Adult and Child Development in the Zone of Proximal Development: Socratic Dialogue in a Playworld

Beth Ferholt and Robert Lecusay

University of California, San Diego

This article analyses adult and child development in the zone of proximal development in an educational practice based in Vygotsky's theories of play: the playworld educational practice. The playworld educational practice is a central component of a Scandinavian play pedagogy that promotes shared responsibility amongst adults and children for engaging in adult–child joint play. The playworld practice, which is based on a work of children's literature, includes joint adult–child scripted and improvisational acting and set design. We explore conditions under which playworld activities create a zone of proximal development that fosters development in both adult and child. Our analysis, based on data from a K-1 classroom, expands Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development so that we see not only the unidirectional development of a child toward an adult stage of development but also the simultaneous development experienced by adults participating in the zone with the child.

In "The Role of Play in Development" L. S. Vygotsky (1978) stated, "Only theories which maintain that a child does not have to satisfy the basic requirements of life but can live in search of pleasure could possibly suggest that a child's world is a play world" (p. 102). Instead, a child's world is as "real" as our own, and play is the activity that creates a zone of proximal development (Zo-ped) for a child. "In play," wrote Vygotsky, "a child always behaves beyond his average age, above his daily behavior; in play it is as though he were a head taller than himself" (p. 102).

Vygotsky argued that there are two paradoxes in play. First, play is not a prototype of everyday activity because in real life action dominates meaning, but in play action is subordinate to meaning. Second, it is only in play that the child can be strictly subordinated to social rules, because it is in play that subordination to such rules leads to pleasure. This difference between the child's play and everyday activity is what makes play a vehicle for creating a Zo-ped for the child. Because the "essential attribute of play is a rule that has become a desire" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 99), in the Zo-ped of play a child is able to put forth the great effort needed to enter into dialogue with her future:

Correspondence should be sent to Beth Ferholt, School of Education, Brooklyn College, 2900 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11210. E-mail: bferholt@gmail.com

> Play gives a child a new form of desires. It teaches her to desire by relating her desires to a fictitious "I," to her role in the game and its rules. In this way a child's greatest achievements are possible in play, achievements that tomorrow will become her basic level of real action and morality. (p. 100)

Relatively recent discussions about development in the Zo-ped expand Vygotsky's concept to include bidirectional development between adult and child, as well as unidirectional development of the child toward the adult model. Vygotsky primarily described development in the Zo-ped as vertical improvement across levels, but developmental psychology must find a way to account for horizontal development across borders in the Zo-ped. The development in the Zo-ped can be described as "crossing of boundaries between worlds, not just . . . ascending on ladders of competence and maturity" (Engeström, 1996, p. 7). Additionally, "Zo-ped is a dialogue between the child and his future; it is not a dialogue between the child and an adult's past" (Griffin & Cole, 1984, p. 62).

RETHINKING THE ZO-PED: MAGISTRAL, SOCRATIC AND MENIPPEAN DIALOGUE

Bakhtin's (1981) work can be used to understand the concept of the Zo-ped through analysis of three types of dialogue: Magistral, Socratic, and Menippean dialogues. Magistral dialogue is the prototypical dialogical genre of the Zo-ped (Cheyne & Tarulli, 1999). It depends upon a power asymmetry between a first and second voice that is derived from an implicit authoritative third voice. Magistral dialogue is focused on a perceived deficit on the part of the second voice that is responded to by the first voice, which ventriloquates this third voice.

Because the first and third voices lead the conversation in reaction to the second voice's perceived deficit, "there is thus a telos (developmental endpoint, educational goal, skill to be acquired, character to be formed, etc.) implicit in the Magistral dialogue" (Cheyne & Tarulli, 1999, p. 18). The first and third voices presume to know where the dialogue is headed and note deviations and initiate corrections in the second voice. And in the final phase of the Magistral dialogue the first voice strives to bring the participants together consensually in the third voice that they now share.

According to Cheyne and Tarulli (1999), Magistral dialogue changes into Socratic dialogue as students take a more active role in the educational process and they become more sensitive to ambiguity and more skilled at negotiating meaning. In this Socratic dialogue the first and second voices both engage in questioning and answering, and there is no guarantee that the dialogue will end with resolution and consensus. The student is not only pulled up into the intellectual world of the teacher. There is "an encounter of differences that allows for interillumination among voices" (Cheyne & Tarulli, 1999, p. 20). The frequent questioning by the second voice may lead to a modification of the stance of the first voice and "could change everything in the world of my (the first voice's) consciousness" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293). In the Socratic dialogue, a child's voice may assert itself in unpredictable and challenging ways, and this may lead to a modified role for the teacher, as the teacher must now be open to limitations of the third as well as the first voice.

Thus, Socratic dialogue features two qualities that correspond with Engeström's (1996) conception of the Zo-ped: It is "forever suspicious of consensus" and "often eludes the telos of the third voice" (Cheyne & Tarulli, 1999, p. 19). Accordingly, "the ideal Socratic dialogue will

be guided by an openness to the emerging truth of the given subject matter and not simply by the adult's prepossessed knowledge" (p. 21). However, the first voice often resists the changing status of the second voice.

PLAYWORLDS

The research presented herein has been inspired by the ideas of Gunilla Lindqvist's (1995) "creative pedagogy of play." This pedagogy is based in Vygotsky's theory of play, and it is in agreement with recent expansions of Vygotsky's concept of the Zo-ped that focus not only on the unidirectional development of a child toward adulthood but also on the simultaneous development experienced by adults participating in the zone with the child. Lindqvist claims that her pedagogy of creative play supports adult–child play that fosters children's ability to produce results in play that are novel to both adults and children.

Most modern theories of play describe adult knowledge, experience or developmental stage as a teleology for children's play. As a result, many contemporary pedagogies promote forms of educational interaction in which adults either structure the children's play itself or predesign children's play environments. However, Lindqvist's play pedagogy consists of adult–child joint play in which adults and children share the responsibility for directing this play, thus creating play in which children and adults both learn from each other and develop.

In Lindqvist's play pedagogy the development of adult–child joint play is made possible through the creation of a common fiction, a space in which both children and adults are creatively engaged. She calls this space a "playworld." In a playworld adults and children work together to bring a classic piece of literature to life through joint scripted and improvisational acting, and the creation of stage sets. In Lindqvist's play pedagogy, the shared responsibility for directing the adult–child joint play is established primarily through the following three conditions.

First, adults in a playworld enter fully into children's play by taking on play roles, putting on costumes, and entering character. In doing so they are required to partially step outside of their role as teacher and to join the children in the role of fellow actor. Second, children as well as the adults co-construct the environment in which play takes place. Third, Lindqvist's pedagogy grounds play in works of children's literature that address epistemological and ethical dilemmas that are of great interest to people in a variety of life stages. This increases the likelihood that the teacher will feel personally invested in the creation of the playworld. The teacher is at least as interested in play as a tool for furthering the children's *and* his or her own understanding of a topic, such as "fear," as he or she is interested in furthering the student's development. Furthermore, these dilemmas are such that it is the combination of different perspectives, rather than skills or experience that come with age, which produces solutions (e.g. What is real?, What to do if someone you love is doing something harmful to themselves and others?, etc.).

In this article we apply Cheyne and Tarulli's conceptions of Socratic and Magistral dialogue as interpretive tools to argue that the Zo-ped is a site for both child and adult development. We explore the conditions under which the construction of the Zo-ped occurs, and how this collaborative process fosters both adult and child development. Our analysis focuses on the discourse and communicative exchanges between an elementary school teacher and his students.

