

Is Students' Autonomy Possible at Contemporary School?

Katerina N. Polivanova

Moscow State University of Psychology & Education; National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7058-1232>, e-mail: kpolivanova@mail.ru

Alexandra A. Bochaver

National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6131-5602>, e-mail: a-bochaver@yandex.ru

The article shows that the modern educational discourse is shifting from discussing the conditions for achieving academic results to analyzing the conditions for the implementation of learning and, more broadly, the life of children and adolescents at school. The question is raised about the importance of analyzing and taking into account the socio-pedagogical conditions for the formation of independence in schoolchildren. Independence is considered as the most important non-objective result of education, non-specific for a traditional school. The condition for the development of independence is the possibility of a trial, a trial action. The school as a social institution is considered within the framework of E. Hoffman's theory of total institutions. It is argued that the disciplinary practices of the school make horizontal communication "teacher-student/group of children" impossible. The article reveals the insufficiency of reducing educational practices to school practices alone and outline, the processes of enriching the educational space through expanding the access to informal and non-formal education.

Keywords: autonomy, agency, trial actions, subjectivation, total institutions, new trends in education.

Funding. The reported study was funded by Russian Science Foundation (RSF), project number 22-18-00416.

For citation: Polivanova K.N., Bochaver A.A. Is Students' Autonomy Possible at Contemporary School? *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2022. Vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 6—15. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2022270301> (In Russ.).

Возможна ли детская самостоятельность в современной школе?

Поливанова К.Н.

ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ); ФГАОУ ВО «Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики» (ФГАОУ ВО НИУ ВШЭ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7058-1232>, e-mail: kpolivanova@mail.ru

Бочавер А.А.

ФГАОУ ВО «Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики» (ФГАОУ ВО НИУ ВШЭ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6131-5602>, e-mail: a-bochaver@yandex.ru

Авторами показано, что современный образовательный дискурс смещается от обсуждения условий достижения академических результатов на анализ условий реализации обучения и шире — жизни детей и подростков в школе. Ставится вопрос о важности анализа и учета социально-педагогических условий формирования самостоятельности школьников. Самостоятельность рассматривается как важнейший непредметный результат образования, неспецифичный для традиционной школы. Отмечается, что условием развития самостоятельности является возможность пробы, пробного действия. Школа как социальный институт рассматривается в рамках теории тотальных институтов Э. Гоффмана. Доказывается, что дисциплинарные практики школы делают невозможными горизонтальные коммуникации «учитель-ученик/группа детей». Выявлена недостаточность сведения образовательных практик к лишь школьным, указано на процессы расширения образовательного пространства через рост доступа к неформальному и неформальному образованию.

Ключевые слова: самостоятельность, агентность, пробующие действия, субъективация, тотальные институты, новые тренды в образовании.

Финансирование. Исследование выполнено при финансовой поддержке Российского научного фонда (РНФ) в рамках научного проекта № 22-18-00416.

Для цитаты: Поливанова К.Н., Бочавер А.А. Возможна ли детская самостоятельность в современной школе? // Психологическая наука и образование. 2022. Том 27. № 3. С. 6—15. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2022270301>

Introduction

Childhood is gaining more and more prominence in social studies. It has traditionally been the subject of research in developmental psychology, where the focus of scholars and practitioners is the change/development of psychological characteristics of the child in the process of growing up.

Today the research field is expanding to include the study of childhood and the child as such, the “here and now”, his/her well-being and life satisfaction.

J. Qvortrup et al. express a seemingly paradoxical, but very heuristic idea, pointing out that children exist in our world not only and not so much to become adults, al-

though, of course, we all expect and hope that they will become adults. However, this expectation has attracted so much attention and has taken on so much importance, that it has been more or less forgotten that children, too, have their own life as long as they are children [20].

M. Spieler criticized the 'adult' view of childhood as early as the mid-1970s [22]. The work of Erica Burman [18], in which she consistently deconstructs the developmental psychology, revealing its internal assumptions: adherence to the norm, the desire to impose a 'correct' view of childhood, the assumption of the child as an object of change, emanating from the adult gaze.

