

Creative Pedagogy of Play – The Work of Gunilla Lindqvist

Monica E. Nilsson
Blekinge Institute of Technology
School of Management
Box 520
S-372 25 Ronneby
Sweden
Phone: +46 (0)708 265221
Fax: +46 (0)457 385607
monica.e.nilsson@bth.se

Abstract:

This paper presents the work of Swedish play scholar Gunilla Lindqvist, particularly what she calls *creative pedagogy of play* and *play worlds*. Creative pedagogy of play is an educational approach that advocates the joint participation of children and adults in a collectively created and shared world of fiction -- a play world. Gunilla Lindqvist's pedagogy is designed to investigate: (1) how aesthetic activities can influence children's play and (2) the nature of the connection between play and the aesthetic forms of drama and literature. Lindqvist bases her own theories about play worlds on Vygotsky's theories of art, play, semiotics, imagination, and creativity. Her main claim is that children develop consciousness through dialogical interactions with adults and peers when they are encouraged and invited to play in a fictitious world where reality and imagination are dialectically related. This paper pays homage to her work and attempts to present her writings in an appreciative and expository fashion.

Key words: Aesthetics of play, imagination and creativity, creative pedagogy of play, play world.

Introduction

The work of Swedish play scholar Gunilla Lindqvist not only contributes to theories of play and early childhood pedagogy design, but also provides new perspectives on Vygotsky's cultural-historical theories of human development. According to Lindqvist, Vygotsky was successful in developing a cultural-historical theory of human development because he initially studied the relationship between humans, art, and literature. According to Lindqvist (1995), Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory on cultural signs is a direct continuation of his aesthetic theory in *Psychology of Art* (1925/1971). In *Creativity and Imagination in Childhood* (2004), his ideas on art are tied together with his general thinking (Lindqvist, 1995). Vygotsky described how we create our conceptions (i.e., how we interpret and express our understanding of the world). Vygotsky described this process as a dialectical relationship between reproduction and production (creativity). The latter, which he calls imagination, is a significant concept in Lindqvist's work.

Lindqvist builds on Vygotsky's theory of play, which, as she points out, is a theory of play as a creative activity. Lindqvist wants to reinterpret Vygotsky's play theory, asserting that his theory is best understood through his original thoughts in *The Psychology of Art* and his inquiries into creativity and imagination as the two basic types of activity (Vygotsky, 2004, p. 7). According to Lindqvist, Vygotsky's ideas give rise to a creative pedagogical approach. She calls her contribution to such an approach *Creative Pedagogy of Play* and *Play Worlds* (Lindqvist, 1995). She investigates how aesthetic activities can influence children's play as well as the nature of the connections between play and the aesthetic forms of drama and literature. Creative pedagogy of play is a pedagogical activity for daycare centers, preschools, and schools where children and adults co-participate in a jointly created and shared world of fiction -- a play world.

My intention with this paper is to give a window into Gunilla Lindqvist's thoughts and ideas on play, creative pedagogy of play, and play worlds. For this purpose I have interviewed and corresponded with Jan Lindqvist and two of Gunilla Lindqvist's former students (Annica Löfdahl and Inga-Lill Emilsson), both presently holding positions as faculty members at the University of Karlstad.

Until recently, Gunilla Lindqvist was a professor of education at the University of Karlstad in Sweden. At the turn of the millennium, Lindqvist became afflicted with severe dementia. At the age of 66, she is now hospitalized and unable to work.

Lindqvist's background is in education, philosophy, and sociology. She held a position at the University of Lund before moving to the University of Karlstad in 1975. Gunilla Lindqvist introduced several of Vygotsky's works in Sweden by having them translated into Swedish. For example, *Imagination and Creativity in Childhood*, which was written in 1930, was translated and published in 1995 in Sweden. Before that Vygotsky's work had only been translated into Italian in 1972. In 1999 Lindqvist organized translations and publications of Vygotsky's textbook *Educational Psychology*, which was first published in 1926.

Gunilla Lindqvist's theory was developed in close collaboration with her husband, Jan Lindqvist, who also held a faculty position at the University of Karlstad. His field was drama and language/literature. Jan Lindqvist describes the theory of creative pedagogy of play as the fruit of his and his wife's combined interests and experiences in developmental psychology, education, literature, and drama.

Gunilla became particularly interested in Vygotsky's work on art, imagination, and creativity, which was, according to Jan, a result of Jan and Gunilla's close collaboration and continuous conversations and discussions. As an anecdote, Jan describes how he used to play

with their son—applying his dramatic skills—and how his wife became intrigued by this. A tradition was established where Jan used to read Vygotsky’s texts out loud while Gunilla did her interpretations by jotting down comments and ideas in a note book. This, Jan explains, was the beginning of Gunilla Lindqvist’s play theory (hereafter Lindqvist refers to Gunilla Lindqvist).

A Cultural Approach to Play

Lindqvist (1995), like Vygotsky, asserts that children play in order to satisfy needs and motives. Thus, play is not about pleasure or surplus energy, which was a common belief at the time of Vygotsky’s research and is still a commonly held view. Play, according to Vygotsky, is a complex phenomenon that entails higher mental processes of cognition, volition, and emotion. Moreover, Vygotsky perceives play as the most significant source for children’s development of consciousness about the world. He states,

Play is the source of development and creates the zone of proximal development /.../ (in play) a child always behaves beyond his average age, above his daily behavior; in play it is though he were a head taller than himself. (Vygotsky, 1981)

Play, according to Vygotsky (1981) is a dynamic interplay between the child’s inner world (thoughts and feelings) and the external world. Play creates a fictitious situation in which actions can be carried out. Thus, children’s play is imaginative; that is, play is a creative process of interpretation in action where, through fantasy, a real situation is given a new and different meaning (Lindqvist, 1995). Meaning dominates play and is the focal point in the dynamic between idea and action. Because play acts out meaning, play reflects reality in a deep sense and cannot be confused with a realistic performance of an action. A child’s capacity to create an imaginary or fictitious situation in play makes play a vehicle for developing abstract thinking.

Following Vygotsky, Lindqvist asserts that play is also about pleasure. Play is pleasurable in at least two ways: (1) In play a child follows “the law of least resistance,” that is, a

child does what he or she wants to. However, during play, children also follow the “greatest resistance law” by subordinating to rules so that the distance from spontaneous input seems to constitute the road to optimal satisfaction in play. This is a paradox according to Vygotsky (1981, p. 173). The form of play (the rules) and the master of the form of play seem to give a child pleasure and excitement. In play a child is capable of mastering her actions and remaining independent of adults. Lindqvist (1995) makes a connection between this and Vygotsky’s (1971) writings about art, aesthetical emotions, and reactions. Lindqvist states that play, as well as art, is an aesthetical form capable of producing an aesthetic emotion. This emotion is different from real emotion, which has the capacity to create new and complex actions, as well as transcend everyday actions and influence the course of events.

Vygotsky described (2004) how creativity includes processes of transformation, exaggeration, and shrinkage. These are also features of play. Lindqvist (1995) writes that according to Vygotsky, dramatic and literary forms dominate a child’s creative processes. Drama, according to Vygotsky, is related to play. Thus, play has a close affinity to art. Both activities contain two coexisting levels: a “real” level -- where the action is carried out -- and a “conditional” level, where the situation is deliberately fictitious. The trick is to keep these two levels alive simultaneously: to be in the fiction and to know it is fiction, and to control the duplicity in the actions. This gives play particularly rich semantic content.

Lindqvist (1995) is critical of how Vygotsky’s successors, mainly Elkonin and Leontiev, came to interpret his theory of play. According to Lindqvist (1995), Vygotsky emphasized, contrary to Elkonin and Leontiev, the dialectics expressed through the relation between the adult world and the child’s world and also between the will and the emotion. She writes that Leontiev does not see any tension between the adult’s world and the child’s world and that play, for

Leontiev, is about a child's inability to acquire adult roles. When a child cannot perform adult actions he instead creates a fictitious situation. Lindqvist writes that for Leontiev, this situation is the most significant sign of play. Play is thus a sign of children's inferiority, and hence play is in fact an infantile activity because, as Lindqvist states, from this perspective, children will gradually grow into the adult world and play is directed toward the future (ibid). Moreover, she claims that the implication is a stress on reproduction (of adult roles) at the expense of creativity. Therefore, Lindqvist attempts to reinterpret Vygotsky's play theory, based on his original thoughts in *The Psychology of Art*, and his inquires into creativity and imagination. According to Lindqvist, Vygotsky's ideas give rise to a creative pedagogical approach instead of an instrumental one. This is because Vygotsky shows how children interpret and perform their experiences by creating new meaning and how emotions characterize their interpretations (i.e., how emotion and thought unite in the process of knowledge construction).

Based on Vygotsky's theories, Lindqvist argues for a cultural, rather than a psychoanalytical or cognitive, approach to play. Psychoanalytical and the cognitive approaches disregard the significant role of adults in play. Either a child confirms his or her knowledge through play (cognitive approach) or processes inner conflicts (psychoanalytical approach). In both cases it is assumed that children should be left alone in their play and that adult support should only be offered passively by providing play material, etc. Instead, Lindqvist (1995) argues that in order to describe the relationship between play and culture, there is a need for a comprehensive cultural theory of play. Thus, for Lindqvist it is important to search for a perspective on culture that makes it possible to understand and explain the dynamic connection between play and culture. As a consequence, Lindqvist opposes a clear-cut distinction between the concept of culture in an anthropological sense and culture as fine art. These two

conceptualizations can and should be combined and thus transcended (1996) in order to understand the connection between play and art forms such as dance, music, lyrics, and drama. Understanding culture in this way would impact our understanding of play.

Lindqvist's theory of play and her creation of an alternative pedagogical activity indicate a critique of present practices in preschools and schools, a topic that is explored further in the next section.

Critical of School and Preschool

The Swedish preschool¹ has a reputation of being progressive and child centered. Despite rhetoric that play is important and that "free play" is a staple of Swedish pre-schools, play is not practiced as much in the Swedish pre-school as one would expect. Lindqvist asks why this is so. Instead of respecting and emphasizing children's play, activities in preschool classes tend to revolve around daily routines as well as efforts to teach "adult knowledge" and norms to the children. Lindqvist's explanation for this situation is that the preschool pedagogy is not built on a cultural and aesthetical view, but rather on psychological theories where art and culture are not emphasized because the creative subjects are given a subordinated role. The Swedish preschool is founded on a psychology-based theory where play is considered a solitary activity for children -- a psychology devoid of societal and cultural context. Thus, Lindqvist is not only critical of preschools specifically but of schools more generally. Her main concern, though, is preschool, which she claims is an institution controlled by time and order. The linear way of perceiving time is in conflict with a child's subjective experience of time and space. Using linear time to organize preschool activities reveals an implicit view on childhood: that it has no value in and of

¹ The Swedish childcare system is public and the municipalities are obliged to provide childcare. Childcare at the preschool level is offered to children from age 1 to 5. Preschool class is provided to children from age 5 to 6. School begins when the child is aged 6 to 7. Leisure time centers are available for children in elementary school.

itself and that it is just a step on the way to adulthood. She argues that adults who manage preschools feel that order protects children from what adults consider chaos, anarchy, lack of direction, and unpredictability. . Instead of managing order and time, Lindqvist asserts that the teacher's task should be to make the students interested in the unknown, to make the familiar unfamiliar, and to facilitate new interpretations and meaning making. Children and young people need to perceive their reality from different perspectives in order to avoid belief in unambiguous truths. They need to be creative. Lindqvist's recipe is an aesthetical view on pedagogy. She argues for a pedagogy uniting consciousness, playfulness, and solidarity. Lindqvist (1995) claims there is a need for a comprehensive theory about the role of the aesthetical subjects in child development and an approach to play where the relationship between imagination and a child's abstract thought processes is the focus of attention. Lindqvist's pedagogical activity (i.e., the creative pedagogy of play) is such an approach.

Creative Pedagogy of Play

Creative pedagogy of play is the result of an inter-disciplinary collaboration and the mixing of fields such as drama, literature, music, dance, art, and pedagogy. Compared to the traditional, fragmented way of applying aesthetical subjects in Swedish educational settings (c.f., Aulin-Gråhamn, et al., 2004, Marner, 2009), Lindqvist advocates for a holistic approach. She wants the entire activity in the preschool and school to be based on a cultural approach.

According to Lindqvist (1995), there seem to be two aesthetical forms of play². The first form is connected to music, poetry, and rhythmic movement. This form begins with a young child's poetic and rhythmic relationship to objects and language. The second form is connected to literary forms and originates from the basic pattern in folktales. This form can be found in

² Lindqvist uses the Swedish term for "pattern" to describe these two forms of play. Hakkarainen & Bredikyte (2009, p. 4) describes it in terms of "two basic models of artistic reflection of reality in play."

children's play and stories starting at the age of three and is also found in children's literature. The plot dominates in this aesthetical form of play. The two forms constitute a basis for the didactical activity of Lindqvist's creative pedagogy of play.

In her publications (1989, 1992, 1995, 1996, 1996b, 2000, 2001, 2001b, 2002), Lindqvist provides rich and concrete examples of creative pedagogy of play projects. The projects (which could last for up to a year) are always based on a theme important in children's lives, for example, fear, marginalization, and racism. Lindqvist collaborated with pre-schools, daycare centers, leisure-time centers, museums, and schools. The projects were often intergenerational, allowing younger children to observe older children's theatrical abilities and to develop their own conscious dramatizations.. Adult participation is also crucial.

A project from the aesthetic form of children's play that Lindqvist calls "music, poetry, and rhythmic movement," is about rhyme. Lindqvist explains (1995) that the tension between fantasy and reality can be found in the ability of rhyme to fortify a child's understanding of reality. Deviations in the rhythmic patterns strengthen a child's knowledge about reality because these deviations contrast with what the child is expecting to hear, and thus enhancing a child's ability to image new combinations. Lindqvist reasons that it is through imagination that children secure their understanding of the world and reality. Conscious deviations from, or breaks with, reality can be found in nursery rhymes, as well as in play and art. That is, the discontinuity between an object and its features gives an object new meaning (i.e., imagination). Lindqvist (1995) emphasizes the significance of "anarchistic" rhymes and poems. These kinds of writing question order, turn things upside down, and create a sense of magic. This sense of magic is important for children who feel inferior and live in a "dangerous" world. Most of Lindqvist's projects are built on dramatizations of a *play world*.

Play Worlds

The aesthetic form of play that Lindqvist (1995) discusses in terms of literary forms -- such as folktale and children's literature -- has three important concepts: (1) the play world, (2) the narrative/plot, and (3) the characters. A play world is a collectively created and shared world of fiction that children and adults work together to make. A playworld combines a child's holistic emotional experience with an aesthetical relation to reality (Hakkarainen, 2004). In order to create a shared play world, adults create figures, characters, and a plot. The plot is developed with the children as well. The adults get inspiration from contemporary and classic literature. The idea is not to take a book and then perform it, but to let the book inspire the creation of a playworld where children and adults can play together. Using a story from a book provides children and adults with a common experience to help them understand each other more quickly and it allows them to enter into the world of the story or fairy tale.

Building up a playworld is a long process where play is the center, not the result. The process goes through different phases such as creating roles and characters, researching and bringing out the foundation for the playworld, and creating the story's plot. The play environment is important but it is through the physical presence of living characters that the playworld comes alive.

In her publications, Lindqvist describes a variety of drama and play projects where playworlds are created. One of the projects, which was the basis for her thesis (1995), was called *Loneliness and Togetherness*. It was built around a theme of fear. Two characters were created. One was a boy, Rasmus, and the other was Fear. The play world began with a scene in which Rasmus is scared of what is hiding under his bed when he tries to go to sleep. Fear (the sense of fear personified) was lying under the bed. In the encounter between Rasmus and Fear it was clear that both of them were scared, but Fear was more frightened than Rasmus. Fear ended up next to

Rasmus in the bed and Rasmus asked if she feels better now that they were together and next to each other. Fear was not entirely convinced that she was safe and therefore asked the children if this place was a safe place. The children answered yes. Rasmus and Fear continued to perform and explore fear by expressing thoughts and emotions connected to fear. For example, they decided that it was possible to take a ride on a ghost train passing monsters, ghosts, and other scary creatures. When Fear visited the preschool next time she brought scary things such as (artificial) snakes, spiders, and rats.

