ISSN: 2325-3290 (online)
Dialogic Pedagogy
an International Online Journal

"Spoilsport" in drama in education vs. dialogic pedagogy

Ana Marjanovic-Shane
Chestnut Hill College, USA

Abstract
In this paper I compare and contrast two educational paradigms that both attempt to overcome alienation often experienced by students in the conventional education. These two educational paradigms are embodied in different educational practices: First, Drama in Education in its widest definition, is based on the Vygotskian views that human cognitive, semantic (meaning-making), and social-emotional development happens in or through play and/or imagination, thus within the imagined worlds. Second, Critical Ontological Dialogic Pedagogy, is based in the Bakhtin inspired approach to critical dialogue among the "consciousnesses of equal rights" (Bakhtin, 1999), where education is assumed to be a practice of examination of the world, the others and the self. I reveal implicit and explicit conceptual similarities and differences between these two educational paradigms regarding their understanding the nature of learning; social values that they promote; the group dynamics, social relationships and the position of learners' subjectivity. I aim to uncover the role and legitimacy of the learners' disagreement with the positions of others, their dissensus with the educational events and settings, and the relationships of power within the social organization of educational communities in these two diverse educational approaches. I explore the legitimacy of dissensus in these two educational approaches regarding both the participants' critical examination of the curriculum, and in regard to promoting the participants' agency and its transformations. In spite of important similarities between the educational practices arranged by these two paradigms, the analysis of their differences points to the paradigmatically opposing views on human development, learning and education. Although both Drama in Education and Dialogic Pedagogy claim to deeply, fully and ontologically engage the learners in the process of education, they do it for different purposes and with diametrically opposite ways of treating the students and their relationship to the world, each other and their own developing selves.

Ana Marjanovic-Shane *is an Associate professor of Education at Chestnut Hill College. She was born in Yugoslavia where she studied psychology, development and linguistics. She greaduated at the University of Pennsylvania in "Interdisciplinary human development", with a special focus on the role of play and imagination in the meaning making processes. Her recent scolarly focus are dialogic relationships and meaning making in education. She is engaged in developing, practicing and studying dialogic pedagogy and democratic education.*

Acknowledgements
I want to express my gratitude to Eugene Matusov for a critical challenge of my initial views that set me on this path of inquiry, and for supporting me to resist pressures when my ideas encountered disbelief and disapproval from some scholars of drama in education. I want to thank Beth Ferholt for believing in the legitimacy of disagreement among the professionals and for supporting the legitimacy of my "spoilsport" voice in the professional publications. I want to thank Kathy von Duyke and Ljubica Beljanski-Ristić for hours and hours of discussions and for providing invaluable feedback to many previous drafts of this article.

> *The player who trespasses against the rules or ignores them is a "spoil-sport." The spoil-sport is not the same as the false player, the cheat; for the latter pretends to be playing the game and, on the face of it, still acknowledges the magic circle. It is curious to note how much more lenient society is to the cheat than to the spoil-sport. This is because the spoil-sport shatters the play-world itself. By withdrawing from the game he reveals the relativity and fragility of the play-world in which he had temporarily shut himself with others. He robs play of its illusion — a pregnant word which means literally "in-play" (from inlusio, illudere or inludere). Therefore, he must be cast out, for he threatens the existence of the play-community. … The spoil-sport breaks the magic world, therefore he is a coward and must be ejected. In the world of high seriousness, too, the cheat and the hypocrite have always had an easier time of it than the spoil-sports, here called apostates, heretics, innovators, prophets, conscientious objectors, etc. (Huizinga, 1955, pp. 11-12).*

Introduction

I must have read this particular quote about the "spoilsport" by Huizinga countless times before, never noticing anything unusual. Of course! A spoilsport is an ultimate destroyer, a destroyer of children's play and games. And being a destroyer of play, he/she, by extension, becomes a destroyer of story-telling, a destroyer of literature and theater; in fact, a destroyer of any endeavor undertaken by imagination, and, thus, a destroyer of our very subjectivities, our communities, our cultures, our lives as human beings! And, of course, something needs to be done to tame such a destroyer: either to convert such a destroyer into a player or to keep this destroyer away from play, so that play – this penultimate developmental activity, would be protected and given a safe space to proceed. The "spoilsport breaks the magic world," says Huizinga, the world in which "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. As in the focus of a magnifying glass, play contains all developmental tendencies in a condensed form and is itself a major source of development" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 102). Like many scholars of play I, too, have been inspired by this Vygotsky's[1] seminal insight. If play is a leading developmental activity of young children (Duncan & Tarulli, 2003), wouldn't it be natural, then, to organize education in such a way to ground it in this natural developmental practice – creating many opportunities for children of all ages to play, to perform and to use imagination? More than that, Vygotsky also claimed that play is nothing but imagination in action, which means that not only young children need to have their education organized on the play principles, but that imagination also needs to have a significant role in educational activities of older children, youth and adults. Thus, I saw diverse forms of play, play-like activities and dramatic arts as an answer to the age-old major educational problem of how to design environments and activities that will authentically and ontologically engage students.

It took an extraordinary confrontational and intense critique of my points of view, by a close colleague[2], to re-awaken a few dormant traces of doubt I had almost forgotten from my past study of young children's metaphors (Marjanovic-Shane, 1989). In that study, I was strongly influenced by Bakhtinian thought, claiming not only that meaning-making always takes place between people and that it involves invoking the imagined worlds, but that meaning-making also is a redefinition of relationships, a redefinition that matters to the involved participants ontologically, rather than merely in the pretend worlds of play. Thus, my colleague's sharp critique of grounding education in play-like environments and activities, made me

[1] For more scholars inspired by Vygotsky's view of play, see the literature on play, performance, creativity and drama in education (see, for instance, Connery, John-Steiner, & Marjanovic-Shane, 2010; Davis, Grainger Clemson, Ferholt, Jansson, & Marjanovic-Shane, 2015; Fleer, 2009; Holzman, 2000, 2009, 2010, 1999; John-Steiner, 2000; Lindqvist, 1995; Marjanović, 1959, 1960, 1961; Marjanovic-Shane, 2010; Marjanovic-Shane, Connery, & John-Steiner, 2010; Moran & John-Steiner, 2003; Sawyer et al., 2003; Singer, Golinkoff, & Hirsh-Pasek, 2006, and many more).

[2] This event happened in a symposium I organized and presented in at a professional conference, and it was startling, dramatic and deeply unnerving. However, despite being very upset at the time of that confrontation, I became thankful to my colleague Eugene Matusov, whose critique set me on an adventure to reassess my views – to look beyond, behind, under and over all known socio-cultural conceptualizations of the roles of play, dramatic arts and imagination in education and in development.

highly sensitive to the tensions between the conceptions of play as leading and even dominant educational activity, on one hand; and, on the other, views of education grounded in critical dialogic meaning-making, guided by the Bakhtinian philosophy. However, the fact that I became sensitive to these tensions was in a large measure disorienting, disconcerting and bewildering. It pointed to something larger taking place in the background, but I could not quite put my finger on what it is – until I saw Huizinga's statement above, again!

In this article I attempt to answer important questions about these tensions that puzzled me over the past few years. Here I explore, compare and contrast what I came to see as *two educational paradigms* embodied in different educational practices:

a) One, based on the Vygotskian views that human cognitive, semantic (meaning-making), and social-emotional development, happens in play or through play (i.e. imagination in action), thus within the imagined worlds. As Cole and Pelapart (2011) wrote, Vygotsky "offers a nuanced reading [of] imagination-as-a-process through which the world is made and, at the same time, through which the self emerges to experience that world" (p. 399). I see many such educational approaches and activities that are based in play, games, role-playing, improv and drama guided by this paradigm. (See the references throughout the text). In this article I loosely call them "Drama in Education" (DiE).

b) The other, based in the Bakhtin inspired approach to critical dialogue among the "consciousnesses of equal rights" (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 285) – in which education is assumed to be a practice of examination of the world, the others and the self in which the students arrive at their subjective, unpredictable and seldom identical truths, i.e. the Internally Persuasive Discourse (Bakhtin, 1991, p. 349; Matusov & von Duyke, 2010). In the practice of critical dialogue, "people not only creatively transform the cultural practice, but also critically evaluate the practice itself, including practice of education" (Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2014a, p. 26). In this article I refer to this educational approach as Dialogic Pedagogy[3].

The purpose of making this contrast is to explore how these two paradigms define and guide innovative educational approaches, which attempt to overcome alienation often experienced by students in the conventional education (Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2012). Here I attempt to reveal implicit and explicit conceptual similarities and differences between these two educational paradigms regarding their understanding the nature of learning; social values that they promote; and the group dynamics, social relationships and the position of learners' subjectivity. I aim to uncover the role and legitimacy of the learners' disagreement with the positions of others, their dissensus with the educational events and settings, and the possible power structure within the social organization of educational communities in these two diverse educational approaches. I explore the legitimacy of dissensus in the two approaches both in regard to the participants' critical examination of the curriculum, and also, and more importantly the legitimacy of dissensus in regard to promoting the participants' agency and its transformations. Although I describe very important similarities and touching points between the two educational approaches, I argue that the differences between them are deeper and that the surface similarities have different meanings and roles within each paradigm. The analysis of differences between these educational approaches that lead me to conclude that they not only have divergent, even opposing views on human development, learning and education; but also that they promote different kinds of learning and transcendence of the self, based on their contrasting educational, social and political values. Thus, although both Drama in Education and Dialogic Pedagogy claim to deeply, fully and ontologically engage the learners in the process of education, they do it for different purposes and with diametrically opposite ways of treating the students and their relationship to the world, each other and their own developing selves. For this reason, I see these

[3] However, there are diverse and quite different understandings of what dialogic pedagogy is, but discussion of their differences is not in the scope of this article. For more discussion see for instance Marjanovic-Shane (2014); Matusov and Miyazaki (2014).

approaches not only to differ along several "dimensions", but in fact, to represent two different educational paradigms. As such they are actually not directly comparable. The very nature of the paradigmatic differences is that what is sensible in one paradigm does not make any sense in another and vice versa. It is like trying to compare an orbit of one planet around the sun (in the heliocentric paradigm) with an orbit of another planet around the earth (in the geocentric paradigm): it just does not make any sense. In this article, therefore, I aim to show two different "beasts", each in its own light – and I can compare directly only their outcomes, rather that their conceptual orientations – that can be only indirectly juxtaposed.

I first describe a few important characteristics that both Drama in Education and Dialogic Pedagogy seem to share. After that I examine the key difference in the theoretical and ideological orientations of these two paradigms – their divergent approaches to the relationship between the reality and imagination. In the next part, I present two educational events and subject them to deeper and more detailed analysis, focusing on several outcomes of these educational practices, which can be more directly compared and contrasted. In the conclusion I claim that the differences between these approaches are deep and based on irreconcilable paradigmatic contrasts.

Before I start, let me briefly define and describe what I will call here "drama in education" (DiE) and "dialogic pedagogy" (DP) approaches. For the purposes of this analysis and easy referencing I use the term "drama in education" (DiE) to describe a wide variety of educational programs, procedures and techniques, all of which use either some form of dramatic arts or some form of children's imaginative play for educational purposes – i.e. to teach a particular curriculum, to immerse students in particular experiences, etc. Thus "Drama in Education" in this article refers to what in reality are diverse educational practices known respectively as: process drama (O'Neill, 1995; O'Toole, 1992; O'Toole, Stinson, & Moore, 2009; Taylor & Warner, 2006); "the mantle of expert" or "role-play" (Bolton, 2003; Heathcote & Bolton, 1995; Heathcote, Johnson, & O'Neill, 1984); playworlds (Baumer & Radsliff, 2009; Ferholt & Lecusay, 2010; Lindqvist, 1995; Lobman & O'Neill, 2011; Marjanovic-Shane & Beljanski-Ristić, 2008; Marjanovic-Shane et al., 2011; Nilsson, 2009); improvisation based education (Lobman & Lundquist, 2007; Sawyer, 1997; Spolin, 1986) and "performative psychology" (Holzman, 2000, 2010). In contrast to diversity of DiE approaches that co-exist without much controversy among them, some Dialogic Pedagogy approaches oppose each other. In fact, there exist different and sometimes sharply opposing "strands" of Dialogic Pedagogy: instrumental DP and non-instrumental DP, epistemological DP, ontological DP and ecological DP, etc.[4] In this paper, however, I use the term Dialogic Pedagogy (DP) to refer mostly to what has been characterized as *critical ontological dialogic pedagogy* (Lobok, 2001; Matusov, 2009; Sidorkin, 1999; Wegerif, 2007, and others). In this particular kind of dialogic pedagogy, the purpose of education is seen as "helping the learners in their own critical examination of their own living and evolving positions, testing their ideas regarding the values, purposes, interests, goals and journeys they want to undertake" and good education is "defined as *praxis of praxis* - a 'critical evaluation and problematizations of ready-made culture' (cf. Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2012) and of the very praxis of teaching and learning by all the participants; promoting learners' authorial stance toward their own learning and development by providing dialogic opportunities for testing ideas, desires, values, motivations, opinions; and promoting learners' self-generated learning journeys" (Marjanovic-Shane, 2014, pp. SI:ddp - 52-53).

I want to point out at the start, that what makes the contrasts between the two educational paradigms – DiE and DP – particularly striking is that they also seem to have a number of important characteristics in common. These common features may be viewed as reasons for some educators to believe that drama in education is either based on dialogic principles (Edmiston, 2014; Lindqvist, 1995),

[4] There are other approaches to dialogic pedagogy that will not be discussed here. See http://diaped.soe.udel.edu/dp-map/?reload=1&page_id=18

and/or that it provokes dialogue (Ewing, 2015; Ferholt & Lecusay, 2010; O'Toole, 1992; Taylor & Warner, 2006), or even that drama in education fully encompasses dialogue as a particular way to communicate among other ways (e.g. "movement") (Edmiston, 2014). My following analysis convinces me otherwise. In brief, I argue that DiE and DP differently value a spoilsport in education. DiE views spoilsport negatively, as Huizinga described it above, while DP views it positively. Let me, then, before introducing and analyzing the contrast between them, provide a list of characteristics that seem to be shared by both educational approaches.

