has expanded this semester to include Aimee, Kelly, and Joyce. When asked about children with whom Lindsey does not like to play, Mr. Ford noted, “She gets upset with Ellen once in a while and doesn’t like to play with her.”

According to Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron, Lindsey likes to swing and get involved in role-playing. Ms. Perron referred to this type of activity as Lindsey “leading stories.” Mr. Ford mentioned the sandbox and Ms. Perron mentioned painting as activities rarely chosen by Lindsey.

Mr. Ford described Lindsey as very verbal in her interactions with the other children and as being the director of the play situation. He pointed out, “She likes to define the roles for the other children, and she defines them so that their roles are subservient to her role. They are the student and she’s the teacher, or she’s the person in charge . . . telling the others what they are.
Ms. Perron portrayed Lindsey as "very bossy." She explained, "She's the one that makes up the story and narrates it and assigns the parts. Lindsey might say, 'Troy you be the baby now. And you get to do this... We're going to go in the house and you're going to capture me.'" However, even though Lindsey appears to be quite bossy, the other children follow her direction. Ms. Perron concluded, "She is an effective boss rather than an ineffective boss."

The teachers agreed Lindsey's interaction style is basically the same as in the beginning of the year. However, they both noted an increase in her effectiveness as a "boss" or "director." Mr. Ford commented, "She's getting more adept at how to gain control and how to get the other children to do what she wants them to do."

The researcher recorded cases of R&T play in which Lindsey initiated the play and then worked to maintain the interaction. Her initiation strategies were usually verbal (e.g., "Na Na Boo Boo!"; "Roger, come and get me!"). She sometimes followed the group (e.g., Lindsey, Kara, Miller, Megan chase Roger), but preferred to be in control of the interactions. She began one episode, "I can catch you!" She then grabbed Troy by his shirt, pulled him from "porch" to the "climber," and put him in the middle of the climber, "Get in there. You are in jail." Thus, began a lengthy episode in which Lindsey tried to keep Troy in "jail." She enlisted the help of Roy, "Roy come help me. Put his hands together behind his back."

Lindsey sometimes disagreed with fellow participants' ideas, but the other children seemed willing to work it out. In the same "jail" episode, Roy wanted to be Darth Vader. Lindsey disagreed, "No, I'm
Darth Vader." Roy, "Both of us is Darth Vader." Lindsey agreed with this and hollered directions once more, "Troy, you have to chase us because we are both Darth Vader."

She pretended to be in trouble to get other children involved in play. In one episode, she directed Troy, "Put your hands around me!" After Troy grabbed her around her waist, she hollered, "Roger and Cain, he's got me!"

She also regulated play. For example, Cain started chasing her. Lindsey ran from Cain, but then stopped by the "swings" and said, "Time out." Cain stopped and stood by her. Then Lindsay says, "You can't get me." She takes off running and the game continued.

As evidenced by the above examples, Lindsey was usually effective in her maintenance of R&T play. This was not always the case. In a couple of chase games with Roger, she "played dead." However, she waited too long to "wake up" and Roger lost interest.

Roger. The teachers identified Cain as Roger's primary playmate choice. Mr. Ford noted Roger will play in a group. However, Mr. Ford's perception is that the group is drawn to Roger and his activity rather than Roger choosing the group. Neither teacher identified any child in particular with whom Roger does not like to play. Ms. Perron noted an exception, "When he and Cain ... get into an argument then Roger will say, 'I do not want to play with Cain. Cain is not my friend.'"

Roger's favorite activity on the playground, according to both teachers, is pretend play (e.g., monsters or police). Mr. Ford stated, "Roger does like more than one type of activity, but his
overwhelming favorite, because he is very verbal and creative, is the role playing." Roger's pretend play is usually very active in nature. According to Ms. Perron, the theme of Roger's pretend play has changed from monster play to police play. Roger rarely chooses less active activities such as playing with play-doh, painting, or going to the water table.

Mr. Ford characterized Roger's interaction style on the playground as "high energy" and "extremely verbal." Mr. Ford explained, "He'll tell them a scenario. He doesn't try to assign people roles. It's just that he . . . can give the most creative expression of a scenario so people will follow it. He'll announce to the children . . . what his role is, so a lot of his talking to them is telling them about what he is doing as opposed to telling them what they are doing." According to Mr. Ford, it is these high energy, elaborate scenarios (e.g., alien spacecraft attacking the preschool and attempting to abduct children) created by Roger which draw the other children to play with Roger.

Ms. Perron described Roger as "king of the playground." She stated, "Everybody wants to play with Roger. When they do the monster play, he is the monster and everybody is wanting to be scared by Roger." Additionally, Ms. Perron reported Roger is emotional in his interactions. He likes to get his way and does let others know he does not like being stopped from doing things his way.

Mr. Ford reported Roger's interaction style had remained consistent since the beginning of the year. Ms. Perron noted Roger has "seemed to grow beyond the playground over the course of the
year." As an example, she cited the time Roger was throwing chalk out of the window of the house and then took the chalk and hid it. She commented, "The whole chalk incident was a very good example of where he was bored on the playground and he is using materials inappropriately. He's trying to find new uses for them because he's used them in every appropriate way possible in his two years here.”

The researcher recorded many R&T episodes in which Roger was a participant. He assigned roles to himself (e.g., Dinosaur Ninja, T-Rex, X-Man, Power Ranger, saber-tooth tiger) and others (e.g., "You are Darth Vader." ; "There's a monster, no a shark!"). He often identified his role before taking action (e.g., "I'm X-boy." Then he made shooting sounds.), or changed his role in the middle of an interaction (e.g., "I'm T-Rex blue. Now I'm saber-tooth tiger." ). Roger also directed R&T play. In one episode, he told the children with whom he was running, "See the bad guy right there? You have to stop him." In another he explained, "He has to come in so we can fight him."

He engaged in a variety of R&T behaviors (e.g., running from, running after, claw at, teasing, karate) with a variety of children (e.g., Lindsey, Miller, Kara, Megan, Joyce, Kelly, Glen, Roy, Troy, Cain). Roger and Cain often played exclusively with each other during R&T play. When they joined a group, they teamed up to "fight" another participant (e.g., taking turns wrestling Troy).

Sociograms

An egocentric network sociogram (see Figures 2-10) was constructed for each child's positive choices of playmates, and for
each child's negative choices of playmates. Egocentric network sociograms depict each individual child, other children with whom he/she has connections, and the connections among those children (Knake & Kuklinski, 1982). For each sociogram, names of older children are within ovals, and names of younger children are within rectangles. A single arrow between two children denoted the direction of the choice (e.g., Glen positively nominated Bob, but Bob did not positively nominate Glen). Double arrows between two children indicated a mutual choice (e.g., both Roger and Cain positively chose each other). As was the case with the profiles, only the sociograms of those children who had a moderate or high level of participation in R&T play are included in this chapter. The reader is referred to Appendix F for the sociograms of the remaining children.

The researcher used the egocentric network sociograms to compare teachers' perceptions of children's playmate choices and children's positive and negative choices of playmates during sociometric interviews. These comparisons revealed that the teachers, especially an individual teacher, were not always accurate in their perceptions of children's playmate choices. The teachers could usually only identify one of the children's actual playmate choices, but rarely more than that. For example, the teachers' perception that Miller chose Kara as a playmate was supported by Miller's actual positive nomination. However, they failed to mention Miller's other choices, Lindsey and Roger. The teachers also commented that Miller tended to play with younger children, but Miller's choices were all older children. It seems the teachers may be more aware of children's
Figure 2. Egocentric network sociograms for Joyce.
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Figure 3. Egocentric network sociograms for Glen
Figure 4. Egocentric network sociograms for Miller
Figure 5. Egocentric network sociograms for Troy
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Figure 6. Egocentric network sociograms for Roy
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Figure 7. Egocentric network sociograms for Cain
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Figure 10. Egocentric network sociograms for Roger
affiliations with other children rather than children's actual choices. They admitted as much with their comments, "I don't know if he doesn't 'like' to play with .... or if they just don't happen to play together."

Complete network sociograms were constructed for positive nominations, negative nominations, co-membership in short R&T episodes, and co-membership in long R&T episodes. The complete network sociograms are based on comprehensive information regarding the links among all the children in the network (Knoke & Kuklinski, 1982).

The first complete sociogram is based on positive nominations and provides a picture of with whom children chose to play (see Figure 11). The second one is based on negative nominations and provides a picture of with whom children chose not to play (see Figure 12). In comparing these two sociograms the researcher discovered Roger and Bob are popular because they have many positive nominations and few negative nominations. Ellen, Wayne, and Jill are rejected because they have many negative nominations and few positive nominations. Aimee and Lindsey appear to be somewhat controversial. They received a high number of positive and negative nominations.

The final two complete network sociograms provide a picture of co-membership in short R&T episodes and long R&T episodes (see Figures 13 and 14). What emerges from comparing these pictures is that the pattern of how children are related in shorter and longer episodes is relatively consistent and stable.
Figure 12. Complete network sociogram for negative nominations
Figure 13. Complete network sociogram for co-membership in shorter R&R play episodes.
Figure 14. Complete network sociogram for co-membership in longer R&T play episodes
These co-membership networks also were partitioned into strongly connected subgroups of network members, or cliques (Knoke & Kuklinski, 1982). In examining these cliques for both short (see Table 6) and long (see Table 7) R&T episodes, and comparing them to children's egocentric network sociograms, the researcher discovered cliques often included both the positive and negative nominations of any particular child. For example, the first clique to emerge from co-membership in long R&T episodes included Glen, Miller, Kelly, Troy, Roy, Roger, Cain, and Kara. In comparing the composition of this clique to Glen's positive and negative nominations, the researcher discovered this clique included not only Glen's positive nominations, Roger and Kara, but also included Glen's negative nomination, Cain. Basically, the cliques included a more expansive group of children than were indicated by the connections appearing on the positive nomination sociogram. This finding could be due to the fact that each child only made three nominations. Children's playmate choices, positive or negative, did not seem to bear upon who they were affiliated with during R&T play.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Co-Membership Cliques for Shorter R&amp;T Play Episodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clique</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glen Miller Kelly Troy Roy Roger Cain Kara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Miller Troy Roy Roger Bob Cain Kara Lindsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Miller Jill Roy Roger Cain Kara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allen Miller Roy Roger Bob Cain Kara Lindsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Allen Glen Miller Roy Roger Cain Kara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Miller Megan Roy Roger Kara Lindsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glen Miller Joyce Kelly Troy Roy Roger Kara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Miller Joyce Troy Roy Roger Kara Lindsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Glen Miller Joyce Kelly Roy Roger Kara Suzy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lawrence Miller Troy Roger Bob Kara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lawrence Miller Jill Roger Kara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Allen Miller Wayne Cain Kara Lindsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Miller Wayne Joyce Kara Lindsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Aimee Troy Roy Kara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Allen Roy Roger Bob Cain Lindsey Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Troy Roy Roger Bob Cain Lindsey Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Allen Wayne Cain Lindsey Ellen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preschool Children's Negotiation of Intersubjectivity during R&T Play

Throughout the observation period, the researcher searched for the parts of the culture, relationships among the parts, and relationships of the parts to the whole. She discusses the results of this search in the following three sections on domain analyses, taxonomic analyses, and componential analyses.

Domain Analyses

The researcher chose to concentrate on five domains which emerged from the data. Each domain had a name or cover term, included terms, and a semantic relationship that connected the cover and included terms. The domains presented here are related to the physical location (i.e., playground), the people on the playground,
and the initiations, negotiations, and terminations of R&T bouts. All of the domains identified for this study are what Spradley (1980) referred to as mixed domains. They contain both folk terms (i.e., language used by people in the situation) and analytical terms (i.e., language used by the researcher to infer cultural meanings).

Quotation marks within each table denote the children's native language.

**Domain 1.** The first domain (see Table 8) includes places on the playground where R&T play occurs. The semantic relationship is location-for-action and takes the form: X is a place for doing R&T play.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8. Domain 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R&amp;T Play</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a place for doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;House&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Porcher&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Climber&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sand box&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassy area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Slide&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Tricycle Path&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain 2.** The second domain (see Table 9) contains various types of persons found on the playground. The semantic relationship is strict inclusion and takes the form: X is a kind of person on the playground.

**Domain 3.** The third domain (see Table 10) encompasses all the techniques children used to initiate R&T play. The semantic
### Table 9. Domain 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person on the Playground</th>
<th>is a kind of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older boys</td>
<td>&quot;Children&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older girls</td>
<td>&quot;Teachers&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger boys</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger girls</td>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10. Domain 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiate R&amp;T Play</th>
<th>is a way to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hit at</td>
<td>Crawl after and growl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run from</td>
<td>Scream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>&quot;Na! Na! Boo! Boo!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claw at</td>
<td>&quot;You can't catch me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoot at</td>
<td>&quot;Come get me!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull down</td>
<td>&quot;Let's bust out of this place!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crouch and clinch teeth</td>
<td>&quot;You can't get it&quot; (beach ball)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate moves (karate chop,</td>
<td>&quot;Do you want me to be the bad guy?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stance, etc.)</td>
<td>&quot;Hey, let's play football.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise fist</td>
<td>&quot;How about we tackle each other?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap shoulder, twist hands by</td>
<td>Sneak up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ears</td>
<td>Stomp up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run with football</td>
<td>Chase or run after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomp</td>
<td>Creep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms open</td>
<td>Crawl after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasp arms</td>
<td>&quot;There's a monster!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act like T-Rex</td>
<td>&quot;The monster!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run by and tap shoulder</td>
<td>&quot;Here come the bad guys!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab bandana</td>
<td>&quot;It's the bad guy!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Roy wants to kill me!&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I hope you're looking for me!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I know where Darth Vader is!&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I'm blue! You're red!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I can catch you!&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;This is a bad dinosaur.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hum Darth Vader tune</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The monster is back.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con'd)
relationship is means-end and takes the form: X is a way to initiate R&T play.

**Domain 4.** The fourth domain (see Table 11) is comprised of the various negotiation acts children used to develop a shared understanding of R&T play. Because there were over 1000 negotiation acts, the researcher included only enough acts to provide examples of all the categories (see Table 12 for frequencies). The semantic relationship is strict inclusion and takes the form: X is a kind of negotiation act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11. Domain 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a kind of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A boy grabs hula hoop to catch someone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A girl says, &quot;Whoever touches me is on my team.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A boy walks around with tongue out hunched over and hands hanging down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A boy says, &quot;Power turtle change to T-Rex.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A boy says, &quot;I'm flying away.&quot; (had been Power Turtle Cat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A girl says &quot;I took all your money.&quot; (Had been in jail)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con'd)
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A boy, being held down by a girl whimpers and struggles to get away—
the girl lets boy get up but still has hold of his shirt.
A girl and boy chase another boy and girl— the chasees stop to let
chasers catch up.

Three girls and a boy chase another boy. The boy being chased looks
back and laughs as he's running away.

A boy says, "You say cowabunga when bad guy comes." A girl asks,
"Who is bad guy?"

A boy and girl pass a girl as they run to swings. She asks, "What
are you pretending to be?"

A boy tries to pull away from the girl holding him, "Get me away.
I'll be good."

After arguing about who is Darth Vader, a boy suggests, "Both of us
is Darth Vader."

A boy asks, "Do you want me to be the bad cowboy? I'll be the bad
guy."