Lindqvist (1995) explains what happened in the fear-theme play world. There was a dynamic relationship built between the children and the emotion of fear. This emotion was performed as having a dual nature -- fear is both the inner experience of being scared and external objects that produce fright. There were two important relationships in the play. The first was the relationship between Rasmus and Fear. These characters shared with each other their desire to control their fear. The second important relationship was between Fear and the children, who had a decisive role in the plot. The children's role was to call Fear out from under the bed and to make her visible. The adults acted out the characters of Rasmus and Fear and it was the children's role to be supportive toward these characters. In this way, the children became participants and created a common world of fiction. It was the emotion of Fear that created meaning for the situation. Even Rasmus' bed had been permeated by Fear. The children played in and under the bed for several weeks, Lindqvist (1995) notes, as the bed was charged with the meaning of Fear.

Lindqvist (1995) argues that one could perceive the character Fear to be a metaphor for the dynamic relationship between imagination and reality. The inner emotion is taking shape and in that way the individual (emotion) and the social (the materialized) components unite within

the same body. In order for imagination to develop, a relationship between the internal emotion and the external world must be established. According to Lindqvist, this is how Vygotsky describes the process of imagination -- as a dynamic between image making and materialization. The performance of Fear is appealing to the children because it addresses their real-life concerns and issues. The children's emotions are touched, and it is their interpretations and imaginations that move the story forward. In addition, their interpretations are a precondition for the play to develop. Lindqvist connects this to Vygotsky's (1971) statement that art is the emotion's social form, which she states is obvious in the play about Fear. In turn, the play about Fear is about the emotion in a double sense since it is an emotion that is being expressed.

The Finnish-Swedish author Tove Jansson's tale *Who Will Comfort Toffle?* and the play world that Lindqvist organized around this story introduced another perspective. In this story loneliness is depicted as the feeling of being worthless and denied an existence. In the tale the children encountered a world filled with meaning. It was a world where a struggle was taking place for the freedom and the right to exist as small, scared, and different. It was a world where fear was embedded in life and where the characters' kindness created the basis for companionship and tolerance. In this imaginative world the children experienced Toffle's fear when he encountered Groke in the fictitious woods (which were copied from the book onto a plastic sheet with a felt-tip pen and displayed on the wall). On their daily outdoor field trip, they also got to meet and interact with Toffle and Groke who were personified by their preschool teachers. Once there, they found a message enclosed in a bottle asking for help from someone called Miffle, who later became Toffle's best friend.

Lindqvist (1995) explains that *Who Will Comfort Toffle?* was structured in a way that generated play among all the children. According to Lindqvist, the aesthetical form of the book

played a role in making it possible to dramatize the characters and the plot from the book. Thus, the dramatic enactment gave life to the plot so that the children could enter into the Moomin Valley where Toffle and Miffle were, influencing the dialogue between the main characters. The tension between threat and companionship in the story allowed for a dynamic plot and enabled imagination and play to thrive. The younger children interpreted this tension in terms of hunting and thrill. The older children decided to chase after Groke, engaging in advanced play together with the adults. When Groke eventually became their friend, the children realized that they had an influence on Groke, which made it difficult to distinguish her as either a good or evil character.

Lindqvist (1995) gives some advice about creating playworlds. It is important that the adults' "performance" is carried out as a dialogue with the children. Too often and too easily adults dominate the play world they are hoping to create. However, as Lindqvist shows, acting out a role enables adults to discover new ways of relating to their children, ways that are less formal and framed by institutional traditions. Being in a role gives teachers a sense of freedom, Lindqvist writes (1995), and further, "to be in role liberates the teachers from the traditional roles and the institutional language game so linked to the teachers' role in preschool and school" (p. 264, my translation).

