

University of Michigan Law School

University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository

Book Chapters

Faculty Scholarship

1974

Rules and Freedom: Games as a Mechanism for Ego Development in Children and Adolescents

Layman E. Allen

University of Michigan Law School

Available at: https://repository.law.umich.edu/book_chapters/307

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.law.umich.edu/book_chapters



Part of the [Educational Methods Commons](#), and the [Educational Psychology Commons](#)

Publication Information & Recommended Citation

Allen, Layman E. "Rules and Freedom: Games as a Mechanism for Ego Development in Children and Adolescents." In *Games in Education and Development*, edited by L. Shears and E. Bower, 59-74. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1974.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Book Chapters by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

CHAPTER 4

RULES AND FREEDOM: GAMES AS A MECHANISM FOR EGO DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS

LAYMAN E. ALLEN¹

INTRODUCTION

A NEW PHASE of Part I begins with this chapter by Layman Allen. The chief difference between the earlier and the later chapters lies in an emphasis first on play, then later on games. Allen summarized the proceedings of a "Rules and Freedom" conference that had been set up by Dr. Eli Bower with the intention of bringing together professional people having a wide variety of backgrounds. In many cases practitioners in one field did not know about the interest in and uses by practitioners in another. In a situation conducive to free exchange of orientations and objectives, the assembled professionals expressed their own positions and explored the implications of positions held by the others. In each case the emphasis was on games as devices to achieve some goal for the participants. It became clear that the game referents themselves varied considerably, but an even greater variety of views of games and play were held by the professionals of different discip-

¹Report on Workshop F, 44th Annual Meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, Washington, D.C., March 23, 1967. Dr. Eli M. Bower of the National Institute of Mental Health organized and served as Chairman of the workshop. Resource Participants were Professors Layman E. Allen of the University of Michigan, Nadine M. Lambert of the University of California at Berkeley, and Loyda M. Shears of the Claremont Graduate School.

lines. Some of the variety arose from the use to be made of the games-in-situation by the child-participants who were to be treated, taught or simply entertained.

Definitions of game and play occupied the conference at some length, and the role-playing that characterizes both emerged as a third entity in its own right in some orientations. Allen noted that the group recommended an empirical study should be undertaken to describe and predict the effects of adult intervention on games and game participants. Such study could be directed toward a better understanding of the game-play continuum as it changes over the developmental sequence. It was emphasized that it was not clear at what level of skill or maturity it would be appropriate to initiate the next level of the sequence. However, it seemed clear that the participant's relationship to rules was central to development and emerging maturity. For example cheating seems to precede negotiated changes in the rules. The urgency of a user's need for the knowledge that such research would yield was highlighted by the conference members' concern for the effects of any new intervention that they might undertake and/or the effect of their usual procedures with different populations or ages of children. They wanted guidelines as they ventured out to improve the welfare and maturational development of children through each child's game-play life. The three following chapters represent efforts to fill the need for descriptive and predictive research findings.

—Editors

THE GROWING INTEREST in games and game-like situations as learning and therapeutic devices in a wide variety of fields of application is reflected in the diversity of the participants in the Second Annual Workshop on Games sponsored by the American Orthopsychiatric Association. Among the sixty participants were representatives from education (university, secondary, and elementary), law, nursing, psychiatry, psychology, recreational directors from hospitals and other institutions, and social work.

A general characterization of the aspects of games that participants were invited to explore is contained in the description of the workshop in the 1967 AOA Program:

Games, like life, are arrangements among persons in which one is free to respond or act within limits set by rules. Since participation in games is voluntary (prescribed play ceases to be play), they are accompanied by pleasurable, absorptive and possibly ego-enhancing separations from life. Games for children are societies in miniature. In the game the child strives for goals against peers based on time and space limitations and agreed upon rules. Yet game's essence is its safety and freedom for individuals and groups to try something new within fair-play rules or limits. Children's adaptability to specific social institutions requires specific game skills to function in that institution. To help lower-class children to be increasingly successful in school, can such functioning (learning to use symbols, work in groups, relate to adults, etc.) be enhanced and developed through use of games or game-like experiences? Can transition from one social setting (deprived home) to another (middle-class school) be bridged more effectively and economically by use of games? Specific examples of attempts to enhance ego processes in managing school-related activities through games use will be presented and discussed.

