

Intrinsic education and its discontents

Eugene Matusov and Ana Marjanovic-Shane

Introduction

Recently, in one of my (the first author) classes for preservice teachers, my students and I discussed diverse approaches to arranging classroom life, which my students initially interpreted as “classroom management.” Very quickly, our discussion started revolving around the notions of punishment and rewards. What is more effective? Pure punishment? Pure rewards? Or some kind of combination of both? What kind of punishment is more effective? What kinds of rewards are more effective? Also, manipulative and non-manipulative organizational educational techniques were introduced in our discussion. For example, asking students to write something – it does not matter what – pulls them away from activities the teacher deems undesirable, without any use of punishments or rewards. This pedagogical manipulation seems to be based on affordances of dictation. Designing seating arrangements provides different psychological and social affordances: whether it is easier or more difficult for the students to get involved in discussions, collaboration on projects, or listening to a teacher. Finally, we labeled this approach to arrangement of classroom life as “classroom management” and focused on its purposes. The students listed the following purposes of classroom management: “keeping students on task,” “keeping control,” “controlling students’ attention,” “preventing acting out,” and “keeping children safe.”

I then put to my students that in all these goals it is the teacher (or school administration, or even the entire society) who defines what is good for the students and what is bad. The teacher defines unilaterally what is the task for the students and what is not; what is worthy for them to pay attention and what is not; what is learning and what is not; what is safe and what is not; what they must do and what they must not; and so on. As one of my students formulated, “the main goal of classroom management is to conform the students to the teacher’s expectations.” I formulated it slightly differently: “the main goal of classroom management is to make students do what the teacher wants them to do.” I also introduced the psychological theory of behaviorism with its primary goal of controlling and predicting behavior through a smart design of punishment and rewards, and their schedule.

My students got very excited about learning more about behaviorism when I abruptly introduced a new theme – alternative ideas – to them. I told them that

some educators criticized classroom management not because it is inefficient, but because it is efficient! These educators disagree that the primary goal of education in a democratic society should be to make students obedient to the authority’s (teacher’s) orders. Thus, when we discussed their own examples and cases of classroom management, they focused on the notion of student “responsibility.” “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 judgment and decision making about what they should study and why. With sadness, she said that it is often impossible in a “real” classroom.

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 (Bénéï, 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 they 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 him/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,"² 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).³ 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 from 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 (13m:18s). The "spy" gets up and points to one of the inmates, saying, "He's got them, sir!" and, thus, he also gives himself away. This is an actual shock for the students who play the "inmates." The boy to whom the "spy" pointed, stands up, glares at the "spy," and emphatically says, "Swine! You, swine!" (13m:36s). The "spy" kneels down, crouches to the floor and puts his hands over his head, deeply shamed. 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. . .'

Why does this example represent intrinsic education? Why does it involve creative authorship?

In our view, in this dramatic play, the boys intrinsically own the situations they play-craft. That is why we see this activity as intrinsic, as a final cause in itself. They are deeply involved in their improvisations, which carry them on their own. After the improvisation starts, they do not need any more outside prompts, a teacher, or an authority to tell them what to do next – they are fully authoring it on their own. We are not sure if this is education or not for the children themselves, that is, whether they considered this activity as educational. Although Dorothy Heathcote thinks that it is – because, in her view, the children were only half playing but also half acting as themselves, and the time will come when the students will realize something about themselves, some deep truth, which may be transformational for their whole person – we do not know that for sure. If it is education, it might involve children's reflection, but this reflection is not guided and necessarily critical. This is why we argue that this is an example of genuine intrinsic education based on creative, but not on critical, authorship.

In contrast, critical authorship intrinsic education 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 heterodiscursia of the participants jumping from one discursive theme to another (Matusov, 2011b) and interrupting each other (Nikulin, 2010; Yakubinsky & Eskin, 1997). The first author provides a good example of critical authorship intrinsic education, as he worked at a Latin-American Community Center afterschool 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 LACC⁴ [9th grade] teenager asked the LRM⁵ 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

instructor asked the child if he would mind spending more time and efforts on the homework if they turned it into something interesting and fun.⁶ The boy replied that he would be happy to do so if the homework were fun and added that he did not mind spending time and efforts on playing computer games that sometimes were very difficult and frustrating.

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 web site 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 students⁷ present in the computer room. [The LRM instructor problematized 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 free will and were final causes in themselves. The activity was eventful for the children as they remembered it many years after, 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)?

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 to 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'

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 him/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).