Similarities between DiE and DP

First, both DiE and DP practitioners hope to engage the participating learners deeply, ontologically, authentically into an enfolding and emergent curriculum in order to overcome the problem of *alienated learning* that is so widely prevailing in the contemporary conventional schooling. Alienated learning is criticized by many educationalists "for its disconnection with the students' personal interests and goals, its alienation of students from intellectual engagement and culture, for being rather superficial, and for the lack of transfer of what students learn in school to activities outside of school (and even inside of school)" (Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2012, p. 160). Both approaches desire to fully engage the learners in deep experiences that would lead to meaningful learning "necessary for the cultural development of human beings who want to participate in and contribute to the cultural practices of their community and live their lives as a creative process" (van Oers, 2012, p. 137). It is believed that such meaningful learning would lead to transformations of the learners' subjectivity, knowledge and relation to life. For instance, Heathcote and Bolton (1995) proclaim that "drama is about making significant meaning" (p. 4) and O'Neill states, "… unlike those working in theatre, one is teaching not *for* the aesthetic experience, but *through* it" (cf. in Taylor & Warner, 2006, p. 29, italics in the original). A meaningful engagement is an engagement of a whole person, like in the "playworlds" that "facilitate not only the cognitive but also the emotional development of children and adults" (Marjanovic-Shane et al., 2011). In a similar vein, in the dialogic pedagogy, students are being invited and engaged to deeply probe their subjective convictions, by testing their ideas, positions, desires, interests, views, relationships, stakes, etc. in order to construct their own "internally persuasive discourse" (Matusov, 2009; Matusov & von Duyke, 2010; Morson, 2004) and thus transcend the given by creating new possibilities, actions and initiatives in their lives. The notion of an "authentic experience", "ontological experience" or "deep experience", e.g. an exciting, engaging, often emotional and perhaps transformative experience, invokes the concept of *perezhivanie*. This Slavic term implies "experiencing" as "living through" an event, "surviving" difficult, dramatic, or even just exhilarating circumstances, which are transformative, vividly felt and remembered. Such "perezhivanie", i.e. authentic experience, is thought to be essential for a transforming impact that an educational event may have on a person (Dewey, 1998). Both drama in education and dialogic pedagogy hope to provide opportunities for students to deeply and authentically experience pedagogical events in which they will have an opportunity for personal transformation and transcendence.

Second, in contrast to conventional education, in both in DiE and DP approaches, education is understood as *praxis* and not as *poiesis* (Aristotle, 2000). According to Aristotle, *poiesis* is a practice which goal, definition, quality and outcome are pre-determined, pre-formed and preset in advance of the practice itself (e.g., preset goals, preset curricular standards, the preset, research-based, criteria of the activity quality, cf. "best practices"). In contrast, in *praxis*, the outcomes, the values, the goals, and the evaluations evolve and emerge from within the practice itself (Carr, 2006). A scholar and, herself, a seminal practitioner of DiE, O'Neill writes, "In suggesting ways in which process drama may be structured and organized, its immediacy and ephemerality must be respected. The process cannot be reduced to a series of predictable episodes or a fixed scenario. An effectively structured dramatic process will achieve development, articulation, and significance while avoiding the repetition of a carefully prearranged sequence, the

transformation of process into superficial product, and the destruction of the spontaneity that is at the heart of the work" (1995, p. xviii). Similarly, a scholar of DP, Matusov claims, "The dialogic learning outcome is defined by the discourse. It is future-oriented, not preset, and unpredictable…" (Matusov, 2009, p. 308).

Third, again in contrast to conventional education, both DiE and DP rely on imagination, improvisation and creativity in generating educational events. In drama in education, the imagined worlds "allow participants to become 'other' or be 'elsewhere', exploring alternatives beyond the actual worlds they inhabit in their everyday lives" (Dunn, 2011, p. 29). In dialogic pedagogy, imagining alternative points of view and/or alternative scenarios to the known events, is paramount for dialogic testing of one's ideas, positions and desires (Lobok, 2012). In both approaches, imagining other worlds (be it imaginary fantasies, or other people's "real" ways of living, alternative social, political, ideological, scientific, etc., ways of existence), is believed to provide opportunities in which learners experience moments of "dual consciousness in which the real and the fictional worlds are held together in the mind" (O'Neill, 1995, p. 159), or are able to have dual (even contradictory) emotional experiences, i.e. "dual affect" (Vygotsky, 1971). Being in a situation in which two points of view are held together, or two emotions are experienced simultaneously, creates illuminating perspectives, opens ways to compare, contrast, and critically test ones existing beliefs, positions, ideas, values and desires.

Fourth, in both practices, the participants are placed in situations in which they may experience moments of "*defamiliarization*" or "*enstrangement*" (Shklovsky, 1990). This term (in Russian *остранение)*, coined by the Russian literary scholar, Victor Shklovsky, describes a literary device of making something that is familiar - unfamiliar; making ordinary things, events, relationships, actions, experiences, etc., to which we became "used to" or to which we became "numbed" – look and feel novel and strange, as if we were experiencing them for the first time. We see them in a new perspective, a new light, as if never experienced, seen or felt before. According to Wittgenstein (1953) "The aspect of things that are most important for us are hidden because of their simplicity and familiarity. (One is unable to notice something-because it is always before one's eyes)… And this means: we fail to be struck by what, when seen, is most striking and most powerful" (p. 50, para. 129). An experience of "enstrangement" provides the learners with new ways of looking at the familiar, and to be suddenly struck by potentially most powerful insights. These insights, in turn, are believed in both educational approaches to have a potential to leading students toward transformations of their subjectivity or to their 'ideological becoming' (Bakhtin, 1991, p. 342).

These common aspects of the two approaches often have lead educational practitioners and researchers to assume natural and intrinsic connections between various forms of drama/play in education and dialogic pedagogy. (Edmiston, 2014; Ferholt & Lecusay, 2010; Lindqvist, 1995; O'Neill, 1995; O'Toole, 1992; O'Toole et al., 2009). However, differences between these two educational approaches reveal very disparate if not conflicting views on learning, development, intersubjectivity, agency and, even more importantly, they reveal oppositions in how the two educational philosophies perceive and define socially valuable transformations of the learner and of the learner's relationships to the Other, to the World and to the Self. In the following analysis, I attempt to show that differences between DiE and DP approaches to education are paradigmatic, rather than a matter of a degree or differences along some continuum. In this article I take a critical perspective on Drama in Education from the point of view of the Ontological Dialogic Pedagogy based on Bakhtinian philosophy. My intention is to uncover hidden aspects of DiE practices that may put the students in "the state of being trapped, a state from which one can escape only by working through the situation" (Heathcote et al., 1984, p. 91).

Suspension of disbelief vs. Suspension of belief

– Or why a "spoilsport" cannot survive in drama pedagogy, but is welcome in critical dialogue –

Huizinga wrote, "the spoil-sport shatters the play-world itself. By withdrawing from the game he reveals the relativity and fragility of the play-world in which he had temporarily shut himself with others. He robs play of its illusion-a pregnant word, which means literally "in-play" (from inlusio, illudere or inludere). Therefore, he must be cast out, for he threatens the existence of the play-community" (Huizinga, 1955, p. 11). However, the "spoil-sport" as the person "who trespasses against the rules or ignores them" is absolutely crucial for critical dialogue: this is the person who reveals different points of view, diverse, often opposing ideas and desires, who is able to transfigure, to shatter, even to annihilate what is assumed to be true and natural, and to carve new boundaries, thus, testing the limits of everyone's reality. This is why, according to Huizinga, "In the world of high seriousness, too, the cheat and the hypocrite have always had an easier time of it than the spoil-sports, here called apostates, heretics, innovators, prophets, conscientious objectors, etc." (Huizinga, 1955, p. 12). Therefore, while s/he may be a "*spoil*-sport" in play and in the "world of high seriousness"[5], in critical dialogue this *player*[6] is the *spark* that that ignites dialogue putting both the illusion and the truth to the test!

Both drama in education (DiE) and dialogic pedagogy (DP) create multidimensional events, allowing their participants to simultaneously experience more than one world with its particular values, rules and sense of time and space. The participants in such events play more than one role. Here, I will analyze such multidimensional educational events that take place across several worlds at the same time, using Bakhtinian concept of "chronotope". Bakhtin defined "chronotope" as the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed, "spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history" (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 184). A chronotope is "a unity of time, space and axiology",[7] i.e., set of values, relationships, rules and expectations that exist for the participants in a time-space. Elsewhere I claim (Marjanovic-Shane, 2011) that one can abstract at least three chronotopes in play, performance and education: The *Imagined Chronotope* (IC) –the imagined, alternative world; the *Reality Chronotope* (RC) - the ontologic world of the participants' real lives, called by Matusov (2003) *Ontological Chronotope*; and the *Community of Players Chronotope* (CoPl) – an immediate local world of organizing the current participants' practice. In this article, as the primary point of contrast between Drama in Education and Dialogic Pedagogy I look at their views, conceptualizations and use of the *imagined worlds* - the Imagined Chronotopes; and at their views, conceptualizations and use of the participants' Reality/Ontological Chronotopes.

I argue that although both DiE and DP invoke and summon up (one or more) imagined worlds, they do it based on different understanding of the role of these worlds in learning and development, and, therefore, for different educational purposes: In DiE the *Imagined Chronotope* dominates over and the participants' life – the *Reality Chronotope*/*Ontological Chronotope*. In contrast, in Dialogic Pedagogy, this

[5] At the end of this article I briefly come back to discussing the difference between education as a unique sphere of human practice, different from all other spheres of practice and activity, when understood as "critical examination of one's understanding of the world, the other and the self" (Matusov & Wegerif, 2014)

[6] I place the asterisks around the term "player" because although not "playing", per se – this participant is actually a player in a "dialogic" game.

[7] Bakhtin defined "chronotope" as a unity of space and time. It was Matusov who added "axiology" to the definition of the chronotope, based on earlier works of Bakhtin and his own development of this concept (Matusov, 2003a).

relationship is completely opposite: it is the students' lives, their *Reality/Ontological Chronotopes* that dominate over the *Imagined Chronotopes*.

Most practitioners and researchers of play/drama in education assume that creating vivid, lively and animated *imaginary worlds* will have a full emotional and cognitive impact on their participants, and thus will enhance their learning (Baumer, Ferholt, & Lecusay, 2005; Ferholt, 2015; Lindqvist, 1995; van Oers, 2012, among many others). The assumption that a child's mental development emerges from within the Imaginary Chronotope (IC) of play was originally developed in context the cultural-historical approach to early childhood. There, it is assumed that human development (cognitive, emotional, social, self-control, etc.) first occurs in play through building imaginary worlds, before it happens "in reality". The assumption that play is the leading activity in early childhood development (Duncan & Tarulli, 2003; Fleer, 2009) is based on Lev Vygotsky's (1978) understanding that play "creates the zone of proximal development" (p. 102) and it is further grounded on Vygotsky's claim that, "In play a child always behaves beyond his average age, above his daily behavior; in play it is as if he were a head taller than himself" (p. 102). Inspired by Vygotsky's approach to the role of play in development, Lindqvist designed what she called "the playworld pedagogy" where "the thinking process [as] a creative process – an imaginary process – […] develops in play because a real situation takes on a new and unfamiliar meaning" (Lindqvist, 1995, p. 51). Creating imagined worlds and dwelling in them as characters, enables the students to be engaged, active, and having a degree of freedom (sometimes even substantial) to explore and to make decisions in these imagined worlds. "The playing child creates a sphere of imagination where it as an active agent may explore and transform very impressive aspects of its own life" (Schousboe & Winter-Lindquist, 2013, p. 2).

This view has deeply influenced many contemporary genres of drama and play pedagogy: playworlds and play pedagogy in general, improvisation in education, performance psychology, process drama, and others (Bolton & Heathcote, 1999; Cole, 2006; Edmiston, 2015; Ewing, 2015; Holzman, 2009; Lobman & Lundquist, 2007; Marjanovic-Shane et al., 2011; O'Toole et al., 2009; Rainio, 2008; Singer et al., 2006). According to O'Neill (O'Neill, 1995), the immediate and practical objective of process drama is to immerse the student in the medium of drama or play, i.e. in an Imaginary Chronotope (IC), where it is assumed that the development, the coming into being, actually takes place. *In all genres of DiE, the Imaginary Chronotope (IC) has the highest priority: it is precisely in the IC, according to the Drama/Play Pedagogues, where the students become active and take responsibility for their actions*. In the words of Heathcote and Bolton (1995), "because the students are to be in role in a fictional context, they will bring a sense of responsibility to their learning, with the result that the teacher is able, through the drama, to make greater demands on the students than if this alternative trigger to learning were missing" (p. 46). Thus the need to be immersed in "pretend", to be in an "*as-if*" world, to sustain an illusion, is seen as one of the strongest determinations in play (see for isntance Giffin, 1984).

To be immersed in the pretense can only be achieved through *suspension of disbelief*[8] (keeping an illusion)! Moreover, it is the collective suspension of disbelief that is crucial in play and performing arts, as well as in Drama in Education, where the realization of the pretense, i.e. the "*as-if*" worlds, depends on the collaborative work of many participants. In fact, suspension of disbelief needs to be contracted by *all* participants – in order for a dramatic performance/play to be built, presented, viewed and appreciated. It is actually not possible to keep suspending disbelief when someone rejects "to play" and would rather not participate. Such a person threatens the very possibility for the others to continue building an Imaginary Chronotope or to keep pretending to live in it "as if" its characters. Such a person is a spoilsport and must

[8] A term a "term coined in 1817 by the poet and aesthetic philosopher Samuel Taylor Coleridge in his *Biographia Literaria"* - http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Suspension_of_disbelief

be cast out or disciplined! The necessity to contract an agreement to suspend disbelief in the IC by all the participants, is the first point of contrast between DiE and DP.