The discussion at the workshop centered around several general themes. The features that distinguish games from play and the relationship of both to role playing were explored at the outset with some consideration given to why it is important to distinguish games from play. The absence of a developmental sequence of games in the literature on games and discussion of the need for more information of this type was then considered. The next topic that emerged in the discussions dealt with the need to clarify the purposes of using games, with emphasis on their role as ego-enhancing activities. Some of the problems of introducing games into various institutional settings were explored, and finally, games that various participants found useful for various purposes were listed and described briefly.

I. Games, Play, and Role Playing

In characterizing games and distinguishing them from play and role playing, at least seven different kinds of games were identified: recreational, pedagogical, therapeutic, role-playing, human interaction, negotiation, and those that serve as a basis for a mathematical theory of strategy. Although there was no express reference to the characterization of a game given by Anatol Rapoport in *Two-Person Game Theory—The Essential Ideas* (1966), the properties there stipulated as essential for a game from the viewpoint of the

Theory of Games were all discussed. Rapoport lists six properties and suggests (pp.17-21) that a game is the totality of rules which define these six essential properties for that particular game:

1. There are at least two bona fide players.
2. The activity begins by a choice by one or more players among a number of specified alternatives ("move").
3. Resulting from this first choice is a situation which determines
 - (a) who is to make the next move, and
 - (b) what alternatives are open to him.
4. Choices made by the players may or may not become known. (All choices known to everyone as soon as made constitutes a game of perfect information.)
5. There is a termination rule.
6. Every play of a game ends in a situation which determines a payoff to each bona fide player.

From this point of view a game does not depend upon:

- (a) the seriousness (or lack of it) of a situation,
- (b) the attitudes of the participants,
- (c) the nature of the acts, or
- (d) the nature of the outcomes.

Rather, it depends upon:

- (a) whether certain choices of actions and certain outcomes can be unambiguously defined,
- (b) whether the consequences of joint choices can be precisely specified, and
- (c) whether the choosers have distinct preferences among the outcomes.

The word *game* has come to mean a great many things to a great many people, ranging along a continuum from "life is a game" to the concept of a very specific, highly delineated entity. In order to insure, therefore, that workshop participants were proceeding from a common conceptual base, initial discussions were directed both toward differentiating between the concepts of *play* and *game* and examining the relationship of *role-playing* to both.

In attempting to isolate those attributes peculiar to each, play and game were differentiated and compared along several dimensions. Play was felt to be a free, spontaneous activity which cannot be prescribed and in which there is no predictable outcome: problems, goals, and rules may change as play progresses. Both games and play contain an element of non-reality, a stepping out

of oneself into another social system, and role-playing can appear in both. In addition both can be problem-solving for an individual. The difference here lies in the fact that in a game situation, prescribed roles and rules follow from predetermined goals and enable the player to reach these designated end-points, whatever they may be. Play is more spontaneous in the sense that both the goals and rules may be changed as one moves through the play situation.

Thus, in a game situation there are certain rules and roles that participants agree upon which condition what is going to happen: Players may vary the roles and the rules but there is always an awareness that something explicit is expected, and one knows whether or not he is conforming to or changing this situation. "That is not playing the game" is a colloquialism which implies that one is not really conforming to the rules of the game but is competing within the framework of a similar but nevertheless different structure. Play, on the other hand, proceeds without anticipation of what the other person is going to do, and many things are both allowable and possible.

A further distinction was drawn between the attitudes associated with playing and those associated with gaming. The gaming attitude is typically in dead earnest: Something of value is at stake and the objective is to win. On the other hand, it was suggested that the attitude of playing is less dedicated to the proposition that someone must come out ahead. However, if one looks at the game situation, it could be found that a person's attitude as he comes into it was that of playing or gaming; and similarly, one could come into the play situation with either of the two attitudes. But participation in play or game activity would tend to shape attitudes in the appropriate direction.

The playground situation was discussed at length because in this setting it becomes evident that a type of continuum exists between games and play. Rules can be implied, they are not always expressed; and this accounts for a shading in and out from one situation into the other. This is particularly evident in the kinds of spontaneous games that emerge on a playground: Kids decide they are going to engage in some activity and rules get "wired in." They might get wired in the sense of an implied set of rules, or the children may actually talk it over and be somewhat more explicit in

their definition of these rules. Rules and games can, and frequently do, arise out of a relatively unstructured situation.

Since role-playing may exist in both play and games, a portion of the discussion centered upon this element and upon the distinction between it and the concept of game. Role-playing was defined as the act of *knowing* that one is taking on the role of somebody else. When young children assume the character of someone else, they actually believe that they are this other person: This would be dramatic play. Role-playing, however, is more sophisticated and entails an actual realization of deliberately taking the part of another.