Valuative 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

Mr. Steve was not with them for whatever reason (Matusov, 2009, Chapter 10). In contrast, in many conventional and some innovative schools, the learning environment is either sterile or highly limited, mono-discursive, and controlled by the teacher. The students are expected to be on-task or on a few tasks, well defined by the teacher (and if not, the teacher may be punished by the school administration). The tasks and subjects are purified from “contamination” by other discourses, practices, and values (often couched in the moniker “best practice”). In a conventional school, tomato is always a fruit, as defined by the biology science practice, and never a vegetable as defined by the culinary practice.

Role academic freedom involves a learner’s right to define his/her own mode of participation in each particular area, educational activity, or topic. It is up to the learner to determine their own approaches to their own interests. A student may determine his/her overall educational goals as, for example, to become recognized by society or by a practice’s experts as a competent and capable practitioner through receiving a license or certificate – i.e., to assume a role of a practice-based credential student. In this case, the goal of education for a credential student is to pass some qualifying tests set by the practice’s experts. It does not matter how the credential student will prepare for these qualifying tests: alone or with a help of somebody or by going to school. Passing the qualifying tests is the most important. In contrast, a student may want to be a good authorial professional, who learns in a community of other professionals as an apprentice. Alternatively, a student may want to engage in a critical dialogue about the life, self, world, and society. All these and other possibilities for students’ roles in education have to be available and legitimate. Also, there should be a possibility for a student to combine or shift between and among these roles. In contrast, in many conventional and some innovative schools, the legitimate role of the student is single and predefined by school authorities, mostly (but not always!) involving the role of a school-based credential student, who successfully jumps through all hoops that the school sets for the students.

We will discuss leisure academic freedom in our conclusion.

In sum, most conventional and some innovative schools deny freedoms and rights to students because they view education instrumentally and not intrinsically. Mass education was designed as the right of society to impose education on the people for economic, political, nationalistic, and other societal goals. The right of a person for such education is nothing more than a right of society to impose its unilaterally designed curriculum on the person. At its best, the right for education in our society is the right of the person to fit into our society, in a way that society defines it. However, there is no right for education for the person’s self-actualization, self-realization, and self-determination – i.e., there is no right for intrinsic education in our society.

Conclusion: why is instrumental education so ubiquitous?

The word “school” (σχολείο) in Greek means leisure (σχολή) – time that one can dedicate to examination of the self, the others, and the world. Aristotle argued that

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,⁸ 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=owKiU099qrw>.
- 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 Mágica” (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.

8 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).

