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Science (Nature Study) as well as Mathematics was taught in practical ways. We measured daily the growth of a banana leaf from a plant growing by the front steps and, as I remember, the growth was six inches or more. We also had a hive of bees with glass on one side so we could watch them. (Dora Derby, Mrs. Cooke’s daughter, from her memories of the first year, 1918, as cited in Palmer, 1968, p. 5).

A Brief Introduction to Hanahau‘oli School
Hanahau‘oli School was launched in 1918 when Sophie Judd Cooke and her husband George brought together their six children with friends on a vacant lot at the corner of Makiki and Nohea (Nowewhi, then) Streets. The land, almost two acres, was surrounded by a lava rock wall built in 1902 and had belonged to C. M. Cooke, Ltd. Two small buildings that the Cookes moved to the site from their Makiki Heights home became the school’s classroom building and shop. Much of the lot was left open for a campus playground and eventually included Hawai‘i’s first jungle gym.

Sixteen children, ranging in age from six to eleven years old, were the first students of this small school, which functioned as a large or extended family. Academic subjects were taught by Miss Cecil Palmer, assisted by Miss Ruth Farrington, that first year. They were joined by Japanese and French teachers, along with Mrs. A. A. Wilson, who traveled to Makiki from Wahiawa two days a week to teach shop. The importance of the shop cannot be overstated as it was a center of much of the learning at Hanahau‘oli, not unlike at John Dewey’s Chicago Laboratory School, where children could work out their ideas in the process of “doing,” characteristic of the progressive education tradition. The school was built upon the belief expressed by Dewey in My Pedagogical Creed that the experience of schooling should be a part of life and not separate from it: “process of living and not simply a preparation for future living. . . .” (Dewey, 1897 in Dworkin, 1959, p.22).

While a fairly radical departure from traditional schooling at that time, the progressive movement was gaining currency nationwide. Mrs. Cooke, along with family friends, had been reading progressive educators like Francis Parker, William Heard Kilpatrick, and John Dewey. A fortuitous meeting with Mrs. Goodrun Thorne-Thomsen of the Francis Parker School in Chicago, who offered practical advice, according to Palmer, for starting a school. “Our school was ‘progressive’ in every sense of the word. We tried new methods and broke with the stilted formal type of instruction which was common at that time.” (Cooke, 1964, p. 78). She named her school “Hanahau‘oli” meaning “Joyful Work” at the suggestion of her brother Henry.

Defying the criticism of many in the community by starting a progressive school, Sophie Judd Cooke followed her beliefs derived from the Progressive Education movement that methods like “correlating (integrating) the work and ‘learning by doing’” were cornerstones of good education and that developing individual and group initiative through projects would be the result of the Hanahau‘oli experience. (Cooke, 1964, p.79). The connection to Dewey in the school’s aims and beliefs was evident from the start. The 1919 school bulletin clearly expressed its aims in Dewey terms:

Our aim is to give the child opportunities for self expression and to provide, through the interests and activities of the school, occupations necessary for the development and unfolding at each stage of his individual powers and capabilities; to show him how he can exercise these powers, both mechanically and socially, in the little world he finds about him.
As Louisa Palmer notes in *Memories*, Hanahau‘oli’s progressive beliefs included the following principles:

- Education is a process of living.
- School life grows out of home life.
- Moral training results from entering into “proper relations with others in a unity of work and thought.”
- Each child’s “endowments” differ from that of others.

Even clearer evidence of the close tie to Dewey was the 1923 bulletin which quotes directly from John and Evelyn Dewey’s *Schools of Tomorrow*: “To find out how to make (find) knowledge when it is needed is the true end of acquisition of information in school, not the information itself” (Palmer, 1968, p. 16). Of equal interest to those who wonder about the progressive legacy at Hanahau‘oli over its almost one hundred year history may be that this statement still guides much of today’s curriculum development at the school. The standards cited in the 1923 bulletin for a “modern school” are the ability to think, to execute, to lead, to co-operate, to judge and to organize (the student’s) own methods of work—the very standards that we continue to hold to today and the ones that are described by contemporary educators as “Twenty-first Century skills.”