Three primary differentiations between role-playing and games emerged in the discussion. The first involved the question of repetitiveness. Unlike the game which can be played again and again and a certain average achieved, there is difficulty in getting repetitiveness in role-playing because there is no specified terminal point. Thus, someone will stop playing a role because he is tired, but this is not inherent in what is going on. Secondly, it was pointed out that it is not possible either to win or to cheat at role-playing, yet the possibility of cheating (in the sense of deviating from the game's prescribed rules) is always present in a game situation. And thirdly, there is no necessary conflict of interest in role-playing. While there may be an initial conflict about being placed in a particular role (e.g., being the baby when children are playing house), once lodged into a role, there may be no competition.

In the course of the workshop discussion, the element of winning and losing emerged as one of the most frequently cited criteria by which to distinguish between play and games. Only in a game situation does a clear win-lose condition emerge. As soon as play becomes a matter of winning and losing, it becomes another communication mode. Several other elements were also felt to be necessary concomitants to a game situation: There must be specified terminal conditions; a predictable outcome; repetitiveness; a predictable sequence; a conflict of interest.

The above distinctions and the following summary of the differences between play and games served as operational definitions upon which the proceedings of the remainder of the workshop were based: When one talks about play, one has in mind a general

sort of activity which differentiates it from other kinds of activity—an activity in which one can imagine, can have fun, can do many things, can increase one's skill. But in talking about a game, one is talking about a specific problem-solving situation: This doesn't necessarily involve a social group. For example, chess has a prescribed beginning and an end. There is a definite goal and a sequence of rules upon which all participants are agreed. These rules may be explicit or implicit: Sometimes it is necessary to penalize players before there is general agreement, but there must be some agreement among the participants that they will play a game according to a certain set of rules. Without this set of rules, the game does not exist.

II. Need for Developmental Sequence of Games

The concept of and need for a developmental sequence of games emerged as another major focal point of the workshop. Discussions in this area developed partially in response to observations that there is a dearth of empirically-tested game sequences which can be used for specific age groups and partially from considering a question about the point at which the child is able to make a transition from play to games in terms of ego-development.

While there are a number of available books containing lists of games for various age groups, several workshop participants suggested that there is no empirical evidence that such games are proposed or evaluated in terms of the skills—social, cognitive, and motor—that are prerequisite to meaningful participation in a game. For example, it was pointed out that many first graders cannot play tag: it is frequently recommended that they play tag, but many of them cannot. The question then arises as to what there is about being a first grader that makes tagging—i.e., running away when someone wants to touch you instead of standing there and becoming *it*—developmentally incompatible with his repertoire of behavior and skills. At what point does a child mentally perceive that running away is better than just standing there and being tagged?

Confronted by such questions, it was widely acknowledged by workshop participants that increased empirical efforts should be directed toward a formulation of the functional prerequisites of gaming behavior: those social, perceptual, and motor skills and

the level of cognitive development which are necessary for meaningful entry into a particular game. In short, it has become increasingly necessary to specify what repertoire of behavior children must have in order to be able to play games in the first place.

In light of the above recommendation, the problem which presents itself is *how* to develop a curriculum of games that will somehow be compatible with a person's physiological development and cognitive abilities: a curriculum which would begin at zero and proceed to some *n*th degree of development. If one can even conceive of such a progression, how does one develop such a curriculum that starts from the beginning? In response to this question, several situations were described in which one could begin to ferret out some of the functional prerequisites of gaming behavior and in which the natural inclination towards a developmental sequence of gaming on the part of children could be observed.

Experience with children in a camp setting seems to provide valuable opportunities for observing the types of games which children make up for themselves. It was suggested that if children are given materials, they will devise games which are appropriate to their particular needs; to their frontier at that particular developmental level. From the discussions on the types of games that children devise, the concept of the *safety-valve* feature of a game emerged. This feature involves that facet of a game which constitutes a socially accepted home-base: a place where one can run and be *free* without having to say "I'm tired, or I'm afraid, or I don't want to participate." Cheating, or changing the rules, is a very primitive attempt at instituting a safety-valve feature in a game's structure. As game-playing ability progresses, however, the concept of boundaries, limits, and a structured resolution of conflict becomes more important than a "way out," although the necessity remains for a game to incorporate socially acceptable means of escaping these boundaries without repercussions in some way or another.