A girl shouts, "I want to get in. I really want to get in!"

A girl hollers, "Come get me! Na Na Boo Boo! Come get me!"

A girl and boy are holding another boy in "jail". The boy being held
says, "Don't get my shoes sandy."

A girl is being chased tells teacher as she runs by swings, "You're
too big for swing!"

A boy says, "I'm Darth Vader." A girl responds, "No I'm Darth
Vader."

A boy says, "Oh no! Here come the bad guys!" Another boy responds,
"No we're the good guys."

A boy pretending to be Superman jumps off turtle. Another boy says,
"Let's play Ninja Turtles." The first boy responds, "No, I'm playing
Superman."

A girl shouts, "I say run for your life!" The boy stays on
"climber."

A boy hollers, "The monster is coming!" Another boy ignores him.
One boy hits at another boy. The other boy then turns away.

A girl asks a boy, "Are you going to chase us, Darth Vader?" The boy
responds, "I don't have my mask and if I don't have my mask, I
can't."

A boy catches a girl in a hug. The girl exclaims, "Stop it!"

A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house. A girl
chases him through sand to grass by turtle climber.

A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They
scream and run.

(table con'd)
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"

A boy walks close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune. A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run."

A girl hollers, "Na Na Boo Boo!" You can't catch us. She runs to turtle.

A boy and girl are using ribbon sticks as light sabers. He hits the girl's "light saber". He falls down and "plays dead".

A boy says, "This is a bad dinosaur." He stomps to sand box.

One boy does karate moves toward another. He says, "You know what? We're the Power Rangers."

One boy explains, "I'm a turtle Power Ranger! Hi Yah!" He then starts doing karate moves toward another boy.

A boy says, "I'm going to get you! I'm the police"

A girl says, "Whoever touches me is on my team. You two are together and we three are together."

A girl runs. A boy chases after her.

A boy and girl growl at a group of 3 children (2 boys and 1 girl). The girl in this group exclaims, "Look, there's a monster."

Two boys run up to another boy hollering, "Power Turtles!" The other boy runs.

A girl tells a boy, "You have to chase us because we are both Darth Vaders!" The boy chases her and her partner.

Two boys push another boy. He shoves back.

One girl pulls another one to the ground. They roll around on ground.

NOTE: The italicized part of each example is the act of interest. The non-italicized part of each example is what preceded the act of interest. Quotation works within the table denote children's native language.

Domain 5. The fifth domain (see Table 13) includes all the methods children used to terminate R&T play. The semantic relationship is means-end and takes the form: X is a way to terminate R&T play.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Shorter Younger</th>
<th>Shorter Older</th>
<th>Longer Younger</th>
<th>Longer Older</th>
<th>Summary Total</th>
<th>Shorter</th>
<th>Longer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVITATION</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPANSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building On</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate Intensity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE OF AGREEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPHASSES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRELEVANT ACT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERMINATION</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTS</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Frequencies of Negotiation Acts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminate R&amp;T Play</th>
<th>is a way to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runs up</td>
<td>Continue to lie in sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threaten.</td>
<td>Ignore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ford asks children to stop wrestling and move away from climber.</td>
<td>Does not chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ford, &quot;You see what happens when too many get on the turtle.&quot;</td>
<td>Continue picking flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jones &quot;You can't do that (jump from climber).&quot;</td>
<td>Does not follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ford lifts a participant and hugs him.</td>
<td>Turn away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ford ties a participant's shoe.</td>
<td>Continue to slide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jones, &quot;This is Ring Around the Rosie.&quot; (stop Troy wrestling)</td>
<td>Continue ride tricycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Perron &quot;You need to find an activity where you don't throw sand. Let's get some chalk and decorate the house.&quot;</td>
<td>Continue play ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Perron &quot;That's too rough. We can't have that on the playground.&quot;</td>
<td>Tell stop growl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jones, &quot;No racing the wagon. You have to slow down.&quot; And start pulling wagon.</td>
<td>Stay in wagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jones &quot;We're not going to slap our friends. Play gentle.&quot;</td>
<td>Continue chase rabbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All teachers, &quot;Time to go in! Line up!&quot;</td>
<td>Continue walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Holly asks boys to stop chase after they jump from top of climber.</td>
<td>Continue climbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ford starts another chase game</td>
<td>Stand in front of house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jones, &quot;We don't push our friends.&quot;</td>
<td>Continue playing bean bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue playing with bubbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue playing with water table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue play house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue chase teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue play football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give back bandana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stop chasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue swinging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stop wrestling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue playing in sand box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue obstacle course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stop to pick flowers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms. Claire, "Is that what Power Rangers do? I've never seen that show."
Run off
Walk away
Wander off
Leave house
Go to deliver flowers
Go to house
Color starting with chalk
Go to work bench
Go to see-saw
Got to ride tricycle
Go to climber
Go to sand by climber
Go to slide
Go to sand
Go draw with chalk
Start playing Ring Around the Rosie
Go play with blocks
Join another child on porch
Go to swing
Rest
Go ride in cart
Go play with bean bag toss
Go play on horse rocker
Go to water table
Start crawling by climber
Go play basketball
Go climb on turtle
Go get a drink
Fall down and lay in sand
Go put out "house fire"
Start talking to teacher
Start hugging teacher
Go to climb on turtle
Start playing hide and seek
Go to feed rabbit
Join chase game with teacher.

**Taxonomic Analyses**

The researcher conducted taxonomic analyses to discover how the identified cultural domains were organized. This process involved exploring relationships or similarities among the included terms of each domain (Spradley, 1980).

**Places for doing R&T play.** Locations for R&T play were organized into areas and equipment. Areas typically encompassed a large amount of space on the playground and the children covered these areas throughout the course of various R&T episodes. Equipment
included stationary playground apparatus and occupied only a limited area of the playground (see Figure 15).

Persons on the playground. The groups of people on the playground included "children" and "teachers." The children were categorized further into younger boys, younger girls, older boys and older girls. The "teachers" were grouped according to their position at the preschool—director, graduate assistant, student teacher (see Figure 16).

Initiating R&T play. Children used a variety of techniques to initiate R&T play with others. They quietly sneaked up on others (i.e., nonverbal approach); requested action; made explicit invitations; displayed enticing acts; and expressed assumed jointness by assigning roles to self, others, or both (see Figure 17 and Table 14).

Negotiation of R&T play. The negotiation acts children used during R&T play fell under four broad categories based on their contribution to the development of a shared understanding. These categories included, expansions, degrees of agreement, emphases, and irrelevant acts. Expansions were divided further into introductions (i.e., new theme, new element, new character), extensions, building on, check status, and regulate intensity. These types of acts contribute to ongoing play by providing or gathering information relevant to play. Degrees of agreement were divided further into acceptances, rejections, revisions (i.e., roles, object use, play style), and conciliation, each expressing various levels of agreement among participants' in a R&T episode. The last two major categories,
Figure 15. Taxonomic analysis of places for doing R&T play
Figure 16. Taxonomic analysis of persons on the playground
Figure 17. Taxonomic analysis of ways to initiate R&T play
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14. Examples of Initiation Acts by Taxonomy Table Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enticing Acts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claw at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoot at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crouch and clinch teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karate moves (karate chop, stance, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise fist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap shoulder, twist hands by ears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run with football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasp arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act like T-Rex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run by and tap shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab bandana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Roy wants to kill me!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I know where Darth Vader is!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I can catch you!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hum Darth Vader tune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The monster is back.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growl and stomp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Look!&quot; and hold up football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I'm going to get you.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run up to and growl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scream and run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawl after and growl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Na! Na! Boo! Boo!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;You can't catch me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Come get me!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Let's bust out of this place!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;You can't get it&quot; (beach ball)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonverbal Approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneak up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomp up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase or run after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawl after</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con'd)
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| Explicit Invitation | "Do you want me to be the bad guy?"  
|                     | "How about we tackle each other?"  
|                     | "Hey, let's play football."          |
| Other              | "There's a monster!"                
|                    | "The monster!"                      
|                    | "Here come the bad guys!"           
|                    | "It's the bad guy!"                 
|                    | "I hope you're looking for me!"     
|                    | "It's Darth Vader!"                 
|                    | "You're Darth Vader!"               
|                    | "The bad guy is trying to take our  
|                    | dog!                                
|                    | "This is a bad dinosaur."           |
| Self               | "I'm a sheriff cowboy and a good    
|                    | guy!                                
|                    | "I'll be blue one."                 
|                    | "I'm superman!"                     |
| Both               | "You're the X-man! I'm T-Rex."      
|                    | "I'm blue! You're red!"              
|                    | "We're good guys!"                  |

emphases and irrelevant acts, typically did not contribute much, if
anything, to ongoing play (see Figure 18 and Table 15).

**Terminating R&T play.** The four major categories which emerged
for ways to terminate R&T play included, interruptions, nonverbal
departures, expressing a disinterest in R&T play (e.g., continue to
play in sand box), and expressing an interest in non R&T play (e.g.,
go to ride tricycle). Both teachers and children interrupted R&T
play. Typically, teachers' only interrupted the play fighting
component of R&T play (see Figure 19 and Table 16).

**Componental Analyses**

According to Spradley (1980), "cultural meaning is determined,
in part, by how categories inside a domain contrast with one another"
(p.131). The researcher performed componental analyses on the
Figure 18. Taxonomic analysis of kinds of negotiation acts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introductions</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Element**   | A boy grabs hula hoop to catch someone.  
A girl says, "Whoever touches me is on my team." | **Description** |
| **Introductions** | A boy walks around with tongue out hunched over and hands hanging down.  
A boy says, "Power turtle change to T-Rex" | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." |
| **Extension** | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." |
| **Building On** | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." |
| **Check Status** | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." |
| **Element**   | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." |
| **Introductions** | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." |
| **Check Status** | Three girls and a boy chase another boy— the boy being chased looks back and laughs as he's running away.  
A boy says, "You say cowabunga when bad guy comes."  
A girl asks, "Who is bad guy?"  
A boy and girl pass a girl as they run to swings.  
A girl asks, "What are you pretending to be?" | A boy starts humming the Darth Vader tune by the house.  
A girl chaples him through sand to grass by turtle climber.  
A boy runs up to a group of four children (2 boys and 2 girls). They scream and run.  
A boy puts his arms around a girl (at her request). The girl then turns to two other boys, "Hey, he's got me!"  
A boy runs close to house swinging a ribbon stick and humming the Darth Vader tune.  
A girl at house screams to other children, "Run, puppies run." |

*Table 15. Examples of Negotiation Acts by Taxonomy Table Categories*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulate Intensity</th>
<th>A boy, being held down by a girl whimpers and struggles to get away- the girl lets boy get up but still has hold of his shirt. A girl and boy chase another boy and girl- the chasees stop to let chasers catch up.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptances</td>
<td>A girl runs. A boy chases after her. A boy and girl at a group of 3 children (2 boys and 1 girl). The girl in this group exclaims, &quot;Look, there's a monster.&quot; Two boys run up to another boy hollering, &quot;Power Turtles!&quot; The other boy runs. A girl tells a boy, &quot;You have to chase us because we are both Darth Vaders!&quot; The boy chases her and her partner. Two boys push another boy. He shoves back. One girl pulls another one to the ground. They roll around on ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>A girl shouts, &quot;I say run for your life!&quot; The boy stays on &quot;climber.&quot; A boy hollers, &quot;The monster is coming!&quot; Another boy ignores him. One boy hits at another boy. The other boy then turns away. A girl asks a boy, &quot;Are you going to chase us, Darth Vader?&quot; The boy responds, &quot;I don't have my mask and if I don't have my mask, I can't.&quot; A boy catches a girl in a hug. The girl exclaims, &quot;Stop it!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>A boy says, &quot;I'm Darth Vader.&quot; A girl responds, &quot;No, I'm Darth Vader.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Use</td>
<td>A girl says, &quot;Don't try to eat grass or anything.&quot; A boy responds, &quot;I'm not eating grass. I'm eating sand. She replies, &quot;Pretend it's grass.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Style</td>
<td>A girl blocks door of &quot;house&quot; so boy can't get in. Another boy says, &quot;He has to come in so we can fight him.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont'd)
| Conciliatory Act | A boy tries to pull away from the girl holding him, "Get me away. I'll be good."
After arguing about who is Darth Vader, a boy suggests, "Both of us is Darth Vader." |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Emphasize Act    | A boy asks, "Do you want me to be the bad cowboy? I'll be the bad guy."
A girl shouts, "I want to get in. I really want to get in!"
A girl hollers, "Come get me! Na Na Boo Boo! Come get me!" |
| Irrelevant Act   | A girl and boy are holding another boy in "jail". The boy being held says, "Don't get my shoes sandy."
A girl is being chased tells teacher as she runs by swings, "You're too big for swing!" |

**Note.** The italicized part of each example is the act of interest. The non-italicized part of each example is what preceded the act of interest. Quotation marks within table denote children's native language.

Domains by identifying attributes of terms within each domain and searching for contrasts based on these attributes (Spradley, 1980).

**Location for R&T play.** The following dimensions of contrast emerged regarding places for doing R&T play: type of surface, position on playground, role in R&T play (see Table 17). The playground in the current study had sand, grass, and concrete surfaces. The positions on the playground included front (i.e., closest to preschool), middle, and back (i.e., closest to back fence). The locations had various roles in children's play - prop for play (i.e., "climber" as jail), base for play, part of a path.

Subtle differences between the use of location in play fighting and play chasing, and in shorter versus longer episodes also emerged.
Figure 19. Taxonomic analysis of ways to terminate R&T play
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Interrupt by Child</th>
<th>Interrupt by Teacher</th>
<th>Nonverbal Departure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Runs up</td>
<td>Mr. Ford asks children to stop wrestling and move away from climber.</td>
<td>Run off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threaten.</td>
<td>Mr. Ford, &quot;You see what happens when too many get on the turtle.&quot;</td>
<td>Walk away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Jones, &quot;You can't do that (jump from climber).&quot;</td>
<td>Wander off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Ford lifts a participant and hugs him.</td>
<td>Leave house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Ford ties a participant's shoe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Jones, &quot;This is Ring Around the Rosie.&quot; stop Troy wrestling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Perron, &quot;You need to find an activity where you don't throw sand. Let's get some chalk and decorate the house.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Perron, &quot;That's too rough. We can't have that on the playground.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Jones, &quot;No racing the wagon. You have to slow down.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Jones, &quot;We're not going to slap our friends. Play gentle.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All teachers, &quot;Time to go in!. Line up!&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Holly asks boys to stop chase after they jump from top of climber.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Ford starts another chase game</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Jones, &quot;We don't push our friends.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Claire, &quot;Is that what Power Rangers do? I've never seen that show.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disinterest in R&amp;T Play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue (to)…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...lie in sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...picking flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...slide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...ride tricycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...play ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...chase rabbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...climbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...playing bean bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...chasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...wrestling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell someone to stop growling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay in wagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand in front of house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give back bandana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in Non R&amp;T Play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Join another child on porch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop to pick flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...swing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...deliver flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...work bench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...see-saw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...ride tricycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...climber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...sand by climber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...slide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...sand box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...draw with chalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start (to)…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...color with chalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...playing Ring Around the Rosie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...crawling by climber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall down and lay in sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join chase game with teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 17. Places for R&T Play: Componential Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain: Places for R&amp;T Play</th>
<th>Dimensions of Contrast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Area</td>
<td>Sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassy Area</td>
<td>Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Tricycle Path&quot;</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Porch&quot;</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Climber&quot; (i.e. &quot;Turtle,&quot; Metal, Houses)</td>
<td>Grass, Sand, Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Slide&quot;</td>
<td>Sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;House&quot;</td>
<td>Grass (3 sides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sandbox&quot;</td>
<td>sand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, these contrasts were difficult to portray in the table and are discussed in text instead. Play fights usually occurred in one spot on the playground (e.g., grassy area by house). Play chasing, on the other hand, involved various paths (e.g., "porch" - "house" - sand by swings - "porch"). When the R&T episode involved both play chasing and play fighting a path developed which included various stopping points in chasing for play fighting to occur. Obviously, longer episodes provided more of an opportunity for these paths to
longer episodes provided more of an opportunity for these paths to develop. Shorter episodes, by their very nature, did not allow for this development and typically involved only one spot on the playground.