METHODS

In the following we examine a discussion among students in a K-1 classroom and their teacher. The teacher and students, together with the authors and other researchers, collaborated over a period of nearly a year to create a playworld in this classroom. The discussion we analyze centers on a conflict that emerged toward the end of this playworld project: The students had decided to stage a play of their playworld but could not agree on the characters that should be included in the play.

Before analyzing this debate, we provide some brief background on this playworld.

Research Site

The K-1 classroom in which we worked was located in a public elementary school on a military base in the United States. At the time of the study, 80% of the students came from military families. Half of the students qualified for free or reduced-cost lunch. The mobility rate at the school was 46%. The student population was 42% European American, 20% African American, 31% Latino, 2% American or Alaska Native, 2% Filipino, 1% Pacific Islander and 1% Asian.

Participants

The participants in the playworld project included the 20 K-1 students (12 kindergarteners and 8 first graders), their teacher, the authors, and two other researchers. The class included 13 girls and 7 boys ranging in age from 5.3 to 7.2 years at the start of the school year. The class was an English Language Learner class with 1/3 of the children classified as English Language Learners. Consequently the class had a higher percentage of Latino students than the school as a whole (50+%).

The Playworld Project

The study combined a pre- and posttest quasi-experimental design with participant–observer ethnography in an intervention or "design experiment." We focus here on the ethnographic observations.

The playworld was based on C. S. Lewis's *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (1950). The first half of the novel was read aloud to the children before the acting began, but the second half of the novel was never read to the children. Instead, over the course of the project the children became more active participants, collectively writing and directing their own resolutions to the novel's central conflicts.

Over the 1-year period during which the playworld took place there were 14 playworld sessions (once-weekly, 2-hr sessions) in which some or all of the participants enacted parts of the novel. Following the enactments, the students, researchers, and teacher would engage in group discussion followed by free play and/or art activities.

Most of these 14 sessions included all four researchers, who played the child heroes of the playworld. The teacher joined during the 7th of these sessions, playing the evil White Witch, and the children joined during the 8th of these sessions, as themselves. For the final of these sessions the children were the primary planners of the adult–child joint play.

All of these playworld sessions involved set pieces and props created by both the adults and children, including some props that were designed to appeal to the participants' senses of touch,

smell and sound. By the time that half of these sessions were completed the teacher, who had been moving the set pieces to the side of the classroom at the end of each playworld session, began to leave the set pieces in place throughout the week. The classroom was filled with the large, colorful structures, and the teacher conducted all of his classroom activities in and around a cardboard dam, cave, castle, and so on.

Ethnographic Data

Our ethnographic data include detailed field notes, audio and video recordings, interviews, and e-mail correspondence. Field notes were written by each of the four participating researchers and by an external observer after each site visit, and occasionally by the teacher. Audio and video recordings were made of all playworld sessions and of all interviews.

Data Analysis

When the enactments of the novel were completed the children told their teacher that they would like to make a play of the playworld to show their parents. Their teacher agreed to help them plan and present this play. We analyze a discussion that took place as part of the planning of this play. In the first part of this discussion the children argue about whether they should use characters in their play that were not originally in the narrative of the playworld. The child most vocally against having "different" characters, Pearl,[1] argues that she does not *like* having new characters. The teacher, Michael, repeatedly asks her why she feels this way. During the second part of this discussion the teacher directs the students to get into groups according to whether they want "different" characters in the play. As the children speak in support of their respective positions their arguments become progressively more nuanced and complicated. Eventually, one child expresses a desire to say something in support of the position being espoused by members of the "opposite" group. During the third part of this discussion the teacher announces that no consensus will ever be reached and tells the students that the class must remain divided. He explains that each side can create their own play. However, the teacher is interrupted by the children, who reject his conclusion and develop and articulate a solution in which two casts of characters are included without dividing the class in two.

RESULTS: A DIALOGIC ZO-PED

The discussion begins with the students sitting on the floor facing Michael, who is also seated on the floor in the regular meeting area. A low table that forms the base of a playworld set piece (the faun's cave) protrudes into the meeting area. One researcher, Beth, sits on the floor to the left of Michael recording the proceedings.

Establishing the Terms of Debate: The Dominance of Magistral Dialogue

During the first part of the discussion Michael repeatedly asks the children who are arguing in favor of having no "different" characters in the play: "Why?" During this first part of the discussion

---

[1]With the exception of the researchers' names, all names are pseudonyms.

Michael also highlights and corrects what he views as the children's inarticulateness. He does this by repeating some children's statements in his own words after they have spoken.

3	Nancy	I think that we should put a parrot . . . a magic parrot!
4	Pearl	I don't like different characters.
5	Michael	Pearl, you're saying?
6	Pearl	I don't like different characters.
7	Michael	You don't like different characters? Why?
8	Pearl	Because, maybe, if we don't know how to do it with different characters.
9	Michael	You say don't know how to do it . . . Anyone else feeling like we shouldn't have different characters? Luke, why not?
10	Luke	Like – oh. Nothing.
11	Michael	Milo?
12	Milo	Cause maybe, um, maybe, um, we forgot a line, but maybe we don't know what to say.
13	Michael	We don't know what to say, but we could make up lines, but –
14	Albert	Maybe we could make words. We could make words.
15	Michael	We could make up the words, but, you know, we don't know exactly what they might say? OK. Anahi.
16	Anahi	Uh, I don't think we could, we should make different characters because maybe can't. We don't know how to make them.
17	Michael	We don't know how, like, how they'll act, kinda? Is that what you're saying?
18	Anahi	No, I mean like how to make like, how to like, like –
19	Michael	Well, this would be us, we'd be these characters, right? (She nods.) So, you're saying we don't know how to, uh, act like that character, like to be that character?
20	Anahi	Yeah.

We interpret this "Why?" question as ventriloquation of the authoritative third voice that gives Michael power in this dialogue. Michael only asks "Why?" of children who use statements of personal preference or emotion to support their positions, not of those children who attempt to construct arguments that emphasize logical reasoning to support their positions. Therefore, it appears that he is using this question to encourage children to support their preference for one character list or another using an argument that emphasizes logical reasoning, a skill that is privileged in schools. Michael's question alludes to deficits in the thinking and speech of certain children. His question also occasionally works to correct these deficits, as he sometimes repeats this question until the child does produce an argument that emphasizes logical thinking. With his repetition of children's statements in his own words, Michael alludes to and corrects a lack of clarity in the speech of certain children.

During this first part of the discussion Michael also directly states that his goal is to have the class reach consensus on this matter so that they can "move on." Around the time when he states this goal, Michael actually ignores or dismisses some children's statements, a rare occurrence in this discussion.

42	Michael	OK, you want to change the story. Yeah, he wants a monkey, she wants a monkey. Some of you are like, now we can't change the story, because we don't know how the monkey will act. Umm. So, we gotta like, we gotta like kind of decide. Because we have, like, the monkey – and so before I start adding other characters – do we do that or not?
43	Milo	Yeah, what you do is he pops out and scares me, on a bird, and I have to fly away, 'cause–

44	Michael	We have the monkey, we have the boar, and we have the knight. Those weren't in our story, right?
45	Nancy	And baby faun?
46	Michael	And baby fauns. SO, we gotta, we gotta decide this, we gotta decide this before we move on. Nancy.
47	Nancy	I think we should do it like this because, um, if, if we just do it the other way it'll be boring because we don't really wanna, some of us don't really wanna do those, because some of us like want a pet or something in the story, and I was thinking that we should add like everything that we want like elks, or something else, or otter, or something . . .
48	Albert	Or something! (laughs)
49	Michael	OK, you know what I think we need to do? OK, here's what we'll do . . .

