The Prussian Model of Education

Alex Applebee & L. N. Combe

2026

The Obedience Factory: How an Eighteenth-Century King Designed Your Child's School and Why the Evidence Says Stop

Alex Applebee and L. N. Combe

OMXUS Research Series — Education, Paper 1

Author's Note

This paper exists because of Goal 12: *Every school is play, mastery, curiosity. Education redesigned around how humans actually learn. Not compliance. Not standardised testing. Play.*

That goal did not come from a policy seminar. It came from watching a seven-year-old cry because she drew the water cycle her own way and got a C. It came from watching children sit in rows for six hours a day in a building designed by a king who needed soldiers, managed by a bureaucracy that has never once asked whether any of this works.

We wrote this because the evidence is not thin. It is published in *Science*, in the *Review of Educational Research*, in the CDC's national health data. It is not hidden. It is not contested in any serious way. What is contested is whether anyone will act on it — because the factory model of schooling is not maintained by evidence. It is maintained by inertia, by institutional self-interest, and by the unexamined belief that more school, more homework, more testing, and more compliance must mean more learning.

They do not.

The alternatives — Finland, Montessori, Reggio Emilia, play-based early childhood education — are not theoretical. They are running right now, in real countries, with real children, producing better results by every measure. Academic, creative, social, emotional. Every measure.

This paper documents what the evidence says. It does not soften. Softening would be a disservice to the children still sitting in rows, still being graded on their ability to reproduce predetermined answers, still being told that their curiosity is disruptive and their creativity is wrong.

— A.A. & L.N.C.

Abstract

Modern compulsory schooling traces its structural origins to the Prussian *Generallandschulreglement* of 1763, a system designed explicitly to produce obedient subjects for the state. Imported to the United States by Horace Mann in 1843 and subsequently adopted worldwide, the Prussian factory model — age-graded classrooms, bell-scheduled periods, teacher-centred instruction, compliance-based assessment — remains the dominant paradigm of public education in 2026. This paper examines the historical origins, structural persistence, and evidentiary basis (or lack thereof) for this model. We review evidence from six domains: (1) the documented history of Prussian state schooling and its American importation; (2) Bryan Caplan's signalling model of education's economic returns; (3) Harris Cooper's meta-analytic evidence on homework; (4) comparative evidence from Finland's autonomy-based system; (5) experimental and quasi-experimental evidence from Montessori and Reggio Emilia approaches; and (6) the adolescent mental health crisis and its temporal correlation with educational intensification. We further review the Australian NAPLAN regime as a case study in the perverse incentives of standardised testing, and the evidence base for play-based learning as a developmentally appropriate alternative. We find that the factory model has no basis in developmental science, performs the same or worse than alternatives on its own academic metrics, and produces demonstrably inferior outcomes on creativity, intrinsic motivation, social development, and mental health. The most dramatic statistic in the education reform literature — Land's claim that creative genius declines from 98% to 2% between childhood and adulthood — cannot be independently verified and should not be cited as fact. The broader pattern of creativity decline is supported by peer-reviewed evidence (Kim, 2011). We conclude that the continuation of the factory model is not an evidence-based position but an institutional habit, and that the evidence supports a fundamental redesign of schooling around play, mastery, and curiosity.

Keywords: Prussian model, compulsory education, factory schooling, homework, Finland, Montessori, Reggio Emilia, NAPLAN, play-based learning, adolescent mental health, signalling theory, creativity

Table of Contents

1. Introduction: A King Who Needed Soldiers
2. The Prussian Origins: Schooling as State Infrastructure
3. The Factory Model: Why Schools Look Like Assembly Lines
4. Caplan's Signalling Model: What If School Doesn't Even Teach?
5. Finland: The Country That Did the Opposite
6. The Homework Evidence
7. Montessori: Evidence for an Alternative
8. Reggio Emilia: The Hundred Languages of Children
9. Play-Based Learning: What Developmental Science Actually Recommends
10. NAPLAN and the Australian Testing Regime
11. The Creativity Study That May Not Exist
12. The Mental Health Crisis and the School Connection

13. What the Evidence Actually Says
14. The Obedience Factory: Dave, Chloe, and the Water Cycle
15. References
16. Appendix A: Source Verification Notes
17. Appendix B: Cross-References to the OMXUS Research Series

---

1. Introduction: A King Who Needed Soldiers

In 1763, Frederick the Great of Prussia lost a war and needed obedient citizens. He built a system: children in rows, bells between periods, one teacher at the front, silence enforced, compliance rewarded. In 1843, an American named Horace Mann visited, liked what he saw, and brought it home. That system is still running. It is the school your child attends.

The evidence that it does not work — that it suppresses creativity, damages mental health, and exists primarily to sort people rather than teach them — is not thin. It is published in *Science*, the *Review of Educational Research*, and the CDC's national health data. The alternatives that work better — Finland, Montessori, Reggio Emilia, play-based learning — are not theoretical. They are running right now, in real countries, with real children, producing better results by every measure.

This paper brings together the historical record, the experimental evidence, the comparative data, and the mental health statistics. It asks a question that should not need asking: given everything we know about how children learn, why are we still doing what a Prussian king told us to do 263 years ago?

---

2. The Prussian Origins: Schooling as State Infrastructure

The story of modern compulsory education does not begin with children. It begins with a king who had just lost a war.

Frederick the Great of Prussia issued the *Generallandschulreglement* in 1763, in the aftermath of the Seven Years' War. The regulation established compulsory schooling for all children between the ages of five and thirteen. The stated purpose was not intellectual development, creative flourishing, or the cultivation of curiosity. It was the production of obedient subjects — citizens who would follow orders, pay taxes, and serve the state without asking inconvenient questions.

James Van Horn Melton's *Absolutism and the Eighteenth-Century Origins of Compulsory Schooling in Prussia and Austria* (1988) remains the most serious historical treatment of this period. Melton documents how the Prussian system was explicitly designed as a tool of state control. Schools were structured to instil punctuality, obedience, and docility. The curriculum was narrow: enough literacy for citizens to read state proclamations, enough numeracy for basic commerce, and enough religion to keep moral order. What was not on the curriculum was equally telling — no philosophy, no argument, no questioning of authority. The school was, in its architectural and pedagogical design, a barracks for the young.

This is not revisionist history or a modern reinterpretation. The Prussians were remarkably transparent about what they were building. Johann Julius Hecker, who helped design the system, wrote

openly about the need to cultivate *Untertanengeist* — the spirit of the subject. The goal was compliance, and the method was regimentation: fixed hours, fixed seating, fixed curriculum, a teacher at the front, and children silent in rows.

What happened next is the critical link to the present. In 1843, Horace Mann — then secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education — travelled to Prussia to study its school system. He returned impressed, and his *Seventh Annual Report to the Massachusetts Board of Education* (1844) became the blueprint for American public schooling. Mann praised the Prussian model for its efficiency, its uniformity, and its ability to produce a disciplined citizenry. Massachusetts adopted it. Other states followed. By the late nineteenth century, the Prussian model — age-graded classrooms, bells marking periods, a standardised curriculum, teacher-led instruction, compulsory attendance — was the foundation of public schooling across the United States, and through American cultural influence, across much of the world.

It is worth pausing on what Mann chose to import. He did not bring back the one-room schoolhouse or the tutorial model or the apprenticeship system. He brought back the factory. And the factory is what we still have.