Persons on playground. The following dimensions of contrast emerged in relation to children on the playground: age, sex, level of participation in R&T play, type of participant (see Table 18). The words chosen for type of participant characterized a particular child’s interaction during R&T play. These characterizations sometimes paralleled those found in the profiles. Instigators were the children who initiated R&T play. They continued to have an important role in ongoing play by contributing to that play in other ways (e.g., extensions, building on). They did not just start a R&T episode and then disappear from the interaction. Children who were strictly contributors, were instrumental in maintaining R&T play. They usually agreed with fellow participants’ ideas and extended them. On the occasions when they disagreed with a play idea, these children offered a way to correct or resolve the disagreement, instead of a flat out rejection of the idea. Followers, on the other hand, were typically accepting of ongoing play and would join in play by imitating the play of others.

Careful examination of the table reveals younger children, with the exception of two boys and a girl, were typically followers during R&T. Boys were the instigators of R&T play. Contributors were scattered throughout all the children. One child was designated an
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN: Persons on Playground-Children</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Level of Participation in Rough-and-Tumble Play</th>
<th>Type of Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Shorter</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cain</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzy</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Older boys had a high level of participation in R&T play. These boys were either instigators or contributors. Younger children's involvement in R&T play was minimal, with the exception of two boys and one girl. Generally, girls' participation in R&T play ranged from minimal to moderate. The pattern for level of participation was similar across shorter and longer R&T episodes. The only exceptions were an older boy and an older girl. Both children's level of participation in R&T play increased from moderate in shorter episodes to high in longer episodes.

**Initiating R&T play.** The following dimensions of contrast emerged for ways to initiate R&T play: how it works, verbal/nonverbal, used to initiate play chasing or play fighting, rate of occurrence, who uses each technique, and what type of acts by which invitations are followed (see Table 19).

Enticing acts were a common strategy used by the children to initiate R&T play. The initiator would spark interest in either play fighting or play chasing by verbally or nonverbally attracting attention to himself or herself. Expressions of assumed jointness involved giving directions regarding roles. Older boys made moderate use of this strategy when trying to initiate R&T play. Older girls gave directions for chasing through requests for action. Boys and younger girls gave direction regarding play style through explicit invitations. Younger boys utilized the element of surprise in nonverbal approaches to get fellow participants' to run, thus leading to chasing. Requests for action, explicit invitations, and nonverbal approaches were rarely used by the children in the current study. A
Table 12. Ways to Initiate R&T Play: Componential Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain: Ways to Initiate Rough and Tumble Episode</th>
<th>How It Works</th>
<th>Verbal/Nonverbal</th>
<th>Play Fight/Play Chase</th>
<th>Rate of Occurrence</th>
<th>Predominantly Used By...</th>
<th>Followed by...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Approach</td>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Nonverbal Chase</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Younger boys</td>
<td>Building On</td>
<td>Building On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enticing Acts</td>
<td>Attract attention</td>
<td>Both Both</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>All children</td>
<td>Acceptances, Building On, Rejection, Termination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests for Action</td>
<td>Give directions</td>
<td>Verbal Chase</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Older girls</td>
<td>Building On</td>
<td>Building On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Invitation</td>
<td>Give directions</td>
<td>Verbal Both</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Boys, younger girls</td>
<td>Emphases</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of Assumed Jointness</td>
<td>Give directions</td>
<td>Verbal Both</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Older boys</td>
<td>Building On</td>
<td>Building On</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comparable pattern emerged for rate of occurrence of each type of invitation across longer and shorter R&T episodes.

The researcher included the ‘followed by’ column to elucidate frequently occurring connections between initiations, various negotiation acts, and terminations. Children extended (e.g., boy hums Darth Vader tune - girl screams, "Run, puppies, run!") or built on (e.g., a child takes a karate like stance - then says, "You can’t kill me cause I’m magic!") enticing acts in both shorter and longer R&T episodes. In longer episodes, children also used acceptances (e.g., a boy runs out of the house - girl chases him) after enticing acts. In shorter episodes, children also used rejections (e.g., one boy grabs another boy from behind - second boy, "No, Darth Vader!") and terminations (e.g., a girl says, "The monster is back!" - partner keeps picking flowers) after enticing acts.

Children built on expressions of assumed jointness in both longer and shorter episodes (e.g., "We are the good guys." - "You say cowabunga when the bad guy comes."). The same was true for nonverbal approaches (e.g., stomp up - growl) and requests for action (e.g., "Na Na Boo Boo! You can’t catch us!" - laugh and run away). Explicit invitations only occurred in shorter bouts. Children followed these explicit invitations by emphasizing the idea they had just presented (e.g., "Do you want me to be the bad guy?" - "I’ll be the bad guy.").

Negotiation of R&T play. The following dimensions of contrast emerged in relation to kinds of negotiation acts: purpose, where used in turn, verbal/nonverbal, rate of occurrence, who uses each type of
act, and type of acts by which negotiation acts are followed (see Table 20).

Four main categories of negotiation acts emerged. These negotiations involved introducing, extending, clarifying, accepting, rejecting, or revising themes, characters/roles, and play styles/elements.

Children used the different types of expansions to maintain R&T play by adding something new to play (i.e., introductions, extensions, building on) or gathering information to help them continue play in a meaningful way (i.e., check status, regulate intensity). The characters and themes introduced, extended or built upon typically revolved around good vs. evil (e.g., puppies, Power Rangers, Power Turtles, Darth Vader, dinosaurs, scaredy cats, put bad guy in jail, good guys chased by bad guys or vice versa, good guys and bad guys fighting each other). When checking the status of play, children would gather information about roles/characters by asking questions (e.g., Who are you?”), or turn around and look back to see if they were still being chased. Children would regulate intensity by either releasing their hold on a partner or by slowing down to let a pursuer catch up.

Children utilized degrees of agreement to express varying levels of agreement with fellow participants’ ideas. When in total agreement with a partner’s idea, a child would respond with an acceptance. The responding child would imitate the ongoing play (e.g., karate movements) or follow along with the ongoing play (e.g., one child exclaims, “Run puppies, run!” and the other children run).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain: Kinds of Negotiation Acts</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Where Used in Turn</th>
<th>Verbal/Nonverbal</th>
<th>Shorter Episode Rate of Occurrence</th>
<th>Longer Episode Rate of Occurrence</th>
<th>Predominantly Used By</th>
<th>Followed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expansion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Incorporate new component</td>
<td>Anywhere</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Older children</td>
<td>Building On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Add new information or expectation to another's idea</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>All children</td>
<td>Acceptance, Building On, Extension, Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building On</td>
<td>Add new information to own idea</td>
<td>Within a turn</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>All children</td>
<td>Building On, Extension, Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Status</td>
<td>Acquire information on how to continue</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>All children</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate Intensity</td>
<td>Adjust intensity level of play</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Younger boys, older girls</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees of Agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>All children</td>
<td>Acceptance, Extension, Building On, Termination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con'd)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN: Kinds of Negotiation Acts</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Where Used in Turn</th>
<th>Verbal/Nonverbal</th>
<th>Shorter Episode</th>
<th>Longer Episode</th>
<th>Predominantly Used By</th>
<th>Shorter Episode Followed By</th>
<th>Longer Episode Followed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Older boys</td>
<td>Termination</td>
<td>Introduction, Acceptance, Termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Disagree and offer adjustment</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Older children</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Rejection, Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation</td>
<td>Resolve disagreement</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Older Boys</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>Building On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPHASES</td>
<td>Draw attention to self</td>
<td>Within a turn</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Younger girls, older children</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRELEVANT ACT</td>
<td>Interrupt or terminate play</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Older boys</td>
<td>Termination</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
researcher noted that if the children were on the same side or team, acceptance involved running with someone after another child. If the children were on opposing sides or teams, acceptance involved running from someone or chasing after someone.

When in total disagreement with a partner, a child responded with a rejection. A rejection included ignoring a partner, removing oneself from play (e.g., run off, do something else), saying no to a specific game idea (e.g., "I don’t want to play Superman."), or requesting that a partner stop activity (e.g., "Stop hugging me."). Children offered no way to resolve the disagreement when using the above strategies.

Revisions and conciliation also involved disagreement, but were different from rejections in that they offered a way to overcome the disagreement and continue play. Through revisions, children adjusted roles (e.g., "I’m not the bad guy. See, I have this good guy stick."), object use (e.g., "I’m not eating grass, I’m eating sand."), and play style, (e.g., "He has to come in so we can fight him"). Through conciliation, children resolved disagreements (e.g., "Both of us can be Darth Vader.").

Emphases were used to draw attention to one’s self by emphasizing own idea (e.g., "Do you want me to be the bad guy? I’ll be the bad guy."). Irrelevant acts had nothing to do with ongoing play. They only served to interrupt longer episodes or discontinue shorter episodes (e.g., "Don’t get my shoes sandy.").

The purpose of each negotiation act determined where it occurred in a turn. Introductions occurred anywhere in a turn because children
used these acts to add a new component to their own or others' ideas. Due to their direct relation to a fellow participant's idea, extensions, check status, regulate intensity, agreements, rejections, revisions, and conciliation occurred only in the beginning of turn. Irrelevant acts also occurred in the beginning of turns. Building on and emphases were related to a participant's own idea and therefore, only occurred within a turn.

Children expressed most types of the negotiation acts both verbally and nonverbally (i.e., introduction, extension, building on, check status, acceptance, rejection, irrelevant act). Three types of negotiation acts were strictly verbal (i.e., revision, conciliation, emphases), and one type was strictly nonverbal (i.e., regulate intensity).

The rate of occurrence for extensions, building on, acceptances, rejections, emphases, and irrelevant acts was the same across shorter and longer episodes. The occurrence of extensions, building on, and acceptances was common. Rejections were used moderately by the children. Emphases and irrelevant acts rarely were used by the children. The rate of occurrence varied across shorter and longer episodes for introductions, check status, regulate intensity, revision, and conciliation. The occurrence of all of these acts increased, either zero to rare use (i.e., regulate intensity, conciliation) or rare to moderate use (i.e., introduction, check status), from shorter to longer episodes, with the exception of revisions, which decreased from moderate to rare use.
All children utilized extensions, building on, check status, and acceptances to negotiate R&T episodes. In addition to the above strategies, older children used introductions, revisions, and emphases. Older boys also employed rejections, conciliation, and irrelevant acts, and one older girl used regulate intensity during R&T play. In addition to the strategies used by all children, younger boys used regulate intensity and younger girls used emphases during R&T play.

The researcher connected the negotiation acts to each other and terminations in the 'followed by' column of the table. She reported frequent connections. If a negotiation act was used rarely and connections were spread across negotiation acts, they were not referenced in the table.

Children built on introductions in longer R&T episodes (e.g., boy hollers, "I'm X-boy!" - then makes shooting sounds). Introductions were used infrequently in shorter episodes, and no clear connections emerged.

In longer episodes, extensions were followed by extensions (e.g., a boy climbs out of center of climber - girl shouts, "Oh no! He's getting out."). Children built on (e.g., "Oh no! He's right behind us!" - "Go faster!") and accepted (e.g., a girl breaks free and runs - another girl chases her) extensions in both longer and shorter episodes.

Children followed building on with extensions (e.g., boy growls at girl - girl screams, "Run!") and acceptances (e.g., girl explains, "You have to chase us because we are both Darth Vaders.") -
boy chases) in both longer and shorter R&T bouts. Building on was also followed by building on in longer bouts (e.g., "Run pups."
"This way doggies."), and terminations (e.g., a boy growls at a girl - girl laughs and keeps riding tricycle) in shorter bouts.

After one child checked status of play in longer R&T episodes, another child would then extend play (e.g., girl, "Who is the bad guy?" - boy, "They have to come in, right?") . Check status was used infrequently in shorter episodes, and no clear connections emerged.

Regulate intensity was not used at all in shorter episodes. In longer episodes, regulate intensity was followed by extensions (e.g., a girl relaxes her hold on a boy, but still has his shirt - boy tries to pull away).

In both longer and shorter R&T episodes, children followed acceptances with acceptances (e.g., girls run - a boy chases them) and terminations (e.g., a boy chases two children around playground to climber - all three rest at climber). Acceptances also were extended (e.g., run after someone - grab them from behind) and built on (e.g., girl runs from boy - girl, "Hey, Darth Vader!" as twists hand by ears) in longer episodes.

Rejections were followed by terminations (e.g., two boys make contact when clawing at each other and one says, "Stop! That hurt!" - then he goes to work bench) in both longer and shorter R&T episodes. In longer episodes, rejections were also followed by acceptances (a girl tells a boy to let her go, "I said stop it!" - the boy lets her
go) and introductions (e.g., boy, "No more!" to being chased - girl, "Whoever touches me is on my team."

In shorter R&T episodes, revisions were followed by acceptances (e.g., boy, "You are nice." - girl stops growling). Children would either revise (e.g., one boy rejects another's Superman idea, "Let's play Ninja Turtles." - the other boy responds, "No, I'm playing Superman." ) or reject (e.g., as she points to two boys a girl says, "No, they are scaredy cats." - one of the two boys leaves) revisions in longer episodes.

Conciliation was not used at all in shorter episodes. In longer episodes, children followed conciliation with building on (e.g., after disagreeing about who can be Darth Vader, a boy suggests, "Both of us can be Darth Vader." - then starts running with partner).

Emphases were used infrequently in both longer and shorter R&T episodes. No clear connections emerged.

In shorter episodes, irrelevant acts were followed by terminations (e.g., child, "You know what we did? We jumped from way up here (top of climber). - teacher, "Well, don't do that anymore." ) Irrelevant acts were used infrequently in longer episodes, and no clear connections emerged.

Terminating R&T play. The following dimensions of contrast emerged regarding ways to terminate R&T play: how it works, verbal/nonverbal, rate of occurrence, who uses each method, and types of acts terminations follow (see Table 21).