Professional observations of emotionally disturbed children in game situations are especially valuable in attempting to isolate developmental factors, since by establishing *why* such children are incapable for performing in a game situation, those skills requisite to gaming behavior become evident. For example, a developmental

progression from motor-play techniques to cognitive areas becomes apparent when one attempts to teach disturbed children how to play. Beginning with motor play techniques seems to facilitate a transition into the cognitive areas, a fact lending support to Piaget's sensory-motor scheme of cognitive functions.

It was suggested further that the inability of emotionally disturbed and retarded children to play games is the same kind of problem that comes up in their inability to learn and their inability to have appropriate and meaningful social interactions. Picking up and expanding upon this observation, it was proposed that there is a common thread—a series of tasks—which one has to know in order to play games and in order to learn. Thus, learning and games are not two separated entities. They are both very much influenced by cognition, perception, and affect, and both require the ability to discern differences in alternatives of behavior, to make a decision, to resolve conflict, to establish social mutuality, to follow directions and orientation, to handle freedom and to handle change.

Another aspect of developmental sequence has to do not with a sequence within the game process *per se* but in the utilization of games as one of the potentials for getting through what Erickson has called critical periods of development: for example, in facilitating the transition from words signifying objects to words signifying relationships or actions, or in helping to develop motor skills that typically emerge during these developmental periods. Using the game of jacks as illustrative of this process, one can see that it not only aids in developing particular hand-skills which are very real at—for example—the second grade level, but that it also involves working with the intellectual concepts of sets and groups. Other games such as matching cards containing various geometric shapes and different colors exist for children who are passing from pre-logical concrete thought processes to more abstract thinking.

The idea of developmental sequences or developmental readiness in game playing is reinforced when one attempts to play games with emotionally impoverished children who for some reason or other have missed out on some vital developmental experiences. In such adult-child interactions, a need exists for coming down to the level at which the child now stands and for providing the

necessary motivation or fundamentals which will enable him to participate at the level at which he should be functioning. Several workshop participants related experiences with this type of child in which external rewards were utilized as incentive for game playing and for achieving skills which would result from game participation. It was suggested that it is meaningless to expect an ego-deprived child to place value on winning *per se*, because he is so accustomed to failing. Thus, external rewards which are concrete and have meaning for the children on their level, particularly food, can provide an incentive for getting involved in the first place. Eventually, of course, it should be learned that one plays not only for the reward but also for what one is doing in the process of playing; but several participants seemed to feel that at the primitive states, external rewards are frequently useful incentives.

It was suggested that experienced and sophisticated users of games might constitute a select group who are using such external devices at appropriate times but who are also aware when to terminate their usage. However, it was felt useful to bear in mind that a great many other people use these external reinforcement techniques with little sophistication and as a consequence may be fostering results and attitudes which are not desirable. Perhaps rewarding a child with food is in actuality simply an act of satisfying a primary need of closeness or of providing these children with a *lap*. If a procedure were followed whereby these needs were satisfied before playing a game, extrinsic rewards would be less likely to remain associated with the game process in a dysfunctional manner. Therefore, there would seem to be a delicate balance between utilizing extrinsic rewards as a catalyst when the repertoire of a player is limited and leaning upon them as a crutch so that the kind of activity going on need not be arranged so that it is intrinsically rewarding.

Many observations were made about the inadvisability of tying the learning process to the feeding process. It was pointed out that this is what typically happens in the school situation, not with food but with its equivalent in terms of social reinforcements (grades, advancement, etc.). Children who learn to expect the external reward, work just *to be told* they are right, not *to feel*

they are right or *to think* that they are right. Thus, one does not find individuals who are learning because they enjoy the process of learning, but who are learning simply for the reward. Several independent streams (ego-psychological, Skinnerian S-R, Piaget) have been converging on the importance of gratifying not only physical needs but also cognitive needs as well, needs which are beginning to be felt to be not simply secondary reinforcements but rather to be more fundamental.

Several persons felt that there are a large number of intrinsic motivations contained in the gaming process: If one can hit upon the right type of game appropriate for the particular developmental level of the learner, one can effectively utilize these intrinsic gratifications as the needed incentives. For example, infants will learn movements that will lead to a rattle being set off, and they will learn the sequence just for the gratification of being able to provide themselves with a systematic sequence of stimuli. Autistic children can learn to manipulate typewriters with no extrinsic gratification.

