

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 046

PS 008 108

AUTHOR Kalyan-Masih, Violet  
TITLE Preoperational Graphic Representation: From Intellectual Realism to Visual Realism in Draw a House-Tree Task.  
PUB DATE Jun 75  
NOTE 8p.; Paper presented at the Annual Symposium of the Jean Piaget Society (5th, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, June 13-14, 1975)  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.58 Plus Postage  
DESCRIPTORS \*Cognitive Development; \*Cognitive Measurement; Cognitive Tests; \*Early Childhood Education; \*Freehand Drawing; Predictive Validity; \*Realism; Test Reliability; Test Validity  
IDENTIFIERS Decentering; Developmental Stages; \*Piaget (Jean)

## ABSTRACT

In a pilot study of children's drawings of "a house with a tree behind it," Piagetian sequence (scribbling, fortuitous realism, failed realism, intellectual realism, and visual realism) was tentatively supported. Children's strategies in decentering from intellectual to visual realism were noted. The study reported in this paper was undertaken to investigate: (1) the developmental sequence in House-Tree task; (2) its relationship with Stanford Binet, Peabody, and four Piagetian measures; and (3) synchronous development among these measures. Data from 49 subjects aged, 3 1/2-6 1/2 years, were used for analysis. Developmental sequence for House-Tree task and relationship among these measures was confirmed. Some evidence for synchronous development at a younger age level was found. The House-Tree task, because of its simplicity, ease, and economy in administering and scoring, has potential for assessing the cognitive development of young children. (Author/ED)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished \*  
\* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort \*  
\* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal \*  
\* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality \*  
\* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available \*  
\* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not \*  
\* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions \*  
\* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT  
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 Preoperational Graphic Representation:  
10 From Intellectual Realism to Visual Realism  
11 in Draw a House-Tree Task  
12 by  
13 Violet Kalyan-Masih, Ph.D  
14 Assoc. Prof., Human Dev. & Family  
15 U. of Nebraska, E. Campus  
16 Lincoln, Nebr. 68503  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

13542

1 a. Statement of Problem

2       Graphic representation is one of the five semiotic  
3 functions of the preoperational period. Yet very few  
4 Piagetian scholars have investigated this area. With  
5 Luquet, Piaget suggests the following stages in children's  
6 drawings:

- 7 1. Scribbling.
- 8 2. Fortuituos realism (some meaning is discovered in the  
9 act of scribbling).
- 10 3. Failed realism or synthetic incapacity (parts of a  
11 figure are juxtaposed or drawn all over the page).
- 12 4. Intellectual realism or 'transparencies' (intuitive  
13 topological relations are maintained with little or no  
14 perspective).
- 15 5. Visual realism (some awareness of perspective is  
16 evident).

17       In an exploratory study of 30 Ss, age three to eight  
18 years, this stage sequence was tentatively confirmed in  
19 their drawings of "a house with a tree behind it." One  
20 intriguing finding was the strategies used in decentering  
21 from intellectual to visual realism. Ss functioning with-  
22 in the first three stages seemed unaware of the 'front-  
23 behind' conflict, but those aware of the difficulty used  
24 the following strategies:

- 25 1. Refusing to draw.

- 1 2. Ignoring or changing the instruction (drawing the tree  
2 to the left or to the right of the house).
- 3 3. Compromise solution (drawing the house on one side of  
4 paper and the tree on the reverse side; or, drawing the  
5 tree first and then superimposing the house on it).
- 6 4. Partial solution (drawing the tree so close to the  
7 house that it almost appears partly hidden behind the  
8 house).
- 9 5. Approximate perspective (tree trunk is hidden behind  
10 the house, only the top of the tree is visible).

11 Are these strategies a matter of personal preference  
12 or developmental necessity? Is some decentering process  
13 at work? Another study was undertaken to investigate:  
14 (1) if Piagetian sequence may be inferred from children's  
15 drawings of "a house with a tree behind it": (2) if this  
16 task performance is related to other cognitive measures;  
17 and (3) if the development is parallel among these meas-  
18 ures.

#### 19 b. Subjects and Procedure

20 Sixty-seven children,  $3\frac{1}{2}$ - $6\frac{1}{2}$  years old, attending two  
21 local nursery schools and one kindergarten were individual-  
22 ly tested. Complete data on 49 children were available for  
23 analysis. The following tasks were given:

- 24 1. Stanford Binet (SB).
- 25 2. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT).

1 3. Single Seriation (SS) - 7 graduated cardboard trees to  
2 be planted in a row from the biggest to the smallest.  
3 Score 0-5.