From the outset, Hanahau‘oli has been a school that subscribes to the notion that first-hand experiences, especially through excursions, give real meaning to learning that information gained from reading a book can, at best, only approximate. As far back as 1919, as captured in a letter from Mrs. Cooke to Mrs. Thorne-Thomsen, there is a record of weekly excursions on Mondays after lunch with visits to places like the Bishop Museum, the Aquarium, the Sugar Planter’s Experiment Station, the printing office, the wharves, the pineapple cannery, Makiki Valley stream, and the blacksmith shop. Mrs. Cooke notes, “These excursions to actually ‘see and experience’ continue to be a vital part of Hanahau‘oli’s work.” (Palmer, 1968, p. 3).

For Mrs. Cooke, the success of her efforts was validated by John Dewey himself during a visit to Honolulu in 1951. “Our crowning event was when Dr. John Dewey, who advocated this theory of teaching, and Mrs. Dewey, came to visit our school and gave us ‘the green light’. This gratified us.” (Cooke, 1964, p. 79).

Given this brief introduction to Hanahau‘oli and its connection with progressive educational thought, the main task of this article is to examine the place of these ideas in the more recent history of the school and to explore their meaning for today’s world of rapid global and digital change. My aims are to examine how current the educational philosophy of the Progressives is for the world of our children’s future lives, when they will come to occupy positions of leadership, and to assess just how “progressive” these traditions and beliefs are.

**Progressive Educational Practice at Hanahau‘oli**

While the mission of Hanahau‘oli has undergone revision over the years, it retains the essential features of the aims and principles cited above: respect for the uniqueness of each individual child; development of individuals who are independent and collaborative; education that challenges and promotes the joy of learning; deepening the child’s understanding of the world through critical and creative thinking; recognizing the natural way of learning by emphasizing “learning by doing,” building a strong connection between home and school; and placing an emphasis upon the arts (*Hanahau‘oli Mission Statement*, revised 2010). The mission’s underlying beliefs are clearly recognizable in the original standards of Hanahau‘oli:

- recognizing that parents are a child’s first teachers and work with the school to promote learning;
- educating the whole child: cognitively, socially, physically and emotionally;
- valuing the natural way children learn and the need for time to be a child;
- providing a developmentally appropriate, child-centered program;
- respecting that children demonstrate different strengths and develop at different rates;
- recognizing that real-life problems and situations offer the best means for constructing meaning;
- supporting collaborative learning, inquiry and self reflection; and,
- focusing on continuous progress for each child as it provides feedback on learning and promotes growth.

Just as the Progressives of John Dewey’s day spoke to the founders of the school, their ideas are still prominent in
the school’s life today and hold promise for guidance of the school in future.

A few years ago, Alfie Kohn wrote an article for *Independent School* (2008), the journal of the National Association of Independent Schools, in which he lamented the lack of progressive schools while extolling their value in today’s world. He cites three basic characteristics of the progressive school, which I will use as the framework for demonstrating Hanahau’oli’s alignment with the progressive tradition: active learning, community collaboration, and teaching the whole child.

### Active Learning and Deep Understanding

Children actively inform the curriculum with their questions, solutions, and explanations; they help to form and evaluate what is learned and are engaged in constructing meaning rather than passively absorbing information. Facts and skills have little meaning themselves but only in a context and for a purpose. Learning becomes centered around themes, projects, and the questions that children pose. Such learning encourages connection-making, concept development, and understanding about how their world functions. Teaching becomes interdisciplinary.

Hanahau’oli’s curriculum is designed around thematic units in social studies and science because of its commitment to the notion that three questions motivate all learning: Who am I? How does the world work? Where do I fit in that world? Units created by the teachers, with student input, address these questions and support children’s natural inquisitiveness. The units are designed to promote the understanding of concepts to help children organize their world and eventually form generalizations about how the world works. These concepts are abstract and broad; they include change, interdependence, adaptation, technology, diversity, survival, and others that unite the curriculum both horizontally and vertically.

Individual units in the JK to Grade 6 program, support a wide variety of topics of study that include human needs, community needs, our island environment, family issues, environmental sustainability, and the origins of democracy. Children at all levels are invited to share what they already know about a topic and what they would like to learn. In this way, they help to shape the direction of their studies, indicate their levels of understanding, and provide input into different areas of interest and focus. Building upon student interests supports active engagement and, when work is shared with the whole group, enhances collective learning. As Dewey would agree, children are giving direction to the curriculum but not determining it. The latter is the responsibility of the adult, the teacher, whose experience is broader and more mature and whose job it is to determine what is important to be learned.