Interruptions by teachers and children disrupted the flow of play. Nonverbal departures basically involved leaving the
Table 21. Ways to Terminate R&T Play: Componential Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN: Ways to Terminate R&amp;T Play</th>
<th>How It Works</th>
<th>Rate of Occurrence</th>
<th>Predominantly Used By</th>
<th>Follow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shorter Episode</td>
<td>Longer Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruption by Child</td>
<td>Disrupts play</td>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>(Director and Graduate Assistants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruption by Teacher</td>
<td>Disrupts play</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Departure</td>
<td>Leave interaction</td>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinterest in R&amp;T Play</td>
<td>Lack of interest</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Non R&amp;T Play</td>
<td>Lose interest</td>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dimensions of Contrast

- Rate of Occurrence: Shorter Episode, Longer Episode
- Predominantly Used By: Older children
- Follow: shorter Episode, Longer Episode
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interaction. Terminations categorized as 'disinterest in R&T play' revealed a lack of interest in R&T play. Children would continue an activity in which they were already involved, or they would just discontinue R&T play. Terminations categorized as 'interest in non R&T play' involved losing interest in R&T play over the course of an episode. Children would either stop R&T play and get involved in another activity, or stop R&T play and rest.

Verbal explanations for terminations were used only when teachers interrupted R&T play or when children expressed a disinterest in R&T play. The remaining termination categories were strictly nonverbal.

Expressing an interest in non R&T play was a common termination strategy for longer and shorter R&T episodes. The rate of occurrence for nonverbal departures was rare in longer and shorter episodes. There was a slight decrease in disinterest in R&T play and interruptions by child, but a slight increase in interruptions by teacher, from shorter to longer R&T episodes.

Older children, in general, utilized interruptions and nonverbal departures to terminate R&T play episodes. Older boys, in particular, terminated R&T play by expressing disinterest in R&T play or interest in non R&T play. Younger children used nonverbal departure to end R&T play.

The researcher connected terminations acts to invitations and negotiation acts in the 'follows' column of the table. She reported frequent connections. If a termination strategy was used rarely and
connections were spread across negotiation acts, they were not referenced in the table.

Child interruptions were infrequent in shorter R&T episodes and nonexistent in longer episodes. No clear connections emerged.

Teacher interruptions were used infrequently in shorter R&T episodes and no clear connections emerged. In longer episodes, teacher interruptions followed extensions (e.g., two children pile one another - teacher asks them to stop) and acceptances (e.g., a boy makes a karate chop at another boy - teacher tells the boys they are playing too rough).

Nonverbal departures followed rejections (e.g., a boy says, "No, Darth Vader!" - then runs off) in shorter R&T episodes. Due to infrequent use of nonverbal departures in longer episodes, no clear connections emerged.

In shorter R&T episodes, disinterest in R&T followed building on (e.g., boy growls at girl on tricycle - girl laughs and keeps riding tricycle), invitations (e.g., girl tells a boy, "I know where Darth Vader is." - boy ignores her), and rejections (e.g., one boy ignores another boy shooting at him - then continues to play on slide). Disinterest in R&T play followed acceptances (e.g., two boys run away from a third boy - third boy doesn't chase them) in longer episodes.

The connections that emerged for interest in non R&T play were the same for both shorter and longer episodes. Interest in non R&T play followed acceptances (e.g., boy runs from a girl - girl stops chasing boy and goes to play in house) and rejections (e.g., a girl
pulls a boy to the ground and he just sits there - then he goes to pick flowers).

**Relationships between Participation in R&T Play and Selected Child Characteristics**

Five null hypotheses were tested for the confirmatory component of the study. The researcher conducted separate t-tests to examine relationships between child sex or age, and proportion of R&T episodes in which a child participated. The first t-test revealed a significant difference ($t(17) = -2.322, p = .033$) between the proportion of R&T episodes in which older and younger children participate. Older children participated in proportionally more R&T episodes than did younger children (Means = .22 and .10, respectively). Therefore, hypothesis 1 (i.e., there is no relationship between children's age and their involvement in R&T play) was rejected.

The second t-test revealed a marginally significant difference ($t(17) = 1.925, p = .071$) between proportion of R&T episodes in which boys and girls participated. Boys participated in proportionally more R&T episodes than did girls (Means = .21 and .10, respectively). Therefore, hypotheses 2 (i.e., there is no relationship between children's sex and their involvement in R&T play) was rejected.

The researcher utilized correlational analyses to explore relationships between children's participation in R&T play and their peer status (i.e., popularity, rejection, and acceptance) as measured by positive peer nominations, negative peer nominations, and peer ratings. The results indicated a significant positive correlation between positive nominations and the proportion of R&T episodes in
which a child participated \((r = .42, p = .037)\) so that preschoolers who were more popular with their peers (i.e., received more positive peer nominations) participated in proportionally more R&T bouts. Therefore, hypothesis 3 (i.e., there is no relationship between children’s level of popularity in the peer group and their involvement in R&T play) was rejected.

The findings revealed a marginally significant negative correlation between negative peer nominations and the proportion of R&T episodes in which a child participated \((r = -.37, p = .058)\) so that the children who were more rejected by their peers (i.e., received more negative peer nominations) participated in proportionally fewer R&T bouts. Therefore, hypothesis 4 (i.e., there is no relationship between children’s level of rejection by the peer group and their involvement in R&T play) was rejected.

No significant correlation emerged between peer ratings and the proportion of R&T episodes in which a child participated. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject hypothesis 5 (i.e., there is no relationship between children’s level of acceptance by the peer group and their involvement in R&T play).
Chapter V

Discussion

The current study included an exploratory, as well as, a confirmatory component. The exploratory component, and primary objective of the study, involved developing an understanding of how children negotiate intersubjectivity (i.e., shared understanding) during R&T play. This included describing the context (i.e., playground and network of relationships) and the experiences of children as they jointly negotiated a shared understanding of R&T play. The researcher discovered, in R&T play, a structure and level of shared thinking among participants similar to other types social play. The confirmatory component, and secondary objective of the study, involved conducting analyses on certain child characteristics as they related to participation in R&T play episodes. A portion of the findings from this aspect of the study corroborated findings from previous research.

The section entitled Preschool Children’s Negotiation of Intersubjectivity during R&T Play contains a discussion of findings from the exploratory component of the study. A discussion of findings from the confirmatory component of the study is located in the section Relationships between Participation in R&T Play and Selected Child Characteristics. The chapter concludes with the following sections: (a) summary of findings, (b) contributions, (c) implications, and (d) directions for future research.
Preschool Children's Negotiation of
Intersubjectivity during R&T Play

At first glance, R&T play may appear to only be wrestling and
chasing. However, the current study provided a closer examination of
R&T play and revealed structural features (i.e., beginning, middle,
end) and a joint negotiation of shared thinking (i.e.,
is intersubjectivity) similar to other types of social play.

For R&T play to be beneficial to children, it must have certain
characteristics. One of the most important characteristics for
successful social play, in general (Garvey, 1974; Howes, Unger, &
Matheson, 1992; Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987), and R&T play, in
particular (DiPietro, 1981), is cooperation. Indeed, cooperation at
every stage of play, especially when negotiating shared thinking,
emerged as a necessary component for maintenance of R&T episodes in
the current study. The remainder of the discussion is organized
around the playground as a place for negotiation, the children as
negotiators, and the structure of a R&T episode.

Playground: A Place for Negotiation

The researcher chose the playground for the social situation
because R&T play, the primary focus of the study, occurs on the
playground. Hart (1993) points out that in comparison to other
contexts, playgrounds are environments where children have more
freedom to interact primarily free from adult-imposed rules. This
allows researchers to explore child behavior as it naturally unfolds
(Hart, 1993).

Similar to findings from earlier research (Smith & Humphreys,
1987), rough-and-tumble play primarily occurred on softer playground
surfaces (i.e., grass, sand). Children incorporated two concrete playground areas into R&T episodes. When children engaged in play fighting behavior on the concrete porch, however, they did so on a blue gymnastics mat, thus softening the surface. The concrete tricycle path, on the other hand, was typically utilized as part of a chase path rather than for play fighting, thus making a soft surface somewhat less important.

The differences between the use of location in play fighting and play chasing, and in shorter versus longer episodes, which emerged in the current study, have not been reported in previous literature. Play fights were static in nature with children being rooted to one spot during the episode. Conversely, the mobility required for chasing lead to the development of paths. Additionally, longer episodes allowed for the development of paths that included stopping points for negotiation. On the other hand, shorter episodes involved only one spot on the playground. Consequently, the length of the R&T episode again appeared as a factor related to emerging differences in this type of play.

In some R&T play episodes, playground equipment became props for play. For example, the children sometimes referred to the climber as a jail during their negotiations of R&T play. When this designation was made, the children’s R&T play revolved around catching someone and putting him/her in jail, keeping someone in jail, or someone getting out of jail. In other episodes, the climber was simply a safe place to rest, and the children would sit on the bars and discuss how play should continue. The children acted toward the climber based on the meaning it had for them. Additionally, this meaning (e.g.,
climber as a jail) was constructed through negotiation during social interaction. This example of meaning construction shaping behavior has a basis in symbolic interactionism, the theoretical framework guiding the current study (Blumer, 1969).

Children: Negotiators

Findings corroborated previous research reporting both boys and girls (Smith, et al., 1992), and younger and older preschoolers (Hart, DeWolf, Wozniak, & Burts, 1992; Pellegrini, 1984) participate in R&T. Qualitative analyses revealed varying levels and types of participation for boys and girls and older and younger preschoolers. While girls were typically involved in R&T play at a minimal to moderate level, boys were involved in R&T at a moderate to high level. Younger children's level of participation ranged from minimal to moderate. Older children's level of participation encompassed the entire range, minimal to high. This slight indication of an increase between younger and older children in the interactional length of R&T play episodes offers some support for Goncu's (1993a) hypothesis that children's play becomes increasingly shared with age.

The various types of participation were spread throughout both sexes and ages of children. Type of participation in R&T play appears to be more a function of general interaction style than of sex and age.

The researcher discovered discrepancies when comparing information from egocentric network sociograms, cliques, and teacher's perceptions of children's playmate choices. It is important to note that these information sources were based on perceptions of children, researcher, and teachers, respectively. These perceptions arose from
each person's own observation and understanding of the situation. One would expect these perceptions to be somewhat inconsistent based on the fact the children, researcher, and teachers all have varying viewpoints.

Smith and Lewis (1985) found that R&T partners were liked above average and tended to be nominated as "best friend" on sociometric measures. Conversely, R&T play partners are not usually nominated as "argued with a lot" or "least liked." Some support for this finding was offered by the complete network sociograms based on positive and negative nominations. For example, Roger was popular and had a high level of participation in R&T. Ellen, Jill, and Wayne were rejected and had a low level of participation in R&T play.

Co-membership sociograms revealed a stable and consistent pattern of relationships from shorter to longer R&T play episodes. Boulton (1991a) found with school-age children, that even though both initiators and recipients of R&T play bouts liked each other more than chance would predict, this was also the case for activities that were not R&T play. He suggested that the choice of partners in R&T play, and other activities, is probably more an indication of existing friendships/affiliations rather than a context for the formation of those friendships. Perhaps R&T play is one context, not necessarily for forming friends per se, but rather for maintaining these relationships (Boulton & Smith, 1992; Smith, 1989).

The researcher discovered that cliques often included both positive and negative nominations of any particular child. Basically, the cliques included a more expansive group of children than were indicated by the connections appearing on each child's positive
nomination sociogram. Perhaps, R&T play serves as a context that allows all children (i.e., friends and nonfriends) to interact, with a child's positive choices, or friends, serving as buffers against a child's negative choices, or nonfriends. Additionally, it may be necessary to look at cliques as a more complete indication of existing affiliations than are the egocentric network sociograms based on limited choice positive or negative nominations. More work is needed to determine if this is true.

Structure of R&T Episode: Steps for Negotiation

The remainder of the discussion pertaining to qualitative results will focus on the structure of R&T episodes. It is this structure that contributes to the construction of shared understanding among participants.

Initiation. For R&T play to begin, a child or children must offer an initiation of some type. Rommetveit (1979) suggests that at this point, the beginning of an interaction, the participants make two presuppositions related to intersubjectivity. First, participants must be willing to negotiate a shared understanding. Second, the speaker presumes the listener has some knowledge about the idea introduced, the listener's knowledge is similar to his/own, and the listener will react in an appropriate manner (e.g., with behaviors congruent to a particular role).

Consistent with earlier research (Boulton, 1991a; Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Sluckin, 1981), R&T play initiations resembled an invitation where respondents could choose whether or not to join play. The categories of invitations emerging from the current study followed closely those delineated by Goncu (1993a). Enticing acts, a common
strategy used by all the children, were well suited for initiating R&T play. These acts were comprised of R&T play behavior, often accompanied by teasing (Blurton Jones, 1967, 1972; Boulton & Smith, 1989), and were used to attract attention to the initiator.

The influence of movies and television on children's play was evident in the fact that the children incorporated a variety of media characters (e.g., Ninja Turtle, Power Rangers) in their R&T play. The study coincided with the re-release of the movie "Star Wars," and the twins, Roy and Troy, often hummed the Darth Vader tune for initiating R&T play. When using this initiation strategy, Roy and Troy assumed the other children knew the tune was related to the character, Darth Vader, that Darth Vader was a bad guy, and that the appropriate behavior would be to run away. This is another example of the children reacting to an object (i.e., Troy as Darth Vader), based on the meaning that object has for them. In this case, meaning was perhaps originally constructed in another context (i.e., movie theater), and applied in the context of R&T play on the playground. This example once again highlights the link between the negotiation of shared meaning and interaction, which is such a part of symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969).

Requests for action and nonverbal approaches were used specifically for initiating chases. Older girls utilized requests for action to verbally request another child to chase them. This makes sense in relation to earlier research which found that girls were more involved in chasing than play fighting (Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Smith & Connolly, 1972). Younger boys used the surprise element of nonverbal approach to get other children to run. DiPietro (1981)
found that boys were less likely to verbally structure their interactions. In the current study, this appears to be the case for younger boys only. Older boys used expressions of assumed jointness in which they initiated R&T play by verbally assigning roles to themselves and/or to others. They sometimes aided their fellow participants' construction of shared understanding by adding information to an expression of assumed jointness that indicated appropriate behavior for a particular character (e.g., "We are the good guys. You say cowabunga when the bad guy comes.").

In shorter bouts, invitations were followed more often by acts where the recipient of the invitations rejected the invitation and/or terminated the R&T episode, and less often by acts of building on or extension. Invitations in longer bouts were followed by acts where the initiator built on his/her invitation, or a recipient of the invitation extended or accepted the invitation. It is evident that in the longer episode, the focus is on maintaining the current interaction. The concept underlying these initiations was cooperation. Either the initiator expresses a willingness to negotiate by offering additional information in the form of building on, or the partner expresses an understanding of the initiator's play idea by extending or accepting it.

Negotiation. As the recipient of an initiation responds, the initiator tests the presuppositions (i.e., willingness to negotiate; listener has similar knowledge base and will react appropriately) delineated by Rommetveit (1979). The testing of these presuppositions is focus of the next section.
During social play, children negotiate themes and ideas for play, roles adopted during play and rules for behavior associated with a particular role, and scripts. These plans, which are jointly negotiated by children, can and often do change as play evolves. This process involves give-and-take and cooperation (Garvey, 1974; Howes, Unger, & Matheson, 1992; Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987).

As outlined by symbolic interactionists, participants in social interactions are able to shape their behavior in a way acceptable to everyone through the negotiation of different personal understandings to a shared understanding or meaning (Blumer, 1969). These negotiations are not static, but rather evolve during the course of interaction (Goncu, 1987, 1993a, 1993b). Participants constantly create, maintain, and change the objects of their world as they construct the meaning of a particular situation (Berk & Winsler, 1995; Blumer, 1969).

The kinds of negotiation acts that emerged from sifting through the R&T episodes were similar to the four categories outlined by Goncu (1993a). The first category of negotiation acts, expansions, were used to maintain R&T play by adding information or gathering information to help children continue play in a meaningful way. The first three subcategories of expansions—introductions, extensions, and building on—were aimed at not only establishing, but also maintaining a shared understanding of play. They required an understanding of the previously presented idea, and a knowledge of appropriate behaviors for responding.

Introductions, extensions, and building on sometimes involved alternating roles from offense to defense or vice versa (e.g., Lindsey
began by chasing a boy to put in jail; she changes role to Darth Vader and directs another child to chase her). This is referred to in the R&T literature as role reversals (Boulton, 1991a). In many research studies (Pellegrini, 1987, 1992, 1993), role reversal serves as a defining characteristic of R&T play.

Findings from the current study corroborated earlier research indicating role reversals can be both immediate and delayed (Boulton, 1991a). For example, Roy and Troy chased and were chased as Darth Vader over the course of one episode as well as over a period of several days. Most of the roles revolved around the theme of good versus evil, which lends itself to the nature of R&T play fighting (e.g., good guy vs. bad guy) and chasing (e.g., Darth Vader chasing others).

The analyses revealed two additional subcategories of expansions - check status and regulate intensity - children used to establish shared understanding of R&T play. Even though the rate of occurrence was rare to moderate for check status, and zero to rare for regulate intensity, across shorter and longer R&T episodes, the researcher retained the two new subcategories for several reasons. First, shorter bouts did not allow time for R&T play to become intense enough to regulate. Second, these categories could be unique to R&T play. In fact, regulate intensity is similar to the self-handicapping reported in the R&T literature. Self-handicapping is when a child intentionally lessens the intensity of his/her actions to allow a fellow participant a chance to change roles (Boulton, 1991a). Strategies to regulate intensity involved intentionally slowing down to resist catching a fleeing child (Boulton & Smith, 1992), releasing
hold on a fellow participant, or slowing down so pursuers can catch
up. Boulton and Smith (1992) suggest these strategies, along with
role reversal, create an environment for the compromise and
cooperation essential to successful episodes of R&T play. Third,
these categories may be more easily detected in video-taped R&T play
episodes, which were not available in the current study.

The second main category of negotiation acts, degrees of
agreement, requires a participant have some level of shared
understanding of a fellow participant’s idea before offering a level
of agreement (Goncu, 1993a). Acceptances, through agreement, and
revisions and conciliation, through resolving disagreements, also
serve to maintain or reestablish intersubjectivity. Conversely,
rejections can be seen as a way to dissolve shared understanding.

When Roy, who had been Darth Vader throughout an R&T play
episode, responded to the question “Who are you?” with “I don’t have
my mask, and when I don’t have my mask, I can’t chase you,” he
revised the meaning the other children had for him. Based on this new
information, the other children no longer had to run from Roy because
he was no longer Darth Vader. This example illustrates the dynamic
nature of meaning construction through interaction as described in
symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969).

Echoing the findings of Goncu (1993a), the remaining categories,
emphases and irrelevant acts were not useful in negotiating a shared
understanding of play. Children repeated their own ideas in emphases,
without consideration for others’ ideas. Irrelevant acts reflected a
lack of understanding or interest in a fellow participant’s idea.
Similar to Goncu's (1993a) study, most of the negotiation acts observed in the current study, contained nonverbal and verbal forms. The exceptions were revisions, conciliation and emphases. The researcher observed only verbal forms of these three types of negotiation acts.

Extensions, building on, and acceptances were common in both longer and shorter episodes. This would seem to suggest the same level of cooperation between shorter and longer episodes. It is important to remember, however, the difference relative to the number of acts within each type of episode (i.e., shorter episodes - 5 or less; longer episodes - 6 or more). Introductions were rare in shorter episodes. This could be because the length of these episodes provided no opportunity to develop one character much less introduce a new one. Rejections received moderate use in both longer and shorter episodes. It is unclear why revisions decreased from moderate use in shorter episodes to rare use in longer episodes. Conciliation was used only in longer episodes, and even then, rarely.

Contradicting earlier research (Goncu, 1993a), results from the current study did not distinguish between younger and older children's use of extensions, building on, or acceptances. Older children and older boys used introductions, rejections, revisions, and conciliation. Based on experience, older children may have more R&T play ideas to introduce than younger children. Older boys' use of rejections may be related to their having definite ideas about R&T play. Their use of revisions and conciliation represents their ability to disagree and then get back on track. Contrary to earlier findings characterizing boys as less likely to verbally structure
their interactions (DiPietro, 1981), the current study did not find this to be the case for older boys.

Consistent with an earlier study (Goncu, 1993a), the present researcher also discovered preschool children follow a particular pattern when they negotiate intersubjectivity during R&T play. According to previous research, preschool children establish shared understanding by responding to extensions with extensions, introductions, and acceptances instead of disagreement or irrelevant acts, with the extension-extension sequence being the most common response sequence (Goncu, 1993a; Goncu & Kessel, 1988). The connections that emerged from longer episodes in the current study were similar to those found by Goncu (1993). This finding offered some support for earlier work reporting utterances of the same kind follow each other with significantly greater likelihood than utterances of different kinds (Goncu & Kessel, 1988).

The current study also extended Goncu’s (1993a) work by examining other sequences of negotiation acts, as well as connections with initiations and terminations. Results indicated that children can maintain longer bouts of joint activity, in this case, R&T play, by extending or accepting a fellow participant’s ideas or building on to their own.

Termination. Eventually, R&T episodes came to an end. According to Boulton (1991a), respecting a fellow participants’ wishes about ending an episode of R&T play is a requirement of participation. Once again, some level of cooperation is necessary for this part of a R&T episode as well.
In addition to the termination acts Goncu (1993a) outlined in an earlier study, interruptions by child and interruptions by teacher were termination acts discovered in the current study. Goncu (1993a) observed dyads of children in a laboratory setting where no interruptions could occur. The current study, on the other hand, used a naturalistic setting in which varying groups of children interacted with each other and their teachers, thus providing opportunities for these interruptions to occur.

Though rare, older children would sometimes interrupt a R&T episode already in progress. These children did not appear to be interested in negotiating a shared understanding with all participants in an ongoing R&T play episode. Rather, they were intent on pulling one participant out of R&T play and into another activity. A clear picture about why this was the case did not emerge from the current study. If an older child was pulling another older child from R&T play, it could be related to wanting to play with established friends with whom they have been in the program for two years. These friends would have a base of common experiences and knowledge from which to draw play ideas (Howes, Unger, & Matheson, 1992).

Interruptions by teacher occurred in relation to play fighting. Adults are able to distinguish play fighting from aggression (Boulton, 1993b; Schafer & Smith, 1996). However, teachers in the current study were still quick to discourage play fighting, possibly because they were afraid it would turn into aggression. Additionally, Schafer and Smith (1996) reported that distinguishing play fighting from aggression is a skill that develops with experience. In the current study, the teachers' (i.e., director, graduate assistants, student
teachers) experience working with preschool children paralleled that of beginning teachers. The teachers' level of experience may have been a factor contributing to their tendency to interrupt play fighting.

A variety of children utilized nonverbal departure. This type of termination involved nothing more than walking away from the interaction. Although a clear picture of why children walked away from the interaction did not emerge from the current study, becoming bored or tired could be possible reasons for this departure.

Older boys were typically the ones to terminate R&T play by expressing a disinterest in R&T play or an interest in another type of activity. This may be related to the fact that older boys had a high level of participation in R&T episodes. Many of the R&T episodes were initiated by older boys and they were the primary participants, therefore, it stands to reason that they would be the ones to terminate R&T play.

In shorter episodes, terminations followed rejections, invitations, acceptance, or building on. These terminations typically reflected a child's disinterest in continuing R&T play, and therefore, an unwillingness to negotiate a shared understanding. In longer R&T episodes, terminations followed rejections and acceptances. When children used rejection to express disagreement with a fellow participant, they offered no way to resolve that disagreement. The lack of negotiation surrounding rejections sometimes led to termination of the R&T episode. Acceptances commonly are related to agreement, and thus cooperation in maintaining an interaction. However, if a R&T episode continued simply because everyone agreed
with each other's ideas, but never offered any new information, then children might lose interest, resulting in the termination of the R&T episode.

**Relationships between Participation in R&T Play and Selected Child Characteristics**

Findings from previous research exploring relationships between R&T play and children's social status have been inconsistent (Pelligrini, 1987). In the current study, results indicated preschoolers who were more popular with their peers participated in proportionally more R&T bouts. Conversely, preschoolers who were more rejected by their peers participated in proportionally fewer R&T bouts. These findings are similar to those from Smith & Lewis (1985) who found that R&T partners were liked above average and tended to be nominated as "best friend," and that R&T partners were not usually nominated as "argued with a lot" or "least liked." Pellegrini (1989a, 1989b) also reported a positive relationship between boys' popularity and R&T play. Taken together, these findings offer support for the belief that R&T play is a social activity that children primarily engage in with friends (Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Smith & Lewis, 1985).

Contradictory to the above results, other researchers have reported a negative relation between children's R&T play and popularity (Hart, DeWolf, Wozniak, & Burts, 1992; Ladd, 1983). The emergence of this negative relation in some studies may be due to the practice of including R&T play and aggression in the same category for analyses (Ladd, 1983). Any relationships that may exist for these behaviors separately are lost in this type of categorization.
No relationship emerged between peer ratings and the proportion of R&T episodes in which a child participated. The failure to find a relationship between children's acceptance in the peer group and their participation in R&T play may be due to the range of the rating scores (i.e., 1.50 to 2.56). The small range may have made it difficult to detect differences in R&T participation based on rating scores.

The finding from the current study regarding the relationship between children's sex and their participation in R&T play corroborated earlier research (Hart, DeWolf, Wozniak, & Burts, 1992). Males participated in more R&T play than females. Findings from studies in which researchers separated play fighting and chasing behaviors for analyses reveal, however, that this sex difference is more obvious for the play fighting component of R&T play (Blurton Jones, 1967, 1972; DiPietro, 1981; Humphreys & Smith, 1987) than for the chasing component (Humphreys & Smith, 1987; Smith and Connolly, 1972). Indeed, both boys and girls have reported liking and participating in play chasing. Researchers have found, however, that boys were more likely than girls to report liking and participating in play fighting (Smith, et al., 1992).

Also consistent with previous research (Hart, DeWolf, Wozniak, & Burts, 1992) findings from the current study indicated that older preschoolers participated in more R&T play than younger preschoolers. Both play fighting and chasing are a common part of children's behavioral repertoires by the time they are three and four years old (Blurton Jones, 1967, 1972; DiPietro, 1981; McGrew, 1972; Smith & Connolly, 1972; Smith, 1974). The frequency of R&T play increases as
children get older until it reaches a peak in middle childhood (Pellegrini & Smith, 1998).

**Summary of Findings**

Rough-and-tumble play is one type of social play that emerges during the preschool years. Researchers have hypothesized that R&T play serves as a vehicle for social development as well as a reflection of that development (Smith, 1989; Smith & Boulton, 1990). A necessary component of R&T play, or any type of social play, is that children negotiate a shared understanding regarding that play. The results of the current study shed light on how children negotiate a shared understanding within the structure of R&T play. Investigating characteristics of children's negotiation of shared understanding (i.e., intersubjectivity) within the structure of R&T play offered insight as to how this type of play contributes to children's participation in the social world.

Similar to successful social interactions described by Guralnick (1992), and Tudge and Rogoff (1989), cooperative R&T episodes included effective and appropriate behavior and knowledge given a particular situation. Children involved in longer R&T episodes attended to the features of the social situation and others' actions. They constructed their behavioral responses, based on their negotiation of personal understandings into shared understanding, across sequences of social exchange as a way to maintain R&T play. Additionally, the slight indication of an increase between younger and older children in the interaction length of R&T episodes offers some support for Goncu's (1993a) hypothesis that children's play becomes increasingly shared or cooperative with age.
Preschool children followed a particular pattern when they negotiated intersubjectivity during R&T play. They established shared understanding or intersubjectivity by responding to extensions with extensions, introductions, building on, and acceptances. This structure was both similar and different across longer and shorter R&T play episodes. The structure of longer and shorter episodes was similar in that both contained a beginning, middle, and end. However, shorter R&T episodes were characterized by shorter negotiations between initiation and termination. Longer episodes, on the other hand, were characterized by lengthier negotiations between initiations and terminations.

Differences between the use of location on the playground in play fighting and play chasing, and in shorter versus longer episodes, emerged from the current study. Play fights and shorter R&T episodes typically involved only one spot on the playground. Play chasing and longer R&T episodes allowed for the development of paths.

Both boys and girls, and younger and older preschoolers participated in R&T play. Type of participation in R&T play, however appears to be more a function of general interaction style than of sex and age.

Co-membership complete sociograms revealed a stable and consistent pattern of relationships from shorter to longer R&T episodes. Cliques included a more expansive group of children than were indicated by the connections appearing on each child’s egocentric sociogram based on positive nominations.

These findings need to be interpreted in light of certain limitations. The children came from somewhat homogeneous
socioeconomic backgrounds. They attended a university laboratory preschool with an excellent adult/child ratio and playground conducive to R&T play. Indeed, much of the playground was covered by soft surfaces such as sand and grass. Finally, the researcher collected sociometric data at one point in time. Prior research (McConnell & Odom, 1986) has shown that preschool children’s responses to sociometric assessments can change over time.

**Contributions**

The current study extended the intersubjectivity literature by examining how this shared understanding was negotiated in another type of social play (i.e., R&T play) as it occurred in a naturalistic setting (i.e., the playground). Additionally, the results of the present study illuminated connections not only among extensions and other negotiation acts (Goncu, 1993a), but also among each type of negotiation act, invitations, and terminations.

The R&T play literature was expanded by the qualitative information provided in the current study regarding the structure of R&T episodes and how that structure influences children’s negotiation of a shared understanding of R&T play. Also, the differences between the use of playground location in play fighting and play chasing, and in shorter versus longer R&T episodes, which emerged from the current study, have not been reported in previous literature.

The present study also made methodological contributions to the field. The researcher developed a definition of a R&T episode that was sensitive not only to children’s behaviors, but also to their dialogue during R&T play. Additionally, the researcher utilized mixed methods (i.e., participant observation; interviews; social network...
analysis, etc.) to develop an understanding of how children negotiate intersubjectivity during R&T play, and what role contextual factors played in this process. Hopefully, future researchers will see the value in the detail provided by qualitative data collection and analyses. Information gained from this type of research could provide insight into findings from earlier R&T research, as well as suggest questions for future quantitative analyses.

**Implications**

The findings from the current study have implications for research and practice. Findings related to the structure and cooperative nature of R&T play reemphasizes the need to study R&T play as a type of social play. Rough-and-tumble play should not be lumped together with aggression or other types of disruptive behavior in research studies.

Information from the current study offers teachers a better understanding of the complex negotiations involved in cooperative R&T play. This insight may then encourage teachers to be more observant of what children are doing during R&T play, and to discover how they can enhance cooperative R&T play. Additionally, an awareness of the different types of negotiation acts could provide teachers with another method of assessing children’s ability to participate successfully in the social world.

