

# Self Managed Learning: a hybrid of Progressive and Democratic Education

Eugene Matusov

Eugene Matusov is based at School of Education, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, USA.

## Abstract

**Purpose** – *The book has generated a passionate dialogue-disagreement (mostly but not entirely) with the book. Dialogue-disagreement is based on challenges, disagreements and rebuttals between opponents, often belonging to different, even irreconcilable, paradigms. The goal of dialogue-disagreement is not so much to convince the opponent to change their mind but rather to critically examine and problematize the two involved paradigms: the authors' and the reviewer's. By taking the generated challenges and disagreements seriously, both irreconcilable paradigms can grow through their replies. Dialogue-disagreement gives the participants-opponents the gift of revealing their own paradigmatic blind spots, which are often invisible from within their paradigms. Dialogue-disagreement is exploratory and based on an agnostic relationship between frenemies, i.e. "friendly enemies."*

**Design/methodology/approach** – *This is a critical book review essay of Self Managed Learning and the New Educational Paradigm (Cunningham, 2021).*

**Findings** – *The reviewer views Ian Cunningham's Self Managed Learning educational paradigm as a hybrid of Progressive and Democratic Education, while the reviewer sees his/her Self-Education paradigm as entirely Democratic (and Dialogic). Elsewhere, the reviewer discussed and critically analyzed the Progressive Education paradigm, which generally involves channeling the student's learning activism and subjectivity toward learning outcomes desired by an educator. It uses the educator's manipulation of the student's subjectivity to make them study what the educator wants them to study. In contrast, the paradigm of Democratic Education assumes that the educatee is the final authority of their own education. The educatee decides whether to study, when to study, what to study, how to study, with whom to study, where to study, for what purpose to study and so on. The educatee makes these decisions by themselves or with the help of other people at the educatee's discretion and conditions. The reviewer charges that Ian's Self Managed Learning paradigm is a hybrid of both paradigms, with the Progressive Education paradigm taking the lead and exploiting the Democratic Education paradigm.*

**Originality/value** – *The book presented a unique, innovative practice worth a critical analysis. The reviewer's dialogue-disagreement with the book reveals a particular hybrid of Progressive and Democratic Education which is common to some innovative self-directed learning.*

**Keywords** *Progressive Education, Democratic Education, Educational manipulation, Philosophical hybrid, Self Managed Learning*

**Paper type** *Literature review*

**T**his is a critical book review essay of *Self Managed Learning and the New Educational Paradigm* (Cunningham, 2021). Usually, when the journal editors ask me to review a book, I read its title and short abstract before deciding to accept the assignment. However, even if I like the title and the abstract, I feel trepidation when agreeing to the editors' request. I worried whether the book I was asked to review would touch me enough to say something valuable: whether the book and my interests will click to inspire me for a deep dialogic response worth sharing with the journal's readers. Fortunately, the book "Self managed [1] learning and the new educational paradigm" by British educationalist Ian Cunningham did not disappoint me, generating many interesting thoughts and emotions in me. My dialogic encounter with this book has taken place. The book has generated a passionate dialogue-disagreement (mostly but not entirely) with the book.

Received 17 August 2023  
Revised 30 August 2023  
Accepted 30 August 2023

The reviewer wants to thank Ana MS, Tina Kullenberg and Abram De Bruyn for providing their feedback on earlier versions of the manuscript.

Dialogue-disagreement is based on challenges, disagreements and rebuttals between opponents, often belonging to different, even irreconcilable, paradigms. The goal of dialogue-disagreement is not so much to convince the opponent to change their mind but rather to critically examine and problematize the two involved paradigms: the authors' and mine own. By taking the generated challenges and disagreements seriously, both irreconcilable paradigms can grow through their replies. Dialogue-disagreement gives the participants-opponents the gift of revealing their own paradigmatic blind spots, which are often invisible from within their paradigms. Dialogue-disagreement is exploratory and based on an agnostic relationship between frenemies, i.e. "friendly enemies" (Kurganov, 2009; Mouffe, 2000).