With this statement, "OK, here's what we'll do . . ." Michael asserts that his voice has the authority to set the course of the dialogue. He ends, "If you think we should keep the added stuff, you're here. If you think no, you're over here." Then Michael points to his right for the "added stuff" and to his left for the "no." All of the children crawl and walk, moving very quickly, to one side of the meeting area or the other. Michael has not included in his instructions a space between the two sides of the argument or the two sides of the meeting area and none of the children remain in the center of the meeting area. Michael's specific plan for the dialogue and the children's response to his directions show that his voice also holds the power to map the use of space in the classroom, and to move the children's physical bodies in this space.

However, two of the children do not confine themselves to the two spaces that Michael has made available through his instructions. Although Pearl and Anahi do move their bodies quickly to Michael's left, they seat themselves on the low table that is attached to the faun's cave. They are on the very border of the meeting area and physically above everyone else, including Michael. They are, also, partially in a prop from the playworld, a space in their classroom that was jointly designed and created by the students and Michael.

Once the students have picked sides Michael takes out the toy tiger that the class uses in some group discussions to assign speakers. The person speaking must hold the tiger while speaking and no one is allowed to speak if they are not holding the tiger. With this system in place, Michael occasionally calls on a child but does not need to actively regulate the discussion so that one child speaks at a time.

At the start of this part of the discussion the children elaborate on their earlier arguments. One side argues that it will be boring not to have new characters. The opposing side argues that including new characters will be confusing.

53	Nancy	I think that we should keep on adding new characters because if we don't have, like, if we don't have new characters then some of us, we we could have, like, pets in the movie because we could *really* make up our own. And *if* we don't *really* do like fun things then we will be bored doing the same thing over and over again. That's why I think that we should add different characters to the movie.
54	Michael	OK. Over to this side. Why not?
55	Pearl	I don't think we have to get like new characters or like all that stuff because – (clears throat) – its gonna get like, um, like, if the monkey is there, um, we don't know what will the monkey say. And, um –
56	Albert	The monkey would say oo aa.
57	Pearl	And we don't know what's that!

Soon the children advocating for "different" characters begin to argue that the class would gain freedom to choose, not just avoid boredom, by including "different" characters in the play. They also begin to make explicit references to the playworld, implying that at least some of them are making a connection between the planning of the playworld and the planning of this play. Michael supports this change in the discussion by offering his affirmation that a detail from the playworld, which a child mentions to support this new argument, has been correctly remembered by this child. In doing so he provides an evaluative statement, thus enforcing Magistral dialogue.

69	Rachel	We could make pets because, we could, we don't have to like say "ooh-ooh ah-ah" or something, we could like just like make up real words.
70	Maya	Yeah, how like Beth and Sonja (two researchers), all them did. How Mr. Beaver –
71	Michael	Right, like, the beaver talked, right?
72	Maya	Um-huh (affirmative).

This change in the discussion is followed by a statement by a student from the "different" character group in support of the arguments made by the children who do not want "different" characters. This comment does not follow either Michael's instruction to the children to choose just one character list to support, or his division and labeling of the meeting area. Michael again speaks, but this time he dismisses the child's example. However, this one exchange is particularly interesting because, while dismissing the child's example, Michael simultaneously expresses his own musing interest in the point the child has raised: This could constitute a momentary break, or the foreshadowing of a change, of the Magistral dialogue.

74	Milo	Why not the robin?
75	Michael	The robin didn't talk. That's weird, huh?
76	Milo	Yeah, 'cause the rest doesn't – talk.
77	Michael	I guess it's symbolism or something. I don't know.

In another example of the children beginning to take a more active role in the discussion, Pearl, and soon other children on her side of the room, stop answering Michael's "why" question. Michael responds by emphasizing the fact that the "different" character position will allow children on both sides of the disagreement the freedom to choose what they would like to do. For the most part the children on Pearl's side of the room do not engage with this logical argument.

81	Pearl	I don't like it when we do it different characters.
82	Michael	Can, can — Explain why. Maybe they've not heard why. Why?
83	Pearl	It's because, um, like, like if, if we . . . (pausing while Michael says something unintelligible to Cayden)
84	Michael	Go ahead, I'm sorry.
85	Pearl	If we, um, like, do the same characters, we don't know what to say.
86	Michael	Well, but Rachel said, she, Rachel, in response to that Rachel said, that we could make up lines. You could make new lines for them, the monkey could say, like the monkey's with the White Witch you could say "don't trust the beavers." Or, or, whatever, or whatever lines they want to say. Right? But, OK, why else don't you want to have new characters?
87	Pearl	Because . . . if, if if we like, um, do do new characters we don't, we won't like it.

Nancy, advocating for new characters, repeats Michael's argument. Michael, who has been pushing the students to make logical arguments, interrupts Nancy and employs sarcasm. He may be trying to silence Nancy because she is exercising the authority of the first voice when she accurately and articulately mimics his argument. And Michael's sarcasm works to reassert the power of the first voice over the second, as the children have not yet mastered sarcasm. They understand enough to be silenced by sarcasm, but not enough to employ sarcasm for their own purposes.

91	Nancy	I think we, we um, we shouldn't do like those k – just the plain old characters, because if we do that we'll start getting bored of doing those characters. And, um, if we do the parrot with the, um, the White Witch, than the parrot could say, "Don't trust him. Never trust him! A child – " And it could do all these, all these weird lines, but *you* yourself can make up your own mind. Like, pretend I was the, uh . . .
92	Michael	(cutting her off) You know, I think we get the idea. Just about – Pearl wants to say something, right, and she has the – Go ahead, Pearl, what did you want to say?

Next Pearl engages with this argument, as it is stated by Nancy, using a logical argument of her own. She points to a text they all know, Sleeping Beauty, and reminds everyone that the Queen's crow in this story did not speak when spoken to. She offers this as evidence that even with the inclusion of new characters, such as parrots and monkeys, these characters would still be unable to speak, and would therefore offer neither relief from boredom nor the opportunity for the children to exercise their freedom of choice in deciding the words these animals should speak. The children sitting around Nancy respond by reasserting their appeal to freedom of choice, freedom from a text and also freedom from the lines other students might choose.

93	Pearl	Um, like, you guys are doing it like, um, like Sleeping Beauty, like, the the queen, she has like a pet a, a crow, and, um, she just talks to it and then, then she, it doesn't speak.
94	Children[2]	Yeah, but it's our play, its all of our plays.
95	Nancy	We can do whatever we want, in the play.
96	Rachel	Well, um, like –
97	Michael	Jenn, can you join us please
98	Rachel	Like, 'cause it's our play and we can say whatever we want in our play. It's our play and we can say whatever we want in our play.

Pearl responds to Nancy and Rachel not with another logical argument, but by observing that she is getting no support from the people on her side of the room, whereas Nancy is being supported by the people on her side of the room. Looking back at Pearl's response, her focus on practical details of the discussion process and on communal support amongst the children may signal the start of the students becoming more sensitive to ambiguity and more skilled at negotiating meaning. Again, Cheyne and Tarulli (1999) argued that these are the ingredients which, when combined with the students taking a more active role in the education process, change Magistral dialogue to Socratic dialogue. Michael then speaks, trying to bring Pearl back to her former logical argument. He urges her to repeat her own argument and in the process he ignores her observation that she is unsupported. But Michael ends up repeating most of the argument

---

[2]We use the term "Children" to refer to two or more children speaking simultaneously.

himself. The authority of the first voice is being challenged more fully and more frequently as the discussion progresses.

