

Preschool Children's Social Play and Involvement in the Outdoor Environment

Nekane Miranda^a, Inaki Larrea^a, Alexander Muela^b, and Alexander Barandiaran^a

^aFaculty of Humanities and Education, Mondragon University; ^bDepartment of Personality, Assessment and Psychological Treatment, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU)

ABSTRACT

Research Findings: The primary purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between social play and involvement in the outdoor pre-school environment. The study included 173 children ranging in age from 3 to 6 years ($M_{age} = 3.95$, $SD = 0.82$) and attending 19 preschools in the Basque Country (Spain). A total of 51 teachers (50 women, 1 man) also participated. Our results indicated that there is a relationship between social participation and involvement and that group play is the type of play that best predicts greater involvement. No significant differences in levels of involvement were found between boys and girls, although gender was found to have a moderating effect on the relationship between the type of group play and involvement. **Practice or Policy:** The results are discussed with reference to the need to implement innovations in the outdoor preschool environment that have a positive effect on child development. The outdoor environment should promote social participation as well as gender equality and inclusion, and consequently it should be designed to offer both access to a natural environment and multiple opportunities for play.

In many European countries there has been a considerable increase in preschool attendance. In fact, the educational policy plan of the European Union predicts that 95% of preschool-age children will be enrolled by the year 2020 (European Commission/Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency/Eurydice, 2013). Early childhood education benefits not only children but also their families and society in general. However, the magnitude of these benefits depends on the quality of the education (Cassidy et al., 2005; Vandell, Belsky, Burchinal, Vandergrift, & Steinberg, 2010). Numerous studies have shown that high-quality preschools are associated with greater well-being and an improved social and emotional balance among children as well as increased cognitive and language skills (Ärlemalm-Hagsér, 2006; Gialamas, Mittinty, Sawyer, Zubrick, & Lynch, 2014; Pinto, Pessanha, & Aguiar, 2013).

In early childhood, play and formal education are two mutually dependent aspects that form part of what constitutes quality in schools. Play is of fundamental importance at this stage of a child's life, as it is associated with learning and development (Pellegrini, 2011; Rubin, Fein, & Vandenberg, 1983; Smith & Hart, 2004). Consequently, one of the goals of early education is to enable children to play and to offer them the resources they need to do so in positive, enjoyable, and learning environments (Fisher, Hirsh-Pasek, Golinkoff, Singer, & Berk, 2011). This interrelationship is widely acknowledged in northern European countries such as Norway (Karila, 2012) and Iceland (Gunnarsdottir, 2014), where play is seen as the basis for early education. However, most of the research conducted in schools has focused exclusively on the classroom, and very few studies have examined the relationship between play and other key variables of children's development with respect to their learning in the outdoor school environment (Ernst, 2014). This was the starting point for the present study, which aimed to examine the relationship between social play and involvement in the outdoor school environment.

The outdoor school environment: A natural context for development and learning

A considerable amount of research has clearly demonstrated the positive influence that outdoor activity can have on various aspects of child development (Moser & Martinsen, 2010). For example, outdoor activity was found to promote children's social competence

(Veiga et al., 2016), to promote motor skills and physical health (Cosco, Moore, & Smith, 2014; Gray et al., 2015), and to reduce levels of aggressiveness and conflict by encouraging affiliative behavior (Blanchet-Cohen & Elliot, 2011; Ouvry, 2003). Some studies have found that outdoor activity has a positive effect on children's concentration (Mårtensson et al., 2009) and imagination and creativity (Canning, 2010) while also fostering an appreciation of nature and of what can be learned from nature experiences (Klaar & Öhman, 2014).

In this context, some authors argue that the design of the outdoor environment, the activities that take place there, and the use that children make of it should be given greater weight both in the early childhood education curriculum and in the everyday functioning of schools (DeBord, Hestenes, Moore, Cosco, & McGinnis, 2005; Kos & Jerman, 2013). Indeed, it is recommended that outdoor environments be more highly valued as precursors of pedagogical environments that facilitate play, learning, and child development (Moser & Martinsen, 2010). Many researchers believe that optimal outdoor environments are those whose design tests the psychomotor skills of children, provides a stimulating environment with different types and levels of challenges, is closely connected with the natural environment, and allows easy access (MacQuarrie, Nugent, & Warden, 2015; Moore, 2014).

It is also stressed that the outdoor environment should be designed in such a way that children can experience it in many different ways and take reasonable risks during their play activity, thus leading them to perceive the environment as stimulating and challenging (Little, Sandseter, & Wyver, 2012).

Social play and the outdoor school environment

Play is a major activity of many children in most cultural communities around the world (Roopnarine, 2011). Play is a key element in child development because it demands learning; the development of linguistic, cognitive, and motor skills; and social competence (Pellegrini, 2011; Rubin et al., 1983; Smith & Hart, 2004). Children's play has been classified on the basis of their cognitive development (Piaget, 1962; Smilansky, 1968) as well as in relation to social maturity (Parten, 1932). Early childhood education

and consequently outdoor school environments are social contexts for play, and as these may often include interaction with peers, there is an opportunity to examine what is known as social play (Coplan, Rubin, & Findlay, 2006).

Social play in early childhood

The development of social play is a complex phenomenon involving the interaction of individual factors (e.g., sociability, emotion regulation, communicative skills), dyadic and group processes (relationships with caregivers and peers), and dimensions of the social context (cultural community, the social and emotional climate of the social setting of play; Howes, 2011). What distinguishes social play from other kinds of play is, obviously, the fact that it requires the coordinated participation of different individuals, and thus it provides a unique context for psychosocial development and for the building of socioemotional resilience. Social play occurs when a child is motivated to engage other children in shared playful activities, is able to regulate emotional arousal, and possesses the skills required to initiate interactions with others such that his or her social overtures are responded to in kind (Coplan et al., 2006).

Social play has enormous potential and serves various functions in the context of child development. During the toddler and preschool developmental periods it is seen as a behavioral manifestation of social competence (Howes, 2011). Various studies have highlighted the fact that when children play together they have the opportunity to mutually adjust their behavior (Pellegrini, 2011). Similarly, this kind of play exposes children to other points of view, which they may then come to share, and in the process they can acquire more complex sets of values, knowledge, and ways of interacting (Howes, 2011; Rubin et al., 1983). Through social play, children also share the symbolic meaning that is implicit to play, an aspect that requires cognitive and communicative skills for understanding and extending the meaning of what play entails (Howes, 2011). These characteristics mean that the ability to engage in social play, in addition to the various nonsocial forms of play, is a good marker of psychosocial adjustment in young children (Coplan et al., 2006). In fact, a lack of social interaction in childhood,

characterized by highly reticent behavior on the part of the child, has been associated with social isolation, shyness (as a trait that hampers social interaction), and social anxiety (Rubin, Coplan, & Bowker, 2009), all of which in turn are predictors of socioemotional difficulties and problems with school adjustment (Coplan, Ooi, Rose-Krasnor, & Nocita, 2014).

