The Debate between Traditional and Progressive Education in the Light of Special Education

Naglaa Mohamed

February 2018

I

The Debate between Scientific and Progressive Education in the Light of Special Education

The debate between progressivism and traditionalism has reached an impasse. Battles in curriculum are, according to Ackerman (2003), "manifestations of a fundamental debate between progressive educators and traditionalists" (p. 345) that has been going on for over a century (Pogrow, 2006). No educational institution exists that is purely progressive or purely traditional in its educational approach. At the same time, no school exists that has managed to escape the influences of either theme. Nonetheless, the traditional system of teaching may have worked well for many students over the last 100 years (Sullivan & Downey, 2015); however, research shows that the industrial epoch's "factory-based" approach to education is failing to serve the needs of 21st century students (Berrett, 2012; Silva et al., 2015), let alone special education students. What follows is a discussion of the characteristics of each theme and its overall impact on special education students.

Key Words: special education, inclusion, progressive education, scientific education, Franklin Bobbitt, John Dewey, Individualized Education Plan (IEP), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), exceptional children.

Franklin Bobbitt, a self-proclaimed pioneer of the field of education, wrote of thoughts and ideas that introduced some of the early traditions of curriculum studies in 1918, at a time when "civilization and humanization" had never "advanced so swiftly" (Flinders & Thornton, 1998, p. 15). Bobbitt believed in the interests of efficiency and the elimination of waste. His aim was to increase student learning while maintaining the minimum amount of cost to society as possible (Flinders & Thornton, 1998). He believed that the curriculum at the time was out-of-date when compared with the twentieth-century breakthroughs in the education field. To Bobbitt, schools were instruments of social adaptation to the preexisting status quo, and the needs of individual students were determined by the demands of adult life (Flinders & Thornton, 1998). Bobbitt's thoughts and beliefs were integral in the formation of the scientific, or traditional theme of education as it is known today.

The traditional approach to education is intrinsically centered around academics. Students' intellectual growth is determined and evaluated by their verbal and mathematical proficiency. Traditional educators emphasize the importance of academic competence and mastery of the curriculum, without much attention to or concern for the emotions of students if and when their efforts fall short (Ackerman, 2003). Students are evaluated with elaborate and exaggerated rubrics and graded on complicated details with even more intricate grade-substitutes (Kohn, 2008). These measures are neither highly accurate measures of academic ability nor highly accurate measures of the academic accomplishment of the individual student (Kauffman & Landrum, 2013); accordingly, it is dangerous to rely on standardized achievement tests to evaluate students' academic achievement, especially special education students, who are in need of specially-designed services.

Additionally, traditional environments typically implement a consequence-based system of control, in which school staff and personnel focus on order and compliance rather than on the development of students' ethical intellect, social skills, and independence (Kohn, 2008). This interjects with special education program structures that, as most professionals in the special education field assert, should be designed to build, support, and develop students' moral reasoning and social skills, including but not limited to learning how to get along with others, being independent, etc. (Heward, 2013). In terms of coursework, traditional educators are encouraged to assign, on a daily basis, homework that does not necessarily deepen students' understanding of ideas; rather, it serves as a model for supplementing what students were just taught (Kohn, 2008). Traditional educators' instruction is based on predetermined curricular hierarchies that implement a "one standard fits all" model. Conversely, one of the components of each special education student's Individualized Education Program is a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel that will be provided for the child to advance appropriately towards achieving the annual goals, to make progress in the general education curriculum, and to be educated and participate with other non-disabled students in nonacademic activities (Heward, 2013).

As Ackerman (2003) states, "For students to achieve understanding, they need to do more than press the record button in class and subsequently play back the teacher's words. Students need to think about what they have heard or read" (p. 348). In a traditional environment, where everything can be systemized and manipulated, learning encompasses a "pound it into them" process (Pogrow, 2006); there is "no place for children's growth spurts or emotional disturbance" (Pogrow, 2006, p. 142). The traditional approach to education does not consider the differences that exceptional children display from one another in terms of their learning aptitudes

that ensures their provision of instruction that is appropriate to their needs and abilities. "The term exceptional children includes children who experience difficulties in learning as well as those whose performance is so advanced that modifications in curriculum and instruction are necessary to help them fulfill their potential" (Heward, 2013, p. 7).