100	Pearl	Nobody else wanna speak right here. (gesturing to her side of the room) Only us. (gesturing between herself and her sister, Andrea)
101	Michael	Marissa. Marissa wants to speak.
102	Marissa	I think, um, I think we shouldn't make like different characters, um, because, because, I think we shouldn't make, um, characters, because, um, maybe, maybe, maybe, because, um, we shouldn't make, like, different ones because, maybe we don't know, what they like talk like, what they like talk like.
103	Michael	But like Rachel said, we could make the lines up. But Pearl's point is, Pearl's point, say your point again about why, even it we have no lines, what's your point, Pearl?
104	Pearl	Um . . . I, I, I didn't know what did, what did you say?
105	Michael	Like what, like why – OK, the point, the point being, OK, like why don't you wanna have new characters? Like tell them like again like why you don't want to have new characters. Like, it's not just, so if they give you lines, you you had something to say about that. Rachel said well we could give them lines and you said . . . even if we have know the lines . . . your point was . . . OK, how do I say this? OK. Remember how Rachel said we could just give them lines, like if they . . . what you say, "I don't trust them," and Nancy said we could have them say, "Yeah, they're evil." And you said something else. What'd you say? You remember?
106	Pearl	You mean like, Sleeping Beauty?
107	Michael	Yeah, so, say that point again.
108	Pearl	Like, sleeping beauty, like the queen, she has like pet, a crow, and, like, she speaks to the crow and then the crow it it just listens to her and go away, that's it. It doesn't speak to her.

At this point children on Nancy's side of the room begin to make references to emotion, instead of attempting to produce logical arguments: Maya raises the subject of sadness. The telos implicit in the Magistral dialogue is being challenged by Maya's statement, and it is interrupted and dismissed by Michael, who again employs sarcasm.

122	Maya	It's 'cause we don't, if somebody, if somebody gets bored, we never, we could, like, be our different character, a monkey, because if we don't add, if we don't add one, then, um, then it'll get bored. Or, it, it, where, and, it's our play, it's all of ours play, and if we don't, if we don't add that, then, then we'll, then we will be sad and we will be, and then we'll, we'll –
123	Michael	(cutting her off) So you're saying it would be boring, it would be sad, and – Pearl, what do you want to say? Pearl.

When Pearl speaks she moves from arguing in support of her position concerning the character list to describing an unusual type of play, in which each character can be played by many people. By speaking about the play itself she is again moving from the realm of the abstract to the realm of the practical (now in a statement concerning the play itself, not just in a statement about this discussion). Michael repeats Pearl's argument and omits her innovative practical suggestion.

124	Pearl	If, it doesn't mean like if we're bored, it doesn't mean we have to have new characters. It means, like, um, we could like go back, like stop, and then somebody else

could be like, if I had, if I was the White Witch and I was tired, and somebody else was the White Witch. I could stop and go down, down the stage, and stop doing the play, and then, somebody else could do it.

125 Michael   So she's sayin' like just because it's boring it would – or it was easy to get bored – there's, you could, she's saying you could be, you could be, be like the White Witch and then do something else or even go off the stage, OK? Hmmm. Hmmm, Hmmm.

Beth's field notes state that at this point "the atmosphere in the room is becoming more charged." Michael turns to Beth and says something incomprehensible, concerning the discussion. He laughs. Nancy then engages in a meta-analysis of the discussion.

133 Nancy   It's kinda like what Pearl said but it's, but it's the opposite.
134 Michael   OK.
135 Nancy   Because like it's not about just having *one* of each, it's not about just *have* to not make new characters. You could do whatever you want because this is *our* play, *everyone's* play. So, all, all of us could do what we wanna do, not what, not like, not what the real book says. We have we could make up our own play, that's why, that's why we could do our own things.

Nancy is emphasizing the freedom to choose afforded by the "different" character list, but also addressing her sense that the two sides of the room are coming together.

Pearl does not appear to respond to the content of Nancy's speech, but she may be addressing Nancy's emphasis on the word "everybody," perhaps a reference to the class as a collective, when she says: "Why is everybody around Nancy?" Next Tomas, who is sitting on Pearl's side of the room, speaks up in support of a character list without "different" characters. He is partially deaf and his speech is difficult to understand.

140 Tomas   (incomprehensible)
141 Michael   You just want to have Lucas, or Mr. Tumnus and Lucas and Cayden and have a party? Mr. Beaver? (Tomas nods in agreement.) OK, why don't you wanna have a monkey? Why?
142 Tomas   Huh.
143 Andrea   'Cause why?
144 Tomas   I don't like it (almost incomprehensible –).
145 Michael   Huh?
146 Andrea   You don't like it?
147 Michael   You don't like it? (Tomas shakes his head no.) You don't like it? OK. 'Cause he didn't like it. Hmm . . .

While Tomas speaks, Andrea (who is Pearl's younger sister) not only joins Michael's "Why?" with her own "Why?" but also tenderly caresses Tomas's ear and neck while smiling at him almost teasingly. Cayden, sitting directly to Michael's right, then raises and then lowers his hand. Michael pulls Cayden by his shirt, gently and playfully, actually lifting him off of the carpet by his shirt. As he pulls at Cayden's shirt Michael is asking Cayden, teasingly, to speak. This behavior is uncharacteristic for Michael, who does not usually touch his students.

At this point Luke says that he was going to say something but that it was something supporting the other side's argument. Maya helps him to finish his thought:

155 Luke   Like, my, my thing was, like, I was gonna say, like, like I thought about it, (incom-
prehensible) like I was gonna say, but, like, it was, like, something from theirs.
(He points across the room to the other group of children, "Pearl's group") Like
something from theirs like, I was gonna say something like that, like I was gonna
say like –

156 Maya   For some, for theirs. (She gestures across the room to the other group of children,
"Pearl's group")

At this very moment when Michael's division of the room and the argument into two oppos-
ing sides appears to be about to be challenged, Michael calls for a break in the meeting. Almost
13 minutes have passed since the last break in the discussion, when Michael split the class in
two, but it is not clear why Michael calls for a break at this very moment. There are no
apparent signs of increased fatigue among the students. When everyone returns to the meeting
after this break Michael says that he does not think anyone will ever switch from one side to
the other.

157 Michael Now, if you hear me, touch your nose. If you hear me clap once. OK, here's the
thing, there's two sides. Just let me recap. We have a side that says, "Hey! We want
new characters, we like new characters, we like this idea." Then we have – Right?
OK. Then we have this side that's like "No. The book's OK the way it is, we don't
need new characters, that's what, we don't *like* new characters." And we have two
sides that are really (pauses to make balancing gesture with hands) different. OK?
And we can't –

Michael thus asserts the need for consensus. He also highlights the children's inability to see
beyond their own positions to the discussion as a whole, which he links to their inability to
recognize that they are making no progress in their discussion.

Transforming the Debate: Moving from Magistral to Socratic Dialogue

At this point Pearl interrupts Michael. She is continuing to think of innovative practical
solutions to the disagreement. She is not providing logical support for her position but return-
ing to the practical details of the activity, the planning of the play of the playworld, which
originally brought the class together to have this discussion. Michael not only prevents Pearl
from speaking, but also silences the students with the first and only "shhh" of the discussion.
He requests that his students give him only an affirmative or a negative in response to his
question.

Such resistance of the first voice to the changing status of the second voice has the potential
to lead to a conflict in which Socratic dialogue becomes Menippean dialogue. This, however,
does not happen here. Michael's authority does not appear to be "turned on its head" at any point
in this discussion.