In contrast to DiE, in the critical ontological dialogic pedagogy (DP), suspension of disbelief is not at all a prerequisite. In fact, and in the opposition to DiE, it is *suspending belief* – i.e. *testing participants' diverse ideas about their reality and their truth* – that represents the modus operandi in Dialogic Pedagogy. This does not mean that there is no production of imagined worlds, imagined scenarios, possible or fantastic Imaginary Chronotopes (ICs). But in critical dialogues, it is the participants' actual, ontologic, reality chronotopes that are in the focus. In Dialogic Pedagogy, the truth touches upon an illusion and, thus, the truth (and therefore the "illusion") "become(s) dialogically tested and forever testable" (Morson, 2004, p. 319). There is no presupposition in the critical ontologic dialogic pedagogy that the imaginary or imagined worlds (IC) need to be jointly constructed or jointly performed by the participants. Any Imagined Chronotope (IC) is understood in DP not in terms of an "*as-if*" world of joint pretense, but rather as a one of potentially many hypothetical "*what-if"* worlds. Moreover, these hypothetical "*what-ifs*", are juxtaposed, compared and contrasted to each other in testing the participants ideas, positions, values, desires, etc. They do not have to be agreed upon, nor jointly realized, nor coordinated among the participants. On the contrary, what represents the "work" of the participants in critical dialogue is precisely the very discovery of the differences and contrasts between and among diverse participants' actual *ontologic positions,* perspectives and ideas. In other words, in critical dialogue *the focus is on the Reality/Ontological Chronotope (RC)*. However, to become aware of one's position in life, to become an author of one's own reality, one needs to encounter, to discover and to face diverse alternatives. Thus the Imagined Chronotopes (IC) – whether perceived as actual alternative lives of the others, or as conveniently constructed phantasies – are necessary to provide boundaries to one's own Reality Chronotope (RC), to render it visible and palpable, ready to be deconstructed and tested in the perpetual transcendence of one's own truths. Thus, providing opportunities to encounter diverse possible and impossible alternative views and positions, bringing up the "what-if" scenarios, having diverse desires and ways of seeing and acting, comparing them and contrasting them, is the crux of critical dialogue and ontologic dialogic education.

Therefore, in Dialogic Pedagogy, based on the *suspension of belief*, the one who does not agree with premises of the "known truths", but perpetuates and deepens critical examinations of any aspect of life is, in fact, the most valuable, legitimate, and necessary participant.

"The Prisoners of war camp" vs. "The Magic Wand"

In order to explore the implications of this fundamental contrast between Drama in Education and Dialogic Pedagogy, in this section I present two educational events – one from Drama in Education and one from a Dialogic Pedagogy approach. I describe a part of Drama in Education workshop held by Dorothy Heathcote in England around 1970. The second event I present and describe took place in a graduate (master level) course on Child Development and Education that I held in a small college in the US a few years ago - with a dialogic pedagogy orientation. As mentioned at the start of this article, these two educational cases cannot be directly compared: belonging to two different educational paradigms, they are in many ways incompatible for comparing to each other. However, they are here to generate several specific characteristics of each of their paradigms, and to analyze their divergent educational outcomes.

"Prisoners of War Camp workshop" – Dorothy Heathcote ("Three Looms Waiting", video by Smedley, 1971)

I chose to describe a start of a drama workshop held by one of the most known drama in education teachers and scholars, Dorothy Heathcote, because it portrays not only a highly skillful practitioner and the founder of this particular DiE approach, but also it provides a glimpse into the art of teaching in this genre,

at its best. This particular drama workshop was filmed and presented within a documentary movie about the work of Dorothy Heathcote, "Three Looms Waiting" by the BBC producer Ron Smedley (1971) and is available on line[9]. This BBC program made Heathcote's work famous around the world. I describe the very start of a workshop that Dorothy Heathcote held with students, residents of a boarding school in Durham, UK. The participants were 14 boys between 10 and 13 years old. Besides these young students, there were also eight teachers sitting in the background, who came to learn more about DiE by observing the work of the already renowned practitioner. The video includes parts of an interview with Heathcote that adds her comments on what she was doing with the boys throughout the workshop. I analyze these comments as Heathcote's "espoused theory" (Argyris & Schön, 1978) of Drama in Education that guided her moment-to-moment decisions in the drama workshops.

The following is a description of the opening of the Drama in Education workshop based on the transcript of the part of the video. I am using a presentation mode that I elsewhere named "stop motion analysis" and interpretation (Rainio & Marjanovic-Shane, 2013).

While reading this DiE case, please focus on the following aspects of this event: the way Heathcote introduces the Imagined World (IC) and the way in which the imagined world dominates in the workshop; how she positions herself visa vie the students within the Imagined chronotope (IC) and in their Reality/Ontological chronotope; the value and legitimacy of agreement and the role of the students' subjectivity and agency.

• • •

Dorothy Heathcote (in further text I call her just Dorothy or DH) entered a large hall of the boarding school. The school principal introduced her to a group of 14 male students. She was now standing in front of a semicircle of young teen boys, who were looking at her with their arms crossed, like a solid wall. Some of them were as tall as her.

She walked a few steps toward them with a smile on her face, and as she approached them, she suddenly lowered herself down and sat on her heels. As she lowered herself, all the boys also went down to sit on the floor, as if by command. Now she appeared taller than any one of them, and dominated the group.

1 DH: Well… You know my name, anyway… don't you? [The boys nod and say, yes]. So… Settle down!

When they all settled down on the floor, Dorothy first quickly explained the presence of the observing teachers. Then she looked at her wrist watch and said,

2 DH: NOW! How long have we got? What time do we stop for dinner?
3 Boys: Twelve!
4 DH: Twelve o'clock… **So, we've got from twelve… from now to twelve to do the play!**

As she says, "*we've got*", she makes a pause and glances around, looking at each boy briefly. Finally she rests her glance on a boy on her left with a significant smile. Doing that, she apparently addresses the boys as partners with whom she will work on a joint project. She slightly chuckles, looks again around the semi–

[9] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=owKiUO99qrw

circle and asks in a very inviting and also a very casual tone, as if she had known these students all for a long time:

5 DH: What would you like to do?

The boys start talking in low voices more to each other than to her. One boy's voice stands out[10]:

6 Boy #3: Do you want us to give suggestions?
7 DH: Well, c'mon now! Let's have a few!
8 Boy #2 [makes a suggestion] "Prisoners of war camp!"
9 DH: [echoes his suggestion] A prison camp! M-hm!
10 Boy #5: [makes a suggestion] "Stone age!"
11 DH: [echoes this suggestion]: "Stone age!" [She nods.]

DH COMMENT – a video insert in the "Prisoners of war" workshop:

> "When I meet a group for the first time, I don't go in with definite ideas of what's going to happen, because I think I must use their ideas. And I want them to see their ideas coming into this marvelous action they bring… So, I try to go in working almost… So, if you think of a gas cooker, and I'm… I'm set at nothing…"

In this comment, which provides a first glimpse into her espoused theory, Heathcote describes her teaching as open-ended and based on the student's interests. She has not come to this workshop with a pre-set curriculum, but rather, she lets the students' interests guide her, and she is ready to create this workshop as an Aristotelian *praxis*. As Heathcote and Bolton claim elsewhere "drama is about making significant meaning" (1995, p. 4), she is attempting now to provide an opportunity for the boys to deeply engage in creating an experience meaningful to them.

Prisoners of war camp workshop (continues):

12 DH: What are we going to do? Which do you fancy?
13 Boys: [all talking at the same time, generating a few more proposals – but finally more and more of them say]: "Prisoner of war camp".
14 DH: [leaning forward into the circle of boys as if she wants to be closer to them, and less of an authority. She asks in a sincere tone] Prisoners of war camp?
15 Boys: [all together] Yes.
16 DH: Let's try this then! [At this moment, she straightens herself out and again she towers over the boys, all the while sitting on the floor].
[She clears he throat] You are going to be captured as prisoners…
17 Boys: [eagerly] Yes!
18 DH: … because **that's what you want**.
19 Boys: [They are now looking at her very intently and with strong attention]
20 DH: **And for this you will have to agree that I am cleverer than you**… because there is only one of me, and there is fourteen of you!
[She looks around capturing the eyes of almost every boy individually. She makes a pause to let her words sink.]

[10] I have numbered the boys randomly, as their names are never mentioned during this workshop. Also, giving them number instead of names seems fit, because we, as the audience, don't know anything about the boys as themselves. We only know them in the roles they play in this dramatic world. I gave the #1 to the boy who in the drama assumes a role of a commander of the others.

So, **if you want to be in a prison camp, you'll have to let me take you there!!! Right?**

21 Boys: [Some boys nod. Some have put their heads on their arms and look at her both dreamily and with full concentration, as if they are getting in a trance.]

This is a crucial moment in which Heathcote creates a contract with the students – a contract in which they promise to follow her and listen to her commands. For Heathcote, having such a contract – both explicitly and implicitly – is a condition for creating a dramatic workshop. "Regarding the contract - this is always about agreeing (a) to the particular context and (b) that 'we shall run it.'" (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995, p. 17) She must be the one to lead them into the imagined world – in which she will direct them to undertake different imagined actions.

At this moment Heathcote begins to assume a different role – a role of a Commanding Officer (CO) in the imagined world – inviting the boys to follow her and step into this world themselves.

22 DH/CO: **NOW!!! Pick up your guns!!!** [She changes her voice completely – getting into a role, potentially of their army commander, giving orders in a firm, yet very friendly voice.]
23 Boys: [start to pantomime picking up the guns as they still sit on the ground]
24 DH/CO: Now, every man get used to laying his gun down in a place where he knows and can put his hand on. So, find out how you pick up your gun and lay it down…. Just go on! [She is again slightly hunched down, making herself closer to the boys, relating to them with confidence of close collaborators.]
25 Boys: [continue to pantomime picking up guns and laying them down.]
26 DH: … Just pick it up and get used to the feeling!...

Her tone now becomes more serious, significant, and solemn. It is this tone of voice that starts to spin the substance of the imagined war and the imagined soldiers, somewhere in the world of a war, potentially in danger.

27 DH/CO: **It matters!** … **It's all there is between you and the Germans with their guns, isn't it? … Really!**
28 Boys: [seem to be drawn into the scene. Several voices confirm Dorothy's remark] Yeah!
29 Boy#5: [raises slightly in the back of the circle and offers an idea] **What if you got a bazooka?**
30 DH: [quickly and decisively eliminates his idea] ***We haven't any bazooka! We have ordinary rifles!***
31 Boy #5: Yeah!
32 DH: ***Is that agreed?*** [She looks around the circle of boys with a fierce, but smiling face. She talks intensely and emphatically, punctuating every word with nods of her head!] ***Nobody start pulling rank to getting bigger guns! Is that agreed?***
33 Boys: [many voices] Yes! Yeah!
34 DH: [She stares into each one of their faces, making sure that this order is understood. It seems that she is doing that not in the role of a military commander but as herself, a drama teacher.
[She adds] Ordinary, standard rifles have been issued for this job…
35 Boys: [adding some unintelligible comments, apparently naming particular brand of the rifles]
36 DH: Well, "202"-s or whatever they are…

DH COMMENT – video insert in the Prisoners of war workshop:

> "The trick is to do something that: a) arrests the attention of the people you are working with; … b) focuses them as a group; and c) straight away tells them what's up, … what's happening! So, usually I try to take a role in such a way that straight away they grasp a lot…"

In this comment, Heathcote summarizes the meaning of what O'Neill (1995) calls, "pretext" – an act that creates an entry point into an Imagined World (IC). In the Prisoners of War Camp workshop – this crucial moment starts in line 22, when Dorothy proclaims: "**NOW!!! Pick up your guns!!!**" in a changed voice signaling that she took up a role of some sort of a Commanding Officer in the Imagined Worlds and that this Commanding Officer considers the boys to be soldiers under his/her command. Dorothy creates an even stronger invitation, a forceful attractor, a "gravitational pull" into this world when she warns everyone that "**It matters!** (knowing where their guns are) … **It's all there is between you and the Germans with their guns, isn't it? … Really!** in line 27.

It seemed that her invitation worked instantaneously, as the boys seem to be enchanted, and getting more and more excited. Yet, at the same time – Heathcote cannot let any dissensus with her happen. She made sure that all boys agreed with her as she proclaimed "**And for this you will have to agree…"** (line 20) – when she was securing a contract with the students that they will **"have to let me take you there!!! Right?"**

When boy #5 suggests, "**What if you got a bazooka?"** (line 29) she stops him immediately from developing his idea, "***We haven't any bazooka! We have ordinary rifles!*** *(line 30)* ***Is that agreed?"*** (line 31)**.** What Boy #5 said was most probably not intended as an attempt to disagree, nor as a spoilsport attempt to destroy this imaginary world, but in fact, most probably as an offer of a new building-block for the imagined world. However, it would appear that his offer was not in agreement with Dorothy's vision of how this imaginary situation should develop. Moreover, his gesture also seems to have clashed with Dorothy's sense of who should be unquestionably in charge of directing this imagined world – as we might conclude from her uttering, "***Nobody start pulling rank to getting bigger guns! Is that agreed?"*** (line 32).

Prisoners of war camp workshop (continues):

37 DH: [as the video returns to the Prisoner of war camp workshop, we see DH walking and yelling loudly *in role* – apparently impersonating a German Officer (GO in further text) yelling at the British captives who are hidden inside some kind of a building. She is walking back and forth and pretending to holding a rifle. She yells at the top of her lungs, in a rude and threatening voice]
Rouse, you Britishers in there?

One of the staples of Drama in Education is the notion of a "teacher in role", i.e. a teacher who assumes a role of a character in the Imagined Chronotope. In this workshop, when Dorothy steps in the roles a commanding officer and an enemy army's officer is a part of the "pretext" - a leading gesture that creates an entry-point into the imagined world. More than that, stepping into a role of a character in an imagined world seems to change the relationship between the teacher and the students, transforming them all into an ensemble of co-actors whose relationships are based on camaraderie. In this role, Dorothy can also guide the development of the imaginary world from within – letting her character shape various opportunities for the others.