I view Ian Cunningham's Self Managed Learning educational paradigm as a hybrid of Progressive and Democratic Education, while I see my Self-Education paradigm as entirely Democratic (and Dialogic). Elsewhere, I discussed and critically analyzed the Progressive Education paradigm, which generally involves channeling the student's learning activism and subjectivity toward learning outcomes desired by an educator (Matusov, 2021a). It uses the educator's manipulation of the student's subjectivity to make them study what the educator wants them to study: "let [the student] always think he is master while you are really master," advised the father of Progressive Education, Jean Jacques Rousseau, to a progressive educator in his pedagogical novel "Emile" (Rousseau, 1979, p. 120). In contrast, the paradigm of Democratic Education assumes that the educatee is the final authority of their own education (Matusov, 2023). The educatee decides whether to study, when to study, what to study, how to study, with whom to study, where to study, for what purpose to study and so on. The educatee makes these decisions by themselves or with the help of other people (e.g. other educatees, friends, parents, peers, advisors, teachers, acquaintances, loved ones, strangers, frenemies) at the educatee's discretion and conditions (Matusov, 2020b, 2020c, 2021b, 2022). I charge that Ian's Self Managed Learning paradigm is a hybrid of both paradigms, with the Progressive Education paradigm taking the lead and exploiting the Democratic Education paradigm. But, let me take a step back and describe the book before engaging in our paradigmatic dialogue-disagreement.

### **The advocacy for "Self Managed Learning"**

My reading of Ian Cunningham's book is that it represents strong advocacy for his educational model (design) and paradigm of what he called "Self Managed Learning" (SML) that he, together with his staff, practiced for the past 30 years at the Self Managed Learning College in the UK. The advocacy involves a description and justification of the pedagogical and learning practices and organization of the SML College, voices of the SML College alumni and students captured in the research study (Freedman, 2019), the history of the College and his "research-based" critique of conventional education in the UK coming from the SML paradigm peppered by Ian's personal stories. My primary interest was in Cunningham's description and justification of the Self Managed Learning College, which was presented especially in Chapters 1-4 and 8-9 and scattered throughout the book. Although his description of the situation of conventional education in the UK was informative, I was less interested in (and impressed by) his critique of conventional education. It is because I do not believe Ian was fully committed to an inquiry – his use of the presented scholarship was more like a persuasion weapon rather than an open-minded investigation [2].

### ***What is Self Managed Learning?***

While reading the book, I tried to imagine what I would see if I visited the Self Managed Learning College. This imaginative visualization was not easy for me because the book's author seemed more interested in ideas than ethnography. Thus, I am not sure that my visualization is correct. I have visited several democratic schools on the East Coast of the

USA. The Self Managed Learning College reminds me of an *agile self-directed learning center* I visited, so I want to warn the reader that I might unconsciously add its aspects to fill out missing parts of the SML College.

“Currently [in 2021], the college has 39 students aged between 9 and 17 and is located on the English south coast in Sussex” (Cunningham, 2021, p. 7). It is called “college” and not “school” for political and philosophical reasons. Politically, it tries cleverly to avoid some oppressive government regulations, which apply only to British “schools.” Philosophically, it fights against age segregation in education and the split between age-based educational practices and institutions. Also, it distances itself from conventional schooling. The SML College is a private educational institution with tuition below the average expenditure per student in a public UK school.

I have a slightly vague image of what the college space looks like. Ian described the College as having many rooms named by the youngest students when it moved into its most recent building: “one quiet room was named after a TV character, another room, which is a small room where students can chill out, was called Bob. I have no idea why it was called Bob, but that is what it is now called” (Cunningham, 2021, pp. 150–151). Young students were assigned the task of naming and creating labels for the college rooms at the meeting of the staff and students. When the College moved into this building, Ian brought “all the resources, materials, desks, chairs, and so on to be put into the largest room and left there” for the college participants – the staff and the students – to decide where it should go, while apparently, he unilaterally split the entire building into more and less quiet areas (pp. 149–150). It was not clear whether the resources could be moved around by the participants or firmly stayed where they were originally placed at the initial meeting. This sketchy arrangement of the space was compatible with the spirit of Ian’s and the college staff’s overall design and control of the students’ degrees of freedom granted to them. There is a difference between freedom being affirmed versus being granted. *Affirmed freedom* sets certain limitations within which a person can act as they wish. *Granted freedom* permits the person to work toward the goal approved by the authority. The latter involves the relationship of domination (Pettit, 2014).