Categories of social participation in play

Children's social participation in play is generally classified into the categories of unoccupied play, solitary play, onlooker play, parallel play, associative play, and cooperative play (Parten, 1932). Taking this categorization as a reference, Rubin (2001) classified social play into three categories: solitary play, parallel play, and group play. These categories comprise various kinds of play that differ in terms of their cognitive complexity. Group play in this case includes associative and cooperative play and is assumed to reflect the highest degree of social participation. A number of studies have indicated that children are more likely to participate in the categories of play that involve greater social participation as they get older (Pellegrini, 1992). Also, Rubin noted that during the preschool stage, parallel play prevails among children between 2.5 and 3.5 years of age, whereas among children ages 3.5 to 4.5 years, associative play is more common.

Social play in the outdoor school environment

It is important to note that most published research concerns social play within the classroom, and very few studies have focused on the outdoor school environment (Ernst, 2014; Veiga et al., 2016). In terms of differences between the indoor and outdoor environments regarding the type of play that children engage in, research has generally found that the outdoor school environment encourages as much if not more social play than does the indoor setting (Bar-Haim & Bart, 2006; Hartle, 1996; Henniger, 1985; Shim, Herwig, & Shelley, 2001) and that play that takes place outside positively complements what is learned indoors (Hart, 1993). For example, Shim et al. (2001) reported that activities performed in the outdoor school environment were more likely to

involve social interaction and included more complex forms of peer play.

Henniger (1985), for his part, found differences in preschool children's indoor and outdoor social play. Specifically, he observed more solitary activity indoors and more parallel play outdoors. Solitary play occurs when a child plays alone, quietly exploring or constructing in his or her social environment (Coplan & Ooi, 2014). Solitary play is used to describe the display of solitary-functional and solitary-dramatic behaviors in the presence of peers. Solitary-functional behavior is characterized by repetitive sensorimotor actions both with and without objects (e.g., skipping, banging blocks), whereas solitary-dramatic behavior involves engaging in pretense while playing alone (e.g., playing make-believe; Coplan & Ooi, 2014).

Conversely, it should be noted that there is also some preliminary evidence to suggest that solitary-active play occurs more frequently during outdoor free play as opposed to indoors (BarHaim & Bart, 2006). Although this type of play has been associated with impulsivity (Coplan & Rubin, 1998), reticent behaviors, less social play, lower peer acceptance (Nelson, Hart, & Evans, 2008), and poorer motor skills and sensory reactivity (Bar-Haim & Bart, 2006), it has been suggested that it does not constitute a maladaptive behavior in the outdoor environment (Spinrad et al., 2004). It is argued that this is because the outdoor environment offers more opportunities for solitary-functional activities (e.g., running, sliding, climbing), and these are not perceived negatively by the peer group (Spinrad et al., 2004).

Some studies focusing on gender differences in social play have found that from the age of 2 years, boys and girls show clear preferences for companions of the same gender and spend more and more time in groups self-organized by gender (Andrews, Hanish, Fabes, & Martin, 2014; Ruble, Martin, & Berenbaum, 2006). In addition, with respect to open-air settings, boys tend to gather in larger, more open areas to play in larger groups where they are both farther away from adults and, at the same time, more public or visible. Their play here also involves more physical contact and fighting and reveals a greater social hierarchy (Davidsson, 2006). By contrast, play among girls is typically carried out in small groups, in more intimate settings, and closer to adults, with

agreed-on turns for involvement and more interactive conversations (Pillitteri, 2009).

The concept of involvement in play research

In addition to the outdoor school environment and social play, another focus of the present study is involvement. In our view, the construct of involvement developed by Laevers (1994) offers a theoretical structure that is flexible enough to enable the quality of children's activity to be evaluated. Involvement refers to a process in the learner. This variable is generated by the learning environment and provides direct feedback about the impact of a teacher's interventions, as it describes qualities that can be observed in the child while teaching is taking place (Laevers & Heylen, 2003). According to Laevers (1994, 2005), children with a high level of involvement are highly concentrated and absorbed by their activity. They show interest, motivation, and an intense and fascinated attitude, and hence they tend to persevere. Their gestures and posture indicate intense mental activity, and they fully experience sensations and meanings.

Although the concept of involvement refers to a dimension of human activity it is not linked to specific types of behavior or to specific levels of development (Laevers, 2003); in fact, it has more in common with the notion of state of flow proposed by Csikszentmihalyi (1997). Given that the primary activity of the child in the outdoor school environment is fundamentally play, then high-involvement play would also include a considerable amount of exploratory activity that requires the child to be immersed in the action that he or she is performing and to function to the best of his or her capabilities. Through such play the child may have a profound and motivating educational experience. Laevers (1994) argued that these characteristics mean that involvement and emotional well-being can give a fair idea about the likelihood of positive personal, socioemotional, and cognitive development in the learner. These two aspects can therefore be regarded as key indicators for assessing the quality and effectiveness of learning in early education—hence the value of creating learning environments that promote them (Laevers & Heylen, 2003).

It should be noted that previous studies that have examined levels of involvement from this perspective have been conducted in the indoor school environment, primarily in

relation to activities that could be considered academic and closely related to school routine, with little attention being paid to possible gender differences (Woods, 2016). The findings suggest that well-being and emotional security in the child, sensitivity on the part of the teacher, or a close child–teacher relationship characterized by a high degree of warmth and openness are associated with higher levels of involvement among children (Barandiaran, Muela, López de Arana, Larrea, & Vitoria, 2015). Conversely, discordant and coercive interactions between child and teacher as well as a child’s overdependence on the teacher have been linked to low levels of involvement (Barandiaran et al., 2015; Doumen, Koomen, Buyse, Wouters, & Verschueren, 2012; Ebbeck et al., 2012). Among those classroom-based studies that have considered gender, Ulich and Mayr (2002) found that although overall levels of involvement were similar among boys and girls, there were substantial differences in terms of their activity preferences. Specifically, they found that boys showed greater involvement than girls in physical play, sand and water play, hammering and wood work, the use of technical instruments, and play with discovery tables or construction material. Girls, by contrast, showed higher rates of involvement in molding and modeling, board and card games, role play, scissoring, gluing and folding, puzzles and worksheets, and listening to music.

The present study

The literature review set out so far in this introduction suggests that an optimal outdoor school environment activity is associated with greater social competence, motor skills, and physical health and has a positive effect on children’s concentration, imagination, and creativity (Moser & Martinsen, 2010). It is also worth mentioning that the high quality of an outdoor school environment has been found to be associated with interaction with nature and to be characterized by play situations, learning, and interactions that encourage the participation and personal initiative of the child (Canning, 2010; Moser & Martinsen, 2010).

