The Great Educational Experiment

Reclaiming the Developmental Foundations of Learning

Jeffrey E. Hansen, PhD

For more than a generation, our children have been the subjects of one of the largest uncontrolled experiments in educational history, and what makes this so unsettling is that it was conducted not in the spirit of careful developmental inquiry but in the cultural momentum of innovation for its own sake. We changed how they were taught to read. We changed the medium through which they learned. We altered the sensory and attentional environment of the classroom. And we did all of this at once, often with great confidence and very little long-term evidence that these changes were aligned with the way the developing brain actually forms.

I was trained in a structured phonetic model of reading instruction that worked because it respected neurodevelopment. Written language is not innate to the human nervous system. The brain must build a reading network by linking visual symbols to phonological processing and meaning through repetition, sequencing, and embodied practice. Systematic phonics provided

that scaffold. It was not fashionable. It was effective. It endured because it produced fluent readers across generations.

The movement away from that model did not occur because the brain changed. It occurred within a broader educational climate that too often equated what was longstanding with what was suspect. In significant sectors of modern pedagogy, tradition came to be viewed as an obstacle to liberation rather than as the accumulated memory of what had worked for developing human beings. Structure was replaced by immersion. Mastery was replaced by exposure. At precisely the same historical moment, printed texts were displaced by screens in the name of efficiency, modernization, and scalability. An entire generation of children became the test case for these converging shifts, and the outcomes are now visible in classrooms, clinics, and homes.

When the Medium Changes the Mind

The research comparing reading across media is no longer ambiguous. When time on task is equal, comprehension and long-term retention are consistently stronger when students read from printed text rather than from screens, especially when the material requires integration, reflection, and conceptual depth. This difference is not about preference. It reflects the embodied nature of cognition.

A physical book provides spatial and tactile anchors. The reader knows where they are in the text not only intellectually but physically. The thickness of the pages, the position of a paragraph, and the movement of the hands create a three-dimensional map of meaning that supports hippocampal encoding and contextual memory. Eye movements in print follow a slower, more linear pattern with frequent regressions for comprehension. Attention settles into a sustained mode.

Screen reading encourages a different neurological posture. Scrolling removes spatial location. Navigation decisions increase cognitive load. The visual environment invites scanning rather than immersion. The reader is subtly trained to extract information rather than to dwell within it. Over time this conditions the brain toward shallow processing and reduces the capacity for synthesis.

> This is not nostalgia for paper.
> It is neurobiology.

Brain State and the Capacity to Learn

From a polyvagal perspective, deep learning requires a ventral vagal state. The nervous system must experience sufficient physiological safety for the prefrontal cortex to sustain attention, integrate complexity, and generate meaning. High-stimulation digital environments bias the child toward sympathetic activation or dorsal withdrawal, states that are adaptive for threat response but incompatible with reflective cognition.

Integrative child psychiatrist Dr. Victoria Dunckley has described this clinically as Electronic Screen Syndrome, a pattern of sleep disruption, chronic stress activation, attentional fragmentation, and emotional lability in children whose nervous systems are immersed in fast-paced digital stimulation. In those states the brain can react, but it cannot synthesize. When higher-order learning is demanded from a chronically dysregulated nervous system, the predictable result is not only academic difficulty but a reduction in resilience itself, because resilience is the capacity of a regulated organism to remain engaged with challenge and return to balance after stress.

> A regulated brain learns.
>
> A dysregulated brain survives.

Early Warnings from Neuroscience and Clinical Practice

These concerns were not absent from the scientific literature. Long before the current cultural unease, my colleague, good friend, and co-author Dr. Andrew Doan, a graduate from Johns Hopkins with a medical degree and a PhD in neuroscience, a prominent neuroscientist who also holds advanced degrees in public health and aerospace medicine, was documenting the addictive architecture of interactive digital media. In his seminal work *Hooked on Games*, he named gaming addiction as a genuine neurobiological and clinical phenomenon at a time when the idea was widely dismissed. In our later book, *Digital Drugs and the Struggle for Connection*, we described how high-stimulation digital environments condition the dopaminergic reward system for compulsive engagement and erode the capacity for sustained attention and relational presence.