I could not find any descriptions of the outdoor college settings in the book – I do not know what to make out of this. Student trips were mentioned. On several occasions in the book, the author affirmed the students’ freedom of movement in the college building. Still, I have questions about the students’ freedom of movement, especially during the first part of the college day, when learning group meets and moving in and out of the building.

There is very little mention of students and staff playing at the College in the book. I suspect it is because of the SML paradigm’s exclusive focus on learning.

The regular college day starts with a community meeting at 9 a.m. The community meeting is chaired by any college member – a staff or a student – in strict rotation. The meeting is governed by a minimum of rules set by the meeting at the beginning of each year and is “relatively informal” (p. ix). Another daily community meeting occurs at the end of the morning. Community meetings are mandatory – everyone must attend. It is unclear precisely what the purpose and content of the community meetings are. The author mentions a PowerPoint presentation on autism by a couple of autistic girls (p. 89), and the staff informed the students about the staff’s strengths so the students could approach them when they needed help or advice (p. 155).

At the beginning of the year, the College split into “learning groups” with 5–6 same-age students and the staff assigned to a learning group who is a “learning group advisor.” The goal of the learning group is that “each person can plan their own learning with support from others” (p. 23). It is unclear who and how the learning groups are formed. The author mentions that the members of learning groups should be able to bond and support each other, “these are people of a similar age and therefore they are often having similar

struggles with what to learn and how to lead a good life. It is not that peers tell individuals what to do in a broader sense, but rather that by being in a group and hearing other people's thoughts and ways of addressing a problem, individuals can start to think for themselves in a deeper way about what they need to do" (p. 40). The learning group meets weekly. It "is not a team or seminar or a tutorial or any of the normal structures that you might find within a school. The group is a place where each person has time to talk about whatever they need to talk about and get help on a whole range of things that they may want to raise" (p. 23). The learning group members develop and share their learning plans, learning progress, challenges, what was and what was not accomplished for the week, plan what and how to study the next week and provide advice and guidance to each other with the advisory support of the staff member: "The weekly learning group [meeting] also provides a space for each student to reflect on their experiences during the previous week and to consider what next to do" (p. 35). In a learning group, a student can be challenged about why they want to study what they want to study by other group members so the student may reconsider their short- and long-term learning goals and "long-held assumptions about the world and their place in it" (p. 42).

Based on discussions at the weekly learning group meetings and the Five Questions survey (see below), learning group advisors provide "offerings" and "services" (e.g. tutoring) to the students to support the students' learning goals. My understanding is that these "offerings" and "services" usually occur during the first part of the day. As one student named Dean (age 13) in the book comments, "What I like is also that I got the afternoons and evenings and weekends to myself as we don't have homework" (p. 130). Dean was interested in filmmaking but did not know how to approach this study. His learning group advisor suggested inviting a filmmaker he knew for the learning group workshop. Dean remembers that one or two other students joined that group for this workshop. Dean mentions that he joined his learning group advisor's offerings for other students, "For instance, in science they were doing dissections. Although I wasn't too sure to start with, I found it quite interesting to understand more about biology" (p. 130). Learning groups and offerings may lead to a "cross-pollination" of the students' interests, which sometimes creates a rich learning environment for some students.

However, reading about learning group advisors' offerings and services reminds me, at times, of helicopter parenting, hovering over the students and magnifying their slight interests in learning something. I can also imagine that the learning groups and offerings may create:

- unwelcome impositions; and
- "educational vortexes" sucking students' subjectivities, attention, energy and time (Matusov *et al.*, 2019) for some other students at some occasions.