What has become known as “learning by doing” or “hands-on” learning is emphasized as children venture into the community to research the subject-matter being studied while developing their understandings through problem formulation, problem solving, simulated learning, and the experience of interacting directly with the environment.

Very much in the Deweyan tradition, the school’s thematic units help children understand that there need be no separation between school and life. School is life and life is learning. Rather than preparing for the future, Dewey believed that education should address what the child needs to know now. The best way to do that is to allow the curriculum to grow out of real home, work, and life situations—like the construction of a new school building.

Construction on campus over the years has provided an ideal area of study for children to investigate. Observing concrete footings being poured for one of our new buildings, children raised questions associated with physics, chemistry, and mathematics as well as with how cement is made. These observations were developed through visits to a cement factory to learn what is involved in the manufacturing process. The children also raised questions for investigation about occupations, tool usage, and gender roles. One of our groups during a project questioned why so few women were on the work crews and interviewed the contractors and workers to seek answers to their question. Another group assumed the role of photojournalists to capture the campus development with digital cameras. They followed up by interviewing those directly affected (students, teachers, and administrators) about how demolition, construction, and new “homes” in which to carry out their work would affect them. Researching, collecting data, and recording results led to the publication of their findings, which they subsequently shared with the school community.

Another group, as part of a project on change and constancy in social studies, made an historical study of our school campus. They interviewed alumni, school administrators, and parents and examined the school archives
for further information. These children constructed three models of the campus covering its founding in 1918, the War Years in the 1940s, and the envisioned new building. The conclusions they drew from the study helped them to understand their world and how it works. They recognized that while the school and campus have experienced change over time, there are some things that can be counted on to stay the same: the importance of experiential learning, the traditions valued by the school community, the value of school’s small size, and the symbolic significance of the school’s bell.

Models of the buildings as they emerged during planning became projects for the study of scale and proportion as well as material usage by some of the older children. The skills and understandings needed to proceed with these activities were integrated into the units, giving them meaning and utility as well as emphasizing that learning is “for now” and not merely a preparation for the future. These examples support Dewey’s notion of what can be called “educative” activities—they are based on children’s interests, grow out of experience, support development, give meaning to skill application, require joint problem solving, and contribute to deep understanding.

A challenge that the Hanahau’oli mixed age, Kualiiwi group (second and third graders) completed this past spring is one that exemplifies our emphasis upon project-based learning. As part of their year-long study of community and interdependence, the group studied how communities make changes over time to meet the needs of their members. Already having studied Hanahau’oli as an interdependent school community, the Kualiiwi children were asked to investigate a real campus problem—its aging playground and play structure. Identifying the need—the current playground is getting old and may become unsafe—the children took on the challenge of designing a new playground that would be more appealing and useful to all community members. They also required that it be safe, and (at the request of the Head of School), that it be more natural in design. The expertise necessary to complete this design project was identified as children applied to take on a variety of roles such as historians, field researchers, designers, and builders. Children were asked to consider their areas of interest and strengths and to indicate how they wished to participate and contribute. This would be a cross-disciplinary project, which the specific roles required; and it would be one that demanded collaboration and an understanding of interdependence both within and among groups.

Guided by an architect parent who met with the full group, the historians were advised to understand their past to get to the future, and not to let their story go. The historians, much like their counterparts during the campus construction, utilized the archival resources as a basis for their research. They also interviewed faculty members of long-standing and some alumni who shared their playground memories, giving this group an historical sense of the growth of the playground and how decisions for change were made in the past. They even consulted notes from the last ad hoc Playground Committee, who were responsible for the current playground design that the students were seeking to change.

The field researchers divided up their work. While some interviewed teachers and children throughout the school to determine needs and wants, others honed their observation and data-collection skills by examining current usage by different age levels during actual recess times. All of their information was shared with the designers who wrestled with the various needs and demands of the school community as they developed drawings for the builders. Notably, the children revealed a sensitivity to the needs of young children with physical challenges and looked for solutions to how the designs could meet safety and access needs. These designs were presented to the physical education teacher, the Head of School, and the board’s Physical Plant Committee for feedback. Following a sharing with the group in which the drawings were explained and a rationale was presented, a final selection was made based upon the group’s assessment of which design best met the needs of the project. The builders were assigned the task of translating the design into a three-dimensional model. This task required extensive measuring, both outside and inside, and the application of the concept of scale along with creative use of materials. The project culminated in a final presentation before an audience of the Playground Planning Committee.