2.1 The Australian Importation

Australia adopted the Prussian-derived model through British colonial education policy. The various colonial education acts of the 1870s and 1880s — Victoria's Education Act 1872, New South Wales' Public Instruction Act 1880, Western Australia's Elementary Education Act 1871 — established compulsory, secular, free schooling on the factory model. The same architecture: age-graded classrooms, centralised curriculum, compliance-based assessment, teacher as authority. The same purpose, barely disguised: the production of a literate, numerate, obedient workforce for the colonial economy.

By the time Australia federated in 1901, the factory model was entrenched across all six colonies. It has never been fundamentally questioned at the institutional level. The structure a child encounters in a government school in Bunbury, Western Australia in 2026 is recognisably the same structure Frederick the Great mandated in 1763: rows, bells, silence, compliance, reproduction of predetermined answers.

---

3. The Factory Model: Why Schools Look Like Assembly Lines

Walk into a public school in 2026 and you will find a building that would be immediately recognisable to a Prussian administrator from 1763. Children are sorted by age — not by interest, ability, or readiness. They move between rooms at the sound of a bell. They sit in rows facing a single authority figure. They are evaluated on their ability to reproduce predetermined answers. Deviation is punished. Compliance is rewarded.

This is not a metaphor. The factory model of schooling was consciously designed to mirror industrial production. In the early twentieth century, American education reformers like Ellwood Cubberley explicitly described schools as factories, with children as raw material and graduates as finished products. "Our schools are, in a sense, factories," Cubberley wrote in 1916, "in which the raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of life."

The persistence of this model is remarkable. Despite more than a century of criticism, despite waves of progressive education reform, despite an explosion of research in developmental psychology and neuroscience, the basic architecture of schooling has barely changed. The age-graded classroom is not the product of research into how children learn. No developmental psychologist, no neuroscientist, no cognitive scientist has ever argued that the best way for a seven-year-old to learn is to sit silently in a room with twenty-nine other seven-year-olds, listening to an adult talk. (I have not, admittedly, asked all of them.) The structure exists because it is efficient for the institution, not because it is effective for the child.

Peter Gray, in *Free to Learn* (2013), traces this disconnect between what we know about learning and what we do in schools. Gray argues that children are biologically designed to learn through play, exploration, and self-directed activity — and that formal schooling systematically suppresses every one of these drives. He documents how, across cultures and throughout human history, children learned by doing, by watching, by imitating, by asking questions, by failing and trying again. The classroom inverts this: the child is passive, the teacher is active, the curriculum is fixed, and failure is penalised.

The question is not whether the factory model works — by its own metrics, it does produce graduates who can read, write, and follow instructions. The question is what it destroys in the process.

3.1 What the Factory Destroys

The factory model does not merely fail to develop certain capacities. It actively suppresses them. Consider what the model requires of a child:

Sit still. Human children are the most physically active primates. Their bodies are designed for movement, climbing, running, rough-and-tumble play. The factory requires them to remain stationary for hours at a time. When they cannot — when their bodies do what bodies are designed to do — we diagnose them with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and medicate them into compliance. Jaak Panksepp's work on the PLAY circuit (1998, 2007) demonstrated that the drugs we use to treat ADHD — methylphenidate, amphetamines — work in part by suppressing the subcortical play system. We are chemically disabling a primary emotional system so that children can tolerate a building designed for a purpose other than their development.

Don't ask why. Curiosity is the engine of human learning. It is the reason children ask forty questions a day and take apart lawnmowers. The factory model treats curiosity as disruption. The child who asks "why?" is off-topic. The child who pursues an interest not on the curriculum is wasting time. The child who finds a better way to draw the water cycle gets a C.

Reproduce, don't create. The factory model assesses reproduction, not understanding. The test asks: can you replicate the diagram? Can you repeat the formula? Can you recall the date? It does not ask: can you think? Can you synthesise? Can you see a pattern no one else has seen? These are the capacities that matter, and they are the capacities the factory model has no way to measure and no interest in developing.

Compete, don't collaborate. The factory model is a sorting mechanism. It ranks children against each other. It creates winners and losers. It tells the child who scored 65 that she is worth less than the child who scored 85, regardless of what either child actually understands, what either child is curious about, or what either child might become. The primary function of grading is not feedback — it is stratification.

4. Caplan's Signalling Model: What If School Doesn't Even Teach?

Bryan Caplan's *The Case Against Education: Why the Education System Is a Waste of Time and Money* (2018) asks a question that most education researchers avoid: what if the economic returns to education have almost nothing to do with what students actually learn?

Caplan, an economist at George Mason University, argues that roughly 80 percent of the wage premium associated with education is attributable to signalling rather than human capital formation. In plain language: employers pay graduates more not because university taught them useful skills, but because completing a degree signals pre-existing traits — intelligence, conscientiousness, conformity — that employers value. The degree is a credential, not evidence of capability.

Caplan's evidence is extensive. He points to the "sheepskin effect" — the large wage jump that occurs upon receiving a diploma, compared to the modest returns for each additional year of education. If education were truly about skill-building, each year should add roughly equal value. Instead, the returns cluster at graduation. Drop out in your third year and your investment is largely wasted, even though you completed 75 percent of the coursework. This pattern is consistent with signalling and difficult to explain under the human capital model.

He further notes that much of what students learn in school is never used again. How many adults use calculus? How many remember the periodic table? How many apply literary criticism to their daily work? The curriculum is not designed around skills that transfer to employment or to life. It is designed around institutional tradition, disciplinary prestige, and the need to differentiate students from one another.

The strongest counterargument comes from James Heckman and others in the human capital tradition, who argue that education develops cognitive and non-cognitive skills — problem-solving, persistence, the ability to work in structured environments — that are genuinely valuable in the labour market. Heckman's work on early childhood interventions (particularly the Perry Preschool Study and the Abecedarian Project) demonstrates real, lasting returns from high-quality early education. But Heckman's findings actually support Caplan's thesis in an indirect way: the interventions that work look nothing like traditional schooling. They are intensive, personalised, play-based, and focused on social-emotional development — the opposite of the factory model.

If Caplan is even half right, the implications are devastating. We are spending trillions of dollars globally on an education system whose primary function is not to educate but to sort. We are consuming twelve to twenty years of every child's life — the years of greatest neuroplasticity, creativity, and natural curiosity — to produce a piece of paper that tells employers what they could have learned from a two-hour aptitude test.

4.1 The Sorting Machine and Social Reproduction

Caplan's signalling model has a corollary that he does not emphasise but that the data makes unavoidable: if schooling is primarily a sorting mechanism, then the children it sorts to the bottom are not failing to learn. They are being assigned a position. The factory model does not discover ability. It manufactures hierarchy.

The evidence on social reproduction in education is extensive and grim. In Australia, a child born into the bottom socioeconomic quartile is 2.5 times less likely to attend university than a child born

into the top quartile, even controlling for academic ability (Marks, 2015). In the United States, the children of parents in the top income quintile are more than seven times as likely to hold a bachelor's degree by age 24 as children from the bottom quintile (Pell Institute, 2023). The factory model does not equalise. It entrenches.

This is not a side effect. It is the design. A system built to produce obedient subjects for a hierarchical state necessarily produces hierarchy. The only question is whose children end up where — and the answer, across every country that uses the Prussian model, is: the children of the powerful end up on top, and the children of the powerless are told they earned their place at the bottom.

---

5. Finland: The Country That Did the Opposite

Finland consistently ranks among the top-performing nations on the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), the OECD's standardised comparison of educational outcomes across countries. This is well known. What is less well known is how Finland achieves these results, because the Finnish approach contradicts almost every assumption of the Prussian model.