One of my criticisms of the book is that it does not provide outliers and any challenging cases for Cunningham's pedagogical design and paradigm.

In the first week of the college year, all students must take a five-questions survey, which constitutes the students' "learning agreement":

- Q1. Where have I been? What has been my experience of learning so far in my life? What other things have happened to me in my life that make me who I am now?
- Q2. Where am I now? What kind of person am I? What are things that I like or don't like? What do I enjoy? And also, what do I find unpleasant? What skills, abilities and knowledge do I have that are important to me? What do I value – what do I care about? What do I believe in?
- Q3. Where do I want to get to? Who do I want to be in the future? What kind of life do I want to lead? What kind of work would I like to do? What things do I need to learn and develop now to help me in life and work?

- Q4. How will I get there? What precisely do I need to learn and how will I learn? What processes will I use to learn things I want to learn? What help might I need? What other resources might I need?
- Q5. How will I know if I've arrived? How will I assess my development? How will I know if I've learned to the level that I need? How will I recognise that I have gained the capabilities and knowledge I need? (pp. 23–24).

It is unclear to me with whom exactly the learning agreement is made – with themselves, with the learning group, with the entire College, with all the above – and what consequences it has when an agreement is broken. Learning groups are mentioned with regard to the learning agreements. Ian talks about the metacognition function of the learning agreement because the learning agreement promotes students' planning and reflection. Many examples in the book support his claim. The student's learning agreement allows them to channel their studies supported by learning groups and advisors.

However, I suspect a more sinister role of “the learning agreement.” I think the learning agreement may create internal pressures for the SML students to study through the “management by the inner guilt” of violating their own agreement (Hargreaves, 1994). In my view, a mandatory agreement – all students MUST write it – is a misnomer: a true agreement implies that a person must have the freedom not to engage in it. I think that the mandatory learning agreement leads to the “learnification” of education (see my further critique below). Learning agreements and learning contracts are birthmarks of Progressive Education, and they are criticized for their manipulative nature in the educational literature (Knowles, 1986; Wald, 1978).

Like learning groups, the learning agreements seem to provide learning surveillance and a panopticon (cf. Foucault, 1995) of the students' learning and lives for the learning group advisors, “It's important that the learning group adviser has a sense of the totality of what each individual student is working on” (p. 155). Although Cunningham claims that “we as learning group advisers would not share anything outside the group without permission” beyond serious issues involving child protection (p. 132), in another part of the book, he reports that the student's learning progress, development and challenges are shared with their parents during the parent meetings (p. 145). There is no respect for the privacy of a student's learning and personal life at the College (and maybe outside as well), as the student remains under the eye of the learning group advisor, the college staff, the student's parents and the student's learning group. In sum, the Self Managed Learning is a well-defined and comprehensive system of “prodding, pushing” (Morrison, 2007) and surveillance to insure that the students will pursue “their interests” and traditional academic curricula.

As to the students' governance of the SML college, the author mentions a Joint Resources Committee, which “has power to handle budget decisions such as for learning resources, cleaning and maintenance, trips, and food and drink” (p. 152). The Committee consists of the staff and students representing each learning group. A staff member chairs the Committee. It is unclear from the book how the Committee is formed precisely, when and how often it meets, how the Committee reports to the entire College, and how collective decision-making is made inside the Committee. It feels like this is the central steering committee for the College as its decision affects a diverse aspect of college life: “At an early meeting of the committee, everyone could see that we had had to budget for quite a large amount of cleaning and maintenance. It was agreed that day-to-day cleaning would be carried out by students [why not also the staff? – EM]. Therefore, we only need to pay for professional cleaning every half term. The money saved was then allocated to the food and drinks budget, so that everything in the kitchen could be freely available to students at no cost” (p. 152).