All of these groups integrated a great deal of mathematics into their work. They employed communication skills—both literacy and design skills—to engage in collaborative problem solving and evaluation of their efforts through daily goal assessment accompanied by a final reflection about the design challenge itself. This was a unit
of high engagement because it was meaningful, demanded authentic intellectual activity, and demonstrated positive participation in community life—requirements that Dewey’s educational philosophy supports as elements of progressive learning. The design of a campus playground, elements of which the Playground Planning Committee intend to incorporate, reinforces the notion that school and life are not separate. This unit also models the correlation of the logical (facts) and the psychological (experience) within a social context, and thus represents the application of Dewey’s belief that subject matter gains meaning not as a collection of objective facts but as a human experience playing a part in the process of living.

**Community, Collaboration, and Social Justice**

In progressive learning environments, children learn with and from each other. They are places where competition yields to collaboration and, what may to some seem like diametric opposites, where independence and interdependence exist side-by-side. A sense of community is fostered as responsibility for self and others is encouraged. Students are assisted to realize that they are part of “widening circles of care” that extend beyond immediate social groups to include a more global world.

“When the school introduces and trains each child of society into membership within such a little community (the school), saturating him with the spirit of service... we shall have the deepest and best guaranty of a larger society which is worthy, lovely and harmonious.” (Dewey, 1899 in Dworkin, 1959, p. 49).

John Dewey’s emphasis upon the individual reflects an understanding that society’s needs are best met when educators capitalize upon the collective strengths, interests, and talents of the community’s individual members. And in order for that to happen, the individual needs of group members should be met. For Dewey, service and spirit are to permeate the entire curriculum and, in effect, the fabric of the school. Working together on a project or an activity implies contributing to something larger than one’s self, to a common and shared purpose. And, the “doing” of an activity is insufficient in his view to meet this purpose. Practical engagement also required the act of “thinking” or “reflecting” to better understand human needs. (Tanner, 1997, p. 3-5).

At Hanahau’oli, the principle of the individual as a community member is a natural outgrowth of both the social studies thematic unit as well as the school environment which promotes a sense of communal living and shared responsibilities. The most obvious demonstrations of this principle are evident in the daily life of the school ranging across such activities as classroom “jobs,” reading/writing buddies, and sixth-grade classroom helpers. The latter role is an “applied-for” position with a periodic performance assessment to ensure the helper is meeting obligations and fulfilling community responsibilities—a very Deweyan notion of school as lived experience. Mentoring in our multiage classrooms by continuing (second year) students is a natural outgrowth of learning about leadership and inclusion. This type of “community service” is defined within the school context. It is a first step toward understanding that a community is a group of people working together to seek a common result. It also reflects a natural extension of the place of family and home as the child’s first teachers and it emphasizes a growing sense of belonging with its attendant responsibilities. Such tasks are applications of John Dewey’s belief that school life grows out of home life and should “deepen and extend the child’s sense of values bound up in his home life” (Dewey, 1897 in Dworkin, 1959, p.23).

Beyond the classroom and campus walls, community involvement is most often a natural result of inquiries that arise from areas of study that emphasize discovering how the world works. An example from a few years ago came about in a Habitat for Humanity project that involved providing lunches for workers. This project arose from one group’s study of the need for shelters in which they learned about Habitat for Humanity’s effort to support affordable housing. Unable to participate in the actual house-building, the students nevertheless wanted to contribute, so they devised a lunch program for workers and, with their parent’s help, carried it out.

Another example grew out of a study of our local community. Children on a learning trip to downtown Honolulu encountered numbers of homeless people and were surprised to discover that even children can be homeless. Wanting to learn more, they contacted a social service agency to find out how they could become involved with this community issue. Discovering that toiletries were in great need, the children conducted a school-wide
drive to help meet this need for homeless children and their families. In both instances, children reflected about the socio-economic problems of our local community as an outgrowth of their unit studies and used that information to help address the problem.