As Kohn (2008) states, in a traditional classroom, students are "separate selves at separate desks" (p. 20); the default classroom arrangement consists of students doing things on their own. They are rarely encouraged to work together in class or on assignments; instead, they are pitted against one another in competition through various means, including honors classes and awards assemblies, thereby undermining a feeling of community (Kohn, 2008). It is futile to establish a successful special education program under the traditional approach to education, as special education programs are heavily based on students' learning needs, and use individualized or adapted materials and methods. As defined by Heward (2013), "Special education is individually planned, specialized, intensive, goal-directed instruction" (p. 33), i.e., it is everything that traditional education is not.

Moreover, traditional classrooms implement an economy in which students are rewarded for complying with adults' expectations and punished for failing to do so. According to John Dewey, in traditional settings, the center of gravity is outside the child; students are expected to adjust to the school's preexisting system and curriculum (Kohn, 2008). These students are rarely thought of or taken into account when educational policies are being reconsidered; similarly, they hold no active role in the design of the curriculum or in other decisions, such as classroom decoration, management, and assessment (Kohn, 2008). With regard to special education, Ramsey, Jolivette, Patterson, & Kennedy (2010) stated that "Using choice-making as an antecedent intervention during academic demands can help to improve the interactions between

students…. as well as decrease inappropriate behaviors and increase task management" (p. 2). Hence, excluding children from choice-making does not comply with the basic structure of a typical special education program.

The traditional approach to education is characteristically interested in improving the short-term skills of students (Kohn, 2008), rather than their long-term dispositions. It thrives in its focus on the rote memorization of lists of facts that rarely have apparent connections to other disciplines (Kohn, 2008), which is problematic for students, especially those with learning disabilities, who are typically unable to retain information on a short-term basis. Traditional education confuses excellence with rigor, and insists that harder material is better. Students are expected to passively absorb vast amounts of information at a time, with no emphasis on or attention to whether they actually understand it. "They end up…spending so much time thinking about how well they're doing that they're no longer as engaged with what they're doing" (Kohn, 2008, p. 21); students are less interested in what they're doing because of the emphasis on getting the right answers. Essentially, they are not constructing their own understanding of ideas; rather, the student's task is "comprehending how the *teacher* has, integrated or applied the ideas... and [then] reconstruct[ing] the teacher's thinking" (Windschitl, 2006, p. 352).

The traditional approach to education implements a time- and credit-based, instructor-led, text-driven curriculum that is delivered to all students at the same time, with no regard to their individual ability (DeLorenzo, et al.; Jerald, 2009; Silva, et al., 2015). The curriculum is tailored to neither the uniqueness of each child, nor the background that s/he brings with them (Sullivan & Downey, 2015). Students typically construe new information in terms of what they previously trust to be true; hence, not taking into consideration a child's background knowledge is problematic because it often causes a child to subconsciously alter the intended meanings of the

teacher's words (Ackerman, 2003). This is especially important for each special education student, who is exceptional and unique; therefore, a single set of procedures, expectations, or coursework that ignored their interests "would be as counterproductive as it was disrespectful" (Kohn, 2008, p. 21). Kuykendall (2004) described the following approach to enhance students' motivation to learn and hope for the future: "Curricula must be revised to foster an appreciation of all the positive components of the students' racial or cultural group as well as the most accurate portrayal of history from the perspective of the particular racial or cultural group" (p. 67), characteristics that are not evident in the traditional environment.

In a progressive setting, on the other hand, a plethora of learning resources are utilized to address each learner's academic and social goals. Child-centeredness, a primary pillar in progressive education (Fallace, 2015), encourages free activity and promotes individuality by presenting children with opportunities to help them adapt to an always-changing world (Powell, 2007). As Har (2011) states,

> [Progressive educators] take a humanitarian view and focus on the use of education to draw forth latent potentials for human development and to cultivate social, intellectual, constructive, and expressive instincts vital for human living. (p. 22)