One of the ways to evaluate the effect that the quality of the outdoor school environment has on child development is to focus on play and to examine its relationship with involvement. However, most research that has taken this perspective has been

limited to the indoor classroom setting, and very few studies have examined the relationship between play and involvement in the outdoor school environment. Furthermore, there has been little research examining the relationship between play and involvement in the outdoor school environment from the point of view of gender. In this respect, many issues remain to be clarified, such as whether there are gender differences in children's involvement in activities taking place in the outdoor school environment and whether gender moderates the relationship between play and involvement.

In light of this, the primary purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between the type of social play in the outdoor school environment and involvement. We hypothesized that greater social play activity (solitary, parallel, or group) would be associated with greater involvement and that children who showed greater group play activity would show greater involvement than would children who engaged more in solitary or parallel play. We did not expect to find gender differences in involvement in the outdoor school environment, nor did we expect to find any moderating effect of gender on the relationship between the type of social play and involvement.

Method

Participants

The participants in the present study were 173 children (87 girls, 50.3%; 86 boys, 49.7%) between 3 and 6 years of age ($M_{age} = 3.95$, $SD = 0.82$) who were attending a total of 19 preschools in the Basque Country (Spain). A total of 51 teachers (50 women, 1 man) also participated. Class sizes ranged from 21 to 25 children, and the staff:child ratio was 1:24. Children spent 5 hr per day in class and 30 min per day outside in the preschool playground. Both the children and the teachers were selected based on their availability. Written informed consent was obtained from all children's parents as well as from the teachers and the school management. This research was carried out in accordance with the current ethical standards established by our universities.

Procedure

The present research was carried out in several steps. First the research project was presented to various schools in the Basque Country. Once informed consent for participation was obtained from the school heads, the teaching staff, and the children's legal guardians, the quality of the outdoor school environment was assessed using the Preschool Outdoor Environment Measurement Scale (POEMS). The outdoor environments analyzed met the minimum requirements established by the Spanish Ministry of Education. They all covered an area of at least 150 m² ($M = 189.5$, $SD = 15.82$) and they were used by children in accordance with an agreed-on timetable that separated children of different ages.

Next the children's free play in the outdoor school environment was recorded. Play observations were carried out over a period of 3 months from April through the third week of June. On each day of observation we selected four children and made recordings lasting 24 min. We had a different list of randomized children to film individually for 6 min, with each child being filmed on a single day. Although the recording focused on the selected child, other children from his or her class who had attended school on that day were also present in the playground. A number of strategies were used to control for the effect of certain variables: We chose days on which the weather was similar (no rain; temperature between 14°C and 18°C), recordings were made at the same time of day (11:00–11:30), the children spent the same amount of time in the classroom (5 hr) and outdoors (30 min), and we ensured a similar teacher:child ratio (1:24) and overall group size (21–25 children). Finally, the recordings were viewed and evaluated using the Play Observation Scale and Leuven Involvement Scale for Young Children.

Measures

The poems

As its name suggests, the POEMS (DeBord et al., 2005) is a scale that measures the quality of the outdoor environment of preschools. The layout and use of a school's outdoor environment was examined through observations of children and teachers outdoors. The observation period required by the scale was 45 to 60 min. The information gathered through observation was complemented by interviews with teaching staff. The

POEMS consists of 56 binary-choice items grouped into five domains: (a) Physical Environment, (b) Interactions, (c) Play and Learning Settings, (d) Program, and (e) Teacher/Caregiver Role. The first domain, Physical Environment, refers to the quality of the physical characteristics of the preschool outdoor environment. A high-quality physical environment is one designed in such a way that children are able to try out their skills in a setting that offers various types and levels of developmental challenges and stimulation, all of which must be easily accessible and closely linked to nature. The physical environment should arouse children's curiosity, fostering their understanding of reality, stimulating their imagination, inviting exploration, communicating a sense of belonging and cultural identity, and promoting the development of competencies. The location of the outdoor play environment is particularly important; namely, it should be well away from risks to children's safety (e.g., roads) and health (e.g., dust, smoke). The second domain, Interactions, refers to the extent to which the outdoor environment encourages children to interact with it. For example, a high-quality environment might contain leaves, flowers or twigs, and so on; promote child-to-child interactions through the presence of two-person benches or objects such as a puppet theater; enable teacher-child interactions during playtime (e.g., facilitating activities, fostering inquisitiveness); and allow for parent-child interactions (e.g., having adequate outdoor seating). The third domain, Play and Learning Settings, refers to the organization of the outdoor play and learning space and the materials available within it. Thus, a high-quality setting would include distinct spaces that promote specific experiences or activities around a common theme (e.g., an active play zone, a storytelling corner, an area for sand and water play, a kitchen garden) and that use good-quality natural or manufactured materials, including materials or objects that can be moved around (pinecones, smooth stones, toys for sand play) depending on their relevance to a given activity and zone. The fourth domain, Program, refers to the integration of the outdoor space within the curriculum. Thus, a high-quality program is one that considers outdoor activity an extension of classroom-based work and regards it as an important part of the curriculum. In other words, there is explicit recognition that children's development and learning can also take place in an outdoor space that is designed to maximize their learning opportunities (investigation, exploration, physical activity and spontaneous movement, social interactions, promotion

of language development, negotiation and cooperation, experiences with various materials, etc.). The fifth and final domain, Teacher/Caregiver Role, refers to the extent to which the educational community (teachers, families, and community resources) seeks to promote high-quality outdoor spaces. It also alludes to the pedagogical style of the teacher/caregiver. High quality here would entail consideration of the outdoor environment as an educational resource that needs the support and participation of teachers, families, and other members of the community. In addition, the teacher/caregiver would ideally adopt an involved and interactive role that includes suggesting ways of organizing outdoor learning spaces while ensuring children's safety but without this involvement becoming intrusive, critical, normalizing, or limiting of children's creative learning opportunities.

When using the POEMS the task for the observer is to check whether each item is present, and this was the first step in our study. Then, once all of the POEMS data had been gathered, we calculated the percentage value of each domain on a scale ranging from 0 to 100 points. The overall mean percentage was then interpreted as follows: 30 or less, very low-quality environment; 31–41, low quality; 42–60, medium quality; 61–70, high quality; and 70 or above, very high quality. The POEMS offers appropriate internal consistency, content validity, and concurrent validity (DeBord et al., 2005). In the present sample, Cronbach's alpha was .84. Cronbach's alphas for each of the domains (factors) were .72, .78, .76, .63, and .71 for Physical Environment, Interactions, Play and Learning Settings, Program, and Teacher/Caregiver Role, respectively. The 19 playgrounds were coded by two raters, both experts in early childhood education. Interobserver agreement was .91 (Spearman correlation).