There is no discussion in the book about how the college norms and rules have been developed, how the participants deal with their violations, how they deal with the interpersonal conflicts, whether they have ever expelled students or staff – why and how it was done and so on. These omissions may reflect the advocacy nature of the book and the overall Progressive Education orientation by the author. Progressive Education tends to hide eruptions of power and deep disagreements (Matusov, 2021a). The overall design of the SML college feels to be authorial. Still, the author of the design is the educator, mostly Ian Cunningham, and not the students [see the discussion of the University of Masters vs the University of Students, in Shugurova *et al.* (2022)]. I found Ian's metaphor of glass that can accommodate any liquid useful and revealing. He argues that he offers "structure[,] not control" (p. 21) to the SML College students because a student can choose and pursue any learning goals. Of course, it is questionable that Ian-designed pedagogical structure really supports "any" learning but only learning he approves. Below I will challenge Ian's claim that his unilaterally designed educational structure – e.g. learning groups, learning group advisors, the advisor's offerings and servings and mandatory learning agreements – does not control, impose or channel the SML college students' educational experiences.

### The Progressive Education nature of the Self Managed Learning paradigm

There are no classrooms, lesson timetables, periods, preset mandatory curricula, homework, tests, imposed learning activities, separated academic subjects and so on at the College. The SML students have the freedom to decide what to learn. They are given time, space and resources to organize their own activities at the College. So, why do I claim that the SML paradigm is highly shaped by Progressive Education and not Democratic Education?

In his book, Ian Cunningham claims the centrality of learning in genuine education. I think he is wrong about that. Education cannot be reduced to learning (Arcilla, 2020). As I argued elsewhere, not all learning is education, and not all education is learning. Education is a person's positive evaluation of the transformation of their subjectivity noticed by the person. In my view, the problem with Conventional and Progressive Education is that this positive evaluation of the transformation of the subjectivity is done NOT by the educatee but by somebody else: teachers, schools, politicians, educational researchers, parents, testing agencies, taxpayers and so on. This is what makes Conventional and Progressive "Education" not truly educational – they steal this evaluation from the educatees (Matusov, 2021b).

At first glance, the SML paradigm allows the students to define their own education. I think it is partially true. The SML students *do* have a lot of freedom to determine what they want to study: filmmaking, guitar playing, theater and so on. However, they do not have the freedom not to learn, not engage in the learning agreement, nor freedom to reject learning groups and learning group advisors. Even more, the key issue of what defines good education is left to the SML educators, not to their students. Cunningham has his own favorite candidates for a good education: education for humanism, education for pursuing one's passions, education for becoming a well-adjusted member of society, education for a career, education for jumping the societal hoops successfully (e.g. like state or entrance exams) and so on. The educationalist's bird's-eye view of what good education for others leads to the unilateral and mandatory pedagogical design and robs the students of answering this question by themselves. This approach is monologic and monopolistic defined by the "I-It" relationship (Buber, 2000): the "objective (research-based, logic-based) view" on good education to be imposed on all people. It contrasts with a dialogic approach to education affirming everyone's right to examine "what is good for me here and now" (Bakhtin, 1986, 2004). Such a monologic educational perspective apparently controls the curriculum in a very hidden way. Let me explain how this control is accomplished at the SML College from what I have noticed in the book.



The book is full of Cinderella-like stories, common to the Progressive Education grand narrative when an alienated, lost or rebellious student comes to the SML College and becomes willing to study what society wants them to study. For example, the book starts with a dramatic story of the government inspectors' unannounced school visit, quizzing the students about what they had learned at the College. Somehow, the students always seemed to include conventional academic subjects like math, English and science in their learning progress at the College. Also, the students expressed highly respectful societal aspirations for their future. The inspectors were impressed, "After this last conversation, the lead inspector stopped his quizzing of our students and said to me that, although I had said there was no imposed curriculum, his view was that we had a broader curriculum than any school, given the wide variety of things that our students study" (p. 14). The College covers the conventional curriculum and much more in the eyes of the inspectors. Similarly, in a story about 14-year-old student Rory who was previously alienated from academic learning in his past school, Rory blossomed through his interest in computer games. Ian was able to engage Rory in computer game making, which led Rory to computer science, which led him to his preparation for the math and English GCSE exams, and so on (pp. 40–41). This bait-and-switch Progressive Education's manipulative strategy of engaging students in the societal curriculum involves the skillful expansion of the students' interests and needs until it covers the curriculum desired by society. I can hear Jean Jacques Rousseau's Progressive mantra throughout the book: "let [the student] always think he is master while you are really master" (Rousseau, 1979, p. 120). Progressive Education still cages students with the imposed curriculum: it is just that the cage is significantly bigger and less visible to the students than in the case of Conventional Education [3].