158 Michael Yeah?
159 Pearl   Um. Like.
160 Michael Go ahead.
161 Pearl   Someone says it's like our play and I wanna do it like the book says and like what if
Mr. Michael could read it and we follow the directions. (Pause as Michael says

		something incomprehensible to Jenn.) What if we follow, um, the directions that has in the book, and if we don't, um (makes a face and lifts hands in the air). I –
162	Michael	OK. So yeah what I'm hearing is, one (few incomprehensible words). I don't think you're ever gonna convince Pearl to add new characters, and I don't think you guys are gonna be convinced that you can't have a monkey, right?
163	Children	Yeah. Yeah. (incomprehensible)
164	Michael	Shhh. Right? Just say yes or no.
165	Children	Yeah.
168	Michael	So what I'm s – what I'm seeing is is that we have two sides that are very different. I'm mean we can't – There's like nothing we can like kinda have a middle ground on here. Either we have new characters or we don't. We can't have like half a new character. We kinda have a new character. If we have a new character we have a new character or we (pause – he appears to be waiting for the children to finish his sentence with the word "don't" and a few children do say "don't" along with him) . . . don't. Do you see what I'm sayin'?

Michael is trying to make the students see what he sees: a conflict with no solution. He fails to interpret what the children have been saying as an indication that they may be approaching a solution to this conflict. Nancy and Milo try to speak, but Michael interrupts them both. Then Michael turns to the researcher, Beth, and asks for a metaphor that will help the children understand the conflict as he sees it, as unsolvable. This is the second of only two times during the entire year that Michael will ask advice of a researcher during class time, and as the first time occurred when he momentarily became observer in his own class and asked a researcher to make a "teacherly" decision, we interpret this event as him stepping, very briefly, outside of his "teacher" role.

The exchange that follows shows that that this discussion addresses a dilemma that is of significant interest to Michael "as a person," not only to Michael "as a teacher" (to use Michael's own words). In an e-mail that he wrote to the researchers one day before this discussion took place, Michael had used just the metaphor that he is now searching for. The context for his use of the metaphor in the email did not concern the playworld directly, but the underlying assertion was the same: some conflicts cannot be solved, so one must simply choose one side and give up the other. Here Beth tells Michael to use the metaphor that he used in his own e-mail, and he responds with great excitement.

186	Michael	Right, Thank you! OK. OK. S-- OK, OK, I got it I got it. So. OK – Remember at Christmas?
187	Children	Yes.
188	Michael	When, when, when we have the gift from Santa, right?
189	Children	Mmm-hmmm (affirmative)
190	Michael	Either we *open* a gift . . . or we *don't*. Once you open it and see what it is . . . you've opened it. Right?
191	Children	Mmm-hmmm (affirmative).
192	Michael	"Oh it's new socks!" You know? You can't *half* open a gift. So we have two sides: this side wants to keep the book *the same*, this boo—this side wants to keep the book, make the book *different*. OK? Neither one is ee-- better than the other, it's just, what you like, vanilla or chocolate? Right?
193		Children Mmm-hmmm (affirmative). Yeah.

194 Michael   OK. It's whatever you like. You guys try to convince them. They try to convince you. No one's switched sides. So what I'm saying is, what *I'm* saying is, I'm thinking that since we have two separate things . . . and you guys don't -- no one seems to be convincing the other side, like their – like Bev-- No one's gonna convince Pearl that we need new characters. I can see that. And I *know* no one's gonna convince you guys that you guys can't have a monkey. I don't think anyone's gonna budge, I think, I think we cou-- We could spend the next *two years* debating this and *Pearl* will not have a monkey in her play, and you guys *will*. Ya see what I'm saying?

195   Children   Mmm-hmmm (affirmative).

196 Michael   So either we're gonna sit here and debate it for forever *or* we have a – y-- go ahead. You were gonna say something.

Nancy agrees with Michael. But before Michael can fully explain his solution to the declared stalemate, she interrupts him and offers the solution that Michael was preparing to suggest. (Nancy's use of the number four instead of two appears to be a mistake, not an integral part of her argument.)

197 Nancy   (clears throat) Because ii– *If* we have four plays then um each of us could have our own, like Pearl and to Pearl and her team could have two and we could have two.

198 Michael   So that –

199 Nancy   (speaking quickly and at the same time as Michael) So we cou – So like this team could make their own and that team could make theirs.

200 Michael   So that's what I was gonna say. That's what I was thinking like it's two, two plays. This play over here. And you guys have the characters from the book. Yeah?

201 Nancy   And they don't have a monkey.

Immediately following this exchange, the discussion appears to reach a climax of emotionally intense engagement for many of the participants. A consensus appears eminent. The conflict has been circumvented, leaving the class split in two and without any shared appreciation of both of the possible character lists. However, Pearl is not to be silenced.

Pearl holds firmly to her position even when Michael tells her, explicitly, that she is being selfish. Michael, in turn, states that he is trying very hard to understand Pearl's argument and appears transfixed by her words when she is speaking. In discussions between researchers and Michael after the debate, upon reviewing the video footage of the debate, the researchers and Michael interpret Michael's tone of voice as expressing not merely attentiveness to Pearl's words, but also support, respect and hope.

Beth's response to this exchange is recorded in her field notes: "I become aware that I am reeling. I can actually feel my stomach sinking, and I think that the situation is becoming a bit overwhelming." Most of the children up to this point have begun to show signs of exhaustion; however, during this exchange many of them sit up straight, stop moving their hands and direct their gazes at Pearl and Michael. We argue that it is at this point in the discussion that the transition to Socratic dialogue first successfully takes place.

The Debate Transformed: The Emergence of Socratic Dialogue

We present the critical moment of the movement to Socratic dialogue uninterrupted, followed by a discussion in which we engage in a detailed analysis of the dialogue that takes place at this time.

202	Pearl	I don't want like two, two, two plays here and they have two plays.
203	Michael	So, how are we going to solve this, we'll--
204	Pearl	(shrugs)
205	Nancy	Yeah because--
206	Michael	OK go ahead but what do you want, Pearl? Us . . .
207	Pearl	Well I don't have, I don't want new characters or, like –
208	Michael	Anahi, can you join us please?
209	Pearl	Like four –
210	Nancy	But Pearl, but you can have your own play. And –
211	Children	(Unintelligible.)
212	Pearl	If we have – If we have three plays then you guys could do your *own* and we could do *our* own. With no – with no monkey no parrots no no baby fawns.
213	Michael	Wait wait –
214	Children	(Unintelligible.)
215	Michael	Wait wait wait wait I'm not–
216	Nancy	(Unintelligible.)
217	Michael	Wait, wait (unintelligible) . . . . are you saying – aren't you saying the same thing like they have a play and you can have a play so two plays? Isn't that what you're saying?
218	Pearl	No, three plays! Like –
219	Michael	(cutting her off) But why three? We have two groups. I don't get it. Why three?
220	Pearl	You – you – you said before we're gonna have three and we're gonna, do it three times.
221	Michael	No no. No. We'll start with – We could do it two. It was – We just had said two because we were gonna so it two different ways, and that's how, an issue to talk about later. No, we said two, but – go ahead –
222	A child	(Unintelligible.)
223	Michael	Three was just like an example. We could have three or four or five. That was just a number I wrote on there. It doesn't have to be three. It's just a number I wrote.
224	Nancy	Mr. Michael –
225	Michael	Yeah.
226	Nancy	'Cause if we have – if we have three –
227	Michael	Wait wait wait wait before before I wanna I wanna so– (unintelligible words) finish your ideas before I hear anyone, so I'm just trying to get yrr– what you're saying straight. OK. You're say – So– Forget the number three. Would you be OK with a play here and a play here, like two plays? (pause) But you look like you're saying like No. Why? At first you were like no you don't want to have two diff– you were like-- You really want them to be like you. I, I'm hearing that in your voice. You're like you want them to be like you. But they want you to be like them too. You don't think two plays'll be a good way? I mean that's . . .
228	Pearl	Well I only wanted to have one.
229	Michael	You just wanted to have one. You wanted to have everyone together?
230	Pearl	Yeah.
231	Michael	OK, I un-- I understand that– She wants–you heard what she's saying?
232	Children	Yeah.
234	Michael	She wants you guys *all* to be in one big play. She like want you to play--, 'cause, she doesn't want to do just a play with just by her self and these guys, she wants to do a play with you guys too. You see what I'm saying? Nancy.
235	Nancy	Because --
236	Pearl	(simultaneously) Because everyone is my best friend –

237 Nancy   Because --
238 Michael   Yeah. Did you hear what she said?
239 Children   Yeah. Because I'm her best friend. We're her best friends --
240 Michael   Right.