The play observation scale

The Play Observation Scale (Rubin, 2001) is a tool that measures the social participation and cognitive quality of preschool children's play. It has proved useful in determining age and gender differences in children's play, socioeconomic status differences in play, effects of the ecological setting of play, individual differences in play, and the social contexts within which the various forms of cognitive play are distributed (Fromberg &

Bergen, 2015). For the purposes of the present study we recorded the free play of each child in the outdoor school environment. We assessed social participation by viewing the video recordings. Ten-second intervals were coded for social participation (six variables: unoccupied, onlooking, solitary play, parallel play, peer conversation, and group play) and the cognitive quality of play (five variables: functional, dramatic, and constructive play; exploration; games with rules), resulting in 36 coding intervals per child over the total observation period of 6 min. The 11 variables can be defined briefly as follows: Unoccupied behavior implies a complete lack of goal or focus; onlooking is when a child watches (or listens to) the behaviors and activities of other children; solitary play is when a child engages in an activity entirely alone; parallel play implies engagement in an activity alongside (but not together with) other children; peer conversation is when a child communicates verbally with others; group play involves engagement in an activity together with another child or children, in which the cognitive goal or purpose is shared among all group members; the goal of functional play is to experience sensory stimulation through simple, repetitive muscular movements; dramatic play implies dramatized life situations or bringing life to an inanimate object; the aims of constructive play and exploration, respectively, are to create or construct something and to obtain visual or auditory information from an object; finally, games with rules imply engagement in a competitive game-type activity following preestablished rules and limits (Rubin, 2001). A training period was required on recorder use by the two observers, both experts in early childhood education. A time code superimposed on each videotape in conjunction with a remotely controlled tape-stop device allowed observers to view tapes in 10-s intervals. Intraobserver and interobserver agreement were .92 and .89 (Cohen's kappa), respectively. This calculation was based on the 30% of videos that were double coded.

Leuven involvement scale for young children

The Leuven Involvement Scale for Young Children (Laevers, 1994, 2005) evaluates the degree of a child's involvement in a given activity. We assessed involvement by viewing the recordings of the children's free play in the outdoor school environment. A total of six intervals, each lasting 1 min, were coded per child, and in each sequence the child's

level of involvement was rated on a scale from 1 to 5. The five scale ratings were as follows: (1) Extremely low involvement: The child hardly shows any activity; (2) Low involvement: The child shows some degree of activity, but this is often interrupted; (3) Moderate involvement: The child is busy the whole time but without real concentration; (4) High involvement: There are clear signs of involvement, but these are not always present to their full extent; and (5) Extremely high involvement: During the episode of observation the child is continuously engaged in the activity and completely absorbed in it.

The average value of each set of six observations was obtained: The lower the score, the less the involvement, and vice versa. A concordance analysis was carried out between two observers (for 30% of the videos), both experts in early childhood education, yielding a mean intraclass correlation coefficient (two mixed effects factors, absolute agreement) of .85.

Data analysis

First, we performed a descriptive analysis of the outdoor school environment. Second, a bivariate correlation analysis was carried out to explore the relationships among the different variables in the study. Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated in all cases except when the variable was dichotomous (gender), in which case the point biserial correlation coefficient was used. Third, given that the data structure implied two levels of analysis—that is, children (Level 1) grouped within playgrounds (Level 2)—we used hierarchical linear models in order to estimate cross-level relationships in the nested data structure (Heck, Thomas, & Tabata, 2013). Analyses were performed using the MIXED procedure in SPSS Version 23.

Results

Descriptive analysis of the outdoor school environment

Table 1 shows the mean scores and standard deviations obtained for the quality of the outdoor environment of the preschools, as measured by the POEMS.

The overall mean quality rating of the schools' outdoor environments was moderate

(60.47%). High ratings were achieved in the Physical Environment and Interactions domains, whereas scores for the other domains indicated medium quality. It should be noted that the score for Teacher/Caregiver Role was slightly above what would be required to consider an outdoor environment as being of sufficient quality.

Table 1. Mean scores and standard deviations for the quality of the outdoor environment.

Domain	M	S	M of Percentages (Range = 0–100)	SD of Percentages	N
Physical Environment (range = 0–13)	1 0. 2 1	2. 84	78.54	21.84	1 9
Interactions (range = 0–13)	9. 8 9	2. 88	76.11	22.19	1 9
Play and Learning Settings (range = 0–13)	7	2. 33	53.85	17.95	1 9
Program (range = 0–9)	4. 4 2	1. 35	49.12	14.96	1 9
Teacher/Caregiver Role (range = 0–9)	3. 5 8	1. 68	44.74	20.96	1 9
Total			60.47	16.65	1 9

The design of the outdoor environments was generally geared toward the main sports played, such that soccer pitches or basketball courts (68%) predominated. In fact, in

many of the environments sports were the only type of activity possible. Indeed, we often observed a large group of children, mostly boys, playing soccer and taking up most of the playground, thus forcing the remaining boys and girls to play in less appealing areas with hardly any resources available for alternative games. Few of the playgrounds offered other play equipment such as jump ropes (55.6%) or nets (5.6%). Furthermore, only rarely did we find complementary equipment that could respond to the diverse interests of boys and girls, such as sand play (5.6%) or drawing (5.6%). When such complementary equipment was available it was sometimes difficult for the children to access (50%), thus hampering their autonomous use of it. The playgrounds analyzed were thus a long way from what one might consider a natural environment for learning (16.7%), that is, a place where children can play and learn by engaging with and manipulating a range of natural elements, materials, organisms, and habitats through sensory, fine motor, and gross motor experiences. Overall, there were low levels of environmental diversity, natural elements, and contact with nature.

With respect to the use of the outdoor school environment, there were limits in both time (30 min break time) and space (restricted to the playground), and children only infrequently made use of some other resources that were available in the public space. When interviewed, teachers tended to give a poor rating to the pedagogical content of the outdoor environment. In general, they saw the playground as a place where children could run around, tire themselves out, and let off steam. For many teachers, the time children spent outside was a period of rest from what really mattered, that is, the syllabus-based learning that took place in the classroom. Consequently, they saw little of educational value in the outdoor environment and regarded their role there as supervising the children and offering help when needed, such as when a child fell down, asked for help, or needed comforting. Consistent with this, we did not observe teachers extending learning about the outdoors or modeling care of the environment. Neither did they appear to have a proactive attitude toward providing new resources that might enrich children's play.

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlation analysis

Table 2 shows the mean scores and standard deviations obtained by the children with respect to type of social play and involvement, broken down by gender and age. In the correlation analysis, involvement showed positive, statistically significant, small-magnitude correlations with parallel play ($r = .19, p < .05$) and moderate-magnitude correlations with group play ($r = .49, p < .01$); group play showed negative, statistically significant, moderate-magnitude correlations with both solitary play and parallel play ($r = -.40$ and $r = -.48$, respectively, $p < .01$) and small-magnitude correlations with gender ($r = -.16, p < .05$).