These are examples of developing that “spirit of service” cited above and of introducing children to the concept of social justice. Both support the progressive idea that education is intended to improve the quality of life, for the individual and the community. Perhaps the most explicit expression of these principles can be found in the sixth-grade classroom. The goal for the sixth grade students is “balancing responsibilities of the greater whole with those of ourselves.” This goal is played out as children study the following central pairs of concepts: self and society; conflict and harmony; diversity and unity; constancy and change. As they complete their final year at Hanahau’oli, children are given opportunities to reflect about themselves as individuals and learners and to practice what it means to be a member of a democratic community. They create a Greek Polis or city-state and set it up as a working community with defined responsibilities, expectations for individual and group functioning, and projects that require sharing individual strengths and talents while supporting the group’s overall goals. The on-going reflection and assessment of how the group is functioning opens opportunities for improvement, problem-solving, and discovery of the importance of respecting and considering diverse viewpoints. Their project is to build a model of community living and democratic decision-making, and to learn this by learning from the experience. It is worth noting that collaboration in all the preceding examples is a key element in community living as defined by Hanahau’oli and its emphasis upon shared projects.

The Whole Child and Intrinsic Motivation

The ideas of teaching the whole child and encouraging them through intrinsic motivation are implicit in the preceding sections but are important to explicate as Dewey values that inform practice at Hanahau’oli.

Teaching the Whole Child

The phrase, “whole child,” may be considered a much over-used one, but questions can be raised about how well-practiced it is once children move beyond the preschool years. It denotes the importance Dewey placed on learning being more than the traditionally academic; it extends to learning how to be a good person as well as moving beyond just verbal and mathematical proficiency. It includes attending to all parts of the child and offering opportunities for growth in the social and physical realm as well as opening opportunities to discover passions and make connections. The second construct, intrinsic motivation, is one worthy of conversation at all levels of education as it addresses a critical issue for progressives, the perception by many that the primary purpose of learning is a utilitarian one. Not only did Dewey support the value of learning derived from the satisfaction of knowing but he also believed, as stated above, that education is a process of living, one that addresses what a person needs to know at the time and not a preparation for future living.

While social development is at the heart of all Hanahau’oli classrooms, in which children and teachers define and create learning communities, opportunities to develop, explore, and refine interests along with talents and passions are also key to each child’s Hanahau’oli experience. The arts play a central role as vehicles for both accessing knowledge and expressing what has been learned. They offer an opportunity to experience life and learn about one’s self and others. Hanahau’oli believes that by virtue of the fact that the arts are an expression of self and culture, they are a worthy areas of study. Even more than that, they also offer children alternative ways of expressing their learning and validate individual strengths.

A project involving the visual arts teacher and a parent who works with mosaics offered the Kulaiwi children an opportunity to express their learning by creating an accurate, wall-sized mural depicting the ocean zones and creatures that inhabit them. Serving as docents for visitors, children explained the nature of the mural and the interdependence of the creatures and their environments. Not only did they become knowledgeable about the ocean itself, but they also learned the mosaic processes required for the mural creation. Teachers often encourage children to demonstrate their learning through visual representations, recognizing the unique skills of some and the limitations that verbal responses may have as reliable measures for determining what a child has learned.

By placing emphasis on the whole child other areas of development and potential interest are opened up, such as
Intrinsic Motivation

*The child’s own instinct and powers furnish the material and give the starting point for all education.* (Dewey, 1897 in Dworkin, 1959, p.20).

According to Dewey, student interest is a key factor in planning for instruction and the curriculum. It offers the motivation for learning and the satisfaction of having one’s questions answered following inquiry. This does not imply, like the more child-driven approach of A. S. Neil at Summerhill, that children should be allowed to decide what and when to study something. Rather, it recognizes that as a teacher plans, she needs to consider the context in which she is teaching and the children in her classroom. At Hanahau’oli, this approach ensures that even when the same thematic units are taught over time, they will always be different and adapted to the group of children engaged in a lesson—the differences shaped by both the developmental stage and experiences and interests of the current group.

Dewey valued the authority of the teacher as a knowledgeable individual whose experience equips her to determine what is important to learn from a conceptual and thematic vantage. At the same time, he argued that children need to be drawn into the planning. One means to achieve this is for the teacher to “interpret the child’s interests” and because of her experience open opportunities for the potential of that interest to be maximized or expanded. At Hanahau’oli, children are invited into this process as teachers explore what the children already know about a topic, the questions they have, and what they might like to learn. Utilizing that information to guide planning ensures that children have a voice in the direction of the curriculum, which is vertically organized around conceptual themes to enhance and extend understanding as the children mature.