When Michael interrupts Nancy to ask Pearl to finish her thought he makes possible what Cheyne and Tarulli (1999) characterized as the ideal Socratic dialogue. The discussion is, for the first time and at this very moment, "guided by an openness to the emerging truth of the given subject matter and not simply by the adult's prepossessed knowledge" (p. 21). Michael's role has been modified, as he must now be open to limitations of the third as well as the first voice, and his students sense this shift and respond with great eloquence and honesty.

   Michael tells Nancy to wait so that he, himself, can try to understand Pearl.

227 Michael   Wait wait wait wait before before I wanna I wanna so– (unintelligible words) finish your ideas before I hear anyone, so I'm just trying to get yrr-- what you're saying straight . . .

He tells Pearl what he thinks she means because this meaning bothers him, not because he thinks it bothers other students.

227 Michael   At first you were like no you don't want to have two diff-- you were like-- You really want them to be like you. I, I'm hearing that in your voice. You're like you want them to be like you. But they want you to be like them too. . .

When he sees that Pearl is sad after he states what he thinks she means, he immediately reopens the discussion to her, and does so with great humility, and tender, caring support.

227 Michael   You don't think two plays'll be a good way? I mean that's . . .

And, when Pearl responds to Michael, he does not ventriloquate a third voice, but instead ventriloquates Pearl's second voice back to her.

228 Pearl   Well I only wanted to have one.
229 Michael   You just wanted to have one . . .

Michael also adds a thoughtful elaboration to Pearl's words, which Pearl affirms.

229 Michael   . . . You wanted to have everyone together?
230 Pearl   Yeah.

And with this affirmation Michael has a breakthrough in his own understanding.

231 Michael   OK, I un– I understand that– . . .

He then shares this understanding with the whole class as both Pearl's and his own, shifting without any apparent inconsistency from "what she's saying" to "what I'm saying".

231 Michael   . . . She wants–you heard what she's saying?

232 Children Yeah.
234 Michael   She wants you guys *all* to be in one big play. She like want you to play--, 'cause,
                she doesn't want to do just a play with just by herself and these guys, she wants to
                do a play with you guys too. You see what I'm saying?

Perhaps most significantly, Michael says all of the above with an intense urgency that appears to be utterly sincere and heartfelt.

   Pearl interrupts Nancy. She no longer needs Michael to help her to make her voice heard. And she makes the statement that will allow the class to proceed with the play.

235 Nancy Because --
236 Pearl (simultaneously) Because everyone is my best friend –

With this statement, "Because everyone is my best friend," Pearl brings to the discussion a topic that has been neglected, in Michael's emphasis on logical reasoning, but a topic that was central to plot of the novel and of the playworld: solidarity. This is a moment when words gather the power to move people, that we adults most often recognize in our favorite of the most influential political speeches (or poetry).

   Michael and several other children, who are sitting on the side of the room opposite Pearl, respond to this statement with awe. In doing so they stress for all the import of Pearl's words.

238 Michael   Yeah. Did you hear what she said?
239 Children Yeah. Because I'm her best friend. We're her best friends --
240 Michael   Right.

And it is at this point that the children on Nancy's side of the room begin to cross over to Pearl's side of the room. The breaking of the class in two, initiated by Michael, is being rejected. As Pearl's argument did not produce logical support for her position, the fact that these children are switching sides after her declaration of friendship could be understood as her successfully eluding the telos of the third voice, the demand for logical reasoning. Furthermore, Pearl has redefined the original conflict as it was presented by Michael, to add "new stuff" or not to, so that this conflict now concerns interpersonal conflicts and loyalties. In this process of redefinition she has also eluded the telos of the third voice

   First one child, without asking, then another child, then Jenn, now crawl to Pearl's side of the room. (Milo is counting the children on each side of the room: we do not know why.)

241 A child   Mr. Michael? Can I go over there?
242 Michael   Yeah, if you want to.
243 Milo   Ten.
244 Jenn   Can I go over there?
245 Michael   Yeah.
246 Jenn   Yay.
247 Milo   Awww. . . Ten. Nine eight.
248 Michael   OK, so, Nancy, you were gonna say?
249 Nancy   If we had three plays then it would be difficult because if we if like they had two
                and we only had one that wouldn't wouldn't been fair.

At this moment Michael interrupts Nancy to ask if Albert went to the bathroom with Luke. There is a class rule that you cannot go to the bathroom in the hall if someone else has already gone to this bathroom. As we have seen, Michael's interruptions of the discussion have tended to fall at crucial moments in the transition to Socratic dialogue.

250	Michael	Wait a second. Um, Albert went to the bathroom with Luke?
251	Cayden	No, no, he was right there outside.
252	Michael	Oh, he's wearing his shoes. OK, good. I thought I made a mistake for a minute. Sorry.
253	Nancy	If--
254	Michael	(interrupting) Go ahead.
255	Nancy	Because if we have three and they had two and we only have one that've been not fair.
256	Michael	Well, we, well three, just, OK, three was just a number I put up there that one day. It doesn't necessarily-- It's just a number I put. That was just a number I– I could have chosen ninety-five.
257	Rachel	You could've chosen any number.
258	Michael	Right. Pretend like I said two, so there's like two plays, there was gonna be two plays. OK?

Only now, after the first and second voices have both engaged in questioning and answering, and some children have crossed the physical space that the first voice had used to divide and correct the second voice, is the move to Socratic dialogue made more permanent. Nancy stands up and says, "I want to go over there." She walks across the empty middle of the meeting area, passing in front of Michael, who stops her.

For most of the discussion, up to this point, Nancy has been a second voice parroting Michael's first voice. As such, she has, for the most part, impeded the development of Socratic dialogue. In light of her compliance with Michael's demand for logical arguments and Pearl's lack of logical support for her position, Nancy's change in position, her physical position as well as her position within the argument, is unexpected. Through her dramatic reversal, Nancy is both solidifying support for Pearl and catching Michael off guard, making a return to the power asymmetry of Magistral dialogue much more difficult. Also, Nancy is joining Michael in being "guided by an openness to the emerging truth of the given subject matter and not simply by the adult's prepossessed knowledge."

Michael asks Nancy, "You don't want new characters anymore?" Nancy makes an exaggerated and stylized thinking face, putting her finger to her chin, and makes an 'hmmm' sound. Michael says, "You can switch, that's fine. Just want to make sure that's what you're . . . " Nancy finishes crossing the meeting area to Pearl's side and walks up to the table where Pearl sits. She sits on the floor next to Pearl and puts her head on Pearl's lap.

Pearl and Nancy then enact a little coda. Nancy, in a very high voice, says "Pearl? Are you gonna have Aslan in the play?" (This character's name resembles Nancy's real name.) Pearl, in her regular voice, says, immediately, "Yes, of course." Michael then turns to Beth and says, with a gleeful smile, "Oh . . . this is being more complicated."

Pearl is finally surrounded by her classmates, her "best friends," and now has a vocal member of the class on her side of the meeting area, as she has requested at several points in the discussion. Participants in the dialogue now appear to have successfully avoided the telos of the third voice. Pearl's classmates have moved to her side of the room even though she did not provide a

logical argument in support of her position. Pearl shrugs in response to Michael asking her what should be done to solve this dilemma (above).