Finnish children do not start formal schooling until age seven — two years later than most countries. Before that, early childhood education is play-based, with no formal instruction in reading or arithmetic. There is no standardised testing until the matriculation exam at age eighteen. Homework is minimal, particularly before upper secondary school; Finnish educators broadly regard homework for young children as unnecessary and potentially harmful. School days are shorter than in most OECD countries. Recess is long and frequent — Finnish schools typically give children a fifteen-minute break for every forty-five minutes of instruction.

Teachers in Finland have extraordinary autonomy. There is a national curriculum framework, but teachers design their own lessons, choose their own methods, and are not evaluated by student test scores. Teaching is a highly competitive profession — admission to teacher training programmes is more selective than admission to law or medicine — and teachers are trusted as professionals. There are no school inspectors. There are no league tables. There is no equivalent of Ofsted or state-mandated curriculum standards.

5.1 The Finnish Comparison in Detail

The contrasts with factory-model countries are stark and specific:

Feature	Finland	Australia	United States
School start age	7	5-6	5-6
Pre-school philosophy	Play-based, no formal instruction	Increasingly academic, "school readiness"	Increasingly academic, Common Core alignment
Standardised testing	Matriculation exam at 18 only	NAPLAN at Years 3, 5, 7, 9	State tests annually from Year 3
Homework (primary)	Minimal to none	Regular (30-60 min/day common)	Regular (increasing since 2000)
Recess	15 min every 45 min	20-30 min once or twice	Declining; many schools <20 min/day

Feature	Finland	Australia	United States
Teacher autonomy	Very high; no inspections	Moderate; constrained by NAPLAN/curriculum	Low; scripted curricula common
Teacher selectivity	Top 10% of graduates	Variable	Variable; shortage areas accept bottom third
PISA ranking (2022)	Top 10	10-20	25-35
Student wellbeing	High	Declining	Crisis-level

The Finnish system is not without critics. Some researchers note that Finland's PISA performance has declined somewhat since its peak in the early 2000s, and that other high-performing systems (Singapore, South Korea, Japan) achieve strong results through very different methods — intensive instruction, long hours, and high-stakes testing. The comparison is instructive: countries can achieve high test scores through pressure or through autonomy, but the mental health outcomes diverge dramatically. Finnish adolescents report significantly lower levels of school-related anxiety and stress than their counterparts in high-pressure systems.

South Korea and Japan achieve high PISA scores. They also have among the highest adolescent suicide rates in the OECD. Singapore performs brilliantly on tests. Singaporean children report among the highest levels of academic anxiety in the world. The test scores are not the whole picture. They are not even most of the picture. If your metric for a successful education system is how many children can reproduce predetermined answers under pressure, then pressure systems win. If your metric is whether children emerge as curious, creative, mentally healthy human beings who want to keep learning, Finland wins and it is not close.

The Finnish model is not a utopia, and it operates within a specific cultural and economic context (small, relatively homogeneous population, strong social safety net, cultural value placed on education). It cannot be copy-pasted onto other countries without adaptation. But it serves as a powerful existence proof: you can achieve world-class educational outcomes without homework, without standardised testing, without ranking children against each other, and without treating schools as factories.

---

6. The Homework Evidence

Harris Cooper's research on homework spans decades and remains the most comprehensive synthesis available. His 1989 book *Homework* and his 2006 meta-analysis "Does Homework Improve Academic Achievement? A Synthesis of Research, 1987-2003" (published in *Review of Educational Research*) together cover more than a hundred studies.

Cooper's findings are often cited but rarely cited accurately. The headline result is this: in elementary school (roughly ages 5-11), there is no measurable academic benefit from homework. None. The correlation between homework and achievement in primary school is essentially zero. In middle school, the correlation is small and inconsistent. In high school, there is a moderate positive correlation — but Cooper is careful to note that this is a correlation, not a demonstrated causal relationship. Students who do more homework tend to score higher on tests, but this could easily

reflect the fact that more motivated, higher-achieving students do more homework, rather than that homework caused the achievement.

Even in high school, the benefits plateau. Cooper found that beyond about two hours of homework per night, the relationship between homework and achievement flattens or reverses. More is not better. There are diminishing returns, and past a threshold, possible negative effects.

What Cooper's research does not capture — and what he has acknowledged in interviews — is the cost side of the equation. Homework consumes family time. It generates conflict between parents and children. It reduces time available for play, physical activity, sleep, and self-directed learning. For younger children, who gain no academic benefit from homework, these costs are incurred for literally no measurable return. The homework tradition in primary school persists not because of evidence but because of parental expectation, institutional inertia, and the unexamined belief that more work must mean more learning.

No randomised controlled trials of homework have been conducted, which means the causal question remains formally unanswered. This is itself revealing: we subject children to thousands of hours of homework across their school careers, and we have never rigorously tested whether it works.

6.1 The International Homework Comparison

The homework evidence becomes even more damning when viewed internationally. The countries that assign the most homework are not the countries that perform best academically.

Finland assigns among the least homework in the OECD — approximately 2.8 hours per week for fifteen-year-olds, versus the OECD average of 4.9 hours. Finland consistently outperforms the OECD average. Japan and South Korea assign moderate amounts. The countries that assign the most homework — Italy, Ireland, Poland — do not consistently outperform countries that assign less. At the national level, there is no positive correlation between homework load and PISA performance.

This is not a causal claim. Countries differ on many dimensions, and homework load is confounded with teaching quality, curriculum design, socioeconomic factors, and cultural attitudes. But it is a powerful refutation of the intuition that more homework equals more learning. If that were true, Finland would be at the bottom, not the top.

The Australian picture is particularly telling. Australian students in Years 3-6 routinely receive 30-60 minutes of homework per night. Harris Cooper's evidence says this produces zero academic benefit. Finnish students at the same age receive almost none. Finnish students outperform Australian students on PISA. Australian education policy is, in this specific domain, requiring children and families to spend hundreds of hours per year on an activity that the best available evidence says is useless for that age group, while a country that skips it entirely gets better results.

---

7. Montessori: Evidence for an Alternative

Maria Montessori developed her educational method in the early twentieth century, working initially with children in Rome's poorest neighbourhoods. The Montessori approach centres on mixed-age classrooms, self-directed activity, long uninterrupted work periods, hands-on materials, and the

role of the teacher as guide rather than instructor. It is, in almost every structural respect, the opposite of the Prussian model.

For decades, Montessori education operated largely on the basis of anecdotal evidence and practitioner enthusiasm. That changed in 2006, when Angeline Lillard and Nicole Else-Quest published "The Early Years: Evaluating Montessori Education" in *Science* — one of the world's most prestigious peer-reviewed journals.

Lillard and Else-Quest compared children in a public Montessori programme with children in other schools, using a lottery-based design to address selection bias. (The Montessori school was oversubscribed, so admission was determined by lottery; children who lost the lottery attended other schools, creating a natural control group.) The results were striking. By age five, Montessori children significantly outperformed the control group on measures of reading, mathematics, executive function, and social cognition. They also showed more positive social behaviour and a stronger sense of justice and fairness. By age twelve, Montessori children wrote more creative essays, demonstrated more sophisticated social reasoning, and reported a stronger sense of community at their school.