**Directions for Future Research**

In future research, video taping R&T episodes would prove especially useful in identifying acts belonging to the check status and regulate intensity categories of negotiation acts. These video-taped R&T episodes could also be used as a point of reference when
interviewing children about R&T play. In this way, the flow of children’s play would not be interrupted.

More work needs to be done comparing shorter and longer R&T episodes. Do shorter R&T play episodes reflect noncooperative R&T play not adequately regulated for affect? Do cooperative longer episodes become uncooperative, and if so, what is the reason for the change?

Another interesting study would involve exploring children’s developing relationships and how negotiation strategies change or evolve with those relationships. What happens when a group of friends are involved in R&T play, and a child who is not considered a friend enters the group? By creating network sociograms for more than one point in time (i.e., “putting the maps in motion”), researchers could gain insight into how the network of relationships affects the children’s negotiation of R&T play.
References


Appendix A

University Human Subjects Committee Approval Forms
ACTION ON PROTOCOL APPROVAL REQUEST

TO: Dr. Diane C. Burts

FROM: Interim Chair, Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects

RE: IRB #1987 DATE: March 14
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PROTOCOL #

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM FOR HUMAN RESEARCH

1. Principal Investigator: Diane C. Burts
   Department: ______________ Phone: __________

   Co-Investigator:
   Department: ______________ Phone: __________

   Student: Michele DeWolf
   Department: ______________ Phone: __________

2. Project title or course name and number: Preschool Children's Negotiation of Intersubjectivity during Rough-and-Tumble Play

3. Proposed duration of project: 9 weeks

4. Site of data collection: University Laboratory Preschool

5. Funding will be sought from: N/A

6. Provide an abstract of the proposed project. Include:
   (1) Objective and significance of the project/course; (2) A description of the procedures the subjects will undergo. Use language appropriate for reviewers/researchers outside your field.

7. Describe the risks, if any, to which the subjects may be exposed.

   One procedure proposed for this study is sociometric interviews. During this interview, a child nominates peers who fit positive or negative descriptors, or rates peers in terms of likability. The information gained from this process is used to determine a child's social position in the peer group or to identify a less accepted child who may benefit from intervention. Some parents, teachers, and ethics review committees speculate that some risk is involved in administering sociometric measures. These risks include the possibility that using this measure may condone the making of negative comments about other people, lead to a more negative view of rejected children than already exists, or cause an increase in negative interactions with unpopular peers (see Bell-Dolan & Wessler, 1994). However, researchers studying the impact of sociometric interviews have not found support for the hypothesis that participation in studies that use sociometric measures involve risks any greater than those ordinarily encountered in everyday life. Children did not increase their negative interactions with unpopular peers, were not more socially withdrawn, and did not express feelings of unhappiness or loneliness following participation in studies that used sociometric measures (Bell-Dolan, Foster, & Christopher, 1992; Bell-Dolan, Foster, & Sikora, 1989; Hayvren & Hymel, 1984).
8. What steps will be taken to minimize risks?

Ethically sound sociometric procedures minimize any negative impact on subjects. Bell-Dolan and Wessler (1994) outlined several techniques researchers should use to ensure the ethical administration of sociometric measures. Researchers should: (a) obtain active written parental consent, (b) give children a choice about whether or not to participate in the task, (c) administer sociometric tasks individually whenever possible, (d) not administer sociometric tasks right before unstructured periods, (e) help children put the task in perspective by discussing topics such as the importance of friendships or being sensitive to others' feelings, and (f) provide confidentiality instructions. The researcher will use these techniques in the current study.

9. Are design alternatives available which would eliminate or reduce risks? ____ Yes  ____ No. If yes, provide justification for not using.

10. Describe any surgical or invasive, non-surgical procedure.

11. For the procedures in the preceding item, provide the qualifications of the person performing such tasks.

12. If drugs are to be administered, state the drug name, actions and dosages.

13. State the qualifications of the person who will administer the drug(s).

14. Describe the process used to select subjects. Purposive sampling will be used to select information-rich cases. Preschool children will be the focus of this study and will be recruited from the University Laboratory Preschool.

15. Describe the process through which informed consent was obtained. An information letter describing the project and seeking parental consent will be distributed to parents of children attending the Laboratory Preschool. Interested parents will return the signed consent form to the preschool director. They will have the opportunity to ask questions at any time before, during, and after the study.

16. How will the privacy of the subjects and the confidentiality of the data be maintained? Children's real names will not be used in any field notes. Rather, each child will be assigned a pseudo-name to ensure confidentiality. Any reporting of findings will be in the form of a general discussion about what was discovered regarding children's negotiation of intersubjectivity in rough-and-tumble play. Information about an individual child will not be provided to anyone.
17. If a physician is involved in your project, state their name, address and telephone number.

18. Is a copy of your consent form attached to the protocol?  
   X Yes    ____ No.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR STATEMENT:

I have read and agree to abide by the University policy on use of human subjects. The project will be conducted in accordance with OPRR guidelines for Human Protection. I will advise the University’s Human Subject Committee in writing of any significant changes in the procedures detailed above.

___________________________   _____________________   _________
Principal Investigator        Title/Rank               Date
TITLE: Preschool Children's Negotiation of Intersubjectivity during Rough-and-Tumble Play

OBJECTIVE:
The primary objective of this study is to understand how children negotiate intersubjectivity (i.e., shared understanding) during rough-and-tumble (R&T) play. This will include describing the context (i.e., playground and relationships) and the experiences of children as they jointly negotiate a shared understanding of R&T play.

JUSTIFICATION:
Successful participation in the social world requires an ability to engage in constructive social interactions with one's peers. Researchers have found that social rejection by the peer group, a result of unsuccessful participation in the social world, is one of the best predictors of academic failure, school drop-out, adolescent delinquency, and psychological difficulties such as anxiety or depression (Kupersmidt, Coie, & Dodge, 1990; Parker & Asher, 1987). Investigating characteristics of children's interactions during various forms of play could offer insight as to how a particular type of play promotes or inhibits children's participation in the social world.

For social interaction to be beneficial for development, it must have certain characteristics. Tudge and Rogoff (1989) suggested that "shared thinking involving coordination of joint activity is central to the benefits of social interaction" (p. 17). Vygotsky (1978) referred to this as intersubjectivity. Scholars conducting research based on this concept propose, as did Tudge and Rogoff, that examining how participants coordinate their joint activity is most important for understanding social exchange (see Berk & Winsler, 1995). Goncu (1993) has used structural features and negotiations of social play to examine the development of intersubjectivity in preschoolers' dyadic play. He called for an examination of how different types of social play are negotiated.

Rough-and-tumble play (i.e., play fighting and play chasing) is a common type of social play during the preschool years. Researchers have hypothesized that rough-and-tumble play serves as a vehicle for social development as well as a reflection of that development (Smith, 1989; Smith & Boulton, 1990). A necessary component of rough-and-tumble play is that children agree that the fighting and/or chasing is pretend.

Researchers primarily have studied intersubjectivity as it relates to cognitive concepts and problem-solving (Tudge & Rogoff, 1989). More recently, they are studying this concept in children's social play. With the current study, the researcher hopes to broaden this literature by exploring how children negotiate a shared understanding, not only about the pretend nature of the fighting and chasing, but also about other features (e.g., themes, roles) of rough-and-tumble play.
The playground offers a unique setting for exploring R&T play (Hart, 1993). Smith and Connolly (1976) reported a corresponding increase between rough-and-tumble play and available square footage on playgrounds. Additionally, researchers are able to explore child behavior as it naturally unfolds in a setting characterized by minimal adult supervision (Hart, 1993).

PROCEDURE:

The researcher will utilize the Developmental Research Sequence outlined by Spradley (1980). This is a qualitative methodology that involves purposive sampling, participant observation, ethnographic interviewing, and inductive analyses.

Purposive sampling is used in qualitative research to acquire information-rich cases that can be studied in depth. For this study, the researcher will use theory-based purposive sampling. A sample drawn in this manner is representative of the phenomenon of interest, in this case, preschool children's negotiation of intersubjectivity during R&T play (Patton, 1990). Therefore, the University Laboratory Preschool will be the site for this study. The researcher will obtain informed consent from the parents of the preschool children attending the Laboratory Preschool.

The researcher will conduct participant observations and interviews during the Spring semester at the Laboratory Preschool. She will observe children's interactions on the playground during outdoor play time which lasts approximately 30 to 45 minutes each day. The researcher will keep field notes and maintain confidentiality of participants through the use of pseudo-names. She will conduct inductive data analysis throughout data collection. This methodology will provide for the systematic examination of the social interactions of participants within the context of interest.

The inquirer will conduct standardized open-ended interviews with the preschool teachers about children's social position in the peer group as well as children's history of social interaction on the playground toward the end of March. The researcher will develop profiles of children's playground interaction history from interview transcripts and use them to inform her interpretation of playground observations.

Formal sociometric interviews will serve as a source of information about children's social position in the peer group (Asher, Tinsley, Singleton, & Hymel, 1979). One of the children's regular preschool teachers will conduct these interviews with children during April. Informal conversational interviews will provide information about the negotiation of intersubjectivity during R&T play from children's perspectives. Questions will arise from the context of the R&T play bouts (e.g., What did "Matthew" do or say to let you know he wanted to play dinosaurs?). Children will have a choice about whether or not to participate in these interviews.

Qualitative methodology was chosen to allow for the examination of children's negotiation of intersubjectivity during R&T play in relation to the context of the playground and existing relationships. In this way, social participation will be studied as part of the social history of the group, rather than isolated from the course of everyday life.
EXPECTED BENEFITS:

At the completion of the study, insight will be gained about how one group of preschool children negotiate a shared understanding of R&T play. This information may illuminate features of R&T play that should be encouraged by teachers.
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Parent and Teacher Information Packet and Consent Forms
Dear Parents,

As a graduate student at the University, children's social development has been my primary research focus. Social interaction is more likely to be beneficial to children's development if it is characterized by shared thinking and joint activity. This is especially true of rough-and-tumble play (i.e., wrestling, play chasing). During this type of play, children must agree, or come to a shared understanding, not only that their activities are pretend, but also on the theme for play and their roles in play. For my doctoral dissertation research I have chosen to observe how children in the University Preschool negotiate shared understanding during rough-and-tumble play.

Outline of Study
Under the direction of Dr. Diane C. Burts, I will observe and record children's playground activities for approximately six to eight weeks, focusing on their rough-and-tumble play. During the course of the observations, I may ask children questions about a particular interaction. These questions will be asked in the natural flow of conversation and at no time will a child be pressured to respond to my questioning. The children will also participate in individual interviews conducted by one of their regular teachers. During these interviews each child will be asked to sort pictures of their classmates who are in the study into groups according to how much they like to play with them at the preschool. For the duration of this task, it will be stressed that "all children in the preschool are friends, but that there are some friends that you like to play with more than others" to remind children about the importance of developing friendships with all children. Again, children will not be pressured to participate in these interviews. Finally, I will interview the children's teachers as another source of information about how children interact with each other on the playground.

Protection of Privacy for Your Child
If you decide to allow your child to participate, I will regard his or her responses to any questions asked during the course of the study as confidential information. Children's real names will not be used in any field notes or final reports. Rather, each child will be assigned a "fake" name to insure confidentiality. Information about individual children will not be provided to anyone.

You may withdraw your child from the study at any time if you wish to do so. I would like to repeat - children will not be pressured to respond to my questions, despite permission from parents.

Informing You of the Results of the Study
At the completion of the study, a summary report will be prepared and distributed to all parents. This report will be a general discussion about what was discovered regarding children's negotiations of shared understanding during rough-and-tumble play. No references will be made regarding individual children.
If your child may participate in this research project, please sign the attached permission form and return it to the preschool by March 20. Your cooperation and interest are greatly appreciated. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me. With your child’s help, I hope to further our understanding of how children negotiate a shared understanding during rough-and-tumble play. Additionally, this study will provide information about features of rough-and-tumble play that teachers can feel comfortable encouraging on the playground.

Sincerely,

Michele DeWolf, Doctoral Student
Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences

Diane C. Burts, Professor
Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences
CONSENT FORM

I hereby consent for my child, _________________________, to participate in the research project, "Preschool Children’s Negotiation of Shared Understanding during Rough-and-Tumble Play," conducted by doctoral student, Michele DeWolf, under the direction of Dr. Diane C. Burts. I understand that the purpose of this project is to study how preschool children negotiate a shared understanding of rough-and-tumble play and what role playground characteristics and children’s peer relationships play in this process. I understand that there are no known risks involved in this project. The results of this research will provide teachers with information about features of rough-and-tumble play that should be encouraged on the playground.

I understand that this study will involve the observation of children’s playground behavior in the preschool. These observations will last for approximately six to eight weeks. I am aware that one of my child’s regular teachers will conduct an individual interview (approximately 10 to 15 minutes) with my child about his/her preferences for play partners. If at any time during this interview my child wants to stop, he/she will be permitted to do so. I am aware that the researcher will interview my child’s teachers about how children interact with each other on the playground.

I understand that all responses will be held in confidence. Children’s real names will not be used in any field notes or final reports. Information about individual children will not be provided to anyone. The results may be published as a group report, and I will have access to the group results.

I understand that participation in this study is voluntary and that I can withdraw my child from the study at any point. I understand there is no penalty for non-participation or early withdrawal. I am aware that I can contact Dr. Diane Burts or Michele DeWolf at if I have any questions or concerns. I understand that if I have questions about subject rights or other concerns, I can contact the Vice Chancellor of the Office of Research and Economic Development.

I have read and fully understand this consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy of the consent form will be given to me.

Date_________________
Name of Child________________________
Signature of Parent or Legal Guardian______________________________
Signature of Investigator__________________________________________
Dear Teacher,

As a graduate student at the University, children's social development has been my primary research focus. Social interaction is more likely to be beneficial to children's development if it is characterized by shared thinking and joint activity. This is especially true of rough-and-tumble play (i.e., wrestling, play chasing). During this type of play, children must agree, or come to a shared understanding, not only that their activities are pretend, but also on the theme for play and their roles in play. For my doctoral dissertation research I have chosen to observe how children in the Laboratory Preschool negotiate shared understanding during rough-and-tumble play.

Outline of Study

Under the direction of Dr. Diane C. Burts, I will observe and record children's playground activities for approximately six to eight weeks, focusing on their rough-and-tumble play. The children will also participate in individual sociometric interviews. Finally, I would like to interview you, the preschool teacher, as another source of information about how children interact with each other on the playground. Depending on how many children are discussed per session, these interviews will require approximately four or five sessions. Each session will be audio-taped and transcribed. I will develop profiles of children's interaction history from these transcripts and use them to help inform interpretation of observations. I will discuss these profiles with you, as a means of insuring a fair representation of each child.

Protection of Privacy

If you decide to participate, I will regard your responses to any questions asked during the course of the study as confidential information. Your real name will not be used in any field notes or final reports. Rather, you will be assigned a pseudo-name to insure confidentiality. You may withdraw from the study at any time.

Informing You of the Results of the Study

At the completion of the study, a summary report will be prepared and distributed to parents and teachers. This report will be a general discussion about what was discovered regarding children's negotiations of shared understanding during rough-and-tumble play. No references will be made regarding individual children.