Prisoners of war camp workshop (continues):

38 Boys: [They are lying on the ground pretending to hold their rifles.] We are just five!
39 DH/GO: [In role of a German Officer] **I know how many there are in!**
40 Boy #11: [from the back of the group] Oh, many. How many then?
[boys' faces are smiling, but they lie on the ground pretending to have rifles]

41	DH/GO:	**The officer will stand up!**
42	Boy #1:	[starts to get up]
43	Boy #3:	[whispers] **Stay down!**
		[some boys are starting to get up]
44	Boy#1:	[He starts to rise and says to the rest of the boys] **Get down!**
45	DH/GO:	[yells at the Boy #1] **Stand up!**
46	Boy #1:	[**goes down** in an attempt to not obey]
46	DH/GO:	[Yells very harshly, increasingly authoritatively, and in a threatening tone] **Stand up!**
47	Boy #4:	[says to Boy #1] **Stay down!**
48	Boy #3:	Do you want to be killed?
49	Boy #1:	[Waives Boy #3 down in a gesture that signals him to stay out of this. He stands up and addresses DH]
		Sir!
		[He gestures with his right hand to his "men" to be quiet and stay out of this.]
50	DH:	[in a changed voice – friendly, almost like she is out of the role of a German officer] **Stop!**

This altercation about standing up or staying down takes place ostensibly within the imagined word between the characters of a German Officer and his British captives. Yet the tensions rise, and the dramatic scene has a feel of a real testing of each other's powers and authority between the boys and Dorothy. The tension at one point is almost threatening to explode and Dorothy seems at this moment to want to relinquish it. She seems as if she is stepping out of the German Commander role, softening her tone when she says, "Stop!" (line 50). However, she quickly resumes it when she sees that the boys are sustaining their roles (see below).

Prisoners of war camp workshop (continues):

51	Boy #1:	[He is standing turned toward her, looking her directly in the eye – without fear in his expression]
52	DH/GO:	[resumes the role of a German officer. Yells slowly and emphatically] You have thirteen men and yourself in the house!
53	Boy #1:	[He looks dismayed]
54	DH/GO:	We know! We have counted them!
55	Boy #1:	[with slight defiance]
		They are not coming out!
56	DH/GO:	You will send out… through this window! …
57	Boy #1:	**No!**
58	DH/GO:	Thirteen guns, plus yours!
59	Boy #1:	[in an attempt to negotiate] Instead of thirteen…
60	DH/GO:	[Very insistently and without a room for negotiation. She raises her voice higher] Fourteen British standard rifles!
61	Boys:	[They are starting to raise from the floor]
62	Boy #1:	[**He puts his right arm out toward the rest of the "men" in a gesture to hold them and to stop them from "coming out of the house".**]

Boy #1 has now emerged as a leader, by taking upon himself the negotiations with the enemy (lines 55, 57) and by trying to protect "his men" (line 61). These negotiations continue for a while, with Boy #1 building his role of a leader firmer, and Dorothy helping that process out by entering in tough verbal clashes with them, like below (transcript continuing at line 97).

Prisoners of war camp workshop (continues):

97	DH/GO:	[To Boy #1] You will get your men out of this house lined up in the street, ready for the wagons!
98	Boys:	[They exclaim all together in many voices] No chance! No chance! No chance!
99	DH/GO:	[In a loud and threatening voice] Is that understood? It is an order! Because if you don't, the place will be blown up…
100	Boy #1:	[To DH/GO] Don't! I give the orders!
101	DH/GO:	I give the orders!
102	Boy #1:	[He is trying to get power and control] Instead of telling me, talk to me!
103	DH/GO:	[In a threatening tone] I shall remember you later!

DH COMMENT – video insert in the Prisoners of war workshop:

> "I won't water down drama! So I use the situations the authors use! The real tense situations of life! [….] Drama is real men in a mess!"

Although the drama workshop continues, we stop here. I analyze several aspects of this workshop and Heathcote's commentary further below by comparing and contrasting it with an event, which happened in a graduate course that I taught with an emerging dialogic pedagogy orientation a few years ago.

"Magic wand" – a dramatic transformational event in a critical ontologic dialogic pedagogy run class - in two acts

The event I describe here was an important transformational point for all participants in the dialogic pedagogy class including the professor (me, I will call myself Emma[11]). This event involves Socratic "torpedo's touch" (Matusov, 2009; Plato, 1961), i.e. a student's intense lived through experience [perezhivanie] of being stunned or numbed by a penetrating, transformational pedagogical event. My description is based on the audio-recording of the class and the class participants' writing on the electronic discussion forum.

While reading this DP case, please focus on the following: the purpose and the way the professor Emma introduces provocations to the students existing beliefs about teaching and learning; how she positions herself visa vie the students within their Reality/Ontological chronotope; the value and legitimacy of (dis)agreement and the role of the students' and the professor's subjectivity and agency.

Act I: Provocation #1 - Skinner's video about training pigeons

That particular class meeting in a master's graduate course on educational psychology for current and future teachers, was about "classroom management". The professor, Emma, introduced a short video by the famous American behaviorist Skinner on "Operant conditioning"[12]. In the class of five graduate students, three current teachers used behaviorist classroom management with their own students. Sarah[13], a current preschool teacher, was working with very young children with autism using a behaviorist pedagogical technique known as Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA)[14] (Cooper, 1982). Two other students, Nora and Adele, both current elementary school teachers, used behaviorist pedagogical strategy known as

[11] I use a pseudonym "Emma" for my then self – to distance my current authorial voice at the time I am writing this text from my then voice as a teacher – a practice I encountered in and adopted from Matusov's book Radical Experiment in Dialogic Pedagogy in Higher Education and it's Centauric Failure" (Matusov & Brobst, 2013).
[12] This video can be found on Youtube - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I_ctJqjlrHA&list=PLabg1zgHPvYPKbDHwqnQvMBd1umL5AlLx&index=2
[13] All names are pseudonyms to protect the identity of the students. I also removed the year and the semester, as well as the course number – for further protection of the students.
[14] http://www.autismspeaks.org/what-autism/treatment/applied-behavior-analysis-aba

token economy (Kazdin & Bootzin, 1972) in their classrooms. Mona, a committed Quaker[15], was working in a Quaker Reggio Emilia play-, art-, and community-based prekindergarten. Cathy was preparing to become a teacher with emerging progressive liberal educational values (cf. Dewey type). Cathy had a three-year-old child who, by the time of the event, had been diagnosed as "at risk for autism" by the child's pediatrician, which might have led Cathy to change her profession and become a teacher. Cathy worried about the instrumental treatment of her son and was interested in learning about more humanist educational approaches through the course. The backgrounds of the five students and the professor set a stage for an educational ideological conflict: three (Sarah, Nora and Adele) against three (Mona, Cathy, Emma). Professor Emma was an emerging dialogic pedagogy teacher who was ideologically closer to Mona and Cathy.

After watching the video, in which Skinner described various aspects of operant conditioning on pigeons, the class instructor Emma asked the students what they thought about Skinner's explanation that in order for a reward to work the pigeons had to be kept hungry. The implication and tone of Emma's question was challenging behaviorism in education: whether behaviorist operant conditioning approach developed with caged pigeons can be applied pedagogically and morally to students (children). At that moment, Sarah said emphatically:

Sarah: The function of the behavior has to be attention [By this Sarah seemed to mean that as the pigeons were hungry for food, students/children are hungry for the teacher/adult's attention]. The function of *most* behaviors is attention. The child will always want your attention. But if he is getting your attention in a way that is dangerous….

Professor Emma did not like Sarah's equalizing of Skinner's hungry caged pigeons with students in her class and wanted to challenge Sarah. Emma's commitment to dialogic pedagogy (among other things) caused her to be disturbed by Sarah's behaviorism.

Prof E.: Ok, so are you saying that…[…] you can use it to manipulate them [children] with that – [the children's] primary need! Just as you can say the pigeon has hunger, so you can use this primary need [for getting attention] to manipulate the child's behavior like this.

Mona also seemed to be upset by Sarah's behaviorist approach and tried to introduce ethics into the discussion. From my previous encounter with Mona in the class, I knew that she was a strong advocate of children's human rights, believing that they should be respected and not manipulated for the teacher's own comfort and control. In addition, Mona was apparently also concerned and worried about possibly positioning Sarah as "a bad educator/person" as a result of her challenge.

Mona: (talking slowly and choosing words): Which then… (coughs), comes down to… to MORALS! If… if you have a teacher, who is a good teacher, then they'll recognize when something like this needs to be… applied… You know, if the students are in harm… […] But if you have a teacher… (Mona is breathing deeply. She seems to feel the tension with Sarah, and is careful with her choice of words) … who just wants it [ABA] for the… classroom management, to get through the day, and isn't really invested in their job…

Prof E.: (trying to "soften" the potential blow to Sarah): Or maybe they are invested but just don't see how else…

Sarah was apparently shocked. She seemed to recognize the moral issue of her ABA practice and tried to distance herself from Skinner's behaviorism while struggling with the clear connection between behaviorism and her ABA strategy.

[15] Quakers is a Christian denomination with strong commitment to human rights, peace, and equality. Quakers treat other people as "friends", including children of all ages. Philadelphia (the City of Brotherly Love, Quaker influenced name), one of the strong centers of Quaker religion in the USA, was where the event occurred.

Sarah: (in apparent distress and confusion, her voice was trembling): I think it [ABA technique she was using with her students] is different than classroom management [i.e., from Skinner's operant conditioning of the hungry pigeon], that's my opinion… They [ABA specialists] use it [behaviorist operant conditioning] to an extent, but they just don't use these phrases [Skinner's language], you know… (Sarah, talks slowly trying to suppress feelings that are welling up, being at the edge of crying).

Two other students, Nora and Adele, who were practicing the behaviorist token economy classroom management strategy in their classrooms, apparently wanted to give comfort and support to Sarah. They argued that at times punishment and manipulation are necessary, appropriate and justified treatments of students/children by the teacher/adults. They claimed that token economy and occasional punishment are their only way of keeping the class in order, which is a prerequisite for successful studying.

Sarah did not participate in this discussion, but attentively listened to it. Neither Mona nor Cathy said much afterwards. I speculate that, for Cathy, this discussion was especially personal because of her three-year old son. She was probably imaging her son under behaviorist treatments by teachers like Sarah — and she was probably very terrified about this possibility. At the same time, like Mona, Cathy seemed to be very concerned about Sarah's feelings being hurt.

Professor Emma saw the polarization of the perspectives, — which can be called: behaviorism vs. humanism — between Sarah, Nora and Adele as behaviorists, and Mona, Cathy, and herself, as humanists. Their, the humanist's, silence and body language signaled disagreement, disapproval and even apparent ethical condemnation of the behaviorist position. Sarah seemed to be caught between the two perspectives because she apparently recognized the negative ethical implications of her behaviorism (in contrast to Nora and Adele). At the very end of the class meeting, Sarah burst out in protest and defended her position. In a shaky voice, holding back tears, she explained in a distressed and angry tone, addressing primarily Professor Emma, that in her practice, based on ABA, she was "not cruel to my students!!! On the contrary!… You don't know what you are talking about! You don't know much about ABA! How can you judge it?! I love my students — I feel like a mother to them! You don't know my day-to-day problems! Enough of this!!!"

The class meeting was over and Sarah left as fast as possible, avoiding looking at and talking to anyone. Mona and Cathy left the class together. Nora and Adele left separately — they had not been close to each other.

Act II – Distress deepens for Sarah; Emma seeks guidance for her own dialogic teacher orientation from her colleague

Professor Emma was puzzled, distressed, and dissatisfied with her lesson: she liked her students to test their ideas but not morally condemn each other or themselves. She wanted to create "a safe learning environment," in which it was safe for the students to raise any ideas and positions for class discussion and testing. Emma was also concerned with her lack of dialogic guidance for the students: that she was not able to deepen the discussion on behaviorism and humanism. She was concerned that the students stayed only at the level of their personal and professional experiences and did not connect their perspectives and experiences with the professional discourses Big Historical Dialogue (Bibler, 2009), analyzing the concerns, implications, values, and PROs and CONs behind these two approaches. Emma was concerned with her lack of guidance for the students. She was *very* concerned that Sarah, Nora, and Adele would remain ignorant and continue harming their students by their behaviorist pedagogical techniques without understanding how bad was what they were doing.

The next day, Sarah, posted on the class Web Forum the following discussion (excerpts):

Sarah: I was rather embarrassed when I left class on Wednesday and was surprised that I had engaged in such a, shall we call it, spirited discussion with the Professor…

> I believe that I reacted in such a single-minded fashion because it went straight to my heart rather than my head. With views so opposite to mine so readily expressed I felt that the care I feel and show for my students was seen by another as a disservice to the child. As a teacher, it makes my heart ache when it is thought that I am not trying to do all I can for students… I know that these strategies, if implemented with caring and respect, can help many students discover more about their world and themselves and to embrace school life in a more positive way for themselves. […] It is my opinion that children are motivated in much the same way as I am, and that sometimes when they need that extra boost to change their way of thinking or their behaviors … I should be able to assist them in this process. […] One of the most important roles of schools is to reach out to children and help them grow with the partnership of the child and the parents to do so.
>
> I hope that I did not offend anyone with my spirited outburst, or impolite argument with the Professor at the close of class. I am sorry and hope that I will be able to control my own behaviors in the future so that I retain my respectful demeanor even when confronted with ideas or statements that are different than mine.
>
> Hopefully this class will continue to allow me to learn to respectfully dissent, stand up for what I believe in with clear statements, and to keep and OPEN mind about new techniques and ideas.
>
> Thanks for listening.

"Humanists" Mona and Cathy responded to Sarah with support, appreciation, and encouragement, stating, "I love to hear debates … What is education if not a free exchange of diverse viewpoints? Your exchange with Emma definitely contributed positively to the class" (Mona), and "THANK YOU for sharing your beliefs. It is clear how dedicated a teacher you are to your students, your school and to yourself!" (Cathy). Surprisingly, "behaviorists" Nora and Adele did not reply in support of Sarah.