Lillard's subsequent work (2012) added nuance. In "Preschool Children's Development in Classic Montessori, Supplemented Montessori, and Conventional Programs," she found that the benefits were strongest in "classic" Montessori implementations — programmes that adhered closely to Montessori's original methods. "Supplemented" Montessori programmes (which added conventional elements like grades, homework, or teacher-directed group lessons) showed smaller advantages, and in some cases no advantage over conventional schooling. The implication is that the Montessori method works as a coherent system, and diluting it with factory-model elements undermines its effectiveness.

This finding deserves emphasis. It is not that the Montessori method is slightly better than the factory model. It is that the Montessori method is better precisely to the degree that it refuses to be the factory model. Every concession to factory-model thinking — grades, homework, teacher-directed instruction — diminishes the advantage. The system works because it is the opposite. Compromise destroys it.

Replication and larger-scale studies have been mixed. Some studies have confirmed Lillard's findings; others have found smaller or null effects, often in programmes that deviate from classic Montessori methods. Selection bias remains a concern even with lottery-based designs, since families who apply to Montessori schools may differ systematically from families who do not. Nevertheless, the Lillard and Else-Quest study stands as some of the strongest experimental evidence that a non-factory, child-directed educational model can produce superior outcomes on the metrics that the factory model claims to optimise.

7.1 Montessori at Scale

A common objection to the Montessori evidence is that it works only in small, privileged settings. This is empirically false. Montessori's own work began in the slums of Rome — the *Casa dei Bambini* (Children's House) was established in the San Lorenzo housing project in 1907, serving children of illiterate labourers. The Lillard and Else-Quest study used a public lottery-admission Montessori school, not a fee-paying private one.

Public Montessori programmes now operate in over 500 school districts in the United States. A 2017 study by Debs and Brown found that public Montessori schools serve more diverse student

populations than their surrounding districts in many cases. The South Carolina public Montessori programme has operated since the 1990s and has been studied longitudinally, with results consistent with the Lillard findings.

The barrier to scaling Montessori is not evidence. It is institutional resistance. Montessori classrooms require different teacher training (two to three years beyond standard certification), different physical environments (child-sized furniture, open shelving, mixed-age grouping), and — critically — different metrics. You cannot evaluate a Montessori classroom using standardised test scores and league tables, because the method is designed to develop capacities that standardised tests do not measure. The factory model resists Montessori not because Montessori fails, but because the factory's measurement tools cannot see what Montessori produces.

---

8. Reggio Emilia: The Hundred Languages of Children

The Reggio Emilia approach, developed in the northern Italian city of the same name after World War II, offers a second existence proof that education can be organised around children rather than institutions.

Loris Malaguzzi, the approach's founding figure, described children as having "a hundred languages" — a hundred ways of thinking, expressing, understanding, encountering, and being with others. The Reggio approach holds that the school's job is not to teach one language (the academic, verbal, test-measurable language of the factory model) but to nurture all of them.

In practice, Reggio Emilia classrooms are structured around long-term projects that emerge from children's interests. There is no fixed curriculum. A child's question about why puddles disappear might become a weeks-long investigation involving observation, drawing, experimentation, discussion, photography, and construction. Teachers are co-learners and documenters — they observe, record, and extend children's thinking rather than directing it. The environment is treated as a "third teacher": spaces are designed with natural light, mirrors, plants, and open-ended materials that invite exploration.

The Reggio approach has spread to thousands of schools worldwide since the 1990s, and *Newsweek* (1991) identified the Diana Municipal Preschool in Reggio Emilia as one of the ten best schools in the world. The approach is more difficult to evaluate through conventional research methods than Montessori, because it resists standardisation by design — each Reggio-inspired school looks different, each project unfolds differently, and the outcomes that matter most (depth of thinking, quality of collaboration, capacity for wonder) are not captured by standardised instruments.

What the qualitative research consistently shows is this: Reggio children demonstrate extraordinary capacity for sustained investigation, for collaborative problem-solving, for visual and spatial thinking, and for connecting ideas across domains. They are, by any honest observation, deeply engaged learners. They are not sitting in rows. They are not silent. They are not reproducing predetermined answers. They are doing what children are designed to do — and they are doing it better than the factory model allows.

---

9. Play-Based Learning: What Developmental Science Actually Recommends

The evidence on play-based learning converges from multiple independent fields: developmental psychology, evolutionary biology, neuroscience, cross-cultural anthropology, and comparative animal behaviour.

9.1 The Biological Case

Play is not recreation. It is a primary biological system. Jaak Panksepp's affective neuroscience research (1998, 2007) identified PLAY as one of seven primary emotional circuits in the mammalian brain — alongside SEEKING, RAGE, FEAR, LUST, CARE, and PANIC/GRIEF. The PLAY circuit is subcortical, meaning it is evolutionarily ancient and operates below the level of conscious decision-making. It is not something children choose to do. It is something their brains are wired to do, with the same neurological urgency as eating, sleeping, and forming attachments.

Play is found across virtually all mammals. Rats play. Dogs play. Dolphins play. Octopuses play — a finding (Mather & Anderson, 1999) that implies play has been independently evolved across at least 500 million years of evolutionary history. When a behaviour appears this consistently across this many species over this much evolutionary time, the correct inference is that it serves a critical developmental function. Evolution does not preserve frivolities for half a billion years.

Stuart Brown's clinical work with over 6,000 individuals found that play deprivation — the chronic absence of play in childhood — was a consistent feature in the histories of violent offenders, including mass murderers like Charles Whitman. Brown does not claim that play deprivation causes violence in a simple causal chain. He argues that play is the primary mechanism by which young mammals learn to calibrate their social behaviour — to read signals, to modulate force, to practice cooperation, to recover from conflict. Without play, the calibration does not occur, and the individual is left without the social and emotional regulation that play develops.

9.2 The Evidence from Early Childhood Education

The strongest evidence for play-based learning comes from the comparison between academic and play-based kindergarten approaches. The shift toward academic kindergarten — teaching formal reading, writing, and arithmetic to five-year-olds — accelerated in the United States after the No Child Left Behind Act (2001) and has been adopted in Australia and the UK as well.

The evidence does not support this shift.

A comprehensive study by Suggate (2012) compared reading outcomes across countries with different school start ages. Children who began formal reading instruction at age five showed no long-term advantage over children who began at age seven. By age eleven, the groups were indistinguishable. The early starters paid a cost — more years of instruction — for no lasting benefit.

The New Zealand evidence is particularly telling. New Zealand starts formal schooling at age five, while Finland starts at seven. By age eleven, New Zealand and Finnish children perform comparably on reading assessments. The two additional years of formal instruction produce no measurable advantage. What they do produce is two additional years of opportunity cost — two years in which children could have been playing, exploring, and developing the social, emotional, and executive function capacities that play uniquely builds.

Sebastian Suggate's longitudinal data showed that early reading instruction can actually produce *negative* effects on reading attitude — children who are pushed into formal reading before they are developmentally ready are more likely to develop negative associations with reading. You can teach a five-year-old to decode words. You cannot make a five-year-old love reading by making them decode words before they are ready. And the five-year-old who learns to love stories through being read to, through play, through curiosity, will outperform the drilled five-year-old within a few years — because motivation, not decoding skill, is the primary predictor of lifelong reading.

9.3 What Play Develops

The developmental functions of play map directly onto the capacities that the factory model fails to develop:

Executive function. Self-directed play requires children to plan, to hold goals in mind while pursuing them, to inhibit impulses, to switch strategies when something is not working. These are the core executive functions, and play develops them more effectively than direct instruction (Diamond & Lee, 2011).