Identifying what children already understand informs instructional planning as teachers seek to build children’s understanding without judging the validity or accuracy of their efforts. Teachers then question the children to help clarify their thinking and utilize what they hear to frame activities and instruction. For example, a topical unit about food for younger children at Hanahau’oli included a subunit about plants and their needs. Children seemed to “have the words” to identify those needs—water, sunlight and air—so the teachers took the opportunity to ask two questions to promote further inquiry: “How do you know? and How can you find out if that is true?” The children proceeded to

The emphasis upon creative activity can be interpreted to support, as Laurel Tanner notes in *Dewey’s Laboratory School*, Dewey’s assertion in *Moral Principles in Education* (1909): “‘...every method that appeals’ to the child’s ‘capacities in construction, production, and creation, marks an opportunity to shift the center of ethical gravity from an absorption which is selfish to a service which is social.’” (Dewey, 1909, p. 26 in Tanner, 1997, p.36).
identify explorable questions (Do plants need air to survive? Do plants need light from the sun?). They were then divided into six investigation groups to make “thoughtful guesses” and set up their investigation plans. Teachers respected children’s plans and offered guidance when a group found it needed support. The most interesting results were derived from plans that initially did not work and from the further inquiry and questions the revisions produced. Children guided this work by determining the interest groups and the questions to pursue, and they did this within the larger context of a unit designed around food as a basic need and the intended learning outcomes that were related to plants as a primary source of food and an integral part of food chains. This unit took advantage of children as natural scientists and yielded “control” of the unit to the children by building upon their interests and understandings. (Inouye & Ross, 2009, p. 21–25).

Projects like this amount to what Alfie Kohn describes as “taking the child seriously.” He notes that, “progressive educators take their cue from the children—and are particularly attentive to differences among them” (2008, p. 21). Thus, the curriculum at Hanahau’oli is designed with the cooperation of the children, and teachers are alert to the idea that children’s questions, knowledge, and experiences may take them in unexpected but valuable directions.

Afterthoughts: The Progressive School in the Twenty-first Century

John Dewey’s understanding of the nature of learning and instruction continues to have relevance today and inform both best practices and curricular focus. Despite the bias reflected in this manuscript in favoring progressive education, it seems evident that educators who support the emphasis on Twenty-first Century Skills will find the progressive tradition informative and instructive as the focus of educational reform shifts from teaching to learning. Current opinion that twenty-first century learners need to be effective and interactive communicators, creative problem solvers, collaborative team members, and critical thinkers harkens back to the outcomes that Dewey sought at his University Lab School—goals shared with other progressive educators of his era. Seeking to provide learning opportunities that develop democratic citizens capable of working together to solve problems and improve the quality of life is the goal of progressive education whether at the local, national, or global level. And, it remains so today, albeit under the guise of sustaining international competitiveness—a value that is not reflective of Dewey’s thinking.

The twenty-first century curriculum is emerging as one that requires interdisciplinary thinking, thematic organization, and project-based learning that is informed by research. It is a curriculum that is connected to the community, both local and global, and extends beyond the classroom walls. It incorporates higher order thinking skills and multiple literacies, including familiarity with the use of technology. Skills and content are integrated and both are taught for application rather than simply as ends in themselves. The concept of knowledge is expanded beyond the memorization of facts to include the use of facts to demonstrate understanding. Teachers are urged to replace traditional means of assessment with more authentic methods that requires students to use what they have learned in real contexts and often with a target audience in mind. This emphasis views learning rather than teaching as the primary goal of education. The teacher becomes a facilitator of that learning by creating the opportunity for it to occur, knowing her students well enough to match their needs, and stretching them to meet challenges. Learners are active participants in their learning and not passive recipients; the goal being to create independent, self-directed individuals who are resourceful and find learning a natural part of daily life both in and out of school. Schools that subscribe to the progressive tradition can serve as models of the type of learning and instruction being called for by those espousing twenty-first century skill development. As Kohn notes, they are the characteristics that define a progressive school.