It was suggested that if a problem is posed that is just beyond what a learner currently understands so that he is aroused to a state of curiosity, external rewards are not needed. In many situations, there may be an important relationship between the extent to which the learner perceives himself as being competent in dealing with a particular problem and the extent to which he can actually cope with it. Building a skill may significantly reduce anxieties. For example, if in arithmetic, children work on problems which are appropriate at whatever stage they happen to be, they are more likely to be able to solve them and to perceive themselves as being able to solve them: and this perception will be intrinsically reinforcing.

There are now a number of games that are so structured that a player is likely to receive the kind of positive reinforcement described above. In chess, for example, a player making a move is resolving the problem posed by his opponent's previous move and simultaneously posing a new problem for his opponent. If it is possible to arrange the situation so that all the players in such a game are at about the same level of skill in game rules and understanding the subject-matter content being dealt with in the game,

the result will likely be that problems of the appropriate level of difficulty are posed: they will be difficult enough so that interest will be sustained and yet in most instances solvable so that players can perceive themselves as functioning well. In this sense, there is a similarity between computer-assisted instruction and games. In games, however, it is another person, rather than a computer, that constructs the next problem for a learner.

Setting up tournament competition in certain arithmetic games furnishes a good example of the dynamics involved in this process. Working with a group of ninety students, an equilibrium will be established by playing in three-player sets, bumping winners up and losers down so that eventually, those persons playing in each set are of about the same level of understanding. Thus, an incentive for constructing problems that are as complex as players can conceive of is established since this is how one gains in the tournament situation. If every individual in a group is at just about the same level of understanding, this means that the others for whom he is posing the problems are presented with problems just at the outer edge of what they currently understand. And yet the probability is high that they will be able to deal effectively with problems that they subjectively perceive as being difficult.

III. Ego-Enhancing Possibilities of Games

During the course of the workshop, it became evident that two different types of gaming situations were being distinguished. In the first situation, children institute and play games on their own initiative. In the second, the situation is imposed on the child by an adult who is utilizing the gaming structure in an attempt to develop or reinforce some particular ego-skill or ego-need in the child. For example, by choosing the types of games which are played, an adult can gear the games to the particular skills and abilities of a child and can thereby enhance his chances for success if this is the desired outcome. It was pointed out that people in the areas of recreation or physical education take as self-evident the fact that children will learn skills through the game process. Similarly, many people feel that games can make significant contributions to the ego structure and to the emotional development of the child. This latter contention was examined extensively during the remaining discussions.

One example of an adult's manipulating the gaming situation had already been dealt with in workshop discussions: The manipulation of external rewards—of reinforcements external to the gaming situation itself—is often utilized by the adult to induce the child to participate in the game. The question which then arises is why such participation is felt to be desirable. One answer lies in the belief that there is, at least potentially, a relationship between games and the development of ego-skills. Social group work literature has begun to define particular games in terms of their ego-rehearsal possibilities: this game for socialization, this for competitiveness, this for cooperation, this for interactive purposes. Other ego skills seen as relevant to the gaming situation consist of the management of assertiveness, aggressiveness, and hostility in socially acceptable ways. It was posited that potentially one of the greatest contributions that game situations might make is in facilitating the transition from the play of pre-school years to the work required for a successful encounter with the educational institution; and it was suggested that the exact nature of this facilitation would be a fruitful area for research.

If one views games as having ego-building potentialities, one must also recognize that the utilization of games to achieve a specific purpose involves a value judgment: What are the kinds of things, the kinds of models, the kinds of ego and problem solving skills that one ought to have when he reaches maturity? By answering these questions, by choosing one game over another, one jumps right into the area of values. It was felt that although specific value systems are involved, their existence is largely a taboo topic in many considerations of the purposes of games; and it was suggested that if adults are bent on *meddling*, on utilizing games for extrinsic purposes, it is imperative that these value issues be made explicit.

A study by Maccoby and Modiani was cited in connection with the cultural values underlying various games. In teaching a Mexican game to American children, or an American game to Mexican children, it was found that modifications soon began to appear in the social structure of the game, modifications which were felt to be consistent with some of the cultural values which were inherent in the notion of games as each group saw it. The way games change

in a situation such as this gives some idea of what they are providing for children, what kinds of experiences, what kinds of ego rehearsals they contain. Each culture seems to have a differential impact on children and the impact seems to be mediated in relation to the kinds of games that the children find most satisfying within that culture.