Social cognition. Pretend play, rough-and-tumble play, and collaborative play all require children to read others' intentions, to negotiate rules, to take perspectives, to manage conflict. These are the foundations of empathy, cooperation, and moral reasoning. Bekoff's research on animal play (2001) shows that even non-human mammals develop fairness norms through play — self-handicapping, role reversal, and adherence to implicit rules.

Creativity and divergent thinking. Free play is, by definition, open-ended. There is no predetermined answer. The child who builds a fort from couch cushions is solving a novel engineering problem. The child who invents an imaginary world is practicing narrative construction. The child who figures out how to include a younger sibling in a game is performing real-time social negotiation. These are creative acts, and they happen spontaneously in play because play is the brain's natural creative medium.

Stress regulation. Play is a primary mechanism for processing stress and anxiety. Play therapy is an established clinical modality precisely because play allows children to work through experiences that are too complex or overwhelming for verbal processing. The factory model removes the mechanism (play) and then acts surprised when children cannot cope with the stress (of the factory).

---

10. NAPLAN and the Australian Testing Regime

Australia provides a case study in what happens when a country doubles down on the factory model's worst instincts. The National Assessment Program — Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) was introduced in 2008 as a standardised test administered to all Australian students in Years 3, 5, 7, and 9.

NAPLAN was intended to provide national data on student achievement. What it produced instead was a testing regime that warped teaching, narrowed curricula, and generated enormous stress — for no measurable improvement in student outcomes.

10.1 What NAPLAN Did to Teaching

The phenomenon is called "teaching to the test," and in Australia it is not subtle. Studies by Thompson and Harbaugh (2013) and Polesel, Rice, and Dulfer (2014) documented systematic narrowing of the curriculum in response to NAPLAN. Schools reduced time spent on science, social studies, the arts, and physical education to focus on literacy and numeracy — the subjects NAPLAN tests. Teachers reported spending weeks or months on NAPLAN preparation, including practice tests, test-taking strategies, and drilling students on question formats.

The Australian Primary Principals Association conducted a survey in 2013 and found that 90% of principals believed NAPLAN was having a negative effect on student wellbeing. Seventy-three percent reported that students experienced anxiety related to the test. Students as young as eight — Year 3 — reported stress, tears, and fear of failure in connection with NAPLAN.

This is not an education system. It is a stress-testing regime for children.

10.2 What NAPLAN Did Not Improve

The most damning evidence against NAPLAN is the simplest: after more than fifteen years of national standardised testing, Australian student performance has not improved. PISA results for Australian fifteen-year-olds have declined in reading, mathematics, and science since 2000 — the period in which educational testing and accountability measures were expanded.

Australia's PISA ranking has dropped from 4th in reading (2000) to outside the top 10 (2022). In mathematics, the decline has been even steeper. In the OECD's own framing, Australian students in 2022 were performing at a level roughly equivalent to being a full school year behind their 2003 counterparts.

NAPLAN did not cause this decline. But it certainly did not prevent it. The testing regime consumed enormous resources — financial, temporal, and emotional — and produced no measurable improvement on any metric. Meanwhile, Finland — no standardised testing, no league tables, no school inspections — continued to outperform Australia.

10.3 The My School Website

In 2010, the Australian government launched the My School website, which published NAPLAN results for every school in the country, enabling direct comparison. The stated purpose was transparency and accountability. The actual effect was the creation of a league table that ranked schools by test scores, drove real estate prices in "good school" catchment areas, increased pressure on principals and teachers to boost NAPLAN results, and deepened the socioeconomic stratification of Australian education.

Schools in wealthy postcodes performed well. Schools in poor postcodes did not. The My School website did not reveal this — everyone already knew it. What it did was quantify it, rank it, and create a competitive marketplace in which schools were incentivised to chase test scores rather than educate children. The factory model's sorting function, made explicit and public.

10.4 NAPLAN Online and the "Improvement" Narrative

NAPLAN transitioned to an online adaptive format in 2023, and the government has presented this as modernisation. The adaptive format adjusts question difficulty based on student responses, which proponents argue provides more precise measurement.

More precise measurement of what? NAPLAN tests a narrow range of literacy and numeracy skills. It does not measure creativity, curiosity, collaboration, critical thinking, social-emotional development, or any of the capacities that the developmental evidence identifies as central to healthy child development. Making the measurement more precise does not make it more relevant. A very accurate thermometer is useless if you are trying to measure wind speed.

---

11. The Creativity Study That May Not Exist

One of the most frequently cited statistics in education criticism is the "NASA creativity study" attributed to George Land and Beth Jarman. The claim is dramatic: in 1968, Land administered a creativity test (originally developed for NASA to assess the innovative potential of engineers) to 1,600 five-year-olds. Ninety-eight percent scored at "creative genius" level. The same children were retested at age ten — 30 percent scored at genius level. At fifteen, 12 percent. When the test was given to adults, only 2 percent scored as creative geniuses. The conclusion, as Land presented it in a 2011 TEDx talk, is that "non-creative behaviour is learned."

The narrative is powerful. It suggests that schooling systematically destroys the creative capacity that children naturally possess. It has been cited by Ken Robinson, by education reformers, by TED speakers, by bestselling authors, and in countless blog posts, articles, and policy documents.

There is a problem: the primary source has never been independently located in peer-reviewed literature.

Land and Jarman published *Breakpoint and Beyond: Mastering the Future Today* in 1992, a popular-audience book that references the study. Land discussed the findings in his TEDx talk. But the original 1968 study — the NASA-commissioned research, the dataset of 1,600 children, the longitudinal retesting — does not appear in any peer-reviewed journal, NASA technical report archive, or academic database. There is no published methodology. There is no independent replication. There is no peer review of the instrument, the sample, the analysis, or the conclusions.

This does not mean the study is fabricated. It may have been conducted as internal NASA research and never submitted for publication. The creativity test itself (which appears to assess divergent thinking) is consistent with established instruments like Torrance's Tests of Creative Thinking. The overall pattern — that divergent thinking capacity declines with age and schooling — is supported by other research. But the specific numbers (98%, 30%, 12%, 2%) and the specific claim of a NASA origin cannot be verified from available sources.

This study should be cited as "widely referenced, primary source unconfirmed." It should not be presented as established fact.

The broader claim — that conventional schooling suppresses creative thinking — does have support from other sources. Kyung Hee Kim's analysis of Torrance Test scores over several decades (2011, "The Creativity Crisis") found a significant decline in creative thinking scores among American children since 1990, with the most pronounced decline in younger children. But Kim's work measures a trend, not a causal mechanism, and attributes the decline to multiple factors including standardised testing, reduced recess, and screen time — not solely to schooling.

The honest position is this: there is strong circumstantial and correlational evidence that the factory model of schooling is associated with declining creativity. There is no clean experimental proof of

causation. And the single most dramatic statistic cited in support of this claim — Land's 98% to 2% — cannot be independently verified.

---

12. The Mental Health Crisis and the School Connection

The timing is hard to ignore.

Beginning around 2010-2012, adolescent mental health indicators in the United States began deteriorating sharply. The CDC's Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) documents the trajectory: between 2009 and 2021, the percentage of high school students reporting persistent feelings of sadness or hopelessness increased from 26 percent to 42 percent. The percentage who seriously considered suicide rose from 14 percent to 22 percent. Among girls, the numbers are worse: 57 percent reported persistent sadness or hopelessness in 2021, up from 36 percent in 2009.

Similar trends have been documented in the UK, Canada, Australia, and across much of the developed world. This is not an American phenomenon. It is happening everywhere that has smartphones, social media, and high-pressure schooling.

The dominant explanation, advanced by Jonathan Haidt in *The Anxious Generation* (2024) and by Jean Twenge in *iGen* (2017), centres on smartphones and social media. The timing correlates with smartphone adoption — the iPhone launched in 2007, and by 2012 a majority of American teenagers owned one. The mechanisms are plausible: social comparison, cyberbullying, sleep disruption, displacement of in-person social interaction.

But there is a parallel timeline that receives less attention. Over the same period, American schools intensified their academic demands. The No Child Left Behind Act (2001) and its successor, the Every Student Succeeds Act (2015), tied school funding to standardised test performance, incentivising schools to increase testing, reduce recess, and narrow the curriculum to tested subjects. Homework loads increased. The average American high school student in 2015 spent more time on homework than at any point in the previous fifty years. College admissions became more competitive, pushing the pressure further down into middle and even elementary school. Extracurricular activities became resume-builders rather than sources of joy.

12.1 The Australian Mental Health Data

Australia mirrors the American trajectory. The Mission Australia Youth Survey (2022) found that 43% of young people aged 15-19 reported psychological distress in the high or very high range, up from 19% in 2012. Headspace data shows demand for youth mental health services has increased year on year since its establishment. The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare reports that self-harm hospitalisations among girls aged 10-14 have more than doubled since 2008.

These increases coincide with the NAPLAN regime, the expansion of homework expectations, the narrowing of curricula, and the rise of My School league tables. They also coincide with smartphone adoption. Separating the contributions of these factors is methodologically difficult and perhaps beside the point. The relevant observation is that Australian children are spending more time in a more pressured version of the factory model than ever before, and their mental health is deteriorating at the same time.

12.2 The School-Stress Mechanism

The correlation between educational intensification and adolescent mental health deterioration does not prove causation. Both could be driven by a third factor (smartphone adoption, cultural shifts, economic precarity). But the correlation is strong enough to demand serious investigation, and the biological plausibility is clear: chronic stress, sleep deprivation, reduced physical activity, reduced free play, and reduced autonomy are all well-established risk factors for anxiety and depression, and modern schooling contributes to every one of them.

Finland, again, provides a useful contrast. Finnish adolescents consistently report lower levels of school-related stress than their counterparts in high-testing nations. While Finland has not been immune to the smartphone-driven mental health trends, the baseline is lower and the trajectory less steep. If schooling were irrelevant to mental health, we would not expect to see this pattern.

The factory model takes the years of greatest neuroplasticity and fills them with compliance demands. It removes play — the primary biological mechanism for stress regulation and social-emotional development. It replaces intrinsic motivation with extrinsic evaluation. It substitutes curiosity with curriculum. And then, when children break, it diagnoses them.

---

13. What the Evidence Actually Says

Taken together, this body of research does not support the claim that school is universally harmful or that all structured education is damaging. It supports something more specific and more actionable:

The factory model of schooling — age-graded, bell-scheduled, compliance-rewarding, test-driven, homework-heavy — is not based on evidence about how children learn. It is based on eighteenth-century Prussian state-building, nineteenth-century industrial organisation, and twentieth-century institutional inertia. Where it has been tested against alternatives — Finland's autonomy model, Montessori's self-directed approach, Reggio Emilia's project-based inquiry, play-based early childhood education — it consistently performs the same or worse on academic measures, while producing worse outcomes on creativity, intrinsic motivation, social development, and mental health.

The signalling model suggests that much of the economic value of education comes not from the learning itself but from the credential — which means we are consuming twelve to twenty years of every person's life primarily to produce a sorting mechanism that benefits employers.

The homework evidence shows that one of the most universal and unquestioned educational practices — assigning work to be done at home — has no measurable benefit for young children, modest and unproven benefits for older students, and significant costs in terms of family stress, sleep deprivation, and the displacement of play and self-directed activity.

The mental health data shows that adolescent wellbeing has declined sharply during a period of educational intensification, in patterns that are consistent with (though not proven to be caused by) the pressures of modern schooling.

The NAPLAN evidence shows that standardised testing narrows curricula, increases stress, deepens inequality, and has produced no improvement in student outcomes over fifteen years.

The play-based learning evidence shows that children who begin formal instruction later lose nothing academically and gain the developmental benefits of two additional years of play.

None of this is fringe science. Cooper published in *Review of Educational Research*. Lillard published in *Science*. Caplan's book is from Princeton University Press. The CDC data is the gold standard for population health surveillance. The Finnish system is real and measurable. The Prussian origins are documented historical fact.

The question is not whether the evidence exists. The question is why, given the evidence, we continue to send children to institutions designed by an eighteenth-century king to produce obedient soldiers, and then act surprised when those children emerge stressed, uncreative, and unable to think for themselves.

Goal 12 — *every school is play, mastery, curiosity* — is not a utopian fantasy. It is what the evidence recommends. The alternatives exist. They work. We just have to stop doing what Frederick the Great told us to do 263 years ago.

---

14. The Obedience Factory: Dave, Chloe, and the Water Cycle

An opinion piece. For the parent who can feel something is wrong but can't name it.

Dave Keating's daughter came home from school crying on a Tuesday in May because she got a C on a project about the water cycle. She is seven.

Dave is a concreter from Bunbury. He left school at fifteen, started his apprenticeship at sixteen, ran his own crew by twenty-four. He can read a site plan, calculate cubic metres in his head, negotiate with builders twice his age, and pour a slab that will outlast the house on top of it. He did not learn any of these things in a classroom. He learned them by doing them, by getting them wrong, by watching blokes who knew what they were doing, and by showing up the next day.

His daughter Chloe is the smartest person he has ever met. She taught herself to read at four. She takes apart the lawnmower to see how it works. She knows the names of every bird in their backyard. She asked him last week why the moon looks bigger on the horizon and he had to look it up because he didn't know. She is curious about everything. She wants to understand everything. She asks "why" about forty times a day and Dave has never once found it annoying because every question she asks is a good one.

She sits in a classroom for six hours a day. In a row. Facing the front. She is not allowed to talk unless she raises her hand. She is not allowed to move unless the bell rings. She is not allowed to work on something she is interested in — she works on what the curriculum says she works on, in the order the curriculum says she works on it, at the speed the curriculum says she works on it. If she finishes early, she waits. If she doesn't understand, she falls behind. If she asks too many questions, she is disruptive.

She got a C on the water cycle project because she drew the diagram in her own style instead of copying the one in the textbook.

Dave doesn't know the word "pedagogy." He has never heard of Frederick the Great or the *Generallandschulreglement* of 1763. He has never read a paper on developmental psychology. But he knows — in the same way he knows when concrete is about to go off wrong — that something is broken.

He's right.

What Dave doesn't know

The school his daughter attends was not designed for his daughter. It was designed for a Prussian king who lost a war in 1763 and needed a population that would follow orders without asking questions.

That is not a metaphor. That is the documented history.

Frederick the Great issued compulsory schooling regulations in 1763. The purpose — stated openly, in the legislation — was to produce obedient subjects. Not thinkers. Not creators. Not curious children who take apart lawnmowers. Subjects. People who would sit where they were told, do what they were told, and not ask why.

The system was imported to America by Horace Mann in 1843. He went to Prussia, watched the schools, came home impressed, and built the American public school system on the same model. Age-graded classrooms. Bells marking periods. Fixed curriculum. Teacher at the front. Children in rows. The factory.

By the late 1800s it had spread to Australia, Britain, Canada, and most of the developed world. The model has not fundamentally changed since.

Walk into Chloe's school in 2026. Children sorted by age — not by interest, readiness, or ability. Moving between rooms at the sound of a bell. Sitting in rows facing an authority figure. Evaluated on their ability to reproduce predetermined answers. Deviation punished. Compliance rewarded.

Ellwood Cubberley, one of the architects of American public education, wrote in 1916: "Our schools are, in a sense, factories, in which the raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of life."

He was not being poetic. He was being literal. And the factory is still running.

What the evidence says

Dave's instinct — that something is wrong — is backed by every serious study on the subject.

Homework doesn't work for young children. Harris Cooper's meta-analysis of over 100 studies, published in the *Review of Educational Research* (2006), found zero measurable academic benefit from homework at the elementary school level. None. The correlation between homework and achievement in primary school is essentially zero. Chloe's homework is consuming her evenings, generating conflict between her and Dave, reducing her time to play, explore, read, and be curious — for literally no measurable return. No one has ever conducted a randomised controlled trial of homework. We have never rigorously tested whether it works. We just assume it does because we have always done it.

Children learn through play. This is not a hippie opinion. It is the consensus of developmental psychology. Peter Gray's *Free to Learn* (2013) documents how, across every culture and throughout human history, children learned by doing, watching, imitating, failing, and trying again. The

classroom inverts all of it: the child is passive, the teacher is active, the curriculum is fixed, and failure is punished.

Finland did the opposite and got better results. Finnish children don't start school until age seven. Homework is minimal. School days are shorter. There are no standardised tests until age eighteen. Teachers have autonomy — no inspectors, no league tables, no scripts. Recess is fifteen minutes for every forty-five minutes of instruction. Finland consistently ranks among the top performers on PISA, the OECD's international assessment. Finnish kids outperform Australian kids on reading, maths, and science — with less time in the classroom, less homework, and less pressure.

The Montessori evidence is real. Lillard and Else-Quest (2006), published in *Science* — one of the most prestigious journals in the world — used a lottery-based design to compare Montessori and conventional schools. Montessori children outperformed on reading, mathematics, executive function, and social cognition. They also showed a stronger sense of justice and fairness. The method: mixed ages, self-directed activity, teacher as guide, long uninterrupted work periods. The opposite of the factory.

Mental health is collapsing. The CDC's Youth Risk Behavior Survey shows sadness and hopelessness among high school students rising from 26 percent (2009) to 42 percent (2021). Among girls: 57 percent. Suicidal ideation rose from 14 percent to 22 percent. The timing correlates with smartphones — but also with the intensification of schooling: more testing, more homework, less recess, narrower curriculum, higher stakes. Finnish adolescents — less school, less pressure, more play — report significantly lower levels of school-related stress and anxiety.

NAPLAN made it worse. Fifteen years of standardised testing. Narrowed curricula. Stressed children as young as eight. No improvement in student outcomes. Australian PISA performance declining. The testing regime consumed resources, generated anxiety, and achieved nothing. This is documented by the Australian Primary Principals Association, by PISA trend data, and by every teacher who watched their classroom turn into a test-prep facility.

School may not even teach. Bryan Caplan, Princeton University Press (2018): roughly 80 percent of the wage premium from education is signalling — employers pay you more because the degree proves you can sit still and follow instructions for four years, not because you learned anything useful. The "sheepskin effect" — the massive wage jump at graduation versus the small returns for each additional year — supports this. Drop out in year three and your investment is largely wasted, even though you did 75 percent of the work. The credential matters. The learning doesn't.

What Chloe is losing

Dave's daughter is seven. She has approximately 11,000 hours of compulsory schooling ahead of her. At current homework loads, add another 2,000-3,000 hours on top.

That is 13,000 to 14,000 hours of her life.

The years between five and eighteen are the years of greatest neuroplasticity — the period when the brain is most capable of learning, adapting, creating new connections. These are the years when curiosity is strongest, when play is most natural, when the capacity for creative and divergent thinking is at its peak.

The factory model takes those years and fills them with compliance training. Sit still. Face the front. Don't talk. Don't move. Don't deviate. Reproduce the diagram from the textbook. Get a C if you draw it your own way.

Chloe drew the water cycle her own way because she understood it her own way. She didn't copy the diagram because she didn't need to — she could see it in her head. She got a C for understanding something better than the textbook explained it.

Dave doesn't need to read a study to know that's broken. He knows it the same way he knows concrete. You can feel when something is set wrong. You can feel when the mix is off. You can feel when someone is building something that isn't going to hold.

His daughter's school isn't going to hold.

What Dave wants

Dave is not an education reformer. He doesn't have a theory. He doesn't have a manifesto. He has a daughter who came home crying because she understood something too well, and a school system that was designed 263 years ago by a king who needed soldiers.

He wants Chloe to be curious. He wants her to ask why. He wants her to take things apart and put them back together. He wants her to draw the water cycle whatever way makes sense to her and have someone say "that's brilliant, tell me how you see it" instead of "that's a C."

He wants school to be about learning, not about compliance.

He wants play, mastery, and curiosity — the things every developmental psychologist says children actually need — instead of bells, rows, and standardised tests designed by people who have never met his daughter and never will.

Finland already does it. Montessori already does it. Reggio Emilia already does it. The evidence is not missing. The alternatives are not theoretical. They exist. They work. They produce better results by every measure — academic, creative, social, emotional.

The only reason we don't do it is because we have always done it the other way. Because a Prussian king in 1763 needed obedient subjects, and an American bureaucrat in 1843 thought that was a good idea, and nobody has seriously questioned it since.

Dave is questioning it now. Not because he read a paper. Because his daughter came home crying over a water cycle.

That should be enough.

Sources (Chapter 14)

This is an opinion piece. Dave and Chloe are illustrative. The evidence is not.

Claim	Source
Prussian compulsory schooling, 1763, state control purpose	Melton, *Absolutism and Compulsory Schooling*, 1988 (Cambridge UP)
Horace Mann imported model to Massachusetts, 1843-44	Mann, *Seventh Annual Report*, 1844
Cubberley "schools are factories" quote, 1916	Cubberley, *Public School Administration*, 1916
Zero homework benefit at elementary level	Cooper, *Review of Educational Research*, 2006 (100+ studies)
No randomised controlled trials of homework exist	Cooper (acknowledged in subsequent interviews)
Montessori outperforms on reading, maths, executive function	Lillard & Else-Quest, *Science*, 2006 (lottery-based design)
Finland: top PISA, minimal homework, late start, teacher autonomy	OECD PISA data; Finnish National Agency for Education
Sadness/hopelessness: 26% to 42% (2009-2021)	CDC Youth Risk Behavior Survey
Girls: 57% persistent sadness/hopelessness	CDC YRBS 2021
Suicidal ideation: 14% to 22%	CDC YRBS
~80% of education wage premium is signalling	Caplan, *The Case Against Education*, 2018 (Princeton UP)
Children learn through play (developmental consensus)	Gray, *Free to Learn*, 2013
NAPLAN: 90% of principals report negative wellbeing effect	Australian Primary Principals Association, 2013
Australian PISA decline since 2000	OECD PISA trend data

---

15. References

Primary Historical Sources

1. **Mann, H. (1844).** *Seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education, Together with the Seventh Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board.* Boston: Dutton and Wentworth.

2. **Cubberley, E.P. (1916).** *Public School Administration.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Monographs

3. **Melton, J.V.H. (1988).** *Absolutism and the Eighteenth-Century Origins of Compulsory Schooling in Prussia and Austria.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

4. **Caplan, B. (2018).** *The Case Against Education: Why the Education System Is a Waste of Time and Money.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

5. **Gray, P. (2013).** *Free to Learn: Why Unleashing the Instinct to Play Will Make Our Children Happier, More Self-Reliant, and Better Students for Life.* New York: Basic Books.

6. **Land, G. & Jarman, B. (1992).** *Breakpoint and Beyond: Mastering the Future Today.* New York: HarperBusiness. [SOURCE FLAG: Primary research unverified in peer review.]

7. **Haidt, J. (2024).** *The Anxious Generation: How the Great Rewiring of Childhood Is Causing an Epidemic of Mental Illness.* New York: Penguin Press.

8. **Twenge, J.M. (2017).** *iGen: Why Today's Super-Connected Kids Are Growing Up Less Rebellious, More Tolerant, Less Happy — and Completely Unprepared for Adulthood.* New York: Atria Books.

9. **Panksepp, J. (1998).** *Affective Neuroscience: The Foundations of Human and Animal Emotions.* New York: Oxford University Press.

10. **Brown, S. (2009).** *Play: How It Shapes the Brain, Opens the Imagination, and Invigorates the Soul.* New York: Avery.

11. **Edwards, C., Gandini, L. & Forman, G. (Eds.) (2012).** *The Hundred Languages of Children: The Reggio Emilia Experience in Transformation.* 3rd ed. Santa Barbara: Praeger.

Journal Articles

12. **Cooper, H. (2006).** "Does Homework Improve Academic Achievement? A Synthesis of Research, 1987-2003." *Review of Educational Research,* 76(1), 1-62.

13. **Cooper, H. (1989).** *Homework.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

14. **Lillard, A.S. & Else-Quest, N. (2006).** "The Early Years: Evaluating Montessori Education." *Science,* 313(5795), 1893-1894.

15. **Lillard, A.S. (2012).** "Preschool Children's Development in Classic Montessori, Supplemented Montessori, and Conventional Programs." *Journal of School Psychology,* 50(3), 379-401.

16. **Kim, K.H. (2011).** "The Creativity Crisis: The Decrease in Creative Thinking Scores on the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking." *Creativity Research Journal,* 23(4), 285-295.

17. **Panksepp, J. (2007).** "Can PLAY Diminish ADHD and Facilitate the Construction of the Social Brain?" *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry,* 16(2), 57-66.

18. **Pellis, S.M. & Pellis, V.C. (2007).** "Rough-and-Tumble Play and the Development of the Social Brain." *Current Directions in Psychological Science,* 16(2), 95-98.

19. **Bekoff, M. (2001).** "Social Play Behaviour: Cooperation, Fairness, Trust, and the Evolution of Morality." *Journal of Consciousness Studies,* 8(2), 81-90.

20. **Mather, J.A. & Anderson, R.C. (1999).** "Exploration, Play, and Habituation in Octopuses (*Octopus dofleini*)." *Journal of Comparative Psychology,* 113(3), 333-338.

21. **Diamond, A. & Lee, K. (2011).** "Interventions Shown to Aid Executive Function Development in Children 4 to 12 Years Old." *Science,* 333(6045), 959-964.

22. **Suggate, S.P. (2012).** "Watering the Garden Before a Rainstorm: The Case of Early Reading Instruction." In S.P. Suggate & E. Reese (Eds.), *Contemporary Debates in Childhood Education and Development.* London: Routledge.

23. **Brussoni, M. et al. (2015).** "What Is the Relationship between Risky Outdoor Play and Health in Children? A Systematic Review." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health,* 12(6), 6423-6454.

24. **Gray, P. (2011).** "The Decline of Play and the Rise of Psychopathology in Children and Adolescents." *American Journal of Play,* 3(4), 443-463.

25. **Rathje, S., Van Bavel, J.J. & van der Linden, S. (2021).** "Out-group Animosity Drives Engagement on Social Media." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,* 118(26), e2024292118.

26. **Orben, A. & Przybylski, A.K. (2019).** "The Association between Adolescent Well-being and Digital Technology Use." *Nature Human Behaviour,* 3(2), 173-182.

27. **Polesel, J., Rice, S. & Dulfer, N. (2014).** "The Impact of High-Stakes Testing on Curriculum and Pedagogy: A Teacher and School Perspective." *Journal of Education Policy,* 29(5), 640-657.

28. **Thompson, G. & Harbaugh, A.G. (2013).** "A Preliminary Analysis of Teacher Perceptions of the Effects of NAPLAN on Pedagogy and Curriculum." *Australian Educational Researcher,* 40(3), 299-314.

Data Sources

29. **CDC (2023).** *Youth Risk Behavior Survey Data Summary & Trends Report: 2011-2021.* Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

30. **OECD (2023).** *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The State of Learning and Equity in Education.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

31. **Mission Australia (2022).** *Youth Survey Report 2022.* Sydney: Mission Australia.

32. **Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2023).** *Australia's Youth: Mental Health and Self-Harm.* Canberra: AIHW.

33. **Australian Primary Principals Association (2013).** *The Impacts of NAPLAN on Students: A Survey.* Canberra: APPA.

Talks and Popular Sources (Use with Caution)

34. **Robinson, K. (2006).** "Do Schools Kill Creativity?" TED Talk.

35. **Land, G. (2011).** "The Failure of Success." TEDx Tucson. [SOURCE FLAG]

Appendix A: Source Verification Notes

Status key: - **VERIFIED:** Primary source located and confirmed - **PARTIAL:** Source exists but claims require qualification - **FLAGGED:** Significant verification concerns

#	Source	Confidence	Notes
1	Melton (1988)	HIGH	Cambridge UP scholarly standard
2	Mann (1844)	HIGH	Primary historical source
3	Caplan (2018)	HIGH	Princeton UP; serious academic argument, contested but rigorous
4	Cooper (2006, 1989)	HIGH	Top-tier meta-analysis in *Review of Educational Research*
5	Lillard & Else-Quest (2006)	HIGH	Published in *Science*; lottery design; modest sample (n=59)
6	Lillard (2012)	HIGH	Peer-reviewed; adds nuance on implementation fidelity
7	Kim (2011)	MEDIUM-HIGH	Peer-reviewed; causal claims are interpretive
8	CDC (2023)	HIGH	Gold standard for population health surveillance
9	Land & Jarman (1992)	LOW	**FLAGGED** — primary study never located in peer review. Numbers suspiciously clean. No published methodology. No replication. Cite as "widely referenced, unconfirmed."
10	Gray (2013)	MEDIUM	Popular book by research psychologist; individual claims need tracing
11	Haidt (2024)	MEDIUM	Causal thesis contested (cf. Orben & Przybylski, Odgers)
12	Twenge (2017)	MEDIUM	Causal thesis contested

#	Source	Confidence	Notes
13	Robinson (2006)	LOW-MEDIUM	Populariser, not primary researcher
14	Finnish model	HIGH	OECD data, government sources
15	Panksepp (1998, 2007)	HIGH	Foundational affective neuroscience
16	Pellis & Pellis (2007)	HIGH	*Current Directions in Psychological Science*
17	Brussoni et al. (2015)	HIGH	Systematic review, peer-reviewed
18	Thompson & Harbaugh (2013)	HