I abruptly introduced a new theme – alternative ideas – to them. I told them that I formulated it slightly differently: “the main goal of classroom management is to conform the students to the teacher’s expectations.” “Responsibility,” in my students’ view, meant children’s conformity to the teacher’s orders and expectations. I challenged this notion by claiming that true responsibility must start with children’s own decision making about what is good and what is bad. However, “classroom management” does not involve children in decision making. As an illustrative example, I told my students that when fascism and Nazism came to power in Europe, some psychologists and educators became concerned that children learned a disposition to fascism in school through classroom management techniques of unconditional obedience. Thus, famous psychologist Kurt Lewin, a German Jewish immigrant from Nazi Germany to the USA, did his famous study of “three teaching styles” to explore this phenomena in 1939 (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939).

I showed them a fragment from Lewin’s video (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1953/1939), which portrayed three experimental situations of clubs of 10-year-old boys in a summer camp with an adult, using authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire styles of arranging and guiding the clubs. Each club was involved in carpeting craft activities. In each situation, a teacher left the children alone at some point. After watching the fragments, I asked my students to predict which group finished the project quicker, which produced better quality work, which group generated more aggression and chaos when the teacher left, which group demonstrated more creativity. After the student’s guesses and discussion of the reasons of their guesses, I reported Lewin’s research results about these inquiries. The students started to realize that different “teaching styles” generated their own systems of values and, thus, their own “efficiencies.” The questions for them shifted from how to control their future students more effectively to what value system is more desirable for them and their future students, education-wise. I asked my students which one of these approaches they liked more. All but one student preferred the democratic approach. The student who preferred the authoritarian approach said that she needed certainty based on control because she would become very anxious in her life. The students who preferred the more democratic approach provided reasons for their preference, such as “making choices,” “creativity,” and “quality of work.” One of these students mentioned that it is very difficult to implement a democratic approach in modern classrooms because teachers are required to achieve educational standards, and for that, one needs an authoritarian approach. She elaborated that in a democratic approach, students must engage in decision making. Indeed, the mainstream school not only prevents students from engaging in, developing, and utilizing their own judgments but also puts teachers in the position of technicians, executing somebody else’s decisions, goals, and values. The technician inquiry of “how” prevails over the professional inquiry of “why” for the
teachers. Mainstream schools rob the teachers of professionalism, which is based on developing authorial, practice-rooted judgments. In its own terms, technological pedagogies demand authoritarian approaches, i.e., “classroom management,” to classroom life. Democratic and communal decision making and governance become very difficult under the regime of technological pedagogies of “covering curriculum” and “delivering educational standards.”

In this chapter, we discuss and analyze impossibilities of genuine intrinsic education on a mass scale in our current society. We define genuine intrinsic education as having a goal in itself, as basic human craving for reflective self-actualization, self-transcendence, and self-realization. In contrast, we define mainstream institutionalized education, both conventional and some innovative, as instrumental, as a servant to other practices and societal spheres like economy, democracy, patriotism, nationalism, societal cohesion, social mobility, and so on. Conventional institutionalized education is often aimed at students’ arrival at curricular endpoints – knowledge, skills, attitudes, values – preset by the teacher and society (Matusov, 2009). However, we argue that genuine education is an inherent and existential human need and right, involving human self-realization, self-actualization, and self-inspiration (Greenberg, 1992). We found two bases for intrinsic education: 1) creative authorship and 2) critical authorship. Both involve promoting students’ authorial agency and voices. Creative authorship is primarily interested in production of new culture. Meanwhile, critical authorship is primarily interested in deconstruction of ready-made culture in a critical dialogue. We abstracted six types of academic freedom that support both kinds of intrinsic education: curricular, instructional, participatory, valuative, ecological, and role-based. These academic freedoms of the students are currently violated almost in all educational institutions. In our view, this is because current society is survival-and-necessity-oriented and not leisure-based (Arendt, 1958). Modern societal and mainstream institutional conditions distract students and teachers from their focus on intrinsic education and their fundamental existential needs. Thus, these conditions produce discontent and a feeling of lifelessness in the participants. “They suck life out of you,” commented a student, who moved from an innovative middle school that promoted a love of learning to a conventional high school that promoted credentials, about his new conventional school (DePalma, Matusov, & Smith, 2009, p. 945). However, changes in technology and economy may create new societal conditions for genuine education in the future, orienting the society on authorial agency and leisure (Markoff, 2016). We will ground our critical discussion in our pedagogical experimentation with genuine education.