In this, what I would call "a conventional curriculum plus" approach (cf. Ravitch, 2013), there is an interesting question of who exploits whom in the SML paradigm, presented by Ian. Is it Democratic Education that exploits Progressive Education to survive institutionally and financially by calming down anxious parents and government inspectors? Or is it Progressive Education that exploits Democratic Education by making students study what society wants them to study in a very manipulative and sneaky way? Or a bit both? I want to leave it for the readers to decide. However, I question the SML paradigm's claim that the learning curriculum is entirely not imposed on their students.

The insistence on the centrality of learning at the SML college (learnification [4]), institutionalized through mandatory learning groups, staff advisors and learning agreements (and through less mandatory but ubiquitous offerings and servings by the learning group advisors), positions students as learning machines and "half-beings" (Sidorkin, 2002, pp. 42–43). According to Sidorkin, the half-being is a normative societal identity, an expression of ageism [5], "oriented toward the [child's] future, and therefore an identity that undervalues the [child's] present" (Sidorkin, 2002, p. 42). Treating students as half-being, where the student's future is overvalued while the student's present is undervalued, is the birthmark of Conventional and Progressive Education. I think the Democratic Education paradigm offers an alternative to treating students as full-beings here and now.

The Greek word "school" (*σχολείο*) originally meant "leisure" (*σχολή*) in Ancient Greece. Ancient Greeks who introduced this word saw education as a form of leisure, among other forms (Arendt, 1958). Studying literature on leisure, I identified four major types of leisure: play, hobby, hanging out with friends and intrinsic education for self-actualization (Matusov, 2020a). Ancient Greek school was envisioned for free people. According to Aristotle, free people are people whose life is not primarily shaped by their life necessities, concerns about survival or orders by other, more powerful, people (Arendt, 1958). In the time of Aristotle, slaves, peasants, artisans, traders, artists, women, sick and children were not viewed as free people. In Ancient Athens, affluent boys did not attend "school" in this leisurely understanding of this term but were engaged in training (Blomer, 2015). Of

course, Aristotle's notion of freedom was based on and constituted by slavery, exploitation, ageism, sexism and patriarchy.

I think that Democratic Education, represented by such democratic schools as Summerhill (Neill, 1960), Sudbury Valley School (Greenberg, 1992), The Circle School (Rietmulder, 2019) and democratic homeschooling (Llewellyn, 1998), is aimed at the realization of the Ancient Greek school as a form of leisure. Leisure and self-determination are central in Democratic Education rather than learning (Rietmulder, 2019) [6]. This condition of leisure allows free self-education to emerge from play, hobbies, hanging out with friends, curiosities and, yes, necessities, which are also present in the background of the students' lives. Students are free to study or not to study and to set the goals and conditions of their studies (including instrumental and credential, present or future learning goals). They can search for advice or not. They can form study groups or not. They can commit to their studies or not. They can reflect on their commitments or not reflect.