Table 2. Mean scores and standard deviations for social participation and involvement.

Variable	Gender				Age Group					
	<i>Girls (n = 87)</i>		<i>Boys (n = 86)</i>		<i>3-4 Years (n = 62)</i>		<i>4-5 Years (n = 58)</i>		<i>5-6 Years (n = 53)</i>	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Unoccupied	1.38	3.08	1.07	1.90	1.39	2.60	1.00	1.63	1.45	3.26
Onlooking	3.56	4.29	3.06	3.91	3.48	4.17	2.98	3.70	3.47	4.47
Solitary play	1.91	2.90	2.78	4.98	3.13	4.49	1.72	3.23	2.09	4.33
Parallel play	2.99	7.58	2.47	6.43	4.73	8.94	1.47	4.98	1.77	5.86
Group play	14.54	9.53	17.83	11.16	14.02	11.20	17.36	9.12	17.40	10.77

Peer	8.	6.3	6.0	5.50	5.95	5.35	8.26	6.2	7.34	6.27
conversatio	20	2	9					6		
n										
Involvement	3.	0.7	3.4	0.58	3.45	0.68	3.36	0.6	3.39	0.72
t	33	7	8					7		

Multilevel analysis

In order to determine whether there were differences both between and within playgrounds with respect to the criterion variable involvement, we carried out a random-effects one-way analysis of variance. Using the variance in the playground factor (0.03) and the variance of the residuals (0.44) we calculated the intraclass correlation coefficient. The value obtained (intraclass correlation coefficient = .06) indicated that of the total variance in the criterion variable, around 6% corresponded to the difference in means of the playgrounds, which thus suggests that children's involvement depends to a small extent on the playground in which they are playing.

In addition, the results of the null model suggested that a multilevel model was not appropriate given that the intercept did not vary significantly between playgrounds (Wald $Z = 1.256$, $p > .05$). Therefore, and following the recommendations of Heck et al. (2013), we performed a hierarchical regression analysis with interaction terms in order to examine the relationship between the type of social play and involvement. It should be noted that the variable gender was reclassified as a dummy variable, with 0 corresponding to boys (the reference group) and 1 to girls. Likewise, the variable age was reclassified into two dummy variables whose reference group was boys in the 3- to 4-year-old age group.

Hierarchical regression analyses

In order to examine the effect of type of social play on involvement we carried out a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses with interaction terms, in which gender, age, and type of play were predictor variables and involvement was a criterion

variable. For each regression analysis, children’s gender and age were entered in the first step; the main effects of solitary play, parallel play, and group play were entered in the second step; and two-way interaction terms (Solitary Play × Gender, Parallel Play × Gender, and Group Play × Gender) were entered in the third, fourth, and fifth steps, consecutively. All necessary assumptions for carrying out the regression analysis were met. Both the histogram of residuals and the probability chart fell within the normal distribution of the data (assumption of parametric data), and application of the Breusch-Pagan test and Koenker’s test revealed no heteroscedasticity problems. In addition, we checked that the value of the variance inflation factor and tolerance indices were within the recommended range.

The analysis revealed a statistically significant interaction between group play and gender, $F(9, 163) = 21.019, p = .0001$. The linear model that included this interaction explained 53.7% of the variance in involvement. The results are shown in Table 3. With respect to primary effects, no effect of gender or age group on involvement was found; hence, there were no differences in involvement between boys and girls or among children of different ages. The results demonstrated that solitary play ($\beta = .209, t = 2.732, p = .007$), parallel play ($\beta = .535, t = 5.269, p = .0001$) and group play ($\beta = .756, t = 7.530, p = .0001$) all predicted involvement. Thus, as might be expected, the greater the frequency of solitary, parallel, or group play, the greater the child’s involvement. More specifically, our analysis of the regression coefficients demonstrated that group play accounted for more of the variance in predictive ability than did either solitary play or parallel play.

Table 3. Regression analysis with type of play, gender, and age as predictor variables and involvement as a criterion variable (N = 173).

Predictor Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5

Gender	-.112	.036	.040	.038	-.256
Age group: 4–5 years	-.061	-.014	-.014	-.014	-.018
Age group: 5–6 years	-.041	-.019	-.021	-.020	-.009
Solitary play		.269**	.273**	.273**	.209**
Parallel play		.625**	.625**	.618**	.535**
Group play		.903**	.903**	.902**	.756**
Solitary Play × Gender			-.009	-.009	.062
Parallel Play × Gender				.008	.126
Group Play × Gender					.280*
R^2 (proportion of variance accounted for)	.015	.525	.525	.525	.537
Added value		.510**	0	0	.012*

Note. Data are standardized (betas regression coefficients).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

With respect to interaction effects (see Figure 1), we found that gender modulated the relationship between group play and involvement ($\beta = .280$, $t = 2.061$, $p = .041$).

Specifically, although a higher frequency of group play was found to predict greater involvement by both boys and girls, in the case of girls the more frequent the group play, the greater the positive effect of that play on involvement.

Discussion

The design and use of outdoor environments

The primary purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between type of social play and involvement in the outdoor school environment. With respect to the design of outdoor environments, our results clearly demonstrated that the environments analyzed fell far short of fulfilling the criteria for high quality suggested by various experts (Kos & Jerman, 2013; Luchs & Fikus, 2013). In general, we found that the design and use of outdoor environments were undervalued aspects in the educational curriculum, and consequently such environments were underused. In addition, the possibilities for play were quite limited, not the least because the environments were geared predominantly to the practice of certain sports, offering little contact with nature.

Generally speaking, therefore, what predominated were physical activities such as soccer, running and jumping around the playground, and games involving chase. Talking with peers and observing the behavior of other children were also common activities. In this regard, we believe that schools in our geographical area must make improvements in order to create high-quality outdoor environments that have a positive effect on child development and learning.

With the exception of Scandinavian countries—such as Norway, Denmark, and Sweden (Kos & Jerman, 2013; Little et al., 2012; Williams-Sieghfredsen, 2012)—and certain schools in the United Kingdom (O'Brien, 2009) and Australia (Elliott & Chancellor, 2014), the situation appears to be similar both in other European countries (Kos & Jerman, 2013) and elsewhere in the world (Chancellor & Cevher-Kalburan, 2014; Ernst, 2014; Hu, Li, De Marco, & Chen, 2014; Ihmeideh & Al-Qaryouti, 2016; McClintic

& Petty, 2015; Shim et al., 2001), although it should be noted that the number of studies conducted on this topic is small. This highlights the need not only for further research into the quality of the outdoor school environment but also for initiatives that enable the outdoors to be used to its full potential.