Intrinsic vs. instrumental education

Traditionally, the purpose of education, and especially institutionalized education, has been defined instrumentally. The primary instrumental goal of education is for education to serve the economy, to prepare students for current and future jobs (Livingstone, 2009). Thus, sociologist and historian of education David Labaree (1997) abstracted three major publicly announced purposes of education. He called the first purpose “social efficiency,” which is to reproduce society economically and promote even more economic advancement. The second purpose of education, as defined by Labaree, is “social mobility,” which is to ensure students will have better, or at least the same, economic and social life as their parents. This instrumental goal of education is the basis of educational credentialism (Hoskins & Barker, 2014). These educational credentials will open gates for students to diverse opportunities: educational, jobs, and so on. Finally, Labaree’s third main purpose of education is “democratic participation.” This instrumental goal of education is for education to serve to promote skillful participation in a democratic society (Dewey, 1966).

In our view, these three publicly announced instrumental goals of education are not exhaustive. There are other instrumental goals of education that have circulated in public discourse, such as patriotism (Straughn & Andriot, 2011); nationalism (Benet, 2007); moral character; social cohesion (Babacan, 2007); social justice (Cochran-Smith, 2010); elimination of poverty (Ribich, 1968); political, cultural, and religious tolerance (Wain, 1996); and so on.

Education should be a means to empower children and adults alike to become active participants in the transformation of their societies. Learning should also focus on the values, attitudes and behaviors which enable individuals to learn to live together in a world characterized by diversity and pluralism. (UNESCO, 2017, March)

The primary purpose of instrumental education is to make all students predictably arrive at preset curricular endpoints (i.e., important knowledge, skills, attitudes, dispositions, values) by the end of the educational term (e.g., lesson, semester, school year, school level). Besides these primary instrumental purposes, there are secondary instrumental purposes that may have little to nothing to do with education per se (except, maybe, creating conditions for education). These secondary instrumental purposes of schooling may include: babysitting, preventing child labor, preventing juvenile delinquency, promoting universal immunization, providing food for children from poor families, promoting desegregation, exposing children to diversity, providing security for children, and so on. These are secondary reasons why students must attend school.

Although in conflict with intrinsic education, instrumental purposes of education can be legitimate (Dumitru, 2018, in press). However, in our view, there is a problem when instrumentality is either the only or the predominant goal of education as opposed to intrinsic purposes of education. An intrinsic purpose of education is rooted in education itself. “I want education because I enjoy education, because education is part of my life, because without education my life is not fulfilled.” My colleagues and I (the first author) (Matusov, Baker, Fan, Choi, & Hampel, 2017) conducted the following study of intrinsic education based on Isaac Asimov’s novella Profession (Asimov, 1959). Asimov envisioned a future...
society in which education is replaced by direct modification of the brain so that people can acquire necessary knowledge, skills, dispositions, and attitudes almost instantaneously without any effort by reprogramming the brain according to preset templates. This procedure has two phases. First, experts examine a young child’s brain for predispositions to certain professions, and then when the child becomes a late teenager, his/her brain is transformed accordingly – a newly certified professional emerges. However, for the main character of the novella, who wanted to be a space-craft pilot, things did not work well. In phase one, the experts discovered that, for some reason, his brain could not be molded into any profession. Instead, the teenage boy was placed in the custody of certified psychologists at a special orphanage for children like him, surrounded by books. Reading books was useless, since it would take a lot of time to learn from books to become a competent professional. After several crises, the boy persevered in studying though the books and finally understood that, instead of having a disability, he belonged to a hidden elite group who designed and controlled the entire society. The inventors are those who enjoy learning for the sake of learning.