Emma became even more alarmed and upset when she saw Sarah's posting on the class web forum. She saw the stinging and numbing "Torpedo's touch" effect (Matusov, 2009, p. 25; Plato, 1961) on Sarah and worried that Sarah would close up, that she had lost Sarah's trust, and with that, potentially the trust of the rest of the students. For Emma, Sarah's silence during the first class meeting, her outburst at the end of that class meeting and her web posting became a signal. It was a powerful signal that she, Emma, needed to make a change in her pedagogy, in order to restore the trust respect, and most of all, the ease everyone in the class had with each other – so that they could continue to freely test their ideas, opinions, positions and desires with each other.

Emma consulted with her educational and research colleague, Eugene[16]. He directed Emma's attention to her own unexamined pedagogical desire to "educate" the "behaviorist" group of her students so that they would stop being behaviorists and became "humanists" like Mona, Cathy, and Professor Emma. He shared that his definition of dialogic education of teachers was in testing the teachers' own pedagogical desires, rather than in molding the students in the preset way dear to the Professor Emma. He suggested that Emma use "a Magic Wand" inquiry with her students.

Act III: Provocation #2 – The Magic Wand

Introduction of the metaphor of the "Magic Wand" inquiry reoriented everyone to new possibilities to explore their own pedagogical desires. On the class web forum, Professor Emma responded to Sarah:

> Dear Sarah,
>
> I started thinking about your words and asking myself what are my desires as a teacher for my students. Don't I wish that my students discovered more about their world and themselves? Don't

[16] I am grateful to my colleague Eugene Matusov for giving me an idea to use the metaphor of a "magic wand" for behavior management techniques when I discussed with him this difficult case and asked his advice of what to do in this situation.

> I wish that my students embraced more about important things that I teach? I started thinking about difficult situations that I have been sometimes challenged as a teacher: what do I want to achieve and in what way with my students. If there were a Magic Wand that I could use to make all my students behave and study exactly as I wanted them to do, would I use it? When would I use it? Isn't ABA (behavioral management) something like a magic wand, to help me as a teacher achieve exactly what I want, with all my students?
> […]
> Let's examine different real and imaginary scenarios and test the limits of our own beliefs about behavioral management techniques. Please post different difficult and problematic educational situations for all of us to think through whether to use or not to use behavioral management. What are the pros and what the cons?
> I apologize for hurting your feelings and making it unsafe for you to express your thoughts in the class. For some reason (and I am now interested in exploring it for my own sake), the behavioral management (ABA) approach in education is really my hot button. I get a knee jerk reaction when it is touched. But I thank you for bringing this issue up and pushing me to start to think about it again.
> What do you think?

Our next class meeting was completely overtaken by the critical dialogue about the "Magic Wand". Sarah, Mona, Cathy, and Adele (all but Nora) enthusiastically and safely explored and tested our own values, desires, and ideas about learning: When would we use “the magic wand” on ourselves? When would we use it as teachers – on our students? Is it educational to make our students unconditionally conform to the teacher’s desire, however good or bad this *desire* might be? When would it be better and more efficient to learn using a "magic wand" to make the students well behaved? Should students become involved in testing ideas about what is good and what is bad, what is right and what is wrong? Is it educationally worthwhile to let our students make their own decisions about their own behavior — moral decisions about what is right and what is wrong — and then reflect on them (this question was very important for Mona)? What would make a difference in our own development and for our own subjectivities? What does it mean to be “educated?” Do we *want* to raise citizens who unconditionally follow the authority, however good the authority may be?

During this critical dialogue about the “Magic Wand” inquiry, “behaviorists” Sarah, Nora, and Adele raised important issues about their institutional settings. They (but especially Adele) said that they were concerned with the institutional pressure to use behaviorist classroom management aiming at active suppressing the students’ “bad” behavior. Nora seemed to accept these institutional settings as a given that could not be changed, cynically seeing her professional responsibility as simply to follow institutional orders, although she did not mind most of these institutional orders. From Nora’s professional position, the “Magic Wand” inquiry seemed to sound interesting but a bit frivolous and inconsequential exercise. However, both Nora and Sarah preferred “positive reinforcements” (something that other students defined as “bribery by rewards”) to “negative reinforcements” of punishments. Sarah apparently badly wanted to be a “good teacher”, having a strong commitment to do only good to her students. For her, the “Magic Wand” inquiry, which tested her pedagogical desires, was apparently very professionally and personally important, exciting, and revealing. This potentially put her on a collision course with her conventional institution. But, this inquiry also baffled her: she saw the children with whom she worked – children “on the autism spectrum” – as “lacking” abilities of self-orientation, focusing attention and self control, so necessary, in her opinion, for learning. She believed that the ABA training would provide exactly such skills to them. How could such a beneficial technique be un-ethical? At what point would it become un-ethical? As to the “humanists” Mona and Cathy, they were on their own territory being interested in finding the limits of their own humanism: when behaviorism can be legitimate (e.g., in quitting smoking).

The event seemed to have a lasting effect on the participants. Afterwards, during the class and many months and years after the class was over, "behaviorist" Adele contacted Professor Emma on several occasions. She said that she often felt as if Little Professor Emma was sitting on her shoulder, asking whether Adele liked her own pedagogical desires behind her pedagogical decisions and actions or not. Mona, Cathy, and Adele often recommend new students to take Professor Emma's class. Cathy asked Professor Emma to be her academic advisor, and Emma accepted this role. So far, I have not heard much from Sarah and Nora.

Contrasting aspects of Drama in Education and Dialogic Pedagogy practices

As I claimed above, although both DiE and DP introduce (one or more) imagined worlds, they do for different educational purposes: In DiE the *Imagined Chronotope* (IC) dominates over and the participants' life – the *Reality Chronotope* (RC); in contrast, in Dialogic Pedagogy, it is the students' lives, their Reality/Ontological Chronotopes that dominate over the imagined worlds. This key difference between the two educational events: the DiE workshop – Prisoners of War Camp, and the DP class – Magic Wand seems to be based on a deeper paradigmatic divergence in conceptualizing education which I explore in this section. The contrast regarding which chronotope is in focus and is prioritized over the other, leads to important differences in pedagogical guidance, in the dynamics of relationships among the participants and in the values prominent in the two approaches. I discuss the following major contrasts between the two educational approaches:

1. Different purposes of the Imagined Chronotopes in Drama in Education and Dialogic Pedagogy and the ways of introducing them: Pre-text vs. Provocation;
2. Contrasting positions of DiE and DP regarding the values and legitimacy of agreement and disagreement among the participants;
3. Different social relationships in the DiE and DP communities of participants;
4. Contrasting assumptions about the roles and the positions of the students' subjectivity and agency in education in DiE and DP.

Purpose, role and construction of the Imagined and Reality Chronotopes in Drama in Education and Dialogic Pedagogy: Pre-text vs. Provocation

> *Process drama is a complex dramatic encounter. Like other theatre events, it evokes an immediate dramatic world bounded in space and time, a world that depends on the consensus of all those present for its existence. (O'Neill, 1995, p. xiii)*

In order to set an immediate dramatic (imagined) world into motion – it is important for a DiE teacher to create such entry points that will attract the students' attention and capture their imagination in a way that would induce their fast transition into the imagined world – and enable them to "suspend disbelief". The first task of a DiE teacher is to create an opportunity for students' rapid immersion into the imaginary world. This can be achieved by designing attractive, even irresistible entry points into the imaginary world, moreover, entry points that would already provide a "structure" and the defining elements of an imagined world. O'Neill calls these entry points "pre-texts". She writes, "The purpose of the pre-text, […] is to arouse anticipation in the group so that they begin to engage in and take responsibility for the development of the drama" (O'Neill, 1995, p. 1). When Heathcote changes her voice in line 22 above – "**NOW!!! Pick up your guns!!!"** and when in line 27 she solemnly announces that knowing at all times where their gun is **"… matters!** … **It's all there is between you and the Germans with their guns, isn't it? … Really!"** she is creating a pre-text – an entry point that announces the Imagined Chronotope.

These entry points can take many different forms. "The dramatic world may be activated by a word, a gesture, a location, a story, an idea, an object; or an image, as well as by a character or a play script. I have found it useful to describe these occasions for initiating dramatic action as *pre-texts*. It is the pre-text that will provide a firm base for the dramatic encounter of process drama" (O'Neill, 1995, p. 19). A pre-text may take a form of direct teaching and information about how the imagined world is supposed to look like, what roles the students will play and what is expected from them in these roles (Bolton & Heathcote, 1999; Edmiston, 2014; Heathcote & Bolton, 1995; Smith, 2010). In other instances, a pretext may be organized as a guessing game activity that slowly draws the students into the Imagined Chronotope. Heathcote and Bolton (1995) describe such a pretext activity as starting a project they call "Life in a medieval monastery", "a plan carried out by Dorothy Heathcote with a student teacher who was about to begin three weeks of practice teaching" (p. 46). At other times, a teacher may speak to children "in role"[17] from the imagined world (O'Neill, 1995), or elicit other people to visit the classroom "in roles" of characters of the imagined world (Baumer & Radsliff, 2009; Marjanovic-Shane et al., 2011). We see Dorothy Heathcote speaking "in role" of a "Commanding Officer" and later as a "German Officer", from the very start of the Prisoners of War workshop.

A pretext leaves a lot of details of the imagined world unspecified and undefined. It's role is just to "ring up the curtain" (Taylor & Warner, 2006, p. 6). This gives the students an opportunity to explore, create, improvise and build different aspects of the imagined world: its characters, relationships, events, artifacts, etc. However, a pre-text is always carefully planned and serves to firmly establish the pre-determined aspects of key characters, the focus themes and the "chronotopical genre" (Bakhtin, 1991) of imagined worlds. Heathcote aptly summarizes the role of the pretext and its purpose in her comment inserted into the video of the Prisoners of War Camp workshop (see above): "The trick is to do something that: a) arrests the attention of the people you are working with; … b) focuses them as a group; and c) straight away tells them what's up, … what's happening! So, usually I try to take a role in such a way that straight away they grasp a lot…"

O'Neil (1995) describes the nature and the purpose of the pre-text in the similar way. "In process drama *the pre-text operates, first of all, to define the nature and limits of the dramatic world and, second, to imply roles for the participants*. Next, it switches on expectation and binds the group together in anticipation. … An effective pre-text or preliminary frame for process drama will carry clearly accessible intentions for the roles it suggests" (p. 20, italics mine). According to Taylor and Warner (2006, p. 10), a carefully chosen pre-text, "contains the seeds of inquiry", "suggests clear purposes and tasks, … sets up expectations, establishes patterns, implies roles, suggests a setting" (p. 6).

Thus, the dual purpose of the pre-text is:

1. To create the entry-point into and the first glimpses of the Imagined World; and
2. To transform the participants' relationships by "binding them" into a cohesive group that agrees to work together on a shared goal.

Both of these are important – since it is the Imagined World that is seen as being the central focus of the educational activity and of the students' learning and transformation. A drama teacher's educational desire may be described as a desire to engage the students in building this imagined world together. Thus

[17] Usually, the literature on Drama in Education does not refer to "teacher" as being in-role when the teacher is acting as a teacher. However, elsewhere I wrote that being a "teacher" means assuming a very specific role in the classroom, a role that can be distinguished from the persona of the same individual outside of the classroom, and a role that can be based on different relationships towards and desires for the students (Marjanovic-Shane & Matusov, 2012, October)

both the students' focus on the imagined world and the spirit of agreed collaboration and working together, of becoming an *ensemble* (Lobman & Lundquist, 2007) are necessary.

In contrast to DiE, in Dialogic Pedagogy, the imagined, alternative worlds are not invoked to "define the nature and limits of the dramatic world", nor to "imply the roles for the participants" (O'Neill, 1995, p. 20), but rather to provide the participants opportunities to test their own beliefs, assumptions, positions and desires in order to put their own subjectivities and agency to the test. Thus, rather than "pre-texts", Dialogic Pedagogy creates these opportunities by introducing "provocations", alternative and provocative ways of seeing the participants' real (ontological) worlds. In DP, teachers desire that the participants experience moments of "*defamiliarization*" or "*enstrangement*" (Shklovsky, 1990), that would urge them to reexamine, deconstruct, and reconsider their existing beliefs and subjectivities. The teacher, as a guide, invites "the students for a journey into 'a curricular land' – a historically emerging discursive space on the subject matter (in a broad sense). The teacher designs a series of provocations that are aimed at surprising the students in order to generate questions in the participants. Discussions of these questions lead to testing ideas and emergence of [AMS: temporary, rather than end-] points in the participants" (Matusov, 2009, p. 86). When the participants' ideas, positions, opinions and desires are put to a test, in dialogic education, they might experience transcendence through more or less exciting, even dramatic, events. In the Magic Wand event described above, we see tensions brewing and erupting among the students, especially strong for Sarah, with the first provocation – when an explicit connection is made between behaviorist training of a pigeon and the ABA strategies of training and disciplining children with autism. We see the subsequent emergence of an ethical dilemma regarding the treatment of small children and dramatic polarization of opinions between the "humanist" and the "behaviorist" positions. In that, the students (and their professor) are focusing on their actual practices – testing their emerging ontological dilemmas regarding such practices. We can also see a different type of engagement and transcendence of their actual subjectivities with the second provocation – "the magic wand". The "Magic wand" establishes a dialogic contrast between the Imaginary Chronotope (of a magic wand) and the participants' Reality (Ontological) Chronotopes. It creates an legitimate opportunity for all the participants (including professor Emma) to ask the question, "what if…" and to examine and consider a myriad of different situations, opinions, desires, conditions, etc. when a behaviorist operant conditioning would be welcome or not, for whom, and for what purposes. The "magic wand" is not a pretext that invites the students to enter and jointly build an Imaginary Chronotope, but rather a provocation to examine their own truths. Furthermore, their truths do not have to become identical, they can differ from and oppose each other, and these differences of opinions are exactly what makes each one of the participants be able to search deeper, and to consider more different and surprising aspects of the issue.

The value and legitimacy of (dis)agreement among the participants

> *From the moment when a child plays 'peekaboo' with its parent or another adult, three of the foundations of drama are being laid: the (1) shared agreement to (2) pretend that produces (3) pleasure. (O'Toole et al., 2009, p. 11, emphasis by the author)*

While DiE prioritizes agreement, cooperation, coordination, unity, unanimity and committed partnership in the joint endeavors, the DP gives legitimacy to dissensus, discord, argument, agonism, and the right of non-participation in the pedagogical events.