In this new form of dialogue Michael leaves "I know what we are going to do . . ." in favor of

268 Michael   OK, go ahead.

And in this new form of dialogue Alice is able to find and describe a practical solution to the conflict.

273 Alice   We still could have two plays but we could do – but you mean your idea was one play with all together, and our plan to do –

Also, in this new form of dialogue, Michael displays great eagerness as he speaks and listens to the students. Michael suddenly appears very excited and starts to snap his finger loudly. He has realized what Alice will say before she says it and is expressing his excitement with his hands.

274 Michael   (simultaneously starts snapping and pointing with one hand at Alice, and laughs)
275 Alice   -- two. We can, so we can have all together for one play and all together for the other play.
276 Michael   Did you guys hear what she said?

Most of the class says, "yeah," but Michael does not listen to them.

278 Michael   I don't think you did, OK, I, OK, you you didn't hear what she said? Ok what she's saying is – . . .

Michael then interrupts himself, just as he is about to announce Alice's solution. This interruption is, again, at a crucial transition moment in the development of the discussion. And that this pattern is repeating itself even at this late stage of the discussion is interesting, as is the fact that Michael is interrupting his description of the solution to the conflict by again directing the children to move their bodies. Many children have joined Pearl on the low table and Michael asks them to move away from the camera. However, Michael exempts Pearl from this move, and does so in a way that explicitly draws attention to her having shown herself to possess some skills that other children in the class do not (yet) possess.

282 Michael   . . . You know what, um, guys, away from the camera. I'm really worried about that camera. I mean, Pearl you're fine because I know you're not gonna bump it but everyone else, I mean, no offense.

No one objects and all the children except for Pearl move to the floor.

Michael then continues, still with great excitement, and has, himself, now moved back to a practical discussion of the dilemma.

283 Michael   Um, OK. Here's what she's saying – you ready? You want to hear this? OK? What she's saying is we do two plays, but you guys are part of their play,
284 A child   And they're part of–

285	Michael	they're part of your play, and so we have one play where we have new characters, and we have one play where we have just the same characters. OK, Pearl, you hear that's what she's saying.
286	Nancy	like, um –
287	Michael	(Interrupting) So one play would be the way you like it where its only new characters – I mean – sorry, only the characters that are in the book. Then you'll do it a second time like how they like where there's . . .
288	Rachel	Like monkeys.
289	Michael	Where there's a monkey and a parrot? Does that, does that sound OK?
290	Nancy	That sounds OK.
291	Michael	You still look sad, why, Pearl?

Pearl does look sad and appears to be having trouble speaking because she is choked up. However, Michael is no longer dismissing her emotions as irrelevant to the discussion. He instead shows real concern that she is sad, and he is able to identify and correct her misunderstanding of the solution, which was the cause of her sadness.

292	Pearl	Because, I don't-- (clears her throat) want to do–
293	Children	(Unintelligible.)
294	Maya	All of us are gonna do it your way, then you guys are gonna do it our way.
295	Pearl	*Oh* – you mean like, first time . . .
296	Nancy	Ooh, I got it—
297	Michael	No no no no wait, she's got to figure it out. Now--
298	Pearl	Um, like first we could do it like
299	A child	Your way.
300	Pearl	like our way first and then when it's done we could do it like your way.

Pearl's smile is huge. Many other children are also sitting up straight and smiling broadly. Nancy raises her head from Pearl's lap, where it is resting. She utters an "Oh!" of realization and then appropriates Michael's earlier metaphor as a means for describing the solution that the class has now reached. Nancy teaches her teacher something new and appropriates his own teaching tool to do so.

302	Nancy	*Oh*!! I have – I know I know . . . Mr. Michael, I figured it out.
303	Michael	Uh-huh.
304	Nancy	because you know how you said that gift thing? Like *first* you have breakfast, then you go downstairs –
305	Michael	Uh-huh.
306	Nancy	-- then *first* you see you see what's under the Christmas tree.
307	Michael	Uh-huh.
308	Nancy	*Then* the first part is like, we, the first part we do it our way, with, like, it's our play with no, with – and then you're going to open the gift, so that's their part.
309	Michael	So what you're saying is, like . . .

Michael again interrupts himself at a crucial moment in the development of Socratic dialogue to address children returning from the bathroom. He quickly hands the discussion back to Nancy, but directs her speech in such a way that he does not follow up on his initial attempt to understand what she is teaching him through her revision of his metaphor. Michael is still the adult

and Nancy the child. They are still in a classroom. He does not face any difficulties when resisting her lesson, no matter how Socratic the dialogue.

322 Michael   OK, you guys missed a lot. You guys have *missed* a lot. No, on the rug with us. You guys missed a lot. OK. Um, Nancy you wanna tell us what, kinda like what we decided?
323 Nancy   Yes.
324 Michael   OK. Tell 'em what we decided.

However, it is not Nancy's one voice that tells these returning children what has been decided in this meeting. Instead Nancy, Pearl, and Michael share this role, each speaking from the others' and their own original positions to construct the new position that has been reached. In this last moment of the discussion, just when Michael declares that he is about to end the discussion, we find our best example of working Socratic dialogue: Many voices speak together, guided by an openness to an emerging truth and within a shifting power asymmetry.

325 Nancy   Because, um, Alice said, Alice said that --
326 Michael   OK, are you guys listening? 'Cause you guys missed this so you might want to hear it –
327 Nancy   Alice--
328 Michael   For everyone to hear, just -- I think we need to move on, so let's -- . OK go ahead.
329 Nancy   Alice said that *first* part we do it Pearl's way, then we do it --
330 Pearl   (interrupts) and then when it ends we are gonna do it like your way.
331 A child   Yeah, but all together . . . with all -- first we do it your way, with all of us over there.
332 Pearl   Like turns, like taking turns.
333 Same child Yeah, like taking turns.
334 Michael   Right, so we'll do two plays, one with . . . only the characters from the book and one play with . . . with some new character . . .
335 A child   Like the parrot and the monkey.
336 Michael   OK? All right. You know what I think we need to do, I think we need to go out the door and go for a run.

Michael then takes the class outside for a run, but they do not all race to the end of the field and back as they usually do. Instead many of the children weave from side to side as they run, some of them waving their arms. Rachel says, as she runs, "I feel like I'm flying." Pearl looks up at the sky as she runs and says, "I look up and I go faster." Nancy walks backwards and rotates her arms as if she is swimming on her back. And then Andrea asks, "Why am I walking backwards?" as she also walks backwards. She answers herself: "I don't have to look. I know where am I'm going." This statement seems to be particularly insightful considering our interpretation of this discussion.

DISCUSSION

We argue that in the preceding debate a Zo-ped was created in which the children and teacher together developed a solution to a conflict that neither the teacher nor his students had been able

to think of on their own. Both Michael and his students experienced a significant change in the way they understood how to define and resolve this conflict. Within the Zo-ped they created, they experienced not only the unidirectional development of children toward an adult stage of development but also the simultaneous development experienced by the adult participating in the zone with these children.