Our study ignores Asimov’s story’s elitism and, instead, focuses on the phenomenon of “learning for the sake of learning.” We interviewed diverse participants from three different countries, asking about an imaginary scenario of a “magic learning pill.” Taking the “magic learning pill” would allow someone to instantaneously acquire desired knowledge and skills. The quality of the knowledge and skills acquired through the magic pill and the best learning would be the same. The participants were asked about their important past learning experiences in and out of school and which of these learning experiences would replace by taking a magic learning pill and which they would not. Based on the responses, my colleagues and I interpreted that when the participants wanted to take a magic learning pill, their learning was instrumental, and when they did not want to take the pill, their learning was “ontological” (i.e., intrinsic). According to our findings, almost all research participants have some important learning experiences for which they would take a magic learning pill and some for which they would not. As Matusov and colleagues describe, non-instrumental, intrinsic education is education that constitutes the participants’ life and, thus, its shortening is undesirable for its participants. In this education, the process is more important than its outcomes (rather, the emerging outcomes are subordinated to the process):

[Take MLP?] No, [I would not take the MLP] because the process is important. . . I feel like I would be losing something, because the actual learning of something is interesting. . . . Well the gradual interaction with some material, when you think about it every day, and start to view it differently. Immediately, now you don’t know it, now you don’t, you go through these stages and understand it completely differently, like something else. And moreover, when you’re immediately there, you don’t have the feeling that the material is something social, with that you lose some of the color, even some of the lines. Do you understand? So, when initially English was something foreign to me, it’s important, because now I hear it through someone else’s ear, as well as with my own. Maybe with mine not as well, as the carriers, but on the other hand, a lot better with that of the other. It becomes kind of like a stereo effect.

(Sasha, Russia, adult, BS) (Matusov et al., 2017, p. 8)

In contrast to instrumental education, which serves other spheres of practice (e.g., economy, nation building, upward social mobility, mastery of a desired practice), ontological education is an end in itself (Dumitru, 2018, in press). It is education for education’s sake. Using Aristotle’s terminology, we could say that education is “the final cause,” irreducible to any other cause. That is why intrinsic education is a basic human right, without which life is incomplete. Intrinsic education constitutes life itself — that is why it is ontological. The primary outcome is to be an important part of the person’s life, valued by the person himself/herself. Ontological education is eventful, existential, experiential, relational, and dialogic. It is based on an authorial meaning-making process (Matusov, 2009).

Intrinsic ontological education is always and primarily personal business, rather than societal. “Education is the discovery and drawing out of the best that is in a person” (de Grazia, 1962, pp. 360–361). Although intrinsic education may have important instrumental implications and outcomes, they are secondary to its intrinsic value for the participant. Intrinsic education may involve some instrumental education — technological and/or authorial — but these aspects are subordinated to the existential values of intrinsic education. For example, Sasha, a Russian participant in our research, experienced learning English as intrinsic education. He benefited instrumentally from this education by being able to read English literature and communicate with English-speaking people. However, these instrumental benefits did not outweigh the existential value of the process of learning English for him.

In contrast to instrumental education, in intrinsic education, curriculum cannot be preset but rather emerges through dramatic events constituting the participant’s life. This emerging curriculum is a never-ending process, as it essentially a relationship between past educational experiences and the present circumstances. It is the participants — and not the teachers, test designers, curriculum experts, politicians, the state, the whole society — who are the final authority for defining the value of their educational experiences.

So far, we have abstracted two main types of intrinsic education (Matusov, 2019, in preparation). The first is creative authorship intrinsic education and the second is critical authorship intrinsic education. In the creative authorship intrinsic education, the focus is on the collaborative or individual production of culture and meaningful life in communities of practice. Existing, ready-made knowledge and culture become material for production of the unknown, emerging ways of existence and experience (Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2016a). The creative authorship type of intrinsic education is about creative participation in projects that promote meaningful life and “learning in our own sociocultural, historically grounded world” (Lave, 1991). Learning in such education is often secondary to
living; it is a byproduct of an unfolding, meaningful communal activity (Matusov, 2009).