These progressive characteristics were ultimately founded John Dewey, whose view of curriculum provides an ostensible distinction with Bobbitt's industrial model. Dewey, known as the father of the progressive education movement and the originator of learning-by-doing, advocated for a child-centered method of democratic teaching, in which students played an active role in their learning (Conner & Bohan, 2014). His educational philosophy has had an astute influence on the educational confabulation today (Har, 2011). Dewey championed the educational theory that children learn best by actively doing and argued that education should

incubate through the encouraged interest of the student by the society around him (Flinders & Thornton, 1998). Dewey's ideal child-centered curriculum emphasized activity, problem solving, and creative thought (Pring, 2007). As confirmed by Flinders & Thornton (1998), comparing and contrasting Bobbitt and Dewey's perspectives exemplifies how different epitomes of the meaning of "curriculum" cause fundamentally different views of educational intentions and practice. Unlike Bobbitt, Dewey believed that looking to the adult society to assess the needs of the school curriculum leads to confining the student to a predetermined fate. This relates back to special education individualized transition plans (ITP) that describes measurable postsecondary goals based on age-appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills, in addition to the transition services needed to assist the child in reaching those goals (Heward, 2013). As described by Heward (2013), "The purpose of the ITP is to ensure that all of our students step into the adult life they desire" (p. 528). Dewey spoke of schools, and education as a whole, as mediums for ameliorating democratic life in the United States; he considered them an important part of community life and instruments for social progress and reform (Flinders & Thornton, 1998), while Bobbitt thought schools existed merely to match students with the preexisting status quo. Dewey believed that curriculum held the potential for society to remake itself and insisted that no strict boundary should exist between curriculum and community life (Flinders & Thornton, 1998). He insisted that curriculum planning must begin with the experience of the child.

The progressive approach to education was established in the late nineteenth/early twentieth century "against the prevailing ideology of big business…cultural uniformity," and citizenship transmission (Krug, 1972, p. 179). Progressivism is a pedagogical theme of American education that has inevitably reflected the social and political happenings of its time. Progressive

education emphasizes a "child-centered, experiential curriculum, an issues-centered approach to learning, and a critical analysis of society" (Conner & Bohan, 2014). Here, there exists a direct relation between progressive education and special education in terms of their focus on "child-centeredness." This is discernable from the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA), which requires states to provide special education services to all children with disabilities ages 3 to 5 and include a voluntary incentive grant program for early intervention services to infants, toddlers, and their families (Heward, 2013). The child-centered progressive theme is also related to the No Child Left Behind Act, which intended to "improve the achievement of all students," and have them taught by "qualified teachers highly trained in their subjects" (Heward, 2013, p. 27). With regards to special education legislation, IDEA ensures the availability of a free, appropriate, public education that emphasizes services "designed to meet their [students'] unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living" (Heward, 2013, p. 16).

Progressive education focuses on the integration of students through hands-on learning and their development in a democratic setting (Flinders & Thornton, 1998). This approach values students' experiences and focuses on their experiential learning that prepares them for life outside of school. Progressive education also puts emphasis on a child's lifelong learning and social needs by encouraging a combination of group work and independent work, critical thinking, and creativity (Kohn, 2008). This theme is evident in the special education student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP), which explicitly describes, among other things, the services and supplementary aids that are to be provided to a student to ensure that his/her needs are met through the necessary, individualized accommodations (Heward, 2013). According to Heward

(2013), a student's IEP "spells out where the child is, where she should be going, how she will get there, how long it will take, and how to tell if and when she has arrived" (p. 62).

These progressive thoughts, as well as their implementation, are also reflected by the six major principles regulated by IDEA since 1975, which include Zero Reject, in which no child with disabilities may be excluded from a free public education, "regardless of the nature and severity of the disability;" Nondiscriminatory Evaluation, Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), and Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), where disabled students receive their education with non-disabled students "to the maximum extent appropriate" (Heward, 2013, p. 16-17).

Research has indicated that a progressive approach to education is far more effective than a traditional one. According to Kohn (2008),

> A truly impressive collection of research has demonstrated that when students are able to spend more time thinking about ideas than memorizing facts and practicing skills - and when they are invited to help direct their own learning – they are not only more likely to enjoy what they're doing but to do it better. Progressive education isn't just more appealing; it's also more productive. (p. 24)

This inference is only reinforced by the lack of research supporting the value of "standardized tests, homework, conventional discipline, competition, and other traditional practices" (Kohn, 2008, p. 24; Kohn, 2000; Kohn, 2006; Kohn, 1986). More recent studies confirm that traditional academic instruction for young children is counterproductive. A study conducted by Wenglinsky (2004) showed that students in elementary and middle schools enjoyed and did better in science when instruction was "centered on projects in which they took

a high degree of initiative. Traditional activities, such as completing worksheets and reading primarily from textbooks, seemed to have no positive effect" (p. 33).