4 4. Double Seriation (DS) - 7 graduated cardboard pots to  
5 be matched with their own right tree. Score 0-5.

6 5. Additive Seriation (AS) - 6 more trees to be inserted  
7 in the row of trees in 3 above. Score 0-5.

8 6. Number (NR) - 7 trees and 7 pots; three transforma-  
9 tions--extension, collapsing and rotation. Score 0-5.

10 7. House-Tree (HT) - draw a house with a tree behind it.  
11 Score 0-10 based on Piagetian sequence for drawing and  
12 strategies derived from the exploratory study.

13 One person administered (1) and (7); another, 2-6.

14 This ensured consistency in administering and scoring.

15 Task performance (1-7) as a function of sex and age (three  
16 levels arbitrarily chosen-I. 40-55 months; II. 56-65  
17 months; and III. 66-78 months), were analyzed by a t test,  
18 ANOVA, and Least Square Differences (LSD). Pearson  
19 product moment correlation coefficients were also  
20 computed.

21 c. Results

22 Sex differences (pooled estimate variance t test)  
23 were not significant in any task. ANOVA comparisons  
24 among tasks x age showed all F ratios to be significant  
25 (P.001). Further analysis by LSD procedure indicated that

1 the three age levels were significantly (P.05) differenti-  
2 ated on HT, SB, PPVt, SS, and DS. Also, the mean scores on  
3 all tasks increased from one level to another in an order-  
4 ed direction (I--II--III). Thus there is some support for  
5 a developmental sequence in HT and other cognitive meas-  
6 ures.

7 For total sample, the correlation coefficients be-  
8 tween HT and other measures were also significant (P.001)  
9 and ranged from .53 to .75. Correlations for each pair of  
10 measures were also significant (P.001) and ranged from .42  
11 to .73. These positive and significant correlations  
12 suggest some degree of relationship between HT and other  
13 cognitive measures. For subsamples the correlation coef-  
14 ficients between HT and other measures were computed. At  
15 level I, four of the six correlations were significant (P.  
16 05) and ranged from .45 to .75. At level II, two of the  
17 six correlations, .63 and .64, were significant (P.01).  
18 At level III, the correlations were low and nonsignificant.  
19 There is some support, at level I, for the parallel devel-  
20 opment of HT and, SB, PPVT, SS, DS and possible, NR. At  
21 level II and III, there is some evidence for a similar  
22 parallel development between HT and two measures, SB and  
23 NR, only.

24 d. Significance and implications of results

25 A developmental sequence in HT task is inferred from

1 an ordered increase in mean scores (I→II→III) and also  
2 from significant differences between task performances at  
3 three levels. Positive and significant correlations be-  
4 tween HT and other tasks, and between each pair of tasks,  
5 suggest relationship among these cognitive measures.  
6 Similar competencies are being assessed by HT task and  
7 other measures; or, perhaps one measure is just as good as  
8 the other.

9 Synchronous development between HT and other cogni-  
10 tive measures is suggested at level I; but for level II and  
11 III, the tendency is not so clear. This may have resulted  
12 from using small subsamples, arbitrarily divided into three  
13 levels. Two age levels during pre-operational period  
14 might have been more consistent with the Piagetian theory.  
15 For more conclusive evidence longitudinal studies will be  
16 necessary. HT task is simple, economical, uses minimum  
17 language (of special advantage with children or Ss with  
18 language inadequacies), and has potential for cognitive  
19 uses in conjunction with Buck's House-Tree-Person pro-  
20 jective measure of personality and family relations.  
21 Further research will have to be done before House-Tree  
22 task could be used as a preschool assessment measure.

Abstract

In a pilot study of children's drawings of "a house with a tree behind it," Piagetian sequence - scribbling, fortuitous realism, failed realism, intellectual realism, and visual realism was tentatively supported. Children's strategies in decentering from intellectual to visual realism were noted. This study was undertaken to investigate: 1. the developmental sequence in House-Tree task; 2. its relationship with Stanform Binet, Peabody, and four Piagetian measures; and 3. synchronous development among these measures. Data from 49 Ss, age  $3\frac{1}{2}$  -  $6\frac{1}{2}$  years, were used for analysis. Developmental sequence for House-Tree task and relationship among these measures was confirmed. Some evidence for synchronous development at younger age level was found. Longitudinal studies only can provide conclusive evidence. House-Tree task, because of its simplicity, ease, and economy in administering and scoring, has potential for assessing the cognitive development of younger children.

1108