The most cherished and indispensable principles in the Community of Players (CoPl) engaged in the construction of an imaginary world are agreement on the common goals, establishing shared ideas and collaboration in realizing these ideas. The agreement among the participants takes two major foci. One is an overall agreement among the participants to participate and share in the Imagined Worlds. "The basic

precondition of drama is that all the participants must voluntarily and together suspend their disbelief, and agree to enter a shared fictional world" writes O'Toole et al. (2009, p. 106). And, according to O'Neill, "Agreement and cooperation among participants are fundamental before any kind of competitive or interactive encounter can take place… Competition, opposition and display all provide aspects of the necessary tension of any game including the 'game' of theatre, but **agreement to play the game and consensus about the kind of game that is being played are prerequisites for the activity**" (O'Neill, 1995, emphasis mine). Before the participants can reach agreements, or, at least accept decisions, the joint construction of an Imagined Chronotope cannot start (Ferholt & Lecusay, 2010). Dorothy Heathcote wrote that "teachers have to be able to **trap the people into an agreement** that for now they will believe in 'the big lie' in order that they will fight through to the process of change and not say, 'I don't like this, Miss', and go away. There is an awful lot of 'I don't like this, Miss', **unless you train people to lure their classes into traps**" (Heathcote et al., 1984, p. 115, highlight by me). We see how this "trap" of consensus works in the Prisoners of War workshop. Dorothy establishes agreement among all and with herself when she says to the boys: "You are going to be captured as prisoners… (Boys: Yes!) … because **that's what you want**. **And for this you will have to agree that I am cleverer than you**… because there is only one of me, and there is fourteen of you! (She looks around capturing the eyes of almost every boy individually. She makes a pause to let her words sink.) So, **if you want to be in a prison camp, you'll have to let me take you there!!! Right?"** (lines 16-20). As mentioned before – in this moment, Heathcote creates a pedagogical contract with the students who are all drawn into the imagined world.

The other type of agreement is focused on building a sense of collaboration and ensemble. Writing about practices for building community with the strong sense of "we", Edmiston (2014) writes that "stories are told in which inevitably a strong sense of common agreement on goals is discovered" (p. 70). Building a strong sense of collaboration and support for each other's ideas is an ongoing requirement that takes a lot of adjustments and personal subordination of each participant's subjectivity to the group. Like keeping a ball in the air, improvisation requires each participant constantly aiming to give personal offers to the group the for the sake of the play. "A careful observer of improvisational groups will recognize that the most skilled members of the ensemble are often not the ones who receive the most laughs or appear to contribute the most. **The real talent in improvisation is expressed by supporting the ensemble**. This is accomplished most effectively through the recognition, acceptance, and giving of offers" write Lobman and Lundquist (2007, p. 3, emphasis mine). In fact, the principles of improvisation that guide the relationships between the players in improvisational episodes, according to Lobman and Lundqvist, are: "The giving and receiving of offers; Don't negate; Make the ensemble look good; and 'Yes, and'"(2007, p. 13). The last one, "yes, and…" refers to the instruction to the players to say "Yes, and…" to anything that precedes their own turn, accepting whatever came before as an "offer" to build the Imaginary World. Replying with a "No", or even with the "Yes, but…" to an offer, ignoring it or denying it would take away the previous member's contribution, and lead toward breaking apart of the Imaginary Chronotope or running into too many obstacles and not being able to proceed with building it.

In the Prisoners of War workshop, Heathcote forges this sense of working together and of being an ensemble from within the imagined world in which she positions herself first as their powerful commander and then as a dangerous enemy. At the very start of building the imagined scene, no one is allowed to be different. When the Boy#5 suggests that someone could have a bazooka, Dorothy quickly and decisively stops him: "***We haven't any bazooka! We have ordinary rifles! Is that agreed?*** (She looks around the circle of boys with a fierce, but smiling face. She talks intensely and emphatically, punctuating every word with nods of her head!) ***Nobody start pulling rank to getting bigger guns! Is that agreed?***" (lines 30 – 32). In addition, Heathcote provides one after another opportunity for the boys to coordinate their actions against the "dangerous enemy" bonding with each other, supporting each other and taking clues from each

other in every action. As the scene progresses, they can keep it smoothly going as they negotiate with each other in roles: about staying down or getting up, whether to surrender the guns or not, recognize their emergent leader – Boy#1 – and his desire to stand up against the enemy and protect them, etc. They don't have to break out the scene to renegotiate any potential disagreements. They became an ensemble.

If any of the participants had not played along with the others, it would have been seen as a disruption, as an "illegitimate" move, something to be either extinguished or the participant would need to be removed.

In contrast to Drama in Education, disagreement and dissensus among the participants are perfectly legitimate in Dialogic Pedagogy. In critical dialogue that engages all participants in testing their ideas, positions, desires, truths, etc., to make disagreement illegitimate, i.e. to impose and demand agreement, would preclude and extinguish participants' free and unhampered process of arriving to their own dialogically constructed Internally Persuasive Discourse (IPD). In fact, "[a]n open-minded honest commitment to ideas, knowledge, and skills **requires the meeting of alternative ideas**, the genuine listening to others, testing ideas, taking one's own and other people's positions seriously, and a commitment to searching for truth rather than to spread one's own dear ideas, manipulate others, and so on" (Matusov & von Duyke, 2010, p. 177, emphasis mine). In fact, without bringing up alternative ideas, positions, perspectives, it would be impossible to engage in a sincere critical dialogue that leads to testing participants' own ideas, transcending their initial truths and developing their own internally persuasive discourse (IPD). Thus, a participant who disagrees with the premises of the Imagined Chronotope and/or with other participants' (including the teacher's) offered truths does not have to be removed from an educational event. On the contrary, supporting dissensus is the premise of making every ones' participation an important, legitimate and welcome: as a dialogic challenge for the community to examine and re-examine their existing truths and transcend them. In this sense, participating in Dialogic Pedagogy (DP) is about developing internally persuasive discourse (IPD) where "truth becomes dialogically tested and forever testable" (Morson, 2004, p. 319). An act of disagreement can be seen as a contribution, an act of dialogic participation that pushes critical thinking further.

In the Magic Wand event, we see the tensions building between the "humanist" and the "Behaviorist" participants. We see Sarah's passionate burst in disagreement with the professor and Mona's and Cathy's attempts to be tactful and yet, condemn the "manipulation" of children as not ethical. Introduction of the Magic Wand metaphor legitimizes such differences, and creates possibilities for each participant to examine different conditions, purposes, and values and to arrive at her own deeply convincing opinion through participating in a legitimately non-consensual dialogue.

Differences in the social regimes in the communities of participants

Another important difference between DiE and DP is in the types of the communities of learners/players they tend to create. Above we saw that in drama and play pedagogies the relationships among the participants are constructed on the principle of the "agreement", agreement both with the teacher and with the group – "the ensemble". In the community of players/learners, disagreements are viewed as temporary and potentially unsafe, and all efforts are made to resolve them in a consensus. Edmiston, for instance, describes one of the DiE sessions: "I paused at this moment [AMS: with the ongoing scene] to shift back into the world of the classroom for two reasons. First, *to agree with all the participants about what was going to happen* so that they would feel physically and emotionally safe as we continued. Second, to give instructions to the adults" (Edmiston, 2014, p. 61). Consensus among the participants is seen as a prerequisite for building the Imagined Chronotope. The teacher's role is assumed to be the one of authority who keeps peace, order and harmony among the participants.

I argue that the governance regime in Drama in Education communities is in some ways similar to the conventional authoritarian education. In both, the teacher plays the highest authority, even a dictator no matter how benevolent. However, while in the conventional education this authoritarian role is taken for granted and unquestioned, DiE is interested in having the students' legitimize this role. In the Prisoners of War, Dorothy actually asks the students if they agree to let "**… me take you there. Right?**" (line 20). Thus, the teacher in DiE becomes a director of a drama production: it is the teacher who does conceptualizing, organizing, leading and guiding the students-participants. While providing some, even a lot of room for the participants to make creative decisions about and within the production, the teacher keeps the authority in all the "registers". For instance, Heathcote writes:

> For me the most secure authority has always been from within the drama situation rather than the teaching one- the authority of role. Not only can I be more flexible in the use of registers, but I fear the teacher authority because I mistrust my ability to cope with a situation which may arise of teacher against class. The role-authority gives me shifting power and a variety of register to be at the service of the class. I may suddenly gather authority to deny or accede to requests, or be minus power but have strong opinions or resist a class in order to strengthen its opinions and decisions. My belief in my attitudes supports their belief in theirs, but this type of teaching takes courage at first and is always a calculated risk (Heathcote et al., 1984, p. 69).

Each individual participant needs to work with and for "the group", the "ensemble". "The most important thing to know about improvisation is that it's an ensemble art" (Lobman & Lundquist, 2007, p. xii). Indeed, a work on drama "… entices the participants into acceptance and mental collaboration. There is a riddle that must be solved. […] As active engagement and interpretation are generated, we become **kindred spirits caught in a web of collusion and this amiable community** wrestles with the tasks of identification, discrimination and recognition that are necessary if the ironic **conspiracy at the heart of the drama** is to be disclosed" (Taylor & Warner, 2006, p. 147, stress mine).

In this way, while arguing that it supports each person's individual and unique meaning making and learning journey, paradoxically, DiE inadvertently may promote the values of communal solidarity, collectivism and deference to the group interests. in its In an extreme form it may even resemble totalitarian socialist or fascist communities, which practice the "collectivist control and direction" (Hayek, 1948, p. 129). In one of the most extreme DiE cases of teaching through creating, enacting and living in an imaginary world, this authoritarian aspect of organizing a community of players/learners was strengthened by the fact that the community was organizing a "pedagogical experiment" in re-creating and experiencing a pretend neo-Nazi society in the history class to study dictatorship as a political form of societal organization. The extreme "collective-petal" force among the participants was also exacerbated by the fact that the teacher kept the "lines" between the imaginary world (of the pretend neo-Nazi society) and the community of learners somewhat blurred. This blurriness of the boundary between the imagined world and the participants actual learning community is highly a-typical for drama in education, and yet, many aspects of DiE were still present: the evolving and unpredictable aspect of a praxis; the full emotional and intellectual engagement of the participants, the opportunities for creative exploration, improvisation and imaginative ways of being in an alternative world – a manufactured Imaginary Chronotope; and a sense of defamiliarization, enstrangement from the participants' own lives-until-then. However, at the same time, this imagined world (IC) "spilled" into and overpowered the actual realities and ontology of the participants. This original pedagogical experiment occurred at Elwood P. Cubberley Senior High School in Palo Alto, California, in late March/early April 1967" (Jones, 1972). Their teacher, Ron Jones, introduced one after another various "experiences that characterized Nazi Germany" – "strength through discipline", "strength through community", "strength through action", "strength through pride" and "strength through understanding" in order for his students to learn about authoritative regimes through their simulated

experiences. The authoritarian and totalitarian aspects of the Nazi society the students were creating for an "experiment" quickly blended into their actual community of learners and their actual lives. The original intention of the teacher and the students was to answer the question how it was possible for a whole society to follow and support a criminal mind of a dictator like Hitler. Ron Jones' original was to create a simulation of a Nazi society in order to test its internal rules, laws, relationships, values, possibilities, commitments, etc., as if in a "test-tube". However, within a week, this runaway experiment started to threaten taking over the whole school forcing everyone in the school into living in the students' newly minted totalitarian society "The Third Wave". The experiment was stopped by Ron Jones, the teacher and the Leader of the Third Wave, in a dramatic, cathartic event in which he revealed the extent to which their community had become like the Nazi society in its extreme form, when they were annihilating every "dissenting" and "different" individual or group[18].

While this may be an extreme manifestation of an authoritarian community, examining other DiE projects and events (Bolton & Heathcote, 1999; Edmiston, 2014; Heathcote & Bolton, 1995; Heathcote et al., 1984; O'Neill, 1995), often provides explicit and implicit descriptions of the indisputable authority of the teacher in directing the play/drama "production" and striving to create a community of players/learners based on promoting strong values of consensus, collaboration, cooperation and unity. We can certainly see this type of community building and governance in the Prisoners of War workshop above.

In contrast to the social regimes in the communities generated DiE, an ontologic dialogic Community of Learners (CoL) does not pressure its members for agreement, collaboration or cooperation. In fact, as the main purpose of dialogic education is in constant testing the truth – differences and deconstruction of views, opinions, desires, projects, etc. are welcome and taken as serious opportunities to learn something more about important topics of interest among the participants. Agreement is neither a condition nor a goal of ontologic dialogic pedagogy, although it may become an emergent and temporary outcome. Furthermore, promotion of the students' dialogic agency necessitates "Legitimacy of and respect for the students' non-participation and non-cooperation, at least at some point…" (Matusov, von Duyke, & Han, 2012, p. 61). Thus the Ontologic Dialogic Pedagogy strives to create a democratic community in which the learners (including the teacher as the Learner #1) become authors of their own development – they "feel ownership of their own learning initiatives, self-assignments, and learning journeys" (Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2014a, p. 17). In that type of community, there is no pressure for all students to participate in the same collaborative project, although they may choose to do so if they wish. In DP communities of learners, the internal relationships among the participants, decision-making and the governance regime also become negotiated subjects for the communal decision-making. Recently, several practitioners of Dialogic Pedagogy have started to develop an "open/opening syllabus" approach to their courses (in college and graduate levels of higher education) where they engage the students to participate in making decisions about all aspects of the course, starting with the curriculum, instruction, assessments, class policies and decision making procedures in the community (Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2014b; Matusov et al., 2014). The Magic Wand event occurred in a class that was run with an open syllabus approach. It could be argued that the democratic regime of the class legitimized the emerging differences in the opinions, and that the introduction of the Magic Wand metaphor provided opportunities for the participants to further examine their distinctions and disagreements, without a need to suppress any of them.