Can Self Managed Learning be freed from Progressive Education? I think so. For that, Self Managed Learning must stop being totalized. At times, some students may like learning groups, learning agreements and having advisors and tutors. They may like to be hovered over or pushed to study what they want to study. When Self Managed Learning is not totalized but one of many forms of available support conditionally and freely chosen by a student, I think it can become an interesting form of Democratic Education that promotes a rich learning environment, educational cross-fertilization, diverse forms of reflection, collaboration, advisement, tutoring and offerings. In Democratic Education, the centrality is not on learning but students' decision-making about their life and education. This clearly occurs for some of the SML college students, as one of the SML alumni reported: "[The SML College] allowed me to make decisions about what was best for me, and I don't regret a single thing" (p. 36). The Self Managed Learning practice when provided on a voluntary basis can contribute to the dialogue on Democratic Education for providing a rich learning environment, advisement and reflection on education.

## Notes

1. The author does not use a hyphen for "self managed": I will continue the author's spelling throughout my review.
2. Let me provide just one example of cherry-picking research by Ian Cunningham. Criticizing conventional UK schools, he argues against large-size schools, citing research that shows that smaller-size schools produce better learning outcomes (of course, defined conventionally!) (pp. 82–83). However, this is a statistical fallacy because smaller-size schools produce more deviation from the mean than larger-size schools: there are also more smaller-size schools that produce worse learning outcomes than larger-size schools (O'Neil, 2017). My criticism of Ian Cunningham's reliance on positivism (e.g. his insistence on research-based educational practice), instrumentalism (e.g. his obsession with the issue of efficiency) and voluntarism (e.g. his cherry-picking advocacy) is beyond the scope of this critical essay.
3. In contrast, Democratic Education is caged (rather than actively caging its students) by the State's oppressive requirements (e.g. compulsory education), the powerful tentacles of credential institutionalism (e.g. passing college entrance exams or SAT) and the mainstream views on education and life (e.g. totalized instrumental perspectives on education).
4. Learnification also leads to totalizing purposeful activity as the most valuable form of life and education at the expense of being and social relationships. Learnification values the product (learning outcomes) over the process.
5. Ian Cunningham tries to fight ageism by calling students "young adults" rather than "children." However, he still calls the SML educators "adults," which implies opposition to "children." I wonder why he does not use the term "staff," like in many Democratic schools. Also, the College learning groups are intentionally age-bounded and age-segregated. I do not buy his argument that age defines the possibility for young people to establish bonds with each other. I think ageism deeply penetrates the SML paradigm.



6. When Katherine von Duyke studied The Circle School (a democratic school cofounded by James Rietmulder), its students asked her: "Why do you constantly ask us about learning. Our school is not about learning" (von Duyke, 2013).