Thus, in today's scientific landscape we find, on the one hand, the continuation of research, both theoretical and empirical, aimed at the child's developmental changes, including those which are occurring within the framework of the educational system. On the other hand, the study of today's realities of childhood as understood not in relation to the future, but in their present condition. The second direction is presented mostly in research on the conditions of children's well-being, including the framework of school education. And another important vector within this second direction is the growing trend of studying children's autonomy.

Theoretical foundations for considering child autonomy

The influential international organization OECD has been pushing the child autonomy agenda for the past three years. The program "Student Agency 2030" [18] has been developed. Its main idea is formulated as follows: the concept of schoolchild agency is based on the belief that schoolchildren have the ability and desire to positively influence their own lives and the world around them. Student agency is defined as the ability to set goals, reflect and act responsibly in order to bring about change.

Note that today Russian and Western scientific literature employs several terms that we can, though understanding their difference, use as the synonyms: *agency* (the ability to act in relation to a structure and to change it); *initiative* (crossing the boundary of semantic fields, according to L.I. Elkonina); *autonomy, independence, personal autonomy* (according to D.A. Leontiev); *subjectivity* (according to V.A. Petrovsky).

All these terms, in our opinion, describe similar abilities of an individual and similar actions. All of them can be described as supersituative behavior, according to V.A. Petrovsky, or as overcoming field behavior, according to K. Lewin. The difference in many respects is largely due to the fact that initially these terms were born in different theoretical models, but by the type of observed behavior they are, we think, quite similar.

Therefore, realizing the importance of theoretical-analytic comparison and refinement of these terms in the future, within the framework of this article we will conditionally allow ourselves not to differentiate them.

The explosive growth of interest in the topic of children's independence is connected, we think, with recognition of the unpredictability of the modern world, its variability. Indeed, if the world is stable and unchanging, it is possible to convey to a child the algorithms for solving basic tasks. If everything changes, and the rate of change only increases, the algorithms stop working, and the ability to overcome the existing context, to act supra-situationally comes to the fore..

If today it is becoming more and more important to study children's autonomy, then two important questions arise: 1) what are the conditions for the development of autonomy? 2) to what extent is child autonomy possible within the educational system? To what extent does the school (and we are limited only to general education) provide a student with a space for performing his/her own actions, where are those gaps in the fabric

of the school context in which independence is appropriate and expected?

The answer to the first question is found in the works of B.D. Elkonin [17]: a trial action is a condition for development. In itself, the problem of the trial, the trial action is quite well developed within the framework of developmental psychology. These theoretical and empirical studies continue the line of cultural-historical theory, in particular, develop ideas about the construct of the zone of proximal development. We can say today that the interaction of a child and an adult in a zone exceeding the actual capabilities of the child, the provision of a test opportunity and the support of this test are conditions for the development of the ability to act independently. If we turn to the theory of subjectivation, then this is an interpretation of the need for a test: a new ability arises in two stages: at first, a new action itself appears, but only under special conditions, and then there is an emancipation of the ability — a test of a new skill in real situations of its application [11]. But the test requires a 'response': a reaction to the action, i.e. the condition of the test is horizontal communication.

Thus, a condition for the autonomy development is the space for free action in which the new ability is tested through the reception of feedback, and thus emancipated from the conditions of its development or directed formation. Consequently, we must answer the second question: where and in relation to what kind of school content children's trials are possible, in relation to what context these trials are performed, whether feedback is possible, i.e. to what extent the model of the zone of proximal development is realized.

To answer this question, we will look at the structure of school as it is presented in classical sociological works. This is necessary, because it is clear today, especially after the pandemic, how narrow and redundant is the idea of school as merely a

place for the transmission of knowledge. The school is a highly complex social institution that addresses a wide range of tasks for the individual, society and the state, and when the lockdown forced the school to be reduced to the organization of classes, everyone — educators, families, and students themselves — felt that under ordinary conditions school is far more than just lessons.