[18] Besides the short story by Ron Jones, recently there have appeared many other documents and testimonies about this dramatic educational event. It inspired feature films. See more at: http://www.thewavehome.com/

The roles and the positions of the students' subjectivity and agency in DiE and DP

> *But of course our students are not to be characters in the psychological sense that a playwright and an audience would expect, but rather as a collective, CHARACTERizing expertise, a group of people committed to a worldview of responsibility (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995, pp. 28, stress by the authors).*

There is a sharp contrast between DiE and DP in their conceptualizations of the students' subjectivities, students' development, and in general, the role of learners' subjectivities in education. First of all, in spite of the common belief that students' subjectivities should undergo some kind of a transformation in the process of education, the two approaches have opposing beliefs regarding the ways in which the participants should be involved and how they should be guided. On one hand, DiE approach believes that the students' actual subjectivities should be taken as "raw material" or as "seedlings" – to be subjected to a process in which these subjectivities will be cultivated and shaped ("molded") by the social expectations, values and knowledge. "Art is the social technique of emotion, a tool of society which brings the most intimate and personal aspects of our being into the circle of social life," wrote Vygotsky (1971, p. 249). On the other hand, DP approach believes that the participant's creative authorship of their own subjectivities should be given a chance to emerge as an unpredictable (and immeasurable) result of the participants' testing their own ideas, positions and desires against the existing and imagined social expectations, knowledge, values and norms.

In Drama in Education approach, the students are expected to enter into an Imagined World (IC), often based on some existing and known past, present or imaginary worlds such as events from history; known myths and folklore; imagined or known lives of culturally known heroes, scientists or artists; written novels; or culturally known role-playing (mother, father, doctor, policemen, etc.). By playing characters in these worlds, it is assumed that the participants will gain experiences of different chronotopic forces and "patterns of activity" (Vygotsky, 1971) that will help them "acquire" and "internalize" these socially valuable experiences, values, desires, etc., and eventually transfer them to their everyday lives and then creatively socialize into targeted socially valuable practices (Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2012; van Oers, 2012).

We can see this in the Prisoners of War workshop: the characters in the Imagined Chronotope of a prison camp are not particular individuals with their unique personalities, histories and relationships. Rather, they are nameless typical functional soldiers – prisoners in a generalized situation of being captured by a typical functional enemy. And while their particular idiosyncrasies as soldiers might eventually emerge within the imaginary world, this process would be carefully controlled and always subordinated to the ultimate learning goals designed by the teacher. In the short excerpt of the Prisoners of War event, the subordination of the appearance of students' subjectivity to the imposed teacher's design is evident when Dorothy Heathcote stops Boy#5 from introducing a bazooka. "***Nobody start pulling rank to getting bigger guns! Is that agreed?"*** (line 32)

In DiE, with this focus on the Imaginary Chronotope, the participants' actual subjectivities are either left out or used as material for constructing the IC. Complex relationships between the dramatic worlds and the actors' lives, discussed by O'Neill, are guided by the primary purpose "to allow the actors' insights to illuminate the characters they were preparing to play" (O'Neill, 1995, p. 37). The students' subjectivities are even further removed from the educational situation in Heathcote's "mantle of expert" approach to DiE. As Heathcote and Bolton (1995) write, "mantle of the expert work requires [AMS: among other things] … an agreement between teacher and students to take on a functional role (i.e., not a character but rather someone who is expert in running something)" (p. 23). In fact, in DiE the student's existing subjectivities are often seen as being "channeled" and formed by the experiences through which they go as figures in an IC – where they are not particular characters, but rather they perform certain functions, positions and

patterns of activity (Vygotsky, 1971, p. 104) with largely predetermined "chronotopic" centers of subjectivity that are not based on "specific character traits", but are shaped by "the properties and characteristics of [their] life" (pp. 104-105). Elsewhere I wrote that a chronotope always "delineat[es] for the players their unique position in relation to others" (Marjanovic-Shane & White, 2014, p. 125). In this way, the students will become "captives" of the IC, where they will animate these characters in "the state of being trapped, a state from which one can escape only by working through the situation" (Heathcote et al., 1984, p. 91). In the Prisoners of War Camp – one does not have a sense of particular personhood of the characters: what is important for development of the IC are their functional roles – they are timeless, universal, typical, generic soldiers/prisoners – not unique people. Their tensions and relations are formed around generic situational issues – and not their personal dilemmas, desires and truths.

In contrast, in Dialogic Pedagogy, the focus is on the students' testing their own ideas, assumptions, positions and desires, understanding of the truth as themselves and their own subjectivities within their own ontologies (cf. "person-idea" in Bakhtin, 1999). The DP approach attempts to create conditions and opportunities for the students to arrive to their own Internally Persuasive Discourse (IPD) (Matusov & von Duyke, 2010; Matusov et al., 2012). "This means that we are aware that our words cannot be understood without the consideration of the words of others – the meaning of our words emerge and exist on the border of our and others' voices" (Matusov & von Duyke, 2010, p. 178). Thus, the invoked, alternative world, the Imagined Chronotope (IC) functions not to take the focus away from the students' subjectivities, but as a necessary spark, a contrast to the participants' existing opinions – to generate a way for them to begin reexamining their positions, actual persuasions, understandings and desires in their actual reality (RC). Rather than having to "animate" characters in an Imagined Chronotope (IC) as it is in DiE, the DP participants use the alternative imagined worlds (chronotopes) as springboards — dialogic provocations — for testing their actual ontological positions and thus free themselves from being trapped in their unexamined and "naturalized" selves. They may become aware of and potentially transcend their subjectivities, emerging from a pedagogical event with new insights and discoveries about themselves. In that sense the imagined alternative characters are not the locus of their transformation, but serve as "boundary objects" (Star & Griesemer, 1989) that help redefine the limits of the participants actual subjectivities. We see these transformations in almost all the participants of the Magic Wand event including the professor (with the potential exception of Nora). Magic Wand as a metaphor for behaviorist conditioning, becomes that boundary object, interpreted by each participant in their own way, generates stories of real and hypothetical situations enriching, deepening and widening everyone's reflective self-examination. The very purpose of DP is to involve the participants in a process of critical authoring of their own subjectivity.

This stark difference in positioning the students' subjectivity is part of the paradigmatic difference of the purpose of education between the DiE and DP. It is an indicator that Drama in Education assumes that the purpose of education is socialization of the learners into the socially valuable practices, in which they will become responsible members. On the other hand, the legitimacy of the authoring of one's own subjectivity reveals that the purpose of education for the ontological Dialogic Pedagogy lies in each learner's deep examination of life, of the others and the self. In other words, DiE approach assumes that the purpose of education is to teach socially valuable knowledge, skills and values to the students and that the students will grow into the responsible, socially accepted knowledgeable individuals. Thus, the learners' personalities, interests, opinions and desires are seen as material that in the process of education needs to be given a certain shape and form. In contrast, DP assumes that the purpose of education is to create opportunities for the learners to engage in meaningful and critical examination of life. The learner's subjectivities are acknowledged as both the beginning and the end points of the process, as the learners are assumed to be consciousnesses of equal rights and the authors of their lives.

Conclusion

In this article I argue that there are paradigmatic differences between the two educational approaches: Drama in Education and Ontologic Dialogic Pedagogy. This does not make the actual educational events generated within these approaches less complex and intricate. In actual play episodes, children (and adults) may change focus many times, alternating between acting "as if" in an imagined world (IC) and negotiating their understanding, beliefs, ideas of truth (RC) (Bonica, 1993; Giffin, 1984; Marjanovic-Shane & White, 2014; Rainio & Marjanovic-Shane, 2013). Within each educational situation in drama/play pedagogy and in the ontological dialogic approach, the dominance of the Imaginary Chronotope (IC) or the Reality Chronotope (RC) may switch, since one does not exist without the other, each growing from the encounter on the boundary of the other. Many drama teachers feel this tension between their intended "drama" event and dialogue. "It may be that it is really this kind of challenge and the *possibility of emancipation* implied in the process that prevents some teachers from using drama, rather than the fears about losing control that are so often expressed by teachers. It may be more worrying for the teachers *to lose control of the ideas* in the classroom than to lose control of children's behaviour. But if teachers want to engage in genuine dialogue with their students they must be prepared for responses which are unpredictable, challenging and transformative", write (Taylor & Warner, 2006, p. 106, stress by me). There may be some Drama in Education genres (e.g. Playworlds) where the focus may switch more often from the Imaginary Chronotope to the Reality Chronotope – leading the participants into genuine critical dialogues, periods of negotiation and probing (Ferholt & Lecusay, 2010; Ferholt & Rainio, 2004; Lindqvist, 1995; Miyazaki, 2007, 2011; Rainio, 2010). However, these periods in Drama in Education may be considered to be "background" or a "break" from the actual educational practice.

In arguing that DiE and DP approaches represent two paradigms, I claim that there are irreconcilable differences in conceptualization of these educational practices even though both represent Aristotelian *praxis* (Aristotle, 2000) – practices that are not pre-determined, pre-formed, nor have pre-set outcomes, but are evolving from within the practice itself.

Drama/play in education is an activity of building and construction, an activity that requires co-ordination, collaboration and agreement in order to achieve its purpose. It is ruled by the logic of joint activities – where the goals have to be shared, and decision-making requires reaching an agreement, cooperation and collaboration (Engeström, 2008). The participants in DiE practice are invited to participate in jointly building an imagined world, most often (although not always) a world which is pre-conceived, pre-planned and directed by the teacher (or another authority) – a world in which, it is assumed that the participants will experience complex and intricate problems, to which they will need to find solutions and discover ways to live, and in that process they will learn and develop as participants in socially meaningful and valuable practices. Discussing Vygotsky's theory, Ferholt and Lecusay (2010) claim that "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" (p. 59). In that sense, DiE is a pedagogical approach that falls in the range between the *closed and the open participatory socialization* (Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2012). In this educational approach, the curriculum – i.e., what the students are supposed to learn from educational drama – ranges from being carefully chosen and pre-planed (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995; Heathcote et al., 1984) through a design of an imagined world and the roles that the participants will have to inhabit and enact – to a more open one where the students can have opportunities to creatively coauthor many aspects of the imagined worlds (Baumer et al., 2005; Ferholt & Lecusay, 2010). In that sense the curriculum ranges from closed and pre-formed *pöiesis* (Aristotle, 2000) to the more or less open *praxis*. The openness and unpredictability of an evolving *praxis* in DiE is always found in its *instruction* – as the students begin their unforeseeable journeys and joint building of the imagined world: creating particular events, relationships and ways of living within its given frame. Students are allowed and promoted to have their own unique

learning trajectories guided by the teacher toward the curricular endpoints (cf. "instructional constructivism", Matusov, 2009). Surprises and differences among the participants are welcome and even aesthetically, socially and educationally pleasing – but only as long as they are in the function of building this particular preplanned and agreed upon imagined world. However, questioning the imagined world itself, casting doubt on its existence or stepping outside its limits is seen as educationally irrelevant and/or illegitimate and, thus, disruptive. The participant who commits such deed: who disagrees with the very foundation of the imagined world, or refuses to participate in its building - is seen as spoilsport who must be either brought back into play, or disciplined, or even removed from the educational event.

In contrast, ontological dialogic pedagogy is not merely *praxis* in socially valuable open-ended activity. Rather, it is *a praxis of praxis* (Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2012) – a critical deconstructive stance on the participants' reality, its cultural practices, truths and values. There is no joint building of an imagined world. The participants' critical meaning making is not bound by shared goals, and thus, dialogic pedagogy is not about socialization in the valuable social practices. Contrary to DiE's focus on collective construction of shared knowledge, the educational principle in Dialogic Pedagogy is *deconstruction* of the known reality, beliefs, opinions and desires - everything can be put under scrutiny, without suppressing or looking away (Derrida, 1984; Rancière, 1999). Dialogic Pedagogy engages participants in dialogues in which truth is "dialogically tested and forever testable" (Morson, 2004, p. 319), where differences of opinions, perspectives, personal desires, etc. create tensions that enable *deconstruction* of the known boundaries, move the limits, create opportunities for the unpredictable transcendence of all existing subjectivities. This deconstruction of truths and subjectivities may not always be socially easy, pleasant or inconsequential. However, it is legitimized in Dialogic Pedagogy and the heretics – people who question the very order of the known world – are taken seriously as those whose visions may compel everyone to reexamine the well-known dear truths. And so, in the critical ontological dialogic pedagogy a "spoilsport" – i.e. a heretic, a potential visionary – is welcome.

References

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.

Aristotle. (2000). *Nicomachean ethics* (R. Crisp, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1991). *The Dialogic imagination: Four essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1999). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (Vol. 8). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Baumer, S., Ferholt, B., & Lecusay, R. (2005). Promoting narrative competence through adult-child joint pretense: Lessons from the Scandinavian educational practice of playworld. *Cognitive Development, 20*, 576-590.

Baumer, S., & Radsliff, K. (2009). Playworlds of children and adults: Cultural perspectives on play Pedagogy. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 17*(1), 11-13. doi:10.1080/10749030903348755

Bibler, V. S. (2009). The foundations of the School of the Dialogue of Cultures Program. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology, 47*(1), 34–60.

Bolton, G. M. (2003). *Dorothy Heathcote's story: biography of a remarkable drama teacher*. Stoke-on-Trent, England ; Sterling, VA, USA: Trentham Books.

Bolton, G. M., & Heathcote, D. (1999). *So You Want to Use Role Play*. Staffordshire, UK: Trentham Books Limited.

Bonica, L. (1993). Negotiations among children and pretend play. In M. Stambak & H. Sinclair (Eds.), *Pretend Play Among 3-Year-Olds* (pp. 55-78). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Press.

Carr, W. (2006). Philosophy, methodology and action research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 40*(4), 421-435.

Cole, M. (2006). *The fifth dimension: an after-school program built on diversity*. New York: Russell Sage.

Cole, M., & Pelaprat, E. (2011). "Minding the gap": Imagination, creativity and human cognition. *integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science, 2011*. doi:10.1007/s12124-011-9176-5

Connery, M. C., John-Steiner, V., & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Vygotsky and creativity: a cultural-historical approach to play, meaning making, and the arts*. New York: Peter Lang.