If you would like to participate in this research project, please sign the attached consent form and return it to me by March 20. Your cooperation and interest are greatly appreciated. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me. With your help, I hope...
to further our understanding of how children negotiate a shared understanding during rough-and-tumble play. Additionally, this study will provide information about features of rough-and-tumble play that teachers can feel comfortable encouraging on the playground.

Sincerely,

Michele DeWolf, Doctoral Student
Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences

Diane C. Burts, Professor
Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences
CONSENT FORM

I, ________________________, hereby consent to participate in the research project, “Preschool Children’s Negotiation of Shared Understanding during Rough-and-Tumble Play,” conducted by doctoral student, Michele DeWolf, under the direction of Dr. Diane C. Burts. I understand that the purpose of this project is to study how preschool children negotiate a shared understanding of rough-and-tumble play and what role playground characteristics and children’s peer relationships play in this process. I understand that there are no known risks involved in this project. The results of this research will provide teachers with information about features of rough-and-tumble play that should be encouraged on the playground.

I understand that this study will involve the observation of children's playground behavior in the Laboratory Preschool. These observations will last for approximately six to eight weeks. I am aware that children will also participate in individual interviews about his/her preferences for play partners. I am aware that the researcher will interview me about how the children at the LSU preschool interact with each other on the playground. I understand that these interviews will require four or five sessions with the researcher and that the interviews will be audio taped and transcribed.

I understand that all responses will be held in confidence. My name will not be associated with any of the responses. The results may be published as a group report, and I will have access to the group results.

I understand that participation in this study is voluntary and that I can withdraw from the study at any point. I understand there is no penalty for non-participation or early withdrawal. I am aware that I can contact Dr. Diane Burts or Michele DeWolf if I have any questions or concerns. I understand that if I have questions about subject rights or other concerns, I can contact the Vice Chancellor of the Office of Research and Economic Development.

I have read and fully understand this consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy of the consent form will be given to me.

Date__________________________

Signature of Teacher______________________________

Signature of Investigator__________________________
Appendix C

Procedures and Forms for Sociometric Interviews
Procedure for Sociometric Interviews

Bell-Dolan and Wessler (1994) outlined several procedures researchers should use to ensure the ethical administration of sociometric measures. Researchers should: (a) obtain active written parental consent, (b) give children a choice about whether or not to participate in the task, (c) administer sociometric tasks individually whenever possible, (d) not administer sociometric tasks right before unstructured periods, (e) help children put the task in perspective by discussing topics such as the importance of friendships or being sensitive to others' feelings, and (f) provide confidentiality instructions. The researcher will follow these procedures as closely as possible in the current study.

One of the regular preschool teachers will conduct the sociometric interviews and thus provide a comfortable environment for the children. Before each individual interview begins, the interviewer will show the child a picture board containing the photographs of classmates in the study. The interviewer will ask the child to name the peer shown in each picture to make sure that the child can recognize his/her classmates in the pictures.

**Nominations**

Have the child look at all of the pictures on the board and say that these are pictures of many of the children in his or her class. Have the child name his/her classmate in each picture. Mention that everyone is friends in the class, but there are some friends he or she likes to play with more than others.
For positive nominations, ask the child to point to one person that he or she likes to play with "a whole lot." Then say, "Who else?" until the child points to three separate children. Mention to the child that he or she can mention other children's names whose pictures are not on the board who are in the class. Circle the names of the children he or she nominates on the score sheet and rank them from 1 to 3 in the order that they are given to you. If the child mentions a name that is not on the score sheet, simply ask, "Who else?" Then make a circle around a space on the score sheet for that child which doesn't have a name on it and number it accordingly.

For negative nominations, ask the child to point to three children (one at a time) that he or she does not like to play with or that he or she does not think are very much fun to play with. Mark the names with an "X" and again rank them from 1 to 3 in the correct order. If for either positive or negative nominations a child says, "That's all, just Tommy" when you ask him or her to point to a second or third person, just take the one or two nominations.

Ratings

Prior to asking about peer ratings, conduct a training session with each child to teach him/her how to use a rating scale and sort procedure. Show each child three boxes on which there will be either a happy face (i.e., something you like a lot), a neutral face (i.e., something you sort of like), or a sad face (i.e., something you do not like very much). Present the child with pictures of various items (e.g., snakes, balloons, ice cream) and ask the child to indicate how
much he/she likes the items by sorting them into one of the three marked boxes.

For the actual peer ratings, use the following procedure. Place the three boxes in front of the child and say something like, "I have three boxes here and each one has a face on it." Explain what each box means to the child. For example:

The first box (point to it) has a big smiling face on it and that means that you like to play with this child a whole lot. This box (point to the center box) has a straight line for a mouth and that means that you kind of like to play with this child a little bit or just sometimes. This last box (point to the box) has a big frowning face on it and that means that you don't like to play with this child very much.

Tell the child that you have pictures of each of the other children and that you want him to put the pictures in the boxes one by one according to how much he or she likes to play with them. Hold the pictures yourself and hand the child each one, one at a time to eliminate his or her going too quickly and getting confused. Emphasize the words "a lot," "kind of," or "not very much" when referring to each box. To clarify, you can say "a whole lot," "a little," and "not much."

Since this is a long task, try to give encouragement to keep him or her from getting bored. You can say things like, "Good!" or even just "OK, now how about ______?" At intermittent points ask the child to tell you what the box means that he/she just put a picture in to make sure that he/she still understands what each box means. At the end of the task, thank the child for "helping" or "playing"
with you and tell the child he or she did a good job. Be sure to mark which boxes each child was sorted into on the score sheet.
Peer Nominations Score Sheet

Name: __________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________

Positive Nominations          Negative Nominations

1. ___________________________  1. ___________________________
2. ___________________________  2. ___________________________
3. ___________________________  3. ___________________________

*******************************************************************************

Name: __________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________

Positive Nominations          Negative Nominations

1. ___________________________  1. ___________________________
2. ___________________________  2. ___________________________
3. ___________________________  3. ___________________________

*******************************************************************************
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### Peer Ratings Score Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consolidated Tabulation Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Peer Ratings</th>
<th>Peer Nominations</th>
<th>PR Avg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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Appendix D

Interview Questions for Teachers
Interview Questions for Teachers

Think about ______________ on the playground.

1. Is there any child or children he/she likes to play with on the playground?
   A. In what way, if any, has this changed from the beginning of the year?

2. Is there any child or children he/she does not like to play with on the playground?
   A. In what way, if any, has this changed from the beginning of the year?

3. What type of activities does he/she usually participate in on the playground?
   A. In what way, if any, has this changed from the beginning of the year?

4. Is there any activity he/she rarely or never participates in on the playground?
   A. In what way, if any, has this changed from the beginning of the year?

5. Briefly describe __________ interactions with other children on the playground?

6. Compare current interaction style of __________ with his/her interaction style at the beginning of the year.
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Profiles of Children
Profiles of Children

Megan. Mr. Ford suggested Megan's playmate choices were tied to activity choices. For example, "If they are being monsters or doggies, she'll play with Glen or Kara or Miller. She'll play with Aimee if at the water table or on the swings." Ms. Perron added Suzy to the list of playmates. While Mr. Ford did not note any changes in Megan's choice of playmates, Ms. Perron commented, "I think that she is playing with them more now than she did last semester." Ms. Perron indicated this increase may be due to the fact that another child with whom Megan was friends no longer attends the preschool. Neither teacher named a specific child with whom Megan does not like to play. However, Ms. Perron pointed out if an individual or a group of children did not want to play with her, Megan would not want to play with that particular individual or group either.

According to both Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron, Megan enjoys swinging, painting, and playing at the play-doh or water table. Mr. Ford added, "Megan likes to crawl around and pretend to be a dog." He also suggested she enjoys feeding the rabbit and will ask almost daily to get a carrot for the rabbit. Ms. Perron mentioned riding tricycles, sliding, and playing in the sand box or house as common activities in which Megan engages. Mr. Ford named the climber as an activity Megan does not typically choose. Ms. Perron explained Megan is afraid of monsters and does not like to be chased.

Ms. Perron pointed out some changes in Megan's activity choices may be due to development. She explained, "At the beginning of the year she could not get up on the tire horse swing by herself, and now
she can." Mr. Ford noted an increase in swinging from the beginning of the year.

When it comes to interacting with other children, Mr. Ford explained Megan's interaction style as seeking out other children with whom she can pretend to be a puppy. Mr. Ford portrayed Megan as a "tag-a-long." He commented, "She'll follow around and play what the other children are playing. Someone else will be the dog owner and Megan will be the puppy - laying down if they tell her to lay down or barking if they tell her to bark."

Ms. Perron sensed Megan had a somewhat "defensive attitude" in her interactions with other children. She explained, "Megan feels unaccepted and builds up defenses against that. And so if there was someone or a group that would not play with her then she would not want to play with them because they wouldn't play with her."

Agreeing with Mr. Ford's characterization of Megan as a tag-a-long, Ms. Perron referred to Megan as a "follower." Ms. Perron also felt Megan could be a "loner," even when she was part of a group.

Ms. Perron did not notice any changes in Megan's interaction style. Mr. Ford, however, cited a change from the beginning of the year in the frequency with which Megan interacts with other children. He commented, "Megan seeks other children out more and plays by herself less."

The researcher noted Megan did not get involved in many R&T play episodes. When she did participate in R&T play, she joined a group (i.e., Kara, Miller, Lindsey, Roger) chasing another child or running
from another child. She did not get involved in the rougher aspects of the play, such as grabbing a person to catch that person.

**Allen.** Both teachers listed Allen’s twin sister Joyce and Roger as Allen’s playmate choices. Allen’s and Roger’s relationship is a relatively new development and appears to be somewhat one-sided. Mr. Ford pointed out, “Allen likes to try to play with Roger - not always successfully - but he likes to try to play with Roger.” Ms. Perron commented, “Allen idolizes Roger. Roger commented on Allen’s coat and said, ‘You are wearing a sissy coat.’ Allen was very upset and made his Mom buy him a ski jacket.” Mr. Ford also mentioned Glen as an additional playmate choice. Ms. Perron could not think of anyone with whom Allen did not specifically choose to play. Mr. Ford mentioned that Allen does not seem to like to play with Bob. He was not sure if Allen made a conscious decision about this or not.

According to both teachers, Allen likes riding tricycles and playing in the wagon, sand box, or house. Mr. Ford listed playing with the rabbit, and Ms. Perron listed the water table as a favorite activity of Allen’s. Allen does not go on the climber or the swings. Ms. Perron explains, “His large motor skills are not very well developed, and he has some fears and so he doesn’t go on the climber.”

As Allen’s attachment to Roger developed, Ms. Perron noticed Allen participating in more running games. Mr. Ford explains, “Allen likes to play police or monsters with Roger. They are the police, and they go around arresting people.”
According to Mr. Ford, Allen typically doesn’t talk a lot in his interactions. He will talk some, but usually only enough to establish a role (e.g., "We’re the police.") or to alert others (e.g., "You need to move out of the way because I’m riding this tricycle.").

Ms. Perron characterized Allen as a "follower" and a "tattletale." For example, "Allen doesn’t deal with his own interactions. He uses the teachers to deal with little problems that come up."

Ms. Perron believed Allen’s interaction style had remained "pretty consistent" throughout the year. Mr. Ford, on the other hand, noted a significant increase in how much Allen interacts with other children. According to Mr. Ford, "Allen watched more at the beginning of the year. He runs in there more now." Mr. Ford offers a couple of reasons for this change in Allen’s interaction style. One reason could be Allen is "just able to talk a lot more and express a lot more than at the beginning of the year." A second reason may be Allen has learned the police roles through interactions with Roger and has become more bold in acting them out.

During R&T play, the researcher observed Allen imitating or following ongoing play. He copied other boys (i.e., Glen, Roger, Cain) acting like dinosaurs, growled and stomped with Glen and Joyce, or joined a group of children (i.e., Kara, Miller) running from someone. He takes the lead from the other children and responds accordingly. For example, Kara and Miller started running from Allen. He growled at them and started chasing them. When Kara started hitting at Allen, he started hitting at her.
Jill. The information on Jill is based on a much shorter observation time. According to the teachers, Jill first came to the preschool in January, and then went on vacation for three weeks not long after starting. Her short time in the preschool is reflected in some of the teachers’ responses to questions in the interview.

Neither teacher could offer much information about Jill’s playmate choices. Mr. Ford commented, “I can’t picture Jill on the playground.” Ms. Perron shrugged her shoulders and said, “I don’t know.” Mr. Ford was the only one to offer any insight about with whom Jill does not like to play. He stated, “I don’t think there is a child she doesn’t want to play with. She’s got her idea . . . and if anybody else changes that . . . then she is kind of going to go off on them.”

Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron gave somewhat similar reports regarding Jill’s activity choices. They listed playing in the sandbox, playing in the water table, and riding tricycles as common choices made by Jill. Mr. Ford added feeding the rabbit to the list. The teachers did disagree about swinging. Mr. Ford reported Jill likes to swing, and Ms. Perron reported that Jill rarely chooses to swing.

Mr. Ford offered more information about Jill’s interaction style than did Ms. Perron. He stated, “Jill doesn’t interact very much with the other children. She watches them sometimes if there is a group activity. She plays beside them . . . , but doesn’t interact that much with them. She’ll communicate to a person trying to enter an activity with her that she has her idea for her game.” Ms. Perron simply characterized Jill as “stubborn.” She stated, “Jill has a
strong temperament. She will stand her ground." Mr. Ford offered a similar description, "She's kind of headstrong about doing her thing." He did not think Jill interacted with the other children very much. Neither teacher reported a change in Jill's interaction style.

The researcher observed Jill in only a few R&T episodes. She got involved by imitating others such as joining Lawrence as he chased Kara and Miller. Jill also followed others' suggestions for play. For example, as she was pulling Roger in a wagon, Roy started to chase them. Roger kept hollering directions (e.g., "Go faster!") and Jill pulled the wagon faster. In another episode, Cain announced, "I'm a sheriff cowboy, and I'm a good guy." Jill also took on the role of a good guy, "I'm a Power Ranger." She followed that with some karate movements similar to Cain's.

Wayne. Both Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron reported Wayne generally plays by himself. Ms. Perron referred to Wayne as a "loner." Mr. Ford commented, "I try to facilitate him getting with other people but he really doesn't. I don't think that it's because he particularly doesn't like anybody because . . . if there is an activity there, he'll be with anybody."

The first thing mentioned by both teachers when asked about Wayne's activity choices was that he likes to climb on top of the turtle and jump off. Ms. Perron commented this behavior has increased since the beginning of the year. She seemed to think it was because they had just started to put a mat by the turtle this semester. The teachers expanded the list of activity choices to include playing with
play-doh, playing in and around the house (i.e., drawing or painting on the house), playing in the sand box, riding tricycles, and climbing. Ms. Perron added finding things as one of Wayne’s activity choices. “He’s . . . aware of the ground, and he explores the ground, so he finds things.” The teachers concurred that Wayne rarely goes on the swings.