In the late 1960s and 1970s the Marxist interpretation of the school and the ideological institution of the state were popular in Western socio-philosophical writings. M. Foucault in "Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la Prison" speaks of the school as an institution for the implementation of a power structure hidden in social relations. This power is realized via special "practices of order" or "disciplinary practices" which are typical for school.

It is possible to describe in the most detail school as an institution through the prism of those structural elements of total institutions described by E. Goffman in his book "Total Institutions" [2]. Let us immediately make a reservation: in the context of this article, we ignore the processes of adult adaptation and degradation discussed in the social sciences. In Goffman's descriptions we are looking for situations where the free action, trial, goal-setting, and achievement of one's own goals are possible. Goffman does not refer to regular schools as the total institutions, only to boarding schools, because what is important to him is the impossibility of leaving the institution. Therefore, we will first consider the school as a total institution, and then show the insufficiency of this assumption. Looking ahead, we will say that the possibility of leaving the school is important precisely as a way of overcoming the totality of the social structure.

School as a total institution

The school as an institution of mass compulsory education was formed in Europe and the USA in the middle of the 19th

century. Russia was lagging behind, it was only after 1917 that this system emerged. Clearly, industrialization was the driving force behind the spread of education, conveyor production, and the outflow of the rural population to the cities. The mass character of education, its accessibility to all segments of the population dictated the need for it to be relatively cheap, regardless of the sources of its funding — public, state, or private.

Massiveness and accessibility required formats in which one teacher could teach a group of children, preferably of relatively similar abilities. It is no coincidence, we think, that the same period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century saw the explosive growth of pedagogy which was developing a factual basis for mass education. It was pedagogy that gave age the absolute independent variable, which manifested itself in the organization of classes on the basis of age.

According to E. Goffman, the essential characteristics of a total institution are the relative small number of 'staff', i.e., pedagogical workers, and the large number of 'guests' — students. The staff carries and holds the norm. Due to its small number, it is forced to carry out its functions based on numerous rules — both verbally fixed and implicit, unarticulated ones. These rules mediate relations within the institution, making bidirectional communication impossible — from teachers to students and back again. If the ratio was 1:1, it would be possible to build personal relationships, the rules would be quite relaxed, the communication would be quite different.

According to Goffman, every institution provides its members with a special world, i.e. every institution is characterized by a tendency of closedness. "Their closedness or totality is symbolically expressed in the barriers for social interaction with the outside world and for going out, which often have a material form" [2; 32]. This indica-

tion of closedness is easily recognized today in, for example, the turnstiles installed at the entrances to school, guard posts, and metal detectors. Despite the fact that the child can physically leave the school building, the structure itself remains closed and connections with the outside world are difficult.

The creation of total institutions is connected to the idea of incapacity, that there are categories of people who need care, even if they themselves may not seek this care. This directly applies to schools since the task of education at all stages of its development has been defined by the need to impart to non-adult pupils the qualities of adults: to make them capable of performing the functions of adults, ensuring the reproduction of the modes of existence.

According to Hoffman's description, "each phase of the daily activities of a member of the institute is carried out by him in the direct accompaniment of a large group of other people who are treated in the same way and who are required to do the same thing together. It is also indicated that all phases of their daily activities are strictly scheduled, one occupation is replaced by another at an agreed time and the entire sequence of cases is prescribed from above by a system of explicit formal rules and a corps of officials. Finally, prescribed classes are subject to a single rational plan that ensures the achievement of the official goals of the institute" [2; 34]. This is exactly how life is arranged at school — rules, regulations, actions in chorus", in full view of a large group of classmates.