Figure 1. Interaction between group play and gender with respect to involvement. Level of involvement was rated on a scale from 1 to 5. The frequencies for group play ranged from 0 to 36.

The relationship between social play and involvement in the outdoor school environment With respect to the relationship between social play and involvement in the outdoor school environment, we found, as expected, that greater social play predicts greater involvement on the part of the child. Furthermore, children who engaged in more group play showed greater involvement than did those who engaged more in solitary or parallel play. This is consistent with the results of other studies that have found an association between greater social play and better results on scales that measure variables related to the learning and development of preschool children (Coplan et al., 2014; Coplan, Wichmann, & Lagacé-Séguin, 2009; Veiga et al., 2016).

Thus, it can be stated that in the outdoor school environment, children become more involved as more social participation is required by the type of play, with group play being the type that predicts the greatest involvement. Given, therefore, that involvement, together with emotional well-being, is a key indicator for assessing the quality and effectiveness of learning in early education (Laevers & Heylen, 2003), we

believe that the design of preschool outdoor environments should be geared toward encouraging social participation, especially in the form of group play. More specifically, however, developments of this kind not only must seek to promote children's contact with nature but also should be based on the concept of affordance (Gibson & Pick, 2000). This concept refers to those properties of the physical environment that stimulate, attract, and support the actions of individuals. It should be noted that affordance is present if the child perceives and acknowledges an opportunity and if the environment is tailored to the child's stage of development; in this respect, the environment and the individual are considered to form part of an interactive system. As Cosco (2007) said, "An object in the play area will be considered clim-able if it is possible to climb on it, slide-able if it allows sliding, or swing-able if one can swing on it" (p. 128; emphases in original). Thus, the environment must be designed in such a way that it affords the possibility of play. For example, two children of preschool age may use some sand, earth, water, grass, twigs, and stones to build a stable and might then place some pressed leaves of different sizes and colors inside to represent the farm animals. The next day they return to the same play area, and this time they are joined by other children who are drawn toward the play. The new children join in and cooperate with the activity, adding new ideas about how the farm works (who arrives, who leaves, etc.) and what the animals do (when they eat and sleep, etc.); they also of course bring their own emotions and problem-solving skills. This then is an example of group social play that promotes involvement and emotional well-being and that would not take place without the combined affordances of elements such as earth, water, grass, leaves, and stones as well as the staging created by the children's own imagination.

Gender differences in involvement in the outdoor school environment

With respect to gender differences examined in the present study, there were, as expected, no differences between boys and girls in levels of involvement in the outdoor school environment. This is consistent with results obtained in studies carried out in German classrooms (Ulich & Mayr, 2002). However, gender was found to have a moderating effect on the relationship between the type of group play and involvement. Our results showed that among both boys and girls, group play predicted greater

involvement. However, although the frequency of group play was lower among girls than boys, among girls the greater the frequency of this type of play, the greater its positive effect on involvement.

One possible explanation for this result relates to the typical setup of the outdoor school environment. As mentioned previously, the design of the outdoor environments we analyzed was geared toward the main sports activities, those most commonly played by boys. Designing the space in this way restricts girls' outdoor play to a narrower range of activities in a much smaller environment, one that may not be very stimulating. This may make it difficult for girls to initiate group play, thereby encouraging more solitary and parallel play. Bearing in mind the importance of group play for child development, this tentative explanation leads us again to propose changes in the design of the outdoor school environment. We believe that these environments should promote gender equality and the inclusion of both boys and girls, and consequently they should be designed in such a way as to offer both access to a natural environment and multiple diverse opportunities for play and learning (DeBord et al., 2005; Moser & Martinsen, 2010). Outdoor school environments of this kind would be better able to promote the social participation of all girls and all boys and would represent a move away from designs that favor the most common sports activities, those that are generally associated with the male gender.

Limitations and future research

The present study does have certain limitations. The results obtained would have greater external validity if they were replicated with larger samples, including outdoor environments with more heterogeneous designs. This would also enable us to examine the effect that the quality of the outdoor environment has on social play and children's level of involvement. In addition, it would be of particular interest to carry out a transcultural study in which the relationship between social play and involvement were analyzed in countries in which the use and design of outdoor environments are noticeably different. A further potential limitation considers the observational nature of the data. Although an observational approach is considered to be methodologically appropriate for

the study of children's social behavior, there are no clear guidelines regarding the necessary frequency and duration of observations (Fabes, Martin, & Hanish, 2009). Thus, although we believe that the number of observations in our study was sufficient given the target variables, future research should aim to increase the frequency and duration of the observations made. Likewise, the present objectives and hypotheses would also benefit from a longitudinal design so that participants could be followed up throughout their preschool and even primary education. Given that a higher frequency of group play is associated with greater involvement, it would also be interesting in future research to examine the effect of the different subtypes of group play (i.e., associative and cooperative) on this relationship. Finally, given that the quality of the relationship between teachers and children in the classroom is a variable that affects involvement (Barandiaran et al., 2015), it would be useful in future studies to examine the effect that the teacher's role and attitudes have on children's involvement in the outdoor environment. We believe that studies of this kind would help to draw attention to the need for teachers to receive training as regards the importance of the outdoor environment for children's development.

Implications for practice and policy

Despite these limitations, the results obtained here allow us to endorse the importance of the outdoor school environment for children's development. The findings also highlight the underlying need in our geographical area to implement innovative projects in schools that specifically address the outdoor environment. These changes would require the participation of all parties, including children themselves, their families, and the community. We also believe that it is vital that any such initiatives receive government support in the form of inclusive education policies that promote the development of all children. Furthermore, initiatives of this kind should not be based exclusively on curricular considerations related to teaching and learning but rather should take their lead from the need to promote children's well-being and gender equality, thereby contributing to the creation of a fairer and more equitable society.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the teachers and children who participated in our study.

Funding

This study was funded by the Foral Council of Gipuzkoa–Basque Country.