As the United States continues to move away from proletarian employment opportunities and toward 21st century jobs (Sullivan & Downey, 2015), the implication is that "districts must do a better job attending to the application of knowledge and skills, going beyond simply teaching students to 'reproduce' what they are taught within familiar contexts" (Jerald, 2009, p. 69). If students aren't learning effectively, it may be because of the persistence of traditional beliefs and practices in schools with students that are no longer capable of learning in this manner (Kohn, 2008). This is evident in special education students' IEPs, which must contain, as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), appropriate measurable postsecondary goals related to training, education, employment, as well as the transition services required to assist the child in achieving these goals (Heward, 2013).

Considering the historical, social, political, and philosophical events of the time are vital when analyzing the traditional and progressive themes of education. The development of each approach reflected the changes taking place in American society due to industrialization, urbanization, and immigration (Shortridge, 2007), as well as other significant events that contributed to the rise and ultimate decline of their adoption. The stock market crash of 1929, for instance, along with its political/social influences, caused a shift in the educational climate in favor of the progressive movement (Conner & Bohan, 2014). The need for social reform was evident as the number of school enrollments climbed exponentially because of the even greater number of unemployed Americans; accordingly, social reconstructionists demanded a change in the social studies courses being delivered to students to reflect the social problems facing the country (Conner & Bohan, 2014). The Depression era (1929 to 1939) arguably held the most

weight on the change and innovation of the American curriculum, particularly in social studies courses. Progressive textbook authors of the time completely changed the tone of textbooks and provided an intrepid and more critical analysis of American history in their work (Moreau, 2003); hence, instruction moved away from traditional characteristics.

Over a decade later, Pearl Harbor was attacked on December 7, 1941. According to Conner & Bohan (2014), before Pearl Harbor, the progressive education movement had reached its peak and characteristics of traditional education had nearly escaped educational institutions, but after this momentous event that had an enduring impact on American education, the decline of the progressive education movement and the re-implementation of the traditional theme had commenced (Conner & Bohan, 2014). During World War II, certain characteristics of progressive education, such as the need for critical analyses of society, became too risky and proposed a threat to the war effort (Conner & Bohan, 2014); thus, the educational climate during the Second World War initiated a shift from questioning American institutions to celebrating them (Altenbaugh, 2003). Now, good citizenship meant a compliant and patriotic student as well as a teacher that taught and supported such citizenship (Altenbaugh, 2003). As it had in World War I, education became more centralized during the Second World War (Evans, 2004) and many educational organizations were mobilized to support the war effort (Conner & Bohan, 2014). The war itself influenced both educational rhetoric and practice in secondary and postsecondary institutions. Although the war was fought overseas, "American schools [played] their part on the home front" (Kliebard, 1995, p. 203).

Often, educational institutions find that they are no longer committed to being unapologetically, *educationally* progressive; instead, they have adopted an atmosphere of progressive in only the political or cultural sense of the theme (Kohn, 2008) and are actually

employing an adversarial approach throughout the school. Of course, it is unrealistic to expect an educational institution to implement progressive ideas in every detail. Schools can, however, adopt progressive characteristics that reflect a commitment to such an approach.

The application of progressivism in American curricula, a major content area within the field of education, can be analyzed at the zenith of the progressive education movement, and again at its decline. During the former, progressives had pushed for a change in curricula in order to reflect the reality of the societal and economic events influencing the conditions of the nation. They believed that students should be exposed to the actual events that had taken, or are currently taking, place within their community. In contrast, during the latter, the American curriculum was expected to portray the nationalistic and ideal American values and traditions to inspire patriotic, unquestioning youth and obedient teachers that encouraged such transformations.

Effectively serving special education students in regular school environments has been and continues to be an important progressive theme of special education reform (Wang & Reynolds, 1996). According to Wang & Reynolds (1996), it is a great victory that each phenomenon of legislation pertaining to special education strives to secure an inclusive and beneficial education for all children, showing a "steady trend of progressive education" (p. 20) in its focus on the individual needs of the students. In addition, a progressive approach in special education implies ensuring special education students' inclusion (Heward, 2013), treating them as valuable members of society and ensuring their provision of the relevant services to help them succeed in their least restrictive environment. The needs of a special education program can only be met through the implementation of a progressive approach to education in American institutions.