In this rigid system of rules and regulations, a 'guest' — a schoolchild — is forced to find his own ways of coping with the lack of freedom. Hoffman describes two types of adaptation: primary and secondary. Primary adaptation is the complete and accurate implementation of the rules of the institute. Those who are capable of such a following at least at the beginning of their stay at

school become “good students” favoured by teachers. By the beginning of middle school, few of them remain. Secondary adaptation is the ability to find such gaps in a strict structure where violation of the rules is possible. This is a well-known desire of children, and especially teenagers, to hide from the eyes of their elders, to get out of their field of vision. In such «blind spots» it is possible to have their own individual life of schoolchildren, their independence.

Thus, if we admit that a modern school has the features of a total institution, it turns out that the space of independence is limited to places alien to the school: these are non-school zones in the school, for example, on the school territory outside the zone of teachers' sight, in school toilets, etc.

Horizontal communication and feedback, which are necessary for the test of autonomy, do not exist in school, and if they do, then it's rather contrary to the school laws.

School as an element of the educational space

Even if we recognize the school as a total institution, in reality it has never been fully like other institutions. For example, in fiction we find many examples of children's warm relations with teachers and with each other, although such examples speak more about the 'imperfection' of the school¹. A huge role in softening the rigid structure and freeing up the places for free action, in addition to establishing personal informal relationships, has always been played by the various kinds of leisure and non-educational practices at school: holidays, joint trips and excursions, class hours, i.e. everything that traditionally belonged to the field of upbringing.

Unlike completely closed institutions, the school exists in society, and children are included in a wide repertoire of interactions. The first and main thing is the existence of

the child in the family and the local community, which provides substantial enrichment of communications, care and acceptance. It can be assumed that initially social skills were acquired mainly outside of school, in communication with peers, with extended family, in household chores [7].

A strictly regulated institution justifies its purpose until the idea of what is due begins to change in it and outside its walls, and until these ideas penetrate into the school. Then the 'unpacking' of the school structure begins, described, in particular, by P.S. Sorokin and I.D. Frumin, although they do not exactly refer to general education [15].

The «unpacking' of the school takes place in two main directions.

The first one is to provide students with a choice within the school: an individual curriculum, elective and additional disciplines, etc. We will also include the project activities of schoolchildren in the same row. The real implementation of these opportunities within the school requires additional research: to what extent, for example, the provided choice is limited or free, to what extent the ability to independently set goals and achieve them develops within the framework of project activities. But the emergence of 'points' for making independent decisions is really expanding. New professional positions are emerging at school, for example, the position of a tutor, a teacher who really implements horizontal communication with a child [4].

The second one is the appearance of a huge number of educational offers outside of school. In large cities, up to 80% of children are engaged in various activities related to the field of additional education. But the supply of educational services on the market is also gaining strength, both directly related to education, for example, the Skyeng service, and having educational functions — Arza-

¹ Let's recall the story of V. Rasputin «French Lessons»..

mas, Khan Academy, etc. These services usually offer services that do not qualify for general education. They help to find ways to solve specific problems related to education: eliminate specific knowledge gaps in preparation for exams, study the subject more deeply or just learn more about the topic of interest.

Ivan Illich in his classic work “Liberation from Schools” wrote that over time the school will lose its exceptional position in the field of education. Elements of the necessary skills can be searched, found and mastered not only within the school walls, but also in many other places. He wrote about the creation of educational networks, about filling a person’s whole life with learning [3].

When the book was written in the 70s, and even when it appeared in Russian in 2006, it seemed that the author was very far from the reality of modernity, the school as an established institution seemed unshakable. But today the situation is changing rapidly. In the book “Education beyond the walls of school: How parents design the educational space of children” published in 2020 [13] we reveal in detail the gradual ‘unpacking’ of the school as the only place of education, and show how the school turns into an element of a multiple space consisting of a variety of educational services.

Also, we must not forget the emergence of alternative forms of education, for example, family education, full-time and part-time education, numerous offers on the market of online educational services, unschooling, etc. [6].