References

- Andrews, N. C. Z., Hanish, L. D., Fabes, R. A., & Martin, C. L. (2014). With whom and where you play: Preschoolers' social context predicts peer victimization. *Social Development, 23*, 357–375. doi:10.1111/sode.12051
- Ärlemalm-Hagsér, E. (2006). Gender, playing and learning in natural outdoor environments. In J. Brodin & P. Lindstrand (Eds.), *Interaction in outdoor play environments: Gender, culture and learning* (pp. 23–44). Stockholm, Sweden: Stockholm Institute of Education.
- Bar-Haim, Y., & Bart, O. (2006). Motor function and social participation in kindergarten children. *Social Development, 15*, 296–310. doi:10.1111/sode.2006.15.issue-2
- Barandiaran, A., Muela, A., López de Arana, E., Larrea, I., & Vitoria, J. R. (2015). Exploratory behaviour, emotional well-being and childcare quality in preschool education. *Anales De Psicología, 31*, 570–578. doi:10.6018/analesps.31.2.171551
- Blanchet-Cohen, N., & Elliot, E. (2011). Young children and educators engagement and learning outdoors: A basis for rights-based programming. *Early Education & Development, 22*, 757–777. doi:10.1080/10409289.2011.596460
- Canning, N. (2010). The influence of the outdoor environment: Den-making in three different contexts. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 18*, 555–566. doi:10.1080/1350293X.2010.525961
- Cassidy, D. J., Hestenes, L. L., Hansen, J. K., Hegde, A., Shim, J., & Hestenes, S. (2005). Revisiting the two faces of child care quality: Structure and process. *Early Education & Development, 16*, 505–520. doi:10.1207/s15566935eed1604_10
- Chancellor, B., & Cevher-Kalburan, N. (2014). Comparing and contrasting primary school playgrounds in Turkey and Australia. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives, 13*(2), 41–59.
- Coplan, R. J., & Ooi, L. L. (2014). The causes and consequences of playing alone in

childhood. In R. Coplan & J. C. Bowker (Eds.), *The handbook of solitude: Psychological perspectives on social isolation, social withdrawal, and the experience of being alone* (pp. 111–128). New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.

Coplan, R. J., Ooi, L., Rose-Krasnor, L., & Nocita, G. (2014). “I want to play alone”: Assessment and correlates of self-reported preference for solitary play in young children. *Infant and Child Development, 23*, 229–238. doi:10.1002/icd.v23.3

Coplan, R. J., & Rubin, K. H. (1998). Exploring and assessing nonsocial play in the preschool: The development and validation of the Preschool Play Behavior Scale. *Social Development, 7*, 72–91.

Coplan, R. J., Rubin, K. H., & Findlay, L. C. (2006). Social and nonsocial play. In D. P. Fromberg & D. Bergen (Eds.), *Play from birth to twelve: Contexts, perspectives, and meanings* (pp. 75–86). New York, NY: Garland Press.

Coplan, R. J., Wichmann, C., & Lagacé-Séguin, D. G. (2009). Solitary-active play behavior: A marker variable for maladjustment in the preschool? *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 15*, 164–172. doi:10.1080/02568540109594957

Cosco, N. G. (2007). Developing evidence-based design. In C. W. Thompson & P. Travlou (Eds.), *Open space: People space* (pp. 125–135). London, UK: Taylor & Francis.

Cosco, N. G., Moore, R. C., & Smith, W. R. (2014). Childcare outdoor renovation as a built environment health promotion strategy: Evaluating the preventing obesity by design intervention. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 28*, 27–32. doi:10.4278/ajhp.130430-QUAN-208

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Finding flow*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Davidsson, B. (2006). The schoolyard as a place of meaning: Children’s perspective. In J. Brodin & P. Lindstrand (Eds.), *Interaction in outdoor play environments: Gender, culture and learning* (pp. 61–79). Stockholm, Sweden: Stockholm Institute of Education.

DeBord, K., Hestenes, L. L., Moore, R. C., Cosco, N. G., & McGinnis, J. R. (2005). *Preschool Outdoor Environment Measurement Scale*. Lewisville, NC: Kaplan Early Learning.

Doumen, S., Koomen, H. M. Y., Buyse, E., Wouters, S., & Verschueren, K. (2012). Teacher and observer views on student-teacher relationships: Convergence across

kindergarten and relations with student engagement. *Journal of School Psychology, 50*, 61–76. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2011.08.004

Ebbeck, M., Winter, P., Russo, S., Yim, H. Y. B., Teo-Zuzarte, G. L. C., & Goh, M. (2012). Measuring children's involvement as an indicator of curriculum effectiveness: A curriculum evaluation of a selected child study centre in Singapore. *Early Child Development and Care, 182*, 609–619. doi:10.1080/03004430.2011.566329

Elliott, S., & Chancellor, B. (2014). From forest preschool to bush kinder: An inspirational approach to preschool provision in Australia. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood, 39*(4), 45–53.

Ernst, J. (2014). Early childhood educators' use of natural outdoor settings as learning environments: An exploratory study of beliefs, practices, and barriers. *Environmental Education Research, 20*, 735–752. doi:10.1080/13504622.2013.833596

European Commission/Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency/Eurydice. (2013). Education and training in Europe 2020: Responses from the EU member states.

Retrieved from

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/EDUCATION/EURYDICE/documents/thematic_reports/163EN.pdf

Fabes, R. A., Martin, C. L., & Hanish, L. D. (2009). Children's behaviors and interactions with peers. In K. H. Rubin, W. M. Bukowski, & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups: Social, emotional, and personality development in context* (pp. 45–62). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Fisher, K., Hirsh-Pasek, K., Golinkoff, R. M., Singer, D. G., & Berk, L. (2011). Playing around in school: Implications for learning and educational policy. In A. D. Pellegrini (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the development of play* (pp. 341–362). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Fromberg, D. P., & Bergen, D. (2015). *Play, from birth to twelve: Context, perspectives, and meanings*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gialamas, A., Mittinty, M. N., Sawyer, M. G., Zubrick, S. R., & Lynch, J. (2014). Child care quality and children's cognitive and socio-emotional development: An Australian longitudinal study. *Early Child Development and Care, 184*, 1–21.

doi:10.1080/03004430.2013.847835

- Gibson, E. J., & Pick, A. D. (2000). *An ecological approach to perceptual learning and development*. New York, NY:Oxford University Press.
- Gray, C., Gibbons, R., Bienenstock, A., Brussoni, M., Chabot, G., Herrington, S., . . . Tremblay, M. S. (2015). What is the relationship between outdoor time and physical activity, sedentary behaviour, and physical fitness in children? A systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *12*, 6455–6474. doi:10.3390/ijerph120606455
- Gunnarsdottir, B. (2014). From play to school: Are core values of ECEC in Iceland being undermined by “schoolification”? *International Journal of Early Years Education*, *22*, 242–250. doi:10.1080/09669760.2014.960319
- Hart, C. H. (1993). *Children on playgrounds: Research perspectives and applications*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hartle, L. C. (1996). Effects of additional materials on preschool children’s outdoor play behaviors. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *11*, 68–81. doi:10.1080/02568549609594696
- Heck, R. H., Thomas, S. L., & Tabata, L. N. (2013). *Multilevel and longitudinal modeling with IBM SPSS*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Henniger, M. L. (1985). Preschool children’s play behaviors in an indoor and outdoor environment. In J. Frost & S. Sunderlin (Eds.), *When children play* (pp. 145–149). Olney, MD: Association for Childhood Educational International.
- Howes, C. (2011). Social play of children with adults and peers. In A. D. Pellegrini (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the development of play* (pp. 231–244). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hu, B. Y., Li, K., De Marco, A., & Chen, Y. (2014). Examining the quality of outdoor play in Chinese kindergartens. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, *47*, 53–77. doi:10.1007/s13158-014-0114-9
- Ihmeideh, F. M., & Al-Qaryouti, I. A. (2016). Exploring kindergarten teachers’ views and roles regarding children’s outdoor play environments in Oman. *Early Years*, *36*, 81–96. doi:10.1080/09575146.2015.1077783
- Karila, K. (2012). A Nordic perspective on early childhood education and care policy. *European Journal of Education*, *47*, 584–595. doi:10.1111/ejed.2012.47.issue-4