…it is the office of the school environment to balance the various elements in the social environment, and to see to it that each individual gets an opportunity to escape from the limitations of the social group in which he was born, and to come into living contact with a broader environment.” (Dewey, 1916, p. 20).

Among the literacies being sought are those made possible and important because of the digital age in which we live. They range from basic literacies such as critical reading and persuasive writing to visual, informational, and cultural literacy—all made more urgent by the expanding connectedness resulting from a rapidly changing technological world. Both progressive schools and more traditional
schools need to consider the impact upon learning that digital advances make possible. The question becomes, “How do we think about these changes within the context of schooling and educating?”

For many, this has become a question about how to integrate technology into the curriculum and the learning process. While this is a valid question to consider, it may not be the central question that John Dewey, if he were around today, would urge schools to think about. Rather, he might ask schools to consider what the impact of technology is upon society, both its positive and negative effects and its potential to improve the quality of life. Dewey understood that technology is in a continuous state of evolution and children must experience an education that recognizes that evolution. This conclusion can be extrapolated from his observations about the Industrial Revolution in The School and Society, “The change that comes first to mind... is the industrial one—the application of science resulting in the great inventions that have utilized the forces of nature on a vast and inexpensive scale: the growth of a world-wide market as the object of production, of vast manufacturing centers to supply this market, of cheap and rapid means of communication and distribution between all its parts... One can hardly believe that there has been a revolution in all history so rapid, so extensive, so complete” (Dewey, 1899, in Dworkin, 1959, p. 35).

Understanding the influence of industrial change was an important part of Dewey’s Laboratory School curriculum for children, and the technological inventions that comprise the dominant features of our digital age will continue to be so for the curriculum of the future. Within today’s context, I would venture to assume that Dewey would urge schools to find the balance between direct encounters with the world, both human and physical, and expanding students’ understanding by using technological tools in their projects. Technology supports the progressive tradition when it enhances a “hands-on” approach involving human interactions. A frog dissection app, a virtual tour of the Ko‘olau Mountains, a “face-time” interview with an Arctic explorer or a Hōkūle’a sailor are all examples of experiences that enhance understanding and bring resources to the child that might not otherwise be available to them.

Equally important is an emphasis upon the social impact of technology. Digital citizenship and responsible use of digital tools that encourages informed and discriminating use of technology and which supports positive interactions among students are essential when educating children about social effects. It is also important to educate families about how to responsibly model and teach their children about the value and public nature of digital communication. Future issues to keep in mind in this ever-changing world are the impact of technology on brain development, the value of family life and activities, and the balance for children that comes from needing “green time” outdoors and the moderate use of tech tools during free time.

At Hanahau‘oli, we know that our children will face a high-tech future. It is a change that connotes the progressive nature of life. Dewey recognized that education is a process of living, and he believed you cannot forecast what the world will be like for the next generation. We at Hanahau‘oli similarly believe that schools cannot prepare children for a predictable set of circumstances for their future. Our goal is to give the child, to use Dewey’s words, “command of himself” which is achieved through an active social and physical education that empowers them to discover how the world works—through creative activity and learning the worth of individual contributions in collective efforts. (Dewey, 1897, in Dworkin, 1959, p. 21–22).

This approach prepares our graduates to be prepared for life through learning in the moment. In Democracy and Education (1916), Dewey writes that “Where schools are equipped with laboratories, shops and gardens, where dramatizations, plays and games are freely used, opportunities exist for reproducing situations of life and for acquiring and applying information and ideas in carrying forward of progressive experiences” (Dewey, 1916, p.161–61). Thus, education becomes a balance between the “real” world and the “virtual” world, where children utilize technology to enhance their learning by offering experiences they might otherwise not have and explore questions derived from their inquiries. It is an education that allows children to visit places and for teachers to bring places to children that they cannot experience directly. Digital tools provide these opportunities; and as children explore and use them, they must also come to understand their impact upon the individual as a member of society. At the same time, it is important to recognize that, at times, “unplugging” will be necessary as research indicates that opportunities to “play” without direction is essential for developing creative thinking.
Progressive schools, by their very nature, need to respond to changing societal conditions. Within that context, learning guided by the teachings of John Dewey will not only make the progressive tradition sustainable but also make it increasingly relevant in a future that will increasingly make demands on students to possess the knowledge to respond to change effectively and productively.
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