References

- Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle, & Barker, E. (1958). *The politics of Aristotle*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Asimov, I. (1959). Profession. In I. Asimov (Ed.), *Nine tomorrows: Tales of the near future* (1st ed., pp. 17-74). Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Babacan, H. (2007). Education and social cohesion. In J. Jupp, J. Nieuwenhuysen, & E. Dawson (Eds.), *Social cohesion in Australia* (pp. 142-157). Port Melbourne, VIC, Australia: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1991). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Trans. C. Emerson & M. Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bénéï, V. (2007). *Manufacturing citizenship: Education and nationalism in Europe, South Asia and China*. London: Routledge.
- Berlyand, I. E. (2009). A few words about Bibier's dialogics: The school of the dialogue of cultures conception and curriculum. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, 47(1), 20-33. doi:10.2753/RPO1061-0405470101
- 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. doi:10.2753/RPO1061-0405470102
- Blacker, D. J. (2013). *The falling rate of learning and the neoliberal endgame*. Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Zero Books.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2010). Toward a theory of teacher education for social justice. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp. 445-467): Springer.
- de Grazia, S. (1962). *Of time work and leisure*. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund.
- DePalma, R., Matusov, E., & Smith, M. P. (2009). Smuggling authentic learning into the school context: Transitioning from an innovative elementary to a conventional high school. *Teachers College Record*, 111(4), 934-972.
- Dewey, J. (1956). *The child and the curriculum and the school and society* (Combined ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education* (1st Free Press paperback ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Dumitru, A. (2018, in press). Neither end, nor means, but both - why the modern university ought to be responsive to different conceptions of the good. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. doi:10.1080/00131857.2018.1449105
- Gorz, A. (1989). *Critique of economic reason*. Trans. G. Handyside & C. Turner. London: Verso.
- Greenberg, D. (1992). *The Sudbury Valley School experience*. Framingham, MA: Sudbury Valley School Press. Retrieved from www.sudval.com/05_underlyingideas.html#05.
- Heathcote, D., & Bolton, G. M. (1995). *Drama for learning: Dorothy Heathcote's mantle of the expert approach to education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hoskins, K., & Barker, B. (2014). *Education and social mobility: Dreams of success*. London: Institute of Education Press.
- Keynes, J. M. (2016). Economic possibilities for our grandchildren *Essays in persuasion* (pp. 321-332). New York: Palgrave. doi:10.1007/978-1-349-59072-8
- Labaree, D. F. (1997). *How to succeed in school without really learning: The credentials race in American education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lave, J. (1991). Situating learning in communities of practice. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, et al. (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 63-82). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive in experimentally created "social climates". *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-299.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1953/1939). Experimental studies in social climates of groups [video recording]. Iowa City: University of Iowa.
- Livingstone, D. W. (2009). *Education & jobs: Exploring the gaps*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Markoff, J. (2016). *Machines of loving grace: The quest for common ground between humans and robots*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Marx, K. (1868). *On the reduction of the working day*. In K. Marx & F. Engels (Eds.), (Vol. 21). Brussels: The Bee-Hive.
- Matusov, E. (2009). *Journey into dialogic pedagogy*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Matusov, E. (2011a). Authorial teaching and learning. In E. J. White & M. Peters (Eds.), *Bakhtinian pedagogy: Opportunities and challenges for research, policy and practice in education across the globe* (pp. 21-46). New York: Peter Lang Publishers.
- Matusov, E. (2011b). Irreconcilable differences in Vygotsky's and Bakhtin's approaches to the social and the individual: An educational perspective. *Culture & Psychology*, 17(1), 99-119. doi:10.1177/1354067X10388840
- Matusov, E. (2013). Chronotopes in education: Conventional and dialogic. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*.
- Matusov, E. (2015). Chronotopes in education: Conventional and dialogic. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 3, A65-A97. doi: 10.5195/dpj.2015.107. Retrieved from <http://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/dpj/article/view/107/91>.
- Matusov, E. (2019, in preparation). *Education in the jobless age of leisure*.
- Matusov, E., Baker, D., Fan, Y., Choi, H. J., & Hampel, R. L. (2017). Magic learning pill: Ontological and instrumental learning in order to speed up education. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 51(3), 456-476. doi:10.1007/s12124-017-9384-8
- Matusov, E., & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2016a). Dialogic authorial approach to creativity in education: Transforming a deadly homework into a creative activity. In V. P. Glăveanu (Ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Creativity and Culture Research* (pp. 307-325). doi: 10.1057/978-1-137-46344-9_15. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Matusov, E., & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2016b). The state's educational neutrality: Radical proposal for educational pluralism (Editorial). *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 4, E1-E26. Retrieved from <http://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/dpj/article/view/170/114>. doi:10.5195/dpj.2016.170
- Matusov, E., & Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2017). Promoting students' ownership of their own education through critical dialogue and democratic self-governance (Editorial). *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 5, E1-E29. Retrieved from <https://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/dpj/article/view/199>. doi:10.5195/dpj.2017.199
- Matusov, E., Marjanovic-Shane, A., & Meacham, S. (2016). Pedagogical voyeurism: Dialogic critique of documentation and assessment of learning. *International Journal of*

- Educational Psychology*, 5(1), 1–26. Retrieved from <http://hijournalpress.com/hijournals/index.php/ijep/article/view/1886/pdf>. doi:10.17583/ijep.2016.1886
- Matusov, E., & Smith, M. P. (2011). Ecological model of inter-institutional sustainability of after-school program: The La Red Mágica community-university partnership in Delaware. *Outlines: Critical Social Studies*, 5(1), 19–45.
- 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.
- Nikulin, D. V. (2010). *Dialectic and dialogue*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Neill, C. (1995). *Drama worlds: A framework for process drama (The dimensions of drama)*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.
- Ribich, T. I. (1968). *Education and poverty*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Smedley, R. (Producer). (1971). Dorothy Heathcote: Three looms waiting. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?list=PLBIE6842FAF6BBA6B&v=f5jBNIEQrZs#t=136>
- Straughn, J. B., & Andriot, A. L. (2011). Education, civic patriotism, and democratic citizenship: Unpacking the educational effect on political involvement. *Sociological Forum*, 26(3), 556–580.
- Taylor, P., & Warner, C. (2006). *Structure and spontaneity: The process drama of Cecily O'Neill*. London: Trentham Books Limited.
- UNESCO. (2017, March). Role of education. *Social and Human Sciences*. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/fight-against-discrimination/role-of-education/>.
- Wain, K. (1996). Education and tolerance. *Higher Education in Europe*, 21(1), 13–24.
- Yakubinsky, L. P., & Eskin, M. (1997). On dialogic speech. *PMLA*, 112(2), 243–256.

Chapter 2

Stress – between welfare and competition

Thomas Szulevicz, Lærke Kromann
Kure and Lillith 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:

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