In describing Wayne’s interaction style, Mr. Ford was more adamant about his perception that Wayne has no interactions with the other children on the playground. When asked why Wayne did not interact, Mr. Ford responded, “He’s one of the younger three’s, and when you are two you don’t play with anybody anyway. At the beginning of the year he was really quiet, and now he’s beginning to come out and say more things - announce things. So he doesn’t seem to be shy. He seems to be just content. He seems just so focused on his own activity, his own mind, his own thinking, that it just doesn’t occur to him to play with anybody else.” Ms. Perron reported a somewhat higher interaction level. She commented, “Sometimes he’s involved with what’s going on . . . kind of being aware. There is some interaction there, but when he’s playing, then he’s just often doing things by himself.”

Ms. Perron and Mr. Ford did not report any changes in Wayne’s interaction style. Mr. Ford said it the best, “He’s consistently not interacted with anybody all year.”

The researcher did not observe Wayne in many R&T episodes. He would typically follow the other person’s lead when he did get involved in R&T play. When someone grabbed Wayne from behind, he
turned around and grabbed them. When someone started to chase Wayne, he would run and then try to hide. Wayne was not involved in the large group R&T episodes, but rather participated in episodes involving only two children.

Lawrence. When asked about Lawrence's playmate choices, Mr. Ford could not single out a specific child with whom Lawrence liked to play. Mr. Ford pointed out, "Lawrence doesn't have a particular child that he hangs around with and plays with all the time. He tends to choose activities rather than children when deciding where to play. Lawrence does not like to play with anybody who doesn't want to play a game the way he designs it. He becomes so focused on his purpose for the activity that if another child comes up and tries to intervene he will say, 'No! That's not how we're doing it. I want to do this.' His choice for the activity dominates." Ms. Perron described Lawrence as a "loner." She commented, "He might play with Miller some. He pushes Allen on the swings." Referring to our previous discussion about other children she said, "He hasn't come up in interactions with any of the other kids. He's off in his own world."

Both teachers agreed Lawrence usually participates in small-motor activities and tends to avoid large motor activities. He will go to the art table (e.g., making pizza out of play-doh), the water table, the sand box, or workshop (i.e., hammers, nails, etc.). He also likes to write on various objects with chalk, and sometimes he will paint at the easel. Mr. Ford commented, "Lawrence rarely or never goes on the swings and the climber. He seems to be large-boned and dense and it might be hard for him to manipulate his own body.
weight in large motor activities. He does go on the slide. However, he can go up steps on the slide, and he doesn't have to climb up bars like he does on the climber." Ms. Perron added, "Lawrence is more likely to push kids on the swings rather than to swing himself. Also, he will ride the tricycles some."

Ms. Perron felt that Lawrence had become more active since the beginning of the year. She cited the day he went on his running races as an example. Mr. Ford, on the other hand, did not think Lawrence's choice of activities had changed much from the beginning of the year, "I've tried to encourage him to do large motor things, but haven't had much success."

Lawrence participates in more "side-by-side" or parallel play than interactive, cooperative play. Ms. Perron characterized Lawrence as a "periphery follower." She said, "He is aware of the other children, but often looking at what's going on. For example, I've had him come up to me and say, 'Ms. Perron, there's a monster on the playground.' So he does get involved sometimes - in the role of being scared by a monster - but on the periphery, on the very edge of it."

According to Mr. Ford, "When Lawrence does interact with the other children, this interaction typically consists of him telling the other children what his idea is for an activity. If they go along with the idea, that is usually the extent of his interaction. However, he will interact with someone very quickly if they try to alter his idea for the activity in any way. For example, if Lawrence is building a sand castle and another child tries to make an addition to the sand castle that's not his planned addition, Lawrence will very
quickly, either physically or verbally, let the other child know or even try to push him or her away with one of his hands and say, 'No, that’s not how I’m doing it. I’m doing this.’”

Both teachers depicted Lawrence’s current interaction style to be very similar to his interaction style at the beginning of the year. However, they noticed subtle differences.

Mr. Ford noted that Lawrence still exhibited a sense of orderliness or following a prescribed idea in his interactions with others. However, due to increasing cognitive ability, Lawrence notices more things and his plans are more elaborate. Therefore, he’s a little more expressive about it when someone has a different idea than his about how play should proceed. "Lawrence still won’t, on his own volition, play cooperatively. But, he does talk to the other children about his activities more than he would at the beginning of the year. Sometimes, especially if I'm there and I try to facilitate it, he’ll do a little bit of cooperative play and invite them to participate in an activity with him. For example, one of his favorite activities outside is to pretend that the slide is an airplane and he flies to different places, and he’ll invite the children to do that. However, he still gets so focused on his idea for an activity that if another child tries to adjust or change the activity, he’s prone to getting angry and telling them ‘No!’ and saying ‘That’s not how we’re doing it. I want to do this.’”

Ms. Perron portrayed Lawrence as more outgoing and physical than he was earlier in the year. "He is still shy, but I think he’s come out some. Also, he has lower levels of large motor development, but
that running episode is a good example of him trying to get beyond that."

The researcher did not document many instances when Lawrence participated in R&T play. In one episode, he even convinced Jill to stop growling by repeating, "You are nice. You are nice." However, when he decided to get involved, Lawrence made some contribution to maintaining the play. For example, he extended play fighting by taking a karate stance, and shouting, "You can't kill me cause I'm magic!"

Aimee. Both teachers reported Aimee likes to play with Kelly, Megan, and Suzy. Mr. Ford viewed these relationships as stable over the course of the year. Ms. Perron believed these relationships had developed later in the year. Mr. Ford recounted a recent development in Aimee's playmate choices, "I don’t think Aimee likes to play with Ellen."

Ms. Perron and Mr. Ford both reported Aimee often chooses swinging, painting, or playing at the water table when on the playground. They explained Aimee also enjoys getting involved in pretend play at the house. Mr. Ford remarked, "She’ll frequently get into a group with the girls if they are running from somebody or teasing somebody." Aimee's definite dislikes include the climber, sandbox, and playing with the wagon. According to Ms. Perron, Aimee's swinging has decreased, and she has started branching out into group activities.

Mr. Ford described Aimee's interaction style as conversational. He noted, "She talks and laughs . . . with the girls when they are in
a group. On the swings, she’ll swing side by side with somebody and talk with them.”

Ms. Perron contradicted herself when talking about Aimee’s interaction style. She labeled Aimee as both a leader and a follower, and offered no evidence to support this contradiction. However, Ms. Perron’s comments regarding Aimee’s awareness of and concern about social placement could be construed as support for describing Aimee as a leader. She stated, “Aimee is kind of asserting a social place. I’ve even heard Aimee saying to a friend on the playground, ‘I’m not playing with you right now. I’m not your friend.’”

Mr. Ford noted that Aimee’s “conversational interaction” had increased from the beginning of the year. Ms. Perron agreed with this observation and concluded the increase in Aimee’s interactions may be due to a decrease in swinging. Additionally, Ms. Perron believed Aimee had become more assertive over the course of the year.

The researcher recorded few instances of R&T play in which Aimee was a participant. For the few times she joined into R&T play, Aimee was part of a group being chased. For example, she and Kara run from Roy shouting, “He’s out! Watch out! There’s Darth Vader!”

Kelly. According to both teachers, Kelly doesn’t have one child, in particular, with whom she always plays. Rather, she plays with many different children. Her playmate choices seem to be determined by where or what she is playing. Mr. Ford commented, “She’ll talk and play with other children if they are in her area.” Ms. Perron reported, “...if she’s over at the swings, she’s with
Aimee. She might be doing the house play with Lindsey . . . at the water table with Roy and Troy.”

Neither teacher mentioned children with whom Kelly did not like to play. Mr. Ford reflected, “. . . there are children that she doesn’t go around and play with. . . but I don’t get a sense that it’s through some strong objection on her part. It’s just that they are doing different activities. . .” Neither teacher felt these playmate choices had changed over the course of the year.

The teachers agreed Kelly generally enjoys quieter activities on the playground. She will choose to play in the house, paint, or work at the manipulative table (e.g., with play-doh). She likes to feed, water, and pet the rabbit, Brandy. She does make more active choices on occasion. These include swinging, jumping off the turtle, pulling the wagon (if she is by herself), riding in the wagon (if other children are there) or participating in a chase game. However, Mr. Ford pointed out, “. . . if other children organize a running/chasing game and she sees it, she’ll go and run with them. She won’t usually be the one to initiate that kind of activity.” While Mr. Ford noted an improvement in Kelly’s swinging ability, neither teacher reported any changes in her actual activity choices.

When asked about activities Kelly rarely or never chooses, Mr. Ford responded, “She’ll do just about the full spectrum of activities at one time or another.” Ms. Perron generally agreed with this assessment, but noted that Kelly did not spend a lot of time in the sand box.
Ms. Perron described Kelly as "an easy-going, get along with everyone type." She did not see Kelly as a "leader" but felt Kelly did take on a "contributor role" when involved in social pretend play. Mr. Ford also noted that if there was a group activity or game, Kelly would be in the "follower role." However, he saw her as being more involved in solitary play or parallel play than in interactive play. He commented, "... she'll talk some with other children as much as necessary ... but it's not really an interactive kind of play where she says, 'Let's work together and pretend like we're cooking something.'" Both Mr. Ford and Ms. Perron agreed that Kelly's interaction style had not changed from the beginning of the year.

The researcher rarely observed Kelly in R&T play episodes. When she does participate in R&T play, she usually joins in a group running from someone (e.g., Kara, Miller and Kelly run from Roy who is humming the Darth Vader tune.) On one occasion she asked a fellow participant, Cain, about play, "Who is the bad guy?" She then responded accordingly by running from the bad guy, Troy.

Ellen. Both teachers listed Bob and Lindsey as Ellen's playmate choices. Mr. Ford noted Ellen has begun to seek out Lindsey as a playmate more frequently. While Mr. Ford reported Ellen will occasionally choose Suzy as a playmate, Ms. Perron specifically mentioned Suzy as someone Ellen would not choose as a playmate.

Ms. Perron and Mr. Ford listed a variety of activities (e.g., swing, play-doh, chasing, climber, tricycles) in which Ellen participates. Mr. Ford reported Ellen has a tendency to base her
activity choices on what Bob is doing. He also contends, "She
doesn't seem to engage in one thing for very long. So that is why she
has to try everything, because she runs around quickly from one
interest area to another." The fact that Ms. Perron prefaced each
activity she listed with "sometimes" offers support to Mr. Ford's
contention. Neither teacher reported a change in Ellen's activity
choices from the beginning of the year.

Mr. Ford portrayed Ellen as "bossy and manipulative" in trying
to get others to do things her way. For example, Ellen might say,
"Bob, let's go over to the swings. We want to go over to the swings
now. Don't we? Don't we want to do that?" Ms. Perron did not
believe Ellen was always effective in this role. She stated, "Ellen
wants to be the leader, but is actually the follower - especially in
her relationship with Lindsey. She will try to lead, but Lindsey will
always overcome and be the one on top. So she ends up doing whatever
Lindsey is doing. And also, with Bob, because she always wants to
play with Bob, she's following Bob and not being the leader in that
instance." The teachers agreed Ellen had been "bossy" from the
beginning of the year. She continued this trend into the new
semester.

The researcher recorded few episodes of R&T play in which Ellen
was involved. She participated in the chasing aspect of R&T play.
Ellen usually followed Lindsey's lead, either running from or crawling
after boys (e.g., Glen, Roger, Cain, Roy). She also joined a group of
boys (i.e., Roger, Cain, Bob) as they stomped after Troy. On a couple
of occasions, she tried to get Lindsey to follow her idea, but was
unsuccesful (e.g., "Lindsey, the monster is back!"); Lindsey keeps picking flowers).

Bob. Mr. Ford reported Bob plays exclusively with Ellen. However, he was not sure if it is Bob’s choice to play with Ellen or if it is Ellen’s choice to play with Bob. He added, "Bob will get in with the other children when the group is play fighting or chasing."

Ms. Perron also listed Ellen as one of Bob’s playmate choices, but expanded the list to include Lindsey, Roger, and Cain. She perceives Bob has recently grown to not want to play with Ellen. He will either just walk away when Ellen approaches or tell Ellen, "No, Ellen, I don’t want to play with you."

According to Mr. Ford, Bob participates in a “good balance” of activities (e.g., climbing, chasing, pretend fighting, sand box, swings). However, according to Mr. Ford, Bob doesn’t do anything for long periods of time. Ms. Perron also listed a variety of activities in which Bob participates (e.g., tricycles, water table, running around, etc.). She viewed Bob’s jumping around from one activity to the next as “disorganization,” rather than a balance of activities.

While he has noticed improvement, Mr. Ford described Bob as somewhat “immature in his interactions and verbalizations.” Ms. Perron portrayed Bob’s interaction style as “very emotional.” She explained, “On one hand, he gets very excited and happy and likes to get involved in the group play. On the other hand, when he gets insulted or rejected, he’s easily upset and will cry.”

When asked about changes in Bob’s interaction style, Mr. Ford commented, “He’s more verbal, and he’ll interact with a greater
variety of children now." Ms. Perron believed Bob had become less emotional in his interactions.

The researcher observed few instances of R&T play in which Bob was a participant. When he participated, Bob got involved in ongoing play by copying the actions of fellow participants. For example, he imitated karate movements of Roger and Lawrence; stomped with Roger, Cain, and Ellen after Troy; or ran with Lindsey from Roy.

Suzy. The teachers' lists of Suzy's playmate choices did not overlap at all. Mr. Ford listed Lindsey, Roger, and sometimes Bob as Suzy's playmate choices. Ms. Perron listed Aimee and Megan as Suzy's playmate choices.

Both teachers reported Suzy rides tricycles, swings, and plays on the climber. Mr. Ford added running and chasing to this list. Ms. Perron used the term "bubble fanatic" to describe Suzy on bubble day, "She'll stay at the bubble table . . . the whole time." Neither teacher offered a clear answer about activities in which Suzy rarely participates beginning their responses with, "I don't think," or "I don't know."

Mr. Ford described Suzy as "pretty verbal," but not in a role-playing or pretend sense. Her interactions are more conversational in nature. He stated, "She'll talk to the other children about what they are doing or what game they are playing." Ms. Perron explained Suzy develops an alliance with her friends, and therefore, has a real camaraderie with them. However, Ms. Perron also perceived that Suzy was struggling with wanting to be a "leader," but ending up being a "follower" in many interactions.
Both teachers believed Suzy's interactions have become more outgoing since the beginning of the year. Mr. Ford explained, "At the beginning of the year she wasn't interacting as much with the other children; she was playing more by herself." Ms. Perron stated, "... she seemed really closed at the beginning of the year and shy. That still happens, but she's opened up a lot, and I think she's more assertive than she was at the beginning of the year."

The researcher only documented Suzy asking questions about, but never actually taking part in R&T play. For example, she saw a group of children running toward her. She asked them, "What's the matter with you guys?" The group hollered as they ran by, "Monster!" Suzy did not join the play.
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Figure F-2. Egocentric network sociograms for Allen
Figure P-3. Egocentric network sociograms for Jill

Negative Nominations

Positive Nominations
Figure F-4. Egocentric network sociograms for Wayne
Negative Nominations

Positive Nominations

Figure P-5. Egocentric network sociograms for Lawrence
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Figure F-6. Egocentric network sociograms for Aimee
Figure F-7. Egocentric network sociograms for Kelly
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Figure F-8. Egocentric network sociograms for Ellen
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Figure P.9. Egocentric network sociograms for Bob
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