References

Ackerman, D. B. (2003). Taproots for a new century: Tapping the best of traditional and

progressive education. *Phi Delta Kappa, 84,* 344-349.

Altenbaugh, R. J. (2003). *The American people and their education: A social history.* Upper

Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Berrett, D. (2012). Harvard conference seeks to jolt university teaching. *The Chronicle of Higher*

Education. Retrieved from https://www.chronicle.com/article/Harvard-Seeks-to-

Jolt/130683.

Conner, C. J., & Bohan, C. H. (2014). The Second World War's impact on the progressive

educational movement: Assessing its role. *The Journal of Social Studies Research, 38,*

91-102.

DeLorenzo, R. A., Battino,W, Schreiber, R., & Carrio, B. (2009). *Delivering on the promise*.

Bloomingham, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Evans, R. W. (2004). *The social studies wars: What should we teach the children?* New York:

Teachers College Press.

Fallace, T. D. (2015). *Race and the origins of progressive education, 1880-1929.* New York:

Teachers College Press.

Flinders, D. J., & Thornton, S. J. (Eds.). (1998). *The curriculum studies reader.* (3rd ed.). New

York: Routledge.

Har, L. B. (2011). A reflective account of a preservice teacher's effort to implement a

progressive curriculum in field practice. *Schools: Studies in Education, 8,* 22-39.

Heward, W. L. (2013). *Exceptional children: An introduction to special education* (10th ed.).

Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Jerald, C. (2009). *Defining a 21st century education.* The Center for Public Education. Retrieved

from www.cfsd16.org/public/_century/pdf/Defininga21stCenturyEducation_Jerald_

2009.pdf.

Kauffman, J. M., & Landrum, T. J. (2013). *Characteristics of emotional and behavioral*

disorders of children and youth (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Kliebard, H. M. (1995). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958.* (2nd ed.). New

York: Routledge.

Kohn, A. (1986). *No contest: The case against competition.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Kohn, A. (2000). *The case against standardized testing.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kohn, A. (2006). *The homework myth.* Cambridge, MA: DaCapo Press.

Kohn, A. (2008). Progressive education: Why it's hard to beat, but also hard to find. *Independent*

School, 67(3), 18-30.

Krug, E. A. (1972). *The shaping of the American high school*, Vol. 2. Madison, WI: University

of Wisconsin Press.

Kuykendall, C. (2004). *From rage to hope: Strategies for reclaiming Black and Hispanic*

students (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.

Moreau, J. (2003). *School book nation: Conflicts over American history textbooks from the Civil*

War to the present. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Pogrow, S. (2006). The Bermuda Triangle of American education: Pure traditionalism, pure

progressivism, and good intentions. *Phi Delta Kappan, 88*(2), 142-150.

Powell, M. (2000). Can Montessorians and Constructivists really be friends? *Montessori Life,*

44-51.

Pring, R. (2007). *Continuum Library of Education Thought*. New York: Continuum

    International.

Ramsey, M., Jolivette, K., Patterson, D., & Kennedy, C. (2010). Using choice to increase time

    on-task, task-completion, and accuracy for students with emotional/behavior disorders in

    residential facility. *Education and Treatment of Children, 33*, 1-21.

Shortridge, P. D. (2007). Maria Montessori and educational forces in America. *Montessori Life,*

    34-47.

Silva, E., White, T., & Toch, T. (2015). *The Carnegie unit: A century old standard in a changing*

    educational landscape. CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

    Retrieved from www.carnegiefoundation.ord.

Sullivan, S. C., & Downey, J. A. (2015). Shifting educational paradigms: From traditional to

    competency-based education for diverse learners. *American Secondary Education, 43*(3),

    4-19.

Wang, M. C., & Reynolds, M. C. (1996). Progressive inclusion: Meeting new challenges in

    special education. *Theory Into Practice, 35,* 20-25.

Wenglinsky, H. (2004). Facts or critical thinking skills? *Educational Leadership, 62*, 32-35.

Windschitl, M. (2006). Why we can't talk to one another about science education reform. *Delta*

    Kappa, 87(5), 349 - 355.