Thus, it is possible to state a significant expansion of the educational space. In particular, there are three types of education: formal, informal, and non-formal. We no longer equate the concepts of ‘education’ and ‘school’. The expansion of general education beyond the school, the emergence of new access points that are not limited by vertical

and hierarchical methods of management and dominance of formal knowledge, lead to the emergence of new spaces of interaction between the knowing and the unknowing, the skillful and the inept, the adult and the child.

There is a new discourse in education — a discussion of the possibility of projecting the ideas of the Convention on the Rights of the Child into educational practice, and, at the same time, there is a new type of communication, in which the child’s voice begins to sound as the voice of an equal participant in the interaction.

Conclusion

We consider the analysis and consideration of the school as a total institution to be the first step towards understanding the school as a space that ensures or hinders development and maturation.

We believe that we have managed, albeit tentatively, to point out the important contradiction. Numerous studies in the field of developmental psychology, in particular, studies of the organization of the probing action, represent predominantly a microanalysis of the act of development, implemented in laboratory conditions. Sociology sets a different focus: macro processes occurring in society, occurring in a variety of nuances and circumstances.

The scrupulous view of psychology, the seeds of the new knowledge about development can be devalued by immersing them in the reality of social processes and circumstances, or significantly distorted. Mechanisms of the emergence of new psychological characteristics may not work in real schools because they will occur in a situation that would block them. Therefore, it is important, in our opinion, not only to raise new research questions regarding the drivers of development, but also to see the social reality in which these drivers are strengthened or weakened, or do not work at all.