Moreover, it is important to choose narratives where children can easily move in and out of roles. The narrative should be open, giving the children opportunities to follow the plot and influence the story. Children should be given opportunities to influence the story through explicit actions but also by choosing and reflecting on different alternatives. The children should gain a critical, creative approach and thus the situations and roles should be contradictory. In this way the children are given the chance to be authors, directors, actors in and of the playworld.

Lindqvist (1996) lists the following as the most important results of her empirical studies of playworlds:

- A shared *Playworld* supports the development of children's play. There is a need to create a cultural context that the children and the adults can relate to in their joint play. The joint fantasy "world" must also be physical – a real play environment.
- In order for the plot to develop, there is a need for rich content -- a *theme* that emotionally touches the participants and that is interesting to the children as well as the adults. Children often have a dramatic relationship with their surroundings in that their narratives and play contain basic conflicts.
- The basic conflicts have to be woven into a *dramatic text*, otherwise the joint play runs the risk of being reduced to a simple "game of tag," lacking a plot or intrigue. It is the dramatic quality of the text that determines if the joint play will develop. Thus, there is a need for literary texts with multiple possibilities for interpretation.
- Adults need to *dramatize the plot* in order for the play to develop. In particular, when acting in *dialogue* with the children, it is the adults' *characters* that give life to the play and push the children into the fiction. The teachers become *mediators* and challenge the children's zone of proximal development. (pp. 82 - 83, Lindqvist's italics, my translation).

Conclusion

Gunilla Lindqvist's work is innovative and challenging in several ways. She is critical of traditional play theories, which separate and emphasize either emotion or cognition but fail to account for the significance of culture in play. Culture, for Lindqvist, goes beyond the dichotomy of culture as defined within the fine arts and anthropology. She searches for a connection

between play and culture where artistic forms such as movement, sound, and drama are natural and original components.

She is critical of the way play has been theorized in cultural-historical activity theory, particularly as Leontiev and Elkonin have presented it. She presents a unique and at times controversial interpretation of Vygotsky's work on play theory. Through her own play theory she illuminates aspects of Vygotsky's work, particularly the significance of imagination and creativity, that until recently not been emphasized in CHAT research. In this regard she is an innovator ahead of her time.

Lindqvist's reinterpretation of Vygotsky's play theory has an expressed purpose of designing, implementing, and studying a pedagogy in which adults assume a creative approach to children's play. Such a theory of play opens up doors to novel interpretations as well as novel designs for pedagogical activities and tools. Thus, her reinterpretation of play theory -- particularly her emphasis on the creative quality of play expressed through the design and implementation of her "pedagogy of creative play" -- paves the way for a cultural approach to play that can guide practice in preschools as well as schools. Her theory ascribes adults with an active role in the creation of playworlds. Her reinterpretation, with its emphasis on creativity, is unique among contemporary Western European and American theories of play (Ferholt & Nilsson, forthcoming).

In times like the present, when learning is approached in terms of preparation and training for tests, Lindqvist's work is provocative and liberating. Her pedagogy values children's needs and interests, not just the needs of adult educators to promote children's learning and development in terms of adult-determined developmental goals, which colonizes children's play. Instead of perceiving adult knowledge, experience, or developmental stages as the teleology of

children's play, which is common in Western European and American theories of play (Ferholt and Nilsson, forthcoming), Lindqvist stresses that play is beneficial to children's present and future lives. She prefers to talk about meaning making and development of consciousness rather than learning and cognitive development (1995).

Some readers may be wondering, if Lindqvist's work is so brilliant, why hasn't her theory and pedagogy received the recognition it deserves? One explanation might be that, due to illness, Lindqvist's career as a researcher was very short (her thesis was completed in 1995 and she became ill in the beginning of 2000). Another reason might be that developmental effects in children were not studied systematically in the playworlds (Hakkarainen & Bredikyte, 2009). Instead, Lindqvist focused her research on understanding the connection between play and culture (mainly drama and literature) in order to develop a creative pedagogy of play. Nevertheless, some of these gaps are starting to be filled. For example, Baumer et al., (2005) shows that playworlds promote narrative competence. Rainio (2007; 2008) shows how playworlds endorse agency. Hakkarainen (2004) shows how playworld activities encourage competence in problem-solving.