Many good examples of creative authorship intrinsic education can be found in drama education (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995; O'Neill, 1995). As most of the “drama pedagogues” claim, drama in education is about making a meaningful transformation for the whole person, “not for the aesthetic experience, but through it” (cf. Taylor & Warner, 2006, p. 29, italics in the original). Thus, in a drama workshop, “The Prisoners of War Camp,” Dorothy Heathcote enters a classroom of 14 boys aged between 10 and 13 years, students in a residential school, and in a few minutes, invites them to engage in making a play. After some discussion, the children and Dorothy choose to create a “prisoners of war camp” (3m:46s). Dorothy assumes various leading imaginary play roles, changing her voice and posture, to help the students build creatively this phantasy world of the camp. As the “senior commanding officer,” she dramatically tells the “new recruits”: “NOW!! Pick up your guns!!! . . . It matters! . . . It’s all there is between you and the Germans with their guns, isn’t it? . . . Really!” (4m:40s). The students are quickly transformed into “soldiers defending their country against a powerful enemy, then captured and put into a prison camp.” In this imaginary prison camp, some of the students play the German guards and the others play the English inmates. Unbeknownst to the students who played inmates, Dorothy secretly nominated one of the “inmates” to be a spy for the “guards.” At one point, a few “inmates” steal the keys form another “prison guard” (10m:30s). At “night,” all the “inmates” start making plans how to escape (12m:24s). The “spy” is among them, included in plotting the escape. At that moment in the play, another “guard” enters and asks the “spy” to hand him the keys (10m:30s). The “spy” gets up and points to one of the inmates, saying, “He’s got them, sir!” (13m:18s). The “guard” enters and asks the “spy” to hand him the keys (13m:18s). The “spy” gets up and points to one of the inmates, saying, “He’s got them, sir!” (13m:18s). The “spy” kneels down, crouches to the floor and puts his hands over his head, deeply ashamed. Other “inmates” start pushing him and yelling “Get out! Move! Get out!” (14m:00s). After the play, the students analyzed what they did and why. The student who played the “spy” said, “I did not really want to betray them” and seemed somewhat embarrassed. In the filmed interview that Dorothy Heathcote gave to other drama educators, she made the following comment about this drama episode:

It looks a bit like an adventure tale, as if everybody is just pretending to be prisoners, and so on. And I think if you would ask the boys about this, they would think that they had a good adventure, you know, it was grand, we didn't do ordinary lessons, for a start... It would take a little time for them to begin to be very honest and say to themselves, 'Well, actually, that was me talking...'

So, what is this example? This is an example of creative authorship intrinsic education. It involves deconstruction of ready-made concepts and ideas, often dear to participants, by testing them against alternative ideas in a critical dialogue. It is a critical examination of the life, self, world, and society in “internally persuasive discourse” (Bakhtin, 1991; Matusov & von Duyke, 2010). The critical dialogue of intrinsic education is often messy, involving heterodiscoursia of the participants jumping from on discursive theme to another (Matusov, 2011b) and interrupting each other (Nikulin, 2010; Yakubimsky & Eskin, 1997). The first author provides a good example of critical authorship intrinsic education, as he worked at a Latin-American Community Center after-school program with his undergraduate students, future teachers. The described events that occurred in a computer room where most of the Latino children of diverse ages played computer games or worked on diverse projects of their choices after their homework was already done:

An LACC [9th grade] teenager asked the LRM [9th grade] instructor (Eugene Matusov) to help him with his homework, which involved writing a structured summary of a newspaper article about science; listing the source, the place, three details, and so on. [The LRM instructor reluctantly accepted this request – just because this young man asked him, not appreciating the meaninglessness of this homework.] The LRM instructor asked the LACC boy if he had already chosen the article. The boy nodded and showed a short article [from a local newspaper] about melting ice in the Arctic. The instructor asked why he had chosen this particular article and the boy replied that it was the shortest article he could find on a science topic, and that he wanted to finish the homework assignment as soon as possible to go to play computer games [in the room]. In order to promote LACC children’s meaningful participation in social and educational activities that eschew school tasks, the LRM
The LRM instructor asked the boy what he was currently interested in and the boy said that he was interested in downloading music [of his choice] from the Internet [as he wanted to become a hip-hop musician]. The LRM instructor went to the New York Times’ website and searched for “music pirating.” [He] found an article about a retired dyslexic schoolteacher who was sued by [several] record companies for illegally downloading music. The article stated that the accused schoolteacher’s son [who was a computer programmer] proved that the record company used static Internet Protocol (IP) addresses to look for perpetrators while his retired mother had a dynamic IP address. In addition, the schoolteacher’s old computer could not handle current Peer-To-Peer (P2P) software required for music pirating. The LRM instructor read and discussed the article with the boy. The article was very long with very difficult vocabulary and grammar but the child was very interested in it and did not mind working through this difficulty. The article generated an avalanche of [diverse] issues for the boy:

- what dyslexia is,
- how a dyslexic could become a teacher,
- what an IP address is and [what is] the difference between static and dynamic IP addresses,
- why it is difficult to discover people who are accessing a website if they use a dynamic IP address,
- why an old Apple II computer cannot handle P2P software,
- what copyright protection is, and finally,
- whether or not it is fair to share and download copyrighted music from the Internet.