References

1. Bochaver A.A., Verbilovich O.E., Pavlenko K.V., Polivanova K.N., Sivak E.V. Vovlechenost' detej v dopolnitel'noe obrazovanie: kontrol' i cennost' obrazovanija so storony roditel'ej [Children's Involvement in Supplementary Education: Monitoring and Value of Education on the Part of Parents]. *Psihologicheskaja nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2018. Vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 32—40. DOI:10.17759/pse.2018230403
2. Goffman E. Total'nye instituty: ocherki o social'noj situacii psihicheski bol'nyh pacientov i prochihi postojal'cev zakrytyh uchrezhdenij [Asylums. Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates]. Per. s angl. A.S. Salina; pod red. A.M. Korbuta. Moscow: Jelementarnye formy, 2019. 464 p.
3. Illich I. Osvobozhdenie ot shkol. Proporcional'nost' i sovremennij mir [Deshooling society]. Per. s angl. Moscow: Prosveshhenie, 2006. 324 p.
4. Kovaleva T.M. Oformlenie novoj professii t'jutora v rossijskom obrazovanii [New profession in Russian education — tutor]. *Voprosy obrazovanija // Educational Studies*, 2011, no. 2, pp. 163—180. DOI:10.17323/1814-9545-2011-2-163-180
5. Leont'ev D.A. Chelovek i zhiznennyj mir: ot ontologii k fenomenologii [Human Being and Lifeworld: From Ontology to Phenomenology]. *Kulturno-istoricheskaja psihologija = Cultural-Historical Psychology*, 2019. Vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 25—34. DOI:10.17759/chp.2019150103
6. Lyubitskaya K.A., Polivanova K.N. Semejnoe obrazovanie v Rossii i za rubezhom [Homeschooling in Russia and abroad] [Elektronnyj resurs]. *Sovremennaja zarubezhnaja psihologija = Modern Foreign Psychology*, 2017. Vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 72—80. DOI:10.17759/jmpf.2017060208
7. Polivanova K.N. [i dr.] Obrazovanie za stenami shkoly [Education beyond School]. Moscow: Izdatel'skij dom NRU VShJe, 2020. 324 p.
8. Osorina M.V. Sekretnyj mir detej v prostranstve mira vzroslyh [Secret child's world inside adult's world]. Saint-Petersburg: Izdatel'skij dom «Piter», 2008. 431 p.
9. Petrovskij V.A. Myslju? — da! No sushhestvuju li? [Do I think? — yes! But do I exist?]. *Kulturno-istoricheskaja psihologija = Cultural-Historical Psychology*, 2011. Vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 12—26.
10. Petrovskij V.A. Psihologija neadaptivnoj aktivnosti [Psychology of nonadaptive activity]. Moscow: TOO "Gorbunok", 1992. 224 p.
11. Polivanova K.N. Proektnaja dejatel'nost' shkol'nikov [Psychology of Project Activity]. 2-e izd. Moscow: Prosveshhenie, 2011. 192 p.
12. Polivanova K.N. Psihologija vozrastnyh krizisov [Psychology of age-related crisis]. Moscow: Academia, 2001. 196 p.
13. Polivanova K.N. Novyj obrazovatel'nyj diskurs: blagopoluchie shkol'nikov [New Educational Discourse: The Well-Being of Schoolchildren]. *Kulturno-istoricheskaja psihologija = Cultural-Historical Psychology*, 2020. Vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 26—34. DOI:10.17759/chp.2020160403
14. Sobkin V.S. Transformacija celej i motivacii ucheby shkol'nikov [Transformation of students' goals and motives]. *Sociologicheskie issledovanija // Sociological research*, 2006, no. 8, pp. 106—115.
15. Sorokin P.S., Frumin I.D. Problema «struktura/dejstvie» v 21 c.: izmenenija v social'noj real'nosti i vyvody dlja issledovatel'skoj povestki [The problem of "structure/action" in the 21st century: changes in social reality and conclusions for the research agenda] [Elektronnyj resurs]. *Sociologicheskie issledovanija [Sociological research]*, 2020, no. 7, pp. 27—36. URL: <http://ras.jes.su/socis/s013216250009571-1-1> (Accessed 22.03.2022). DOI:10.31857/S013216250009571-1
16. Fuko M. Nadzirat' i nakazyvat'. Rozhdenie t'jur'my [Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison]. Moscow: Ad Marginem, 2013. 488 p.
17. Elkonin B.D. Sovremennost' teorii i praktiki Uchebnoi Deyatel'nosti: klyucheve vyprosy i perspektivy [Modern Era of the Theory and Practice of Learning Activity: Key Issues and Perspectives]. *Psihologicheskaja nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2020. Vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 28—39. DOI:10.17759/pse.2020250403
18. Alonso-Mencia M.E., Alario-Hoyos C., Maldonado-Mahauad J., Estévez-Ayres I., Pérez-Sanagustín M., Delgado Kloos C. Self-regulated learning in MOOCs: lessons learned from a literature review. *Educational Review*, 2020. Vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 319—345.
19. Burman E. Deconstructing developmental psychology. Taylor & Francis, 2016. 238 p.
20. Cook-Sather A. Student voice across contexts: Fostering student agency in today's schools. *Theory into practice*, 2020. Vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 182—191. DOI:10.1080/00405841.2019.1705091
21. Grazia V., Mameli C., Molinari L. Adolescents' profiles based on student agency and teacher autonomy support: does interpersonal justice matter? *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 2021. Vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 1117—1134.
22. Goodman J.F., Eren N.S. Student agency: Success, failure, and lessons learned. *Ethics and Education*, 2013. Vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 123—139.
23. Hvid Stenalt M., Lassesen B.T. Does student agency benefit student learning? A systematic review of higher education research [Elektronnyj resurs]. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. 2021. DOI:10.1080/02602938.2021.1967874 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/ref/10.1080/02602938.2021.1967874?scroll=top> (Accessed 23.05.2022).
24. Mameli C., Grazia V., Molinari L. The emotional faces of student agency [Elektronnyj resurs]. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 2021. Vol. 77, 101352. URL:

- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0193397321001155> (Accessed 23.05.2022).
25. Qvortrup J. et al. (ed.). *The Palgrave handbook of childhood studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 456 p.
26. Qvortrup J., Corsaro W.A., Honig M.-S. *Why Social Studies of Childhood? An Introduction to the Handbook*. The Palgrave handbook of childhood studies. Eds Qvortrup J., Corsaro W.A., Honig M.-S. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, pp. 1—19.
27. OECD (2018), *Education 2030 — Conceptual learning framework: Background papers*. Paris, OECD Publishing, 31 p. DOI:10.1787/9789264234833-en
28. Spieler M. *The Adult Ideological Viewpoint in Studies of Childhood*. *Rethinking Childhood. Perspectives on Development and Society*. Ed Skolnick A. Boston/Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1976, pp. 168—186.
29. Vaughn M. *What is student agency and why is it needed now more than ever?* [Elektronnyi resurs]. *Theory Into Practice*, 2020. Vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 109—118. DOI:10.1080/00405841.2019.1702393 URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00405841.2019.1702393?src=recsys> (Accessed 23.05.2022).

Литература

1. Бочавер А.А., Вербилович О.Е., Павленко К.В., Поливанова К.Н., Сивак Е.В. Вовлеченность детей в дополнительное образование: контроль и ценность образования со стороны родителей // *Психологическая наука и образование*. 2018. Том 23. № 4. С. 32—40. DOI:10.17759/pse.2018230403
2. Гоффман Э. *Тотальные институты: очерки о социальной ситуации психически больных пациентов и прочих постояльцев закрытых учреждений* / Пер. с англ. А.С. Салина; под ред. А.М. Корбуа. М.: Элементарные формы, 2019. 464 с.
3. Иллич И. *Освобождение от школ. Пропорциональность и современный мир* / Пер. с англ. М.: Просвещение, 2006. 324 с.
4. Ковалева Т.М. Оформление новой профессии тьютора в российском образовании // *Вопросы образования*. 2011. № 2. С. 163—180. DOI:10.17323/1814-9545-2011-2-163-180
5. Леонтьев Д.А. *Человек и жизненный мир: от онтологии к феноменологии* // *Культурно-историческая психология*. 2019. Том 15. № 1. С. 25—34. DOI:10.17759/chp.2019150103
6. Любичкая К.А. Семейное образование в России и за рубежом [Elektronnyi resurs] // *Современная зарубежная психология*. 2017. Том 6. № 2. С. 72—80. DOI:10.17759/jmfp.2017060208
7. *Образование за стенами школы* / Поливанова К.Н. и др. М.: Издательский дом НИУ ВШЭ, 2020. 324 с.
8. Осорина М.В. *Секретный мир детей в пространстве мира взрослых*. СПб: Издательский дом «Питер», 2008. 431 с.
9. Петровский В.А. Мыслью — да! Но существуем ли? // *Культурно-историческая психология*. 2011. Том 7. № 3. С. 12—26.
10. Петровский В.А. *Психология неадаптивной активности*. М.: ТОО «Горбунок», 1992. 224 с.
11. Поливанова К.Н. *Проектная деятельность школьников. Пособие для учителя*. 2-е изд. М.: Просвещение, 2011. 192 с.
12. Поливанова К.Н. *Психология возрастных кризисов*. М.: Academia, 2001. 196 с.
13. Поливанова К.Н. Новый образовательный дискурс: благополучие школьников // *Культурно-историческая психология*. 2020. Том 16. № 4. С. 26—34. DOI:10.17759/chp.2020160403
14. Собкин В.С. Трансформация целей и мотивации учебы школьников // *Социологические исследования*. 2006. № 8. С. 106—115.
15. Сорокин П.С., Фрумин И.Д. Проблема «структура/действие» В XXI в.: изменения в социальной реальности и выводы для исследовательской повестки [Elektronnyi resurs] // *Социологические исследования*. 2020. № 7. С. 27—36. URL: <http://ras.jes.su/socis/s013216250009571-1-1> (дата обращения: 22.03.2022). DOI:10.31857/S013216250009571-1
16. Фуко М. *Надзирать и наказывать. Рождение тюрьмы*. М.: Ad Marginem, 2013. 488 с.
17. Эльконин Б.Д. Современность теории и практики Учебной Деятельности: ключевые вопросы и перспективы // *Психологическая наука и образование*. 2020. Том 25. № 4. С. 28—39. DOI:10.17759/pse.2020250403
18. Alonso-Mencia M.E., Alario-Hoyos C., Maldonado-Mahauad J., Estévez-Ayres I., Pérez-Sanagustin M., Delgado Kloos C. Self-regulated learning in MOOCs: lessons learned from a literature review // *Educational Review*. 2020. Vol. 72. No. 3. P. 319—345.
19. Burman E. *Deconstructing developmental psychology*. Taylor & Francis, 2016. 238 p.
20. Cook-Sather A. Student voice across contexts: Fostering student agency in today's schools // *Theory into practice*. 2020. Vol. 59. No. 2. P. 182—191. DOI:10.1080/00405841.2019.1705091
21. Grazia V., Mameli C., Molinari L. Adolescents' profiles based on student agency and teacher autonomy support: does interpersonal justice matter? // *European Journal of Psychology of Education*. 2021. Vol. 36. No. 4. P. 1117—1134.
22. Goodman J.F., Eren N.S. Student agency: Success, failure, and lessons learned // *Ethics and Education*. 2013. Vol. 8. No. 2. P. 123—139.
23. Hvid Stenalt M., Lassesen B.T. Does student agency benefit student learning? A systematic review