Lindqvist's work has also inspired the development of different kinds of playworld projects. Each unique project is shaped by the socio-cultural conditions of the participants. Teams in Finland, Japan, USA, Serbia, and Sweden are currently (both separately and in conjunction) setting up playworld projects for investigation (c.f. Ferholt, 2009, forthcoming; Ferholt & Lecusay, forthcoming a, forthcoming b; Ferholt & Nilsson, forthcoming; Hakkarainen, 2004; Hofmann & Rainio, 2007; Marjanovic-Shane, et al, submitted; Miyazaki, 2005a, 2005b, 2008; Nilsson, 2008, submitted; Rainio, 2007, 2008a, 2008b). What these studies have in common is that they build on Lindqvist's play theory and test her pedagogy, but they also strive

to develop and go beyond what Lindqvist created. One main interest is to deepen the understanding of the role of imagination and creativity in human conduct and the relationship between cognition, emotion, and the body. By performing playworlds of different kinds these studies also evoke new questions, such as how to recognize and appreciate children's diverse everyday cultures -- for example, peer cultures, as discussed by Lindqvist's former student Annica Löfdahl (2009), or popular media culture (Nilsson, submitted), which are both significant aspects of children's lives. Hence, the legacy of Lindqvist's work is beginning to make its mark. Her work inspires and challenges our understanding and interpretation of socio-cultural and cultural-historical theory in general and Vygotsky's work on play in particular. This in turn comes with implications for the development of meaningful activities for children, youth, and adults.

References

- 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.
- Egan, K. (1989). *Teaching as storytelling. An alternative approach to teaching and curriculum in the elementary school*. University of Chicago.
- Elkonin, D. (1988) *Legens psykologi. (The psychology of play.)* Copenhagen: Sputnik.
- Ferholt, B. (2009) Adult and child development in adult-child joint play: The Development of cognition, emotion, imagination and creativity in Playworlds. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Diego.

- Ferholt, B. (forthcoming) Synthetic-analytic method for the study of Perezhivanie: The application of Vygotsky's method of literary analysis to playworlds. In *Mind, Culture, and Activity*: Special Issue on Play.
- Ferholt, B. (submitted) Stages of Perezhivanie: Analysis of perezhivanie in a playworld. In Pentti Hakkarainen (Ed.), *Imaginative Early Education*.
- Ferholt, B. & Lecusay, R. A (forthcoming a) Multiperspectival analysis of creative imagining: Applying Vygotsky's method of literary analysis to a playworld. In Vera John-Steiner, Cathrene Connery and Ana Marjanovic-Shane (Eds.) *Dancing with the muses: A cultural historical activity theoretical (CHAT) approach to play, meaning-making and creativity*. Peter Lang.
- Ferholt, B. & Lecusay, R. (forthcoming b). Adult and child development in the zone of proximal development: Socratic dialogue in a playworld. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*.
- Ferholt, B. & Nilsson, M. (forthcoming). Gunilla Lindqvist's "pedagogy of creative play" in the United States: Current practice and Vygotsky's theory of play. In Minati Panda, (Ed.) *Shared Worlds, Shared Minds: Research and Applications in Cultural Psychology*.
- Aulin-Gråhamn, L., Persson, M. & Thavenius, J. (2004). *Skolan och den radikala estetiken*. (The school and the radical aesthetics). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Hakkarainen, P. (2004). Narrative learning in the Fifth Dimension. *Outlines: Critical Social Studies*, 6(1), 5-20.
- Hakkarainen, P. & Bredikyte, M. (2008) The zone of proximal development in play and learning. *Kul'turno istoricheskaya psikhologiya (Cultural-historical psychology)* 4. 2-11.