- Klaar, S., & Öhman, J. (2014). Children's meaning-making of nature in an outdoor-oriented and democratic Swedish preschool practice. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 22, 229–253. doi:10.1080/1350293X.2014.883721
- Kos, M., & Jerman, J. (2013). Provisions for outdoor play and learning in Slovene preschools. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 13, 189–205. doi:10.1080/14729679.2013.769888
- Laevers, F. (1994). *The Leuven Involvement Scale for Young-Children (LIS-YC) manual and video-tape*. Leuven, Belgium: Centre for Experimental Education.
- Laevers, F. (2003). Making care and education more effective through well-being and involvement. In F. Laevers & L. Heylen (Eds.), *Involvement of children and teacher style: Insights from an international study on experiential education* (pp. 13–24). Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press.
- Laevers, F. (2005). *Sics [Ziko]: Well-being and involvement in care*. Leuven, Belgium: Kind and Gezin and Research Centre for Experiential Education.
- Laevers, F., & Heylen, L. (2003). *Involvement of children and teacher style: Insights from an international study on experiential education*. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press.
- Little, H., Sandseter, E. B. H., & Wyver, S. (2012). Early childhood teacher's beliefs about children's risky play in Australia and Norway. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 13, 300–316. doi:10.2304/ciec.2012.13.4.300
- Luchs, A., & Fikus, M. (2013). A comparative study of active play on differently designed playgrounds. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 13, 206–222. doi:10.1080/14729679.2013.778784
- MacQuarrie, S., Nugent, C., & Warden, C. (2015). Learning with nature and learning from others: Nature as setting and resource for early childhood education. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 15, 1–23. doi:10.1080/14729679.2013.841095
- Mårtensson, F., Boldemann, C., Söderström, M., Blennow, M., Englund, J. E., & Grahn, P. (2009). Outdoor environmental assessment of attention promoting settings for preschool children: Part of salutogenic concept. *Health and Place*, 15, 1149–1157. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2009.07.002

- McClintic, S., & Petty, K. (2015). Exploring early childhood teachers' beliefs and practices about preschool outdoor play: A qualitative study. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 36, 24–43. doi:10.1080/10901027.2014.997844
- Moore, R. (2014). *Nature play and learning places: Creating and managing places where children engage with nature*. Raleigh, NC, and Reston, VA: Natural Learning Initiative and National Wildlife Federation.
- Moser, T., & Martinsen, T. (2010). The outdoor environment in Norwegian kindergartens as pedagogical space for toddlers' play, learning and development. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 18, 457–471. doi:10.1080/1350293X.2010.525931
- Nelson, L. J., Hart, C. H., & Evans, C. A. (2008). Solitary-functional play and solitary-pretend play: Another look at the construct of solitary-active behavior using playground observations. *Social Development*, 17, 812–831. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00470.x
- O'Brien, L. (2009). Learning outdoors: The forest school approach. *Education 3-13*, 37, 45–60. doi:10.1080/03004270802291798
- Ouvry, M. (2003). *Exercising muscles and minds: Outdoor play and the early years curriculum*. London, UK: National Early Years Network.
- Parten, M. B. (1932). Social participation among pre-school children. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 27, 243–269. doi:10.1037/h0074524
- Pellegrini, A. D. (1992). Kindergarten children's social-cognitive status as a predictor of first-grade success. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 7, 565–577. doi:10.1016/0885-2006(92)90099-K
- Pellegrini, A. D. (2011). *The Oxford handbook of the development of play*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Piaget, J. (1962). *Play, dreams, and imitation in childhood*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Pillitteri, A. (2009). *Maternal and child health nursing: Care of the childbearing and childrearing family*. Baltimore, MD: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Pinto, A. I., Pessanha, M., & Aguiar, C. (2013). Effects of home environment and center-based child care quality on children's language, communication, and literacy outcomes. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 28, 94–101. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2012.07.001
- Roopnarine, J. L. (2011). Cultural variations in beliefs about play, parent-child play, and

- children's play: Meaning for childhood development. In A. D. Pellegrini (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the development of play* (pp. 19–40). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rubin, K. H. (2001). *The Play Observation Scale (POS) (Revised)*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Rubin, K. H., Coplan, R. J., & Bowker, J. C. (2009). Social withdrawal in childhood. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 141–171.
doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163642
- Rubin, K. H., Fein, G., & Vandenberg, B. (1983). Play. In P. H. Mussen & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality and social development* (pp. 693–774). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Ruble, D. N., Martin, C. L., & Berenbaum, S. (2006). Gender development. In W. Damon, R. M. Lerner, & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol 3. Social, emotional and personality development* (pp. 858–932). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Shim, S.-Y., Herwig, J. E., & Shelley, M. (2001). Preschoolers' play behaviors with peers in classroom and playground settings. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 15*, 149–163. doi:10.1080/02568540109594956
- Smilansky, S. (1968). *The effects of sociodramatic play on disadvantaged children: Preschool children*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Smith, P. K., & Hart, C. H. (Eds.). (2004). *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of childhood social development*. Malden, MA: Wiley.
- Spinrad, T. L., Eisenberg, N., Harris, E., Hanish, L., Fabes, R. A., Kupanoff, K., . . . Holmes, J. (2004). The relation of children's everyday nonsocial peer play behavior to their emotionality, regulation, and social functioning. *Developmental Psychology, 40*, 67–80. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.40.1.67
- Ulich, M., & Mayr, T. (2002). Children's involvement profiles in daycare centres. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 10*, 127–143.
doi:10.1080/13502930285209001
- Vandell, D. L., Belsky, J., Burchinal, M., Vandergrift, N., & Steinberg, L. (2010). Do effects of early child care extend to age 15 years? Results from the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth. *Child Development, 81*, 737–756. doi:10.1111/j.1467-

8624.2010.01431.x

Veiga, G., Leng, W., Cachucho, R., Ketelaar, L., Kok, J. N., Knobbe, A., . . . Rieffe, C. (2016). Social competence at the playground: Preschoolers during recess. *Infant and Child Development*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1002/icd.1957

Williams-Siegfredsen, J. (2012). *Understanding the Danish forest school approach: Early years education in practice*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Woods, A. (Ed.). (2016). *Examining levels of involvement in the early years: Engaging with children's possibilities*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.