of higher education research [Электронный ресурс] // Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. 2021. DOI:10.1080/02602938.2021.1967874 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/ref/10.1080/02602938.2021.1967874?scroll=top> (дата обращения: 23.05.2022).

24. *Mameli C., Grazia V., Molinari L.* The emotional faces of student agency [Электронный ресурс] // Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology. 2021. Vol. 77, 101352. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0193397321001155> (дата обращения: 23.05.2022).

25. *Qvortrup J. et al.* (ed.). The Palgrave handbook of childhood studies. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 456 p.

26. *Qvortrup J., Corsaro W.A., Honig M.-S.* Why Social Studies of Childhood? An Introduction to the

Handbook // The Palgrave handbook of childhood studies / Eds Qvortrup J., Corsaro W.A., Honig M.-S. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. P. 1—19.

27. OECD (2018), Education 2030 — Conceptual learning framework: Background papers. Paris, OECD Publishing. 31 p. DOI:10.1787/9789264234833-en

28. *Spieler M.* The Adult Ideological Viewpoint in Studies of Childhood // Rethinking Childhood. Perspectives on Development and Society / Ed Skolnick A. Boston/Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1976. P. 168—186.

29. *Vaughn M.* What is student agency and why is it needed now more than ever? [Электронный ресурс] // Theory Into Practice. 2020 Vol. 59. No. 2. P. 109—118. DOI:10.1080/00405841.2019.1702393 URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00405841.2019.1702393?src=recsys> (дата обращения: 23.05.2022).

Information about the authors

Katerina N. Polivanova, Doctor of Psychology, Professor, Moscow State University of Psychology & Education, Moscow, Russia; Academic Supervisor of the Center for Modern Childhood Studies, Institute of Education, National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE), Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7058-1232>, e-mail: kpolivanova@mail.ru

Alexandra A. Bochaver, PhD in Psychology, Head of the Center for Modern Childhood Studies, Institute of Education, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6131-5602>, e-mail: a-bochaver@yandex.ru

Информация об авторах

Поливанова Катерина Николаевна, доктор психологических наук, профессор кафедры возрастной психологии им. Л.Ф. Обуховой, ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ); научный руководитель Центра исследований современного детства Института образования, ФГАОУ ВО «Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики» (ФГАОУ ВО НИУ ВШЭ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7058-1232>, e-mail: kpolivanova@mail.ru

Бочавер Александра Алексеевна, кандидат психологических наук, директор Центра исследований современного детства Института образования, ФГАОУ ВО «Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики» (ФГАОУ ВО НИУ ВШЭ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6131-5602>, e-mail: a-bochaver@yandex.ru

Получена 17.05.2022

Received 17.05.2022

Принята в печать 15.06.2022

Accepted 15.06.2022