- Hofmann, R., & Rainio, A. P. (2007). "It doesn't matter what part you play, it just matters that you're there." Towards shared agency in narrative play activity in school. In R. Alanen & S. Pöyhönen (Eds.), *Language in action. Vygotsky and Leontievian legacy today*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Leontiev, A. N. (1982). The psychological bases of play in pre-school children. In L.C. Hydén (Ed.) *Soviet Child Psychology. An Anthology*. Stockholm: Kontrakurs Pan.
- Lindqvist, G. (1989). *Från fakta till fantasi*. (From Facts to Fantasy). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Lindqvist, G. (1992). *Ensam i vida världen*. (Lonely in the wide world). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Lindqvist, G. (1995). *Lekens estetik. En didaktisk studie om lek och kultur i förskolan*. Forskningsrapport 95: 12, SKOBA, Högskolan i Karlstad. (The Aesthetics of Play. A Didactic Study of Play and Culture in Preschools. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Uppsala studies in Education 62. Stockholm/Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International).
- Lindqvist, G. (1996). *Lekens möjligheter*. (The possibilities of play). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Lindqvist, G. (1996b) The aesthetics of play. A didactic study of play and culture in preschools. *Early Years Volume, 17*(1). 6-11.
- Lindqvist, G. (2000). *Historia som tema och gestaltning*. (History as theme and gestalt). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Lindqvist, G. (2001). When small children play: How adults dramatize and children create meaning. *Early Years, 21*(1), 7-14.
- Lindqvist, G. (2001b). The Relationship between Play and Dance. In *Research in Dance Education, 2* (1), 41-53.

- Lindqvist, G. (2002). *Lek i skolan*. (Play in school). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Lindqvist, G. (2003). Vygotsky's theory of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 15(4), 245-251.
- Löfdahl, A. (2007) *Kamratkulturer i förskolan*. (Peer cultures in preschool). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Marjanovic-Shane, A., Ferholt, B., Nilsson, M., Rainio, A. P., Miyazaki, K., Hakkarainen, P., Pesič, M., Beljanski-Ristić, L. (submitted). Playworlds - An Art of Development. Play and Culture Series, Volume 11. Association for the Study of Play (TASP)
- Marner, A. (2009) Vilken Vygotskij? Sociokulturell metod och semiotik i relation till estetiska ämnen och läroprocesser. Institutionen för estetiska ämnen, Lärarutbildningen, Umeå universitet. (Which Vygotskij? Sociocultural method and semiotics in relation to aesthetical subjects and learning processes. Department of aesthetical subjects, Umeå University). www.educ.umu.se/~marner/artiklar/Vilken%20Vygotskij.pdf Retrieved 20090115
- Miyazaki, K. (2005a). Role of artist in the collaborative artwork production at the workshop for children. Paper presented at the 2005 American Educational Researchers Association Conference. Montreal.
- Miyazaki, K. (2005b). Extending narrative learning through combining different modes of art activities. Paper presented at the first International Society for Cultural and Activity Research, Seville, Spain.

Miyazaki, K. (2008). Children's play and the imagination in art production. Paper presented at the 2nd Conference of the International Society of Culture and Activity Research. San Diego.

Nilsson, M. (2008) Development of voice through the creative process and multimodal tools in digital storytelling. Paper presented at ISCAR - Second Congress of the International Society for Cultural and Activity Research, 9-13 September, 2008, San Diego, California, USA.

Nilsson, M. (submitted) Pedagogy of Possibilities: Developing Voice in Digital Storytelling Through Narrative and Multimodality. In P. Hakkarainen, (Ed.) *Imaginative Early Education*.

Rainio, A. P. (2007). Ghosts, bodyguards and fighting fillies: Manifestations of pupil agency in play pedagogy. *ACTIO: International Journal for Human Activity Theory*, 1, 149-160.
http://www.chat.kansaiu.ac.jp/english/publications/actio/pdf/8_Rainio.pdf

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

Rainio, A. P. (2008b). Developing the classroom as a figured world. *Journal of Educational Change*, 9(4), 357-364.

Video: Dagis-TV:s utbildningsprogram om ett lekpedagogiskt arbetssätt från Hybelejens daghem i Karlstad med Gunilla och Jan Lindqvist. TV-producent: Birgitta Sohlman, UR, 2006-93517-1.

Vygotsky, L. (1971). *The Psychology of art*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published in 1930).

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

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Imagination and its development in childhood. In *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky*. New York: Plenum Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1997) *Educational psychology*. Boca, Raton, FL: St. Lucie Press. (Original work published 1926).

Vygotsky, L. S. (2004). Imagination and creativity in childhood. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 42(1), 7-97.