Magistral to Socratic Dialogue

At first the classroom dialogue in this discussion remained primarily Magistral. Michael ventriloquated a third voice, attempted to correct a deficit in his students, and took responsibility for directing the discussion toward consensus. Soon after Michael split the class in two, the dialogue became more Socratic. The children presented nuanced arguments and responded to each other's arguments, rather than to Michael's rearticulation of their arguments. The children's desire to organize the play in a way that made everyone happy began to take precedence over Michael's proposals to reach consensus lead towards consensus between two sides of a conflict. Michael maintained some of the Magistral dialogue from the start of the discussion but also alternated between it and behaviors supportive of Socratic dialogue such as mimicking the children's nonverbal playful behavior. During this middle portion of the discussion we saw "an encounter of differences that allow(ed) for interillumination among voices" (Cheyne & Tarulli, 1999, p. 20)

However, the dialogue became primarily Socratic only after Michael declared that there was no solution to the conflict and a solution that would circumvent the conflict was suggested. The dialogue became "suspicious of consensus" and began to successfully "elude the telos of the third voice" (Cheyne & Tarulli, 1999, p. 19) in a number of ways. Pearl refused to present logical support for an abstract position or to strive for consensus at the cost of not expressing her emotions, and Nancy changed her position, contradicting her earlier stance and offering no explanation for why she did this. Michael contributed to this shift by discontinuing many of his Magistral techniques. He tried to understand Pearl's position, not to correct her but to seek an emerging solution. He ventriloquated Pearl's (second) voice, elborating upon her argument and even adopting it as his own. He let himself be interrupted and he condoned Pearl's challenge to his regulation of the classroom's physical space, allowing her to sit on the table connected to the faun's cave. And Michael modified his stance in response to Alice's statement.

To paraphrase Cheyne and Tarulli (1999), in this Socratic dialogue the children asserted their voices in unpredictable and challenging ways, and this lead to a modified role for the teacher, as Michael became open to limitations of the third and first voices. Furthermore, this Socratic dialogue was "guided by an openness to the emerging truth of the given subject matter and not simply by the adult's prepossessed knowledge" (Cheyne & Tarulli, 1999, p. 21). During this final portion of this discussion Michael, Pearl, Nancy, and Alice together developed a solution to this conflict that was beyond the scope of Michael's prepossessed knowledge.

Socratic Dialogue in a Playworld

Although the children's debate was not (overtly) play, it contained elements of play. It was a playful reflection upon the playworld, as it embodied in one form or another the key principles of Lindqvist's play pedagogy. First, Michael did not enter into the children's play by taking on a play role, though he did join in some of the physical playfulness of the children. Second,

children and adults did not collaborate to organize the environment in which the discussion took place, but the children did challenge their teacher's mapping of the space in the classroom: Pearl sat on the boundary between the meeting area and the playworld, and above the other children and Michael; Nancy, offering no explanation, crossed to the other side of the room despite her own logical arguments earlier in the debate. Third, in their discussion the children and their teacher confronted epistemological and ethical dilemmas meaningful to them all.

We see in the children's debate that Lindqvist's pedagogical principles emerge at crucial moments in the transition to more shared responsibility for directing dialogue, or to more Socratic dialogue. Michael's physical playfulness with Cayden occurred just before the transition to the more Socratic portion of the discussion. Michael's realization that he had been using the same metaphor to describe his own thinking about a conflict in his life outside of the classroom occurred at the start of this final portion of the discussion. Nancy crossed the room in the middle of this final portion of the discussion, and Michael discussed Pearl's position on the table near the very end of the discussion.

In this debate we witness how Michael and the children transpose modes of interaction in the playworld to the classroom outside a playworld. Michael and the researchers were reminded of one event in the playworld while viewing video footage of the children's debate. One important and climactic moment in the playworld involved one session in which the children captured the White Witch, played by Michael, in an attempt to convert her from being evil to being good. In this session the children were in costumed and were following a script. They ran up to Michael and put a cardboard box over his head. This caused Michael to accidentally fall to the floor. The children were jumping with joy as they did this. In one of his field notes Michael described this moment as one in which he was giving the children an age-appropriate gift, "the gift of how to catch a witch if you are a kindergartener or first grader." However, as this moment was one of moments Michael claimed where his favorite, this moment was also a gift from the children to their teacher.

Our data are particularly interesting because they are part of an instantiation of Lindqvist's pedagogy that is not fully play. It raises the possibility that the creation of a playworld can also lead to shared responsibility for directing other classroom activities. As we have tried to show, such sharing, or at least Socratic dialogue in classroom discourse, allows for the creation of Zo-peds that produce impressive development, and also pleasure, for adults and children alike.

Vygotsky (1978) insisted that a child's world is not a play world, separate from and less real than our own world. It is this claim that supports Lindqvist's conviction that children are never alone in play, but rather that adults are always a part of children's play, and therefore that designing a play pedagogy involves deciding *upon the ways that* adults will join children in play, not whether adults will enter children's play at all. Although Michael appeared to hinder the development of Socratic dialogue at crucial points in the discussion, he also supported the creation of Socratic dialogue. He passionately and persistently presented his own position while remaining flexible and open to the children's input. He opened himself to criticism, but he was simultaneously fully and actively engaged. He pushed the children to continue the discussion, and to try to understand his arguments, even when many of the younger children were lying on the floor and rocking back and forth, exhausted, and even when he thought his argument was too complicated for children of this age to understand. Finally, as we have shown, he worked with the children to co-create the statement that changed the course of the discussion: "Because everyone is my best friend."

Further Areas of Study

As we have shown in this article, Lindqvist's pedagogy of creative play has the potential to promote Zo-peds in which Socratic dialogue supports both adults and child development. Lindqvist's theory of play and play pedagogy raises the question of just what sorts of development we would like to foster in schools: only development that will allow children to succeed in formal educational settings, and possibly development toward adult stages of knowledge, wisdom or skill, or also creative development, development toward an unknown future that is significant to adults and children alike, in their lives both in and out of schools.

Cheyne and Tarulli (1999) wrote that the Zo-ped is usually presented as nurturing, but that it has the "capacity to dominate, discourage and oppress" (p. 24). They suggested that the possibility of Socratic dialogue can mitigate these negative tendencies in the Zo-ped. Theories and practices of play such as Lindqvist's may help us liberate children from some of the injustices they experience at the hands of their more powerful adult teachers, and the results of such liberation could be as beneficial for the adults as they are for the children. We hope to explore this, as well as other topics of investigation, through further analysis of the discussion that we have presented here.

Furthermore, Lindqvist's pedagogy of creative play has the potential to be a powerful tool for teacher training, including in-service training. Michael is now conducting his third playworld. He has adapted the pedagogy so that it no longer requires more than one adult participant (himself), and he and his students produce extremely successful, regular, yearlong playworlds with minimal support from the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition. Michael also continues to write frequent e-mails concerning the playworlds in his classroom to the researchers who first introduced him to this pedagogy, as well as to meet regularly with these researchers to discuss these playworlds. These practices are as much for his own growth as a teacher as they are for our continued documentation of his work with his students. Michael sees this pedagogy, along with his continued collaboration with the researchers, as fostering his development as a teacher. The potential of playworlds for fostering self-reflexive practice in teachers, as well as for fostering long-term and mutually beneficial collaboration between teachers and educational researchers, are both important topics for future research.

Finally, this analysis does not exhaust these data in the service of supporting the concept of Zo-ped as a site of both child and adult development. Work that has begun toward placing this discussion back within the context of this year-long playworld project, employing a multiperspectival means of analysis, has guided this analysis and must be pursued if we are to more fully understand the many and complex dynamic processes taking place within this Zo-ped.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Cheyne, J. A. & Tarulli, D. (1999). Dialogue, difference and voice in the zone of proximal development. *Theory and Psychology*, *9*, 5–28.

Engeström, Y. (1996). Development as breaking away and opening up: A challenge to Vygotsky and Piaget. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, *55,* 126–132.

Griffin, P., & Cole, M. (1984). Current activity for the future: The Zo-ped. In B. Rogoff & J. Wertsch (Eds.), *Children's learning in the "zone of proximal development"*, (pp. 45–64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewis, C. S. (1950). *The Lion, the witch and the wardrobe*. New York: Macmillan.

Lindqvist, G. (1995). *The aesthetics of play: A Didactic study of play and culture in preschools*. Uppsala, Sweden: Uppsala University.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.