The possibility was also suggested that unless one is very sure about the type of game one is utilizing, unless one understands the dynamics of its ego-building possibilities, there is a chance that one can build in or magnify exactly the opposite of what he thinks he is accomplishing. Analogy was drawn between games and newly developed drugs: They both have side-effects. For example, it is often felt that by channelling aggression through the gaming situation, aggressive behavior can be regulated in other social settings. One workshop participant noted, however, that in her experience, the aggression stimulated in dodge-ball frequently carried over into aggressive behavior in the classroom and after school. Several others voiced the opinion that violence in a game situation reinforces violence outside of the immediate game setting, a fact which might have some connection with Karl Menninger's analysis of violence in our society—the argument that we are not only intrigued with violence, but we teach it, foster it, encourage it, and condone it in a wide variety of ways. The point to be made is that anyone involved in utilizing games with children should be aware both of the types of activity which he might be fostering both advertently and inadvertently and of the value systems within which he is operating.

The comments on the transmission of aggression and statements that learning how to participate in a game facilitates the individual's ability in decision-making are inextricably tied to the concept of transfer. The important issue involved is whether, in fact, transfer can be expected to occur between activity in a game situation and similar activities in real life. How does one look at the transferability of the skill or learning that takes place in the game setting in relation to the functioning of people in non-game life. For example, does playing Crows and Cranes, which involves moving back and forth from one group to another, really have anything to do with the ability of a child to cope with moving from one location

to another? What are the elements in life and games that are sufficiently related to be conducive to the process of transfer? While several experiences with effective transfer were cited by workshop participants, especially transfer which occurred from individual therapy session to a school situation, the dynamics of the transfer process were felt to be wide open to and beckoning for empirical investigation.

TABLE 4-I
GAMES RECOMMENDED BY PARTICIPANTS

<i>Name of Recommender</i>	<i>Name of Game</i>	<i>Purpose of the Game</i>	<i>Use with what Audience</i>
Layman Allen	WFF'N PROOF— The Game of Modern Logic	To teach mathematical logic and develop positive attitudes towards this kind of symbol-handling activity and towards self in doing it.	6th grade through college
	ON-SETS— The Game of Set Theory	To teach set theory and confidence in dealing with it.	1st grade through junior college
	The PROPAGANDA Game	To teach some of the manipulative and emotional techniques that are used to influence public opinion.	junior and senior high school
	CONFIGURATIONS— Number Puzzles and Patterns	A solitaire game to teach some projective geometry.	junior high school through college
	EQUATIONS	To teach arithmetic and confidence in dealing with it.	1st grade through high school
C. Brush	Games	Available Henry Brush, Bus. Mgr. 1717 Hillside Road Southampton, Penn. 18966	all age groups
Bob Freeman	<i>Card Series</i> a) red and black b) war c) crazy 8's d) go fish e) casino	As diagnostic tool to see level at which child is able to perform.	5-6 and up
	<i>Games such as</i> I doubt it, Red Light, Capt. May I	Help emotionally disturbed children to deal with legal "cheating."	7-12

<i>Name of Recommender</i>	<i>Name of Game</i>	<i>Purpose of the Game</i>	<i>Use with what Audiences</i>
	<i>Sorry</i> ®	Group interaction.	7-12
	<i>Skunk</i> ®	Teach idea of "stop while ahead."	7-12
	<i>Others</i> Candyland®, Cootie®, Twister®, Lotto®, etc.	Colors, numbers, left/right direction.	4+
Ralph Hartshorn	<i>Variations on Charades</i> — Kids act out someone everyone knows: worker, principle, teacher, other kids	A form of eliciting feelings about significant individuals if group is relatively nonverbal or threatened at the time.	
Takako Salvi	<i>Card Tricks</i> Not the cheating kind but the kind than can be explained by logic	Creates a reversal of the power role between patient and doctor. Develops ego strength of a sick patient who has been forced into a position of dependency by his illness.	hospitalized, physically sick children
Loyda Shears	Sticks and Chips	To teach competitive strategies.	children 3rd grade and up
Emily Snyder	Punchanella—Each child participates (hopping, jumping, etc.) Hokey-Pokey	Motor skills. Follow and gain inner controls.	
	Finger-plays—10 Little Indians, etc.	Small muscle control.	
Marilyn Sutton	Sorry	Coping and ego integrative strength tolerance for losing, etc. channel hostility and desensitize for numeral content.	5-12
	Dominos®	(Same as above.)	5/6-12
	Junior Scrabble®	(Same as above, and desensitize for symbol formation.)	8-10
	Animated Dart Games as "baseball"	Channel hostility.	3/6-12
	Throwing bean bags at figures chalked on blackboard and erasing them	Channel hostility.	3-5