## References

- Arcilla, R.V. (2020), *Wim Wenders's Road Movie Philosophy: Education without Learning*, Bloomsbury Academic, London.
- Arendt, H. (1958), *The Human Condition*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986), *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, University of TX Press, Austin, TX.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (2004), "Dialogic origin and dialogic pedagogy of grammar: stylistics in teaching Russian language in secondary school", *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, Vol. 42 No. 6, pp. 12-49.
- Bloomer, W.M. (2015), *A Companion to Ancient Education*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, West Sussex, Malden, MA.
- Buber, M. (2000), *I and Thou* (R. G. Smith, Trans. 1st Scribner Classics ed.), Scribner, New York, NY.
- Cunningham, I. (2021), *Self Managed Learning and the New Educational Paradigm*, Routledge, New York, NY.
- Foucault, M. (1995), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (2nd Vintage Books ed.), Vintage Books, New York, NY.
- Freedman, L. (2019), "The self managed learning college study", Centre for Self Managed Learning, Brighton, available at: <https://smcollege.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/20/2020/08/A-summary-of-research-on-Self-Managed-Learning.pdf>
- Greenberg, D. (1992), "The birth of a new paradigm for education", available at: [www.sudval.com/05\\_underlyingideas.html#05](http://www.sudval.com/05_underlyingideas.html#05)
- Hargreaves, A. (1994), *Changing Teachers, Changing Times: Teachers' Work and Culture in the Postmodern Age*, Cassell, London.
- Knowles, M.S. (1986), *Using Learning Contracts*, 1st ed., Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Kurganov, S.Y. (2009), "Reading and literature in the primary and middle schools of the dialogue of cultures", *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, Vol. 47 No. 2, pp. 30-58.
- Llewellyn, G. (1998), *The Teenage Liberation Handbook: How to Quit School and Get a Real Life and Education*, (Rev., 2nd ed.), Lowry House, Eugene, OR.
- Morrison, K.A. (2007), "Free school teaching: a journey into radical progressive education", State University of New York Press, Albany, available at: [www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip074/2006032528.html](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip074/2006032528.html)
- Mouffe, C. (2000), *The Democratic Paradox*, Verso, London.
- Matusov, E. (2017), "Envisioning education in a post-work leisure-based society: a dialogic perspective", Palgrave, New York, doi: [10.1007/978-3-030-46373-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46373-1).
- Matusov, E. (2020b), "A student's right to freedom of education and a teacher's fiduciary obligation to support it: reply to the commentaries", *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, Vol. 8, pp. SF97-SF114, doi: [10.5195/dpj.2020.357](https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2020.357), available at: <https://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/dpj1/article/view/357/220>
- Matusov, E. (2020c), "A student's right to freedom of education", *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, Vol. 8, pp. SF1-SF28, doi: [10.5195/dpj.2020.356](https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2020.356), available at: <https://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/dpj1/article/view/356/213>
- Matusov, E. (2021a), "Progressive education is the opium of the educators", *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, pp. 1-34, doi: [10.1007/s12124-021-09610-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-021-09610-2).
- Matusov, E. (2021b), "The relationship between education and learning and its consequences for dialogic pedagogy", *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, Vol. 9, pp. E1-E19, available at: <https://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/dpj1/article/view/425/226>

- Matusov, E. (2022), "The teachers' pedagogical fiduciary duty to their students", *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, pp. 1-26, doi: [10.1007/s12124-022-09690-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-022-09690-8), available at: <https://rdcu.be/cL1JZ>
- Matusov, E. (2023), "Relationships between democratic education and dialogic education: conclusion", *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. A285-A296, doi: [10.5195/dpj.2023.560](https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2023.560), available at: <https://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/dpj1/article/view/560>
- Matusov, E., Marjanovic-Shane, A. and Gradovski, M. (2019), "Dialogic pedagogy and polyphonic research art: bakhtin by and for educators", Palgrave Macmillan, New York, doi: [10.1057/978-1-137-58057-3](https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-58057-3).
- Neill, A.S. (1960), *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing*, Hart Publishing Company, New York, NY.
- O'Neil, C. (2017), *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*, Broadway Books, New York, NY.
- Shugurova, O., Matusov, O. and Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2022), "The university of students: a place for joint self-education", *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, Vol. 10, pp. E1-E42, doi: [10.5195/dpj.2022.497](https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2022.497), available at: <https://dpj.pitt.edu/ojs/dpj1/article/view/497/238>
- Pettit, P. (2014), *Just Freedom: A Moral Compass for a Complex World*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York, NY.
- Ravitch, D. (2013), *Reign of Error: The Hoax of the Privatization Movement and the Danger to America's Public Schools*, 1st ed., Alfred A. Knopf, New York, NY.
- Rietmulder, J. (2019), *When Kids Rule the School: The Power and Promise of Democratic Education*, New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island.
- Rousseau, J.J. (1979), *Emile: Or, on Education*, Basic Books, New York, NY.
- Sidorkin, A.M. (2002), *Learning Relations: Impure Education, Deschooled Schools, & Dialogue with Evil*, P. Lang, New York, NY.
- von Duyke, K. (2013), "Students' agency, autonomy, and emergent learning interests in two open democratic schools", PhD Doctoral Thesis, University of Delaware, Newark, DE.
- Wald, R. (1978), "Confronting the learning contract", *Alternative Higher Education*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 223-231.

## Corresponding author

Eugene Matusov can be contacted at: [ematusov@udel.edu](mailto:ematusov@udel.edu)

---

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:  
[www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm](http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm)  
Or contact us for further details: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)