What was once regarded as alarmist has become ordinary classroom reality. Students skim but struggle to synthesize. They experience complexity as overwhelm rather than invitation. They avoid sustained effort not because they lack character but because their attentional systems have been trained for rapid novelty.

> The problem is not motivation.

The problem is state.

The Body Keeps the Score in the Classroom

To speak only of cognition is still too narrow. The same physiological dysregulation that undermines attention also contributes to the pediatric obesity crisis through sleep disruption, sedentary immersion, chronic stress hormone activation, and altered appetite signaling. We are not merely changing how children learn. We are altering the metabolic and autonomic conditions of their bodies.

Children live in time-dependent developmental windows. Language, regulation, social attunement, and attentional capacity do not develop indefinitely. When those windows are disrupted, the effects are not easily reversed. This became painfully clear during the COVID period, when policies designed for immediate safety often failed to account for the long-term relational and neurodevelopmental costs to children whose critical periods for social, linguistic, and regulatory development do not return once lost. Children are not abstractions in a policy debate. They are organisms in development.

When Progress Becomes Amnesia

It is necessary to name the cultural dynamic that made these converging shifts possible. In significant sectors of education there has been a form of progressivism that equates innovation with moral advancement and inherited practice with oppression. The intention has often been humane. The outcome has too frequently been the destabilization of methods that were developmentally-sound before their function was fully understood.

This is not an argument against change. It is an argument against change that occurs without a research base, without longitudinal evidence, and without respect for the time-dependent nature of childhood.

Children do not have experimental childhoods to spare.

Incentives, Systems, and the Question of Formation

The digitization of education was also the creation of a vast new market. Tools were adopted because they were scalable and fundable, and what was considered developmentally questionable for the children of those designing these technologies became normalized for everyone else. This does not require the assumption of malicious intent. It does require an honest examination of incentives.

When formation is subordinated to efficiency and delivery systems, the question of what kind of human being is being shaped recedes from view.

The Loss of Deep Reading

At its deepest level this is not a dispute about pedagogical technique. It is a question of whether a culture still understands how a mind is formed. Deep reading builds sustained attention, strengthens executive function, develops empathy, and creates the neurological conditions for moral imagination. It is one of the primary ways a person learns to inhabit a perspective not their own.

> When that capacity is weakened, the effects are not confined to academic performance.
> The architecture of the self is altered.

The Courage to Remember

There is, however, a profoundly hopeful way to read this moment. Nervous systems can be re-regulated. Cultures can recover memory. The data that now trouble us also illuminate a path forward. We already know how to teach reading in ways that align with the science of the brain. We already know that children require embodied learning, relational presence, and environments that support physiological regulation.

The task before us is not to reject the new but to discipline it. Innovation must be tested against the only standard that finally matters: does it deepen learning, strengthen regulation, and foster the long-term development of whole human beings?

> Not all innovation is advancement.
> Not all tradition is limitation.
> The task is discernment.

To restore printed texts to a central place in the formation of attention is not regression. To teach reading in ways that align with neurodevelopment is not nostalgia. To create classrooms in which nervous systems can settle is not a retreat from modernity. It is the recovery of the conditions under which resilience grows.

Resilience is not grit.

Resilience is a regulated nervous system capable of sustained engagement with reality.

If we are willing to hold on — dearly, even preciously — to those practices that have demonstrated their capacity to form human beings well, and if we are willing to welcome the genuinely new only after it has shown itself capable of doing the same, then this period will not be remembered as the era in which we lost the reading brain or destabilized childhood.

It will be remembered as the moment we recovered our developmental wisdom and chose once again to build human beings rather than systems.