Cooper, J. M. (1982). Applied behavior analysis in education. *Theory into Practice, 21*(2), 114-118. doi:10.1080/00405848209542992

Davis, S., Grainger Clemson, H., Ferholt, B., Jansson, S.-M., & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Dramatic interactions in education: Vygotskian and sociocultural approaches to drama, education and research*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Derrida, J. (1984). Deconstruction and the other: An interview with Jacques Derrida. In R. Kearney & P. Ricœur (Eds.), *Dialogues with contemporary continental thinkers: the phenomenological heritage: Paul Ricoeur, Emmanuel Levinas, Herbert Marcuse, Stanislas Breton, Jacques Derrida*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Dewey, J. (1998). *Experience and education* (60th anniversary ed.). West Lafayette, Ind.: Kappa Delta Pi.

Duncan, R., & Tarulli, D. (2003). Play as the leading activity of the preschool period: Insights from Vygotsky, Leont'ev, and Bakhtin. *Early Education & Development, 14*(3), 272 - 292.

Dunn, J. (2011). Child-structured socio-dramatic play and the drama educator: What is our role? In S. Schonmann (Ed.), *Key Concepts in theater/drama education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Edmiston, B. (2014). *Transforming teaching and learning with active and dramatic approaches*. New York: Routledge.

Edmiston, B. (2015). Dialogue and social positioning in dramatic Inquiry: Creating with Prospero. In S. Davis, H. Grainger Clemson, B. Ferholt, S.-M. Jansson, & A. Marjanovic-Shane (Eds.), *Dramatic Interactions in Education: Vygotskian and Sociocultural Approaches to Drama, Education and Research* (pp. 79-96). London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Engeström, Y. (2008). *From teams to knots: activity-theoretical studies of collaboration and learning at work*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ewing, R. (2015). Dramatic play and process drama: Towards a collective Zone of Proximal Development to enhance language and literacy learning. In S. Davis, H. Grainger Clemson, B. Ferholt, S.-M. Jansson, & A. Marjanovic-Shane (Eds.), *Dramatic Interactions in Education: Vygotskian and Sociocultural Approaches to Drama, Education and Research* (pp. 135-152). London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Ferholt, B. (2015). Perezhivanie in researching playworlds: Applying the concept of perezhivanie in the study of play. In S. Davis, H. Grainger Clemson, B. Ferholt, S.-M. Jansson, & A. Marjanovic-

Shane (Eds.), *Dramatic Interactions in Education: Vygotskian and Sociocultural Approaches to Drama, Education and Research* (pp. 57-75). London: Bloomsbury.

Ferholt, B., & Lecusay, R. (2010). Adult and child development in the zone of proximal development: Socratic Dialogue in a Playworld. *Mind Culture and Activity, 17*(1), 59 — 83. doi:10.1080/10749030903342246

Ferholt, B., & Rainio, A. P. (2004). *Playdrama: A Transitory activity that combines play, drama and philosophical dialogue.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association 2004 Annual Meeting, San Diego.

Fleer, M. (2009). A cultural historical perspective on play: Play as leading activity across cultural Communities. In I. Pramling-Samuelsson & M. Fleer (Eds.), *Play and learning in early childhood settings* (pp. 1 - 17): Springer.

Giffin, H. (1984). The Coordination of meaning in the creation of a shared make-believe reality. In I. Bretherton (Ed.), *Symbolic play: Development of social understanding* (pp. 73 - 100). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Hayek, F. A. v. (1948). *Individualism and economic order. [Essays]*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Heathcote, D., & Bolton, G. M. (1995). *Drama for learning: Dorothy Heathcote's mantle of the expert approach to education*. Portmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Heathcote, D., Johnson, L., & O'Neill, C. (1984). *Dorothy Heathcote: collected writings on education and drama*. London: Hutchinson.

Holzman, L. (2000). Performative psychology: An untapped resource for educators. *Educational and Child Psychology, 17*(3), 86-103.

Holzman, L. (2009). *Vygotsky at work and play*. New York: Routledge.

Holzman, L. (2010). Without creating ZPDs there is no creativity. In C. Connery, V. John-Steiner, & A. Marjanovic-Shane (Eds.), *Vygotsky and creativity* (pp. 27-39). Philadelphia: Peter Lang.

Holzman, L. (Ed.) (1999). *Performing psychology: a postmodern culture of the mind*. New York: Routledge.

Huizinga, J. (1955). *Homo ludens; a study of the play-element in culture*. Boston,: Beacon Press.

John-Steiner, V. (2000). *Creative collaboration*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Jones, R. (1972). The Third Wave, 1967, an account. *libcom.org*. Retrieved from Libcom.org website: http://libcom.org/history/the-third-wave-1967-account-ron-jones

Kazdin, A. E., & Bootzin, R. R. (1972). The token economy: An evaluative review. *Journal of applied behavior analysis, 5*(3), 343-372. doi:10.1901/jaba.1972.5-343

Lindqvist, G. (1995). *The aesthetics of play: A didactic study of play and culture in preschool* (Vol. 62). Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsalensis.

Lobman, C., & Lundquist, M. (2007). Unscripted learning: using improv activities across the K-8 curriculum. xvii, 185 p.

Lobman, C., & O'Neill, B. (Eds.). (2011). *Play, performance, learning and development: Exploring relationship*: University Press of America.

Lobok, A. (2001). *The probabilistic world: The chronicles of the philosophical-pedagogical reflections of an educational experiment*. Yekaterinoburg, Russia: Association of Small Businesses.

Lobok, A. (2012). My Educational odyssey to dialogic agency-based probabilistic pedagogy. *Journal of Russian and Eastern European Psychology, 50*(6), 5-8.

Marjanović, S. (1959). O nekim problemima dečjeg stvaralaštva [On some issues of children's creativity]. *Naša Deca, 9-10*.

Marjanović, S. (1960). Problemi dramskog rada sa decom (Predgovor) *Vesele jednočinke (Funny OneAct Shows)*: Mlado Pokolenje.

Marjanović, S. (1961). Novi metodi dramskog rada sa decom. *Društvo i Vaspitanje, 4*.

Marjanovic-Shane, A. (1989). *Metaphor beyond play: development of metaphor in children.* (Ph.D. Doctoral Dissertation), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2010). From Yes and No to Me and You: A playful change in relationships and meanings. In C. Connery, V. John-Steiner, & A. Marjanovic-Shane (Eds.), *Vygotsky and creativity: A cultural-historical approach to play, meaning making and the arts* (pp. 41-59). New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2014). A paradigmatic disagreement in "Dialogue on Dialogic Pedagogy" by Eugene Matusov and Kiyotaka Miyazaki. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal, 2014* (Special Issue: Dialogue on Dialogic Pedagogy), 48-54.

Marjanovic-Shane, A., & Beljanski-Ristić, L. (2008). From play to art – From experience to insight. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 15*(2), 93 - 114.

Marjanovic-Shane, A., Connery, C., & John-Steiner, V. (2010). A Cultural-historical Approach to Creative Education. In C. Connery, V. John-Steiner, & A. Marjanovic-Shane (Eds.), *Vygotsky and creativity: A cultural-historical approach to play, meaning making and the arts* (pp. 215-232). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Marjanovic-Shane, A., Ferholt, B., Miyazaki, K., Nilsson, M., Rainio, A. P., Beljanski-Ristić, L., . . . Pešić, M. (2011). Playworlds - An art of development. In C. Lobman & B. O'Neill (Eds.), *Play, Performance, Learning and Development: Exploring Relationship* (Vol. 11): Play and Culture Series.

Marjanovic-Shane, A., & Matusov, E. (2012, October). *Metamorphosis of Pedagogical Desire: Transformation of self in becoming a dialogic teache*. Paper presented at the The 7th International Conference on Dialogical Self, Athens, GA.

Marjanovic-Shane, A., & White, E. J. (2014). When the footlights are off: A Bakhtinian interrogation of play as postupok. *International Journal of Play, 3*(2), 119-135. doi:10.1080/21594937.2014.931686

Matusov, E. (2003). Types of teaching analyzed by chronotopic relations. Retrieved from http://ematusov.soe.udel.edu/cultures/Teaching.htm

Matusov, E. (2009). *Journey into Dialogic Pedagogy*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Matusov, E., & Brobst, J. (2013). *Radical experiment in dialogic pedagogy in higher education and its centaur failure: Chronotopic analysis*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Matusov, E., & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2012). Diverse approaches to education: Alienated learning, closed and open participatory socialization, and critical dialogue. *Human Development, 55*, 159–166. doi:10.1159/000339594

Matusov, E., & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2014a). Democratic dialogic education for and from authorial agency. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 10*(1), 9–26. doi:10.5964/ejop.v10i1.762

Matusov, E., & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2014b). *Open syllabus: Education as praxis of praxis*. Paper presented at the 15th International Bakhtin Conference - Bakhtin as Praxis: Academic production, Artistic Practice, Political Activism, Stockholm, Sweden.

Matusov, E., Marjanovic-Shane, A., Richardson, S., Gates, L., von Duyke, K., Campbell, B., . . . Kilby, H. (2014). *Open and opening syllabus: Successes and challenges of democratic education in higher Ed*. Paper presented at the The 35th Annual Ethnography in Education Research Forum, GSE, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

Matusov, E., & Miyazaki, K. (2014). Dialogue on dialogic pedagogy. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal, 2014*(Special Issue: Dialogue on Dialogic Pedagogy), 1-47.

Matusov, E., & von Duyke, K. (2010). Bakhtin's notion of the Internally Persuasive Discourse in education: Internal to what? (A case of discussion of issues of foul language in teacher education). In K. Junefelt & P. Nordin (Eds.), *Proceedings from the Second International Interdisciplinary Conference on perspectives and limits of dialogism in Mikhail Bakhtin Stockholm University, Sweden June 3-5, 2009* (pp. 174-199). Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Matusov, E., von Duyke, K., & Han, S. (2012). Community of learners: Ontological and non-ontological projects. *Outlines - Critical Practice Studie, 14*(1), 41-72.

Matusov, E., & Wegerif, R. (2014). Dialogue on 'Dialogic Education': Has Rupert gone over to 'the Dark Side'? *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal, 2*, E1 - E20. doi:DOI: 10.5195/dpj.2014.78

Miyazaki, K. (2007). *Teacher as the imaginative learner: Egan, Saitou and Bakhtin*. Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Research Symposium on Imagination and Education, Vancouver.

Miyazaki, K. (2011). Encountering another dialogic pedagogy. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology, 49*(2), 36-43. doi:10.2753/rpo1061-0405490205

Moran, S., & John-Steiner, V. (2003). Creativity in the making. In R. K. e. a. Sawyer (Ed.), *Creativity and development* (First ed., pp. 61-90): Oxford University Press.

Morson, G. S. (2004). The process of ideological becoming. In A. F. Ball & S. W. Freedman (Eds.), *Bakhtinian perspectives on language, literacy, and learning* (pp. 317-331). Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nilsson, M. E. (2009). Creative pedagogy of play—The work of Gunilla Lindqvist. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 17*(1), 14-22. doi:10.1080/10749030903342238

O'Neill, C. (1995). *Drama worlds: A Framework for process drama (The Dimensions of Drama)*: Heineman.

O'Toole, J. (1992). *The Process of drama: Negotiatin art and meaning*. London: Routledge.

O'Toole, J., Stinson, M., & Moore, T. (Eds.). (2009). *Drama and curriculum: A giant at the door* (Vol. 6): Springer.

Plato. (1961). *Meno*. Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Rainio, A. P. (2008). From resistance to involvement: Examining agency and control in a playworld activity. *Mind, Culture and Activity, 15*(2), 115 - 140.

Rainio, A. P. (2010). *Lionhearts of the playworld: An ethnographic case study of the development of agency in play pedagogy.* (Doctoral Degree), University of Helsinki, Finland, Helsinki.

Rainio, A. P., & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2013). From ambivalence to agency: Becoming an author, an actor and a hero in a drama workshop. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 2*(2), 111-125. doi:10.1016/j.lcsi.2013.04.001

Rancière, J. (1999). *Disagreement: politics and philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sawyer, R. K. (1997). *Pretend play as improvisation: Conversation in the preschool classroom*. Mawah, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Press.

Sawyer, R. K., John-Steiner, V., Moran, S., Sternberg, R. J., Feldman, D. H., Nakamura, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2003). *Creativity and development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schousboe, I., & Winter-Lindquist, D. (Eds.). (2013). *Children's play and development: Cultural historical perspectives* (Vol. 8): Springer.

Shklovsky, V. B. (1990). *Theory of prose* (B. Sher, Trans. 1st American ed.). Elmwood Park, IL: Dalkey Archive Press.

Sidorkin, A. M. (1999). *Beyond discourse: Education, the self, and dialogue*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Singer, D. G., Golinkoff, R. M., & Hirsh-Pasek, K. (2006). *Play=learning: how play motivates and enhances children's cognitive and social-emotional growth*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Smedley, R. (Producer). (1971). Dorothy Heathcote: Three Looms Waiting. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?list=PLB1E6842FAF6BBA6B&v=f5jBNIEQrZs - t=136

Smith, M. P. (2010). *The parallel discoursive universes of teachers and students.* (Ph.D. Doctoral), University of Delaware, Newark, DE.

Spolin, V. (1986). *Theater games for the classroom, A teacher's handbook*. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.

Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). Institutional ecology, "translations" and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's museum of vertebrate zoology, 1907-39. *Social studies of Science, 19*(3), 387-420.

Taylor, P., & Warner, C. (2006). *Structure and Spontaneity: the process drama of Cecily O'Neill*. London: Trentham Books Limited.

van Oers, B. (2012). Meaningful cultural learning by imitative participation: the case of abstract thinking in primary school. *HUman Development, 55*, 136–158. doi:10.1159/000339293

Vygotsky, L. S. (1971). *The psychology of art*. Cambridge, Mass.,: M.I.T. Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). The role of play in development. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (pp. 93-104). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wegerif, R. (2007). *Dialogic, educational and technology: Expanding the space of learning*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations*. New York,: Macmillan.

This journal is published by the University Library System, University of Pittsburgh as part of its D-Scribe Digital Publishing Program and is cosponsored by the University of Pittsburgh Press.