The LRM instructor demonstrated how to find the IP address on a computer connected to the Internet, discussed dyslexia and the purpose of education, and the old versus new computer operating systems. Another topic of discussion was that many LACC kids want to become successful musicians in future earning a lot of money and yet still want to be able to download music for free.

Very soon, many LACC children in the computer room stopped playing computer games and joined their discussion, as well as some UD students present in the computer room. [The LRM instructor systematized music pirating for the children, many of whom wanted to become famous hip-hop musicians: “How will you earn money if your fans pirate your music from the Internet?!” To the instructor’s surprise, the children started asking him about what he was doing at the LACC in their response.] The children asked why the LRM instructor from UD spent so much time at LACC and who paid him for that. When they learned that it was UD that paid the instructor for his academic work, teaching, research, and scientific articles and that his publications were openly available in libraries, the children suggested that musicians should also have tenure and be paid by a university so their music could also be available in libraries for free. That was a very interesting and fresh idea even for the LRM instructor and later he discussed this issue in his University class. The teenage boy wrote two summaries of the article: one according to the teacher’s rigid structure and the other based on the [entire] LRM discussion. Fortunately, the teacher appreciated his second summary. She awarded him with an A (the highest grade in the US schools) and invited him to read his article summary on the school’s public-address system for the entire school. The LRM instructor created a learning community around the article about music pirating in which all the participants, including himself, were peripheral participants.

Unfortunately, it is not always possible to “hijack” traditional, decontextualized school homework and turn it into something meaningful for the children.

(Matusov & Smith, 2011, pp. 29-30)

Why does this example represent intrinsic education? Why does it involve critical authorship? The evidence that the described activity was intrinsic for the children is because it successfully competed with other intrinsic activities—computer games, free chatting, and projects—that the children chose of their own will and were final causes in themselves. The activity was eventful for the children as they remembered it many years later, and for not only its interesting outcomes but also its intensity of “being together” with each other and me. The experience was also educational for everybody, including me. Mateo (a pseudonym for the teenage boy) told me later that for him there were two most striking lessons: 1) academic learning can be fun and powerful (his second essay was read over school intercom) and 2) we invented a viable system, in which musicians can be paid while their music was free to download. Through our collective guidance, we all involved ourselves in critical deconstruction ideas about dyslexia, IP, music pirating, and so on. One of the inquiries for our collective critical deconstruction was why teachers could not make this deep, eventful, and fun learning, similar to described above, an everyday school experience.

**Conditions for intrinsic education: seven students’ academic freedoms and rights**

Why indeed? Why cannot conventional and even most innovative schooling make students experiences eventful, deeply meaningful, and fun (even if it is difficult and frustrating)?
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First of all, intrinsic education starts with open appreciation of a learner’s authorship of his/her own learning and education in general by the learner and the relevant others (Matusov, 2011a). Intrinsic education is not about reproduction of a ready-made culture in a new generation as conventional and even some innovative schooling assumes. Rather, intrinsic education is about production of a new culture, culture-making, on small or large scales (Berlyand, 2009; Bibler, 2009). A production of a new culture can occur through either learners’ creative authorship or critical reflective authorship. This authorship can be self-initiated by the learner in some short-term (e.g., a stand-alone question) or long-term (e.g., a long-term project or journey) self-assignment or responsive to a teacher’s or peer’s or somebody else’s dialogic provocation. This highly contrasts with conventional and some innovative schooling where most learning activities are constantly assigned by the teacher (Matusov, 2015). In intrinsic education, a learner’s authorship can be assisted by the teacher (or by other people) or autodidact. This important characteristic of intrinsic education demands an important educational right – the right of the student to define his/her own curriculum, instruction, and valuation (what to value in his/her education). In intrinsic education, guidance starts with the learner request for help addressing others, self, texts, Internet, and so on.

The learner’s right of defining his/her own (intrinsic) education is based on the learner’s multidimensional academic freedoms. These multidimensional academic freedoms and rights involve:

1. Curriculum: Freedom to decide what to learn;
2. Instruction: Freedom to decide how, when, where, and with whom to learn and ask for guidance;
3. Participation: Freedom to engage or disengage, freedom to learn or not to learn, freedom of a no-fault divorce from any teacher or learning community;
4. Valuation: Freedom to determine what is or is not important for the learner to study or do, the quality, and the purpose of his/her education;
5. Ecology: A right to have access to and opportunity for a rich educational environment, pregnant with and supportive of diverse discourses, practices, and values;
6. Role: Freedom to define what kind of student the learner wants to be in every particular situation and overall (e.g., a credential student, a self-responsible critical learner, an other-responsible critical learner, a creative learner, an autodidact, an apprentice);
7. Leisure: Freedom from necessities and needs such as hunger, sickness, concerns about shelter, concerns about safety, concerns about future well-being, and so on.

Curricular academic freedom involves a learner’s right to pursue his/her own academic interests, questions, inquiries, needs, and passions. These interests, questions, inquiries, needs, and passions may pre-exist in the learner or emerge in an interaction with the teacher, peers, other people, texts, experiences, observations, activities, and so on. For example, in our classes, we provide our college students with Curricular Maps. Initially, a Curricular Map involves a list of topics that we have developed based on our own authorial judgments, on authorial judgments by colleagues teaching similar courses around the world (via their syllabi posted on the Internet), and our past students’ interests. Finally, during the class term, our current students can and do amend the course’s Curricular Map at any time. At the end of each class, our students are engaged in selecting a topic for the next class. Often our students vote on the topics, but at times they want to decide by consensus, or by accepting several topics and splitting the class into smaller groups, or by asking the instructor to make a choice for them, or by flipping a coin on the several most popular topics of their choice. Also, students often try to convince their peers to join them in voting for the topic of their choice. Recently, we started experimenting by offering our students a list of themes within chosen class topic to start our discussion, which the students can always amend with their own themes. The Curricular Map creates an image of the vast, rich, and growing field of study – representation of the rich and inexhaustible learning environment – for the students. This democratic process of selecting topics to study or themes to discuss promotes both students’ activism and ownership of their own learning and education. It discursively and powerfully forms their educational desire, “I want to study/learn” (Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2017). In intrinsic education, curriculum is always emerging, surprising, and, thus, cannot be preset. In contrast, in many conventional and some innovative schools, it is up to educational authorities to define and mandate curricular topics, themes, and their sequence, disabling students’ educational activism, desire, and ownership. Curriculum is imposed on the students. Students do not have a legitimate right to define their curriculum, often justified by their ignorance to do so. Their educational desires are tabled until after school is over. Efforts are made to motivate students to engage in the school-imposed curriculum and/or to make school-imposed curriculum attractive to the students, such as, for example, in progressive innovative education (e.g., Dewey, 1956).

Instructional academic freedom involves a learner’s right to organize his/her own study in whatever way may fit the learner. Classes, guidance, and learning activities cannot be imposed on the student, only offered and suggested by teachers or initiated by the students. The student has a right to be the final authority to accept, reject, or modify these guiding offers, suggestions, or invitations. Students must have a right to choose or create their own classes, to choose or invite teachers or peers with whom to study. As in the case of the Curricular Map, a teacher can develop a list of possible diverse rich learning activities and projects that the students can choose from, modify, or amend with their own. Guidance cannot be imposed on the students by the teachers (or peers, or institutions) but only can be offered. Of course, the students can ask for guidance. In contrast, in many conventional and some innovative schools, classes, guidance and learning activities are determined by school authorities and imposed on the students. Students’
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instructional choices are illegitimate there. This often leads to insensitive guidance that generates resistance in the students, to which many teachers reply with oppression or bribing. It also often undermines the students' educational interests, desires, and confidence in their own educational aspirations and abilities.

Participatory academic freedom involves a learner's right to move freely, in and out, to and from learning and educational activities and communities. The students' right of non-participation and disengagement has to be respected and valued. The students' non-participation, disengagement, and divorce from activities and communities must not be punished, as is often the case in many conventional and innovative schools. This right creates an opportunity for a self-correcting process in educational practice, where the students can vote by their feet when educational practice or guidance becomes insensitive for their educational (or other) needs or meaningless for them (Matusov & Marjanovic-Shane, 2016b). In contrast, in many conventional and some innovative schools, participation is mandatory and unconditional. Students' non-participation is viewed as illegitimate and punishable. It makes the educational practice insensitive and leaves it without feedback based on the primary benefactor of the educational practice - the student himself/herself. Using accountability as a feedback loop creates parasitic practices of summative assessments that undermine the trust between the teacher and the student and the educational process itself (Matusov, 2009; Matusov, Marjanovic-Shane, & Meacham, 2016).

Educative academic freedom involves a learner's right to define the values, quality, and purpose of their own learning and education. In intrinsic education, purpose, value, and quality of the educational activity emerge in the activity itself (i.e., "praxis" in Aristotelian terms) and do not pre-exist the educational practice (i.e., "poiesis" in Aristotelian terms). Before learners become involved in a particular educational activity, the purpose, value, and quality of this activity does not exist but rather emerges from within it. In the example described above, my undergraduate students, preservice teachers, wanted to study classroom management, mostly focusing on how they can most effectively control their future students. However, in our discussions of the goals of "classroom management," with my guidance, we came across the difference between the notions of students' responsibility and students' unconditional obedience. My preservice teachers became perplexed about their previous commitment to classroom management with its goal of students' unconditional obedience. They became interested in the notion of responsibility and its promotion through engaging their future students in their own investigation of diverse values and in democratic governance of their own education. In their Exit Reflections at the end of the class, when my preservice teachers summarized what the class was about, they referred to "building a classroom community" and to "democratic governance," not to "classroom management."

Another inherent aspect of intrinsic education, evident in the example, is students' realization, examination, and transformation of their educational values, desires, and goals. They started the semester wanting to study classroom management but ended up wanting to study democratic governance, building learning communities, and promoting students' responsibilities. This was important learning and had an educational value in its own turn for them. Learners' realization of transformation of learners' educational goals, values, desires, and qualities in education can be called a meta-learning.

Finally, it is the learner, not the teacher, who is the primary and final authority for educational evaluation of the quality of the learner's work, setting educational purposes, and defining its educational values. The teacher does not have a right to see the student's work without the student's permission (Matusov et al., 2016). In contrast, in many conventional and some innovative schools, valuation is exclusively done by the school authority, which increasingly includes private testing companies. Often the quality of education is predefined as all students successfully arriving at curricular endpoints, preset by society, school authorities, teachers, and testing agencies. The hidden curriculum of such schooling involves students learning how to please this school authority rather than to engage in genuine education.

The ecological right for a learner's education involves both the access to diverse resources and the legitimacy to pursue diverse practices, discourses, and values. Thus, at the Latin-American Community Center at Wilmington, Delaware, USA, a computer instructor, Mr. Steve Villanueva, has organized a Lego-Logo Club for Latino/a children of very diverse ages from 5 to 18 years old as a part of their afterschool program (Matusov, 2009, Chapter 10). The Club settings involved a computer room with some children playing computer games or engaging in other activities unrelated to the Lego-Logo Club. In the center of the room, there were big desks with the Lego-Logo blocks and settings for robots designed by the children. Mr. Steve was preparing the children for the national competition. This was an extremely rich and diverse learning environment. Some children were involved exclusively in engineering tasks of the robotics competition, some exclusively in programming the robots, and some in-between; some were interested in the aesthetics of robots; some were videotaping the work. However, some children were involved in robotics projects outside of the competition promoted by Mr. Steve (e.g., making robot-cars that could "dance" to the music, like their favorite Latino wrestler Eddie Guerrero). A few very little children were sitting under the long desks with Lego-Logo settings and playing with little cars that they made out of Lego-Logo blocks. A few teenage girls were discussing romance and pregnancy symptoms. A few young boys were engaged in horse-play and teasing. One boy engaged in an engineering task suddenly said that he was bored and wanted to go play basketball. Mr. Steve commented that the boy should have left for basketball a half hour before, when his team had left. The boy left and came back after about a half hour. There were many discourses: separate, overlapping, and dynamically emerging and shifting. Children moved freely among diverse activities and discourses. The learning environment was heterodiscursive, affording very diverse activities and discourses (Matusov, 2011b). Everything was legitimate. At times, Mr. Steve or other children asked for help from those children who were not engaged in the preparation for the competition, but they were free to move back to their activities after they helped (some did and some not). All in all, the children loved to come to the Club and could come and work on their activities even when
we should seek education for our children and ourselves “not as being useful or necessary, but because it is liberal and noble” (Aristotle & Barker, 1958, pp. viii, 3, 1–13). He viewed genuine, i.e., intrinsic, education as a basic existential craving of a free citizen in a democratic society, a free citizen who does not work and whose basic needs are fulfilled. For Aristotle, instrumental education is mostly needed by those who are not free from labor and survival. Of course, in Ancient Greece, intrinsic education of citizens, free from labor and concerns of necessities, was possible through slavery and exploitation of women, peasants, and artisans. In our times, intrinsic education still remains a luxury that can be affordable by very few.

However, with the emergence of robotics, telecommunication, and automatization, things might change (Markoff, 2016). A time may be coming when fewer and fewer people will be needed to engage in the world economy. A few economists predicted the rise of so-called technological unemployment (Gorz, 1989; Keynes, 2016; Marx, 1868). Although it is not necessarily guaranteed (see, Blacker, 2013, for an alternative, dystopian, possibility), technological unemployment may lead to an emergence of a leisure-based society, in which a growing number of people do not need to work, while they are all receiving growing universal income. In this leisure-based society, intrinsic education may be able to take root and become a universal human right, while instrumental education may become subordinated to intrinsic education (Matusov, 2019, in preparation).

In sum, we argue that the past and present ubiquity of instrumental education is caused by a necessity-based society, in which people do not have genuine leisure on a universal basis. Intrinsic education is a form of genuine leisure, leisure that is based on people’s self-actualization and self-realization. Modern educational institutions are built to promote instrumental education and non-educational functions (e.g., health, babysitting and so on) at the expense of intrinsic education. Unless our society changes to allow a spread of genuine leisure, we do not expect spread of intrinsic education despite its being a fundamental existential human need.

Notes
1 The Magic Learning Pill for learning English the language.
2 This particular drama workshop was filmed and presented within a documentary movie, Three Looms Waiting, by the BBC producer Ron Smedley (1971), about the work of Dorothy Heathcote, one of the most known teachers and scholars of drama in education. The video is available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=owKiU09999w.
3 Through our summary, we point the minutes and seconds when these events take place in the video.
4 Latin-American Community Center (LACC).
5 “La Red Magica” (LRM) – a university–community partnership between LACC and University of Delaware (UD).
6 Although at the moment, I was improvising and did not know if I could deliver “something interesting and fun.”
7 University of Delaware (UD) undergraduate teacher education students who had a practicum at LACC as a part of their class on cultural diversity in education.
Of course, this type of leisure-based society will never be based purely on leisure, but will also involve work for a decreasing number of people (Matusov, 2019; in preparation).
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Chapter 2

Stress – between welfare and competition

Thomas Szulevicz, Lærke Kromann
Kure and Lilith Olesen Løkken

Introduction

In a recent Danish student life study, 47% of the questioned students considered themselves stressed. This might not be surprising since most Western societies are witnessing epidemics of psychological problems. Even so, it is interesting to take a closer look at why so many Danish university students consider themselves stressed.

In many ways, Danish students can be considered privileged: there are no tuition fees at universities, every Dane over the age of 18 is entitled to public support for his or her further education – regardless of social standing – and job prospects are fairly good in Denmark with relatively low rates of graduate unemployment.

Based on an empirical study, this chapter will discuss the phenomena of stress and well-being among university students. The empirical material in the article portrays how university students feel distressed, lonely and pressured. The article analyses and discusses student stress and well-being in relation to 1) new neoliberal university reforms and societal changes where many countries have moved from the model of welfare state to that of the competitive state, 2) whether (Scandinavian) students generally lack resilience and 3) whether universities themselves might play an active role in the cultivation of distressed and vulnerable students.

We conclude the chapter by claiming the need for insisting on an educational agenda within higher education. Over the last years, higher education has changed rapidly, with a significant expansion of the monitoring of educational outcomes, by increased political regulation and by a neoliberal logic of markets. One of the consequences has been that educational and pedagogical questions have been marginalised on behalf of administrative, political and economic ones, and we argue that problems related to a growing number of distressed students both have to be understood and solved from an educational perspective.

University life and stress

On 9 October 2017, a big conference on stress and well-being among university students was held at the seat of the Danish parliament, Christianborg Palace. In the press coverage of the conference it was stated that:

Alarmingly many students are plagued by stress and distress across the country. This has to be addressed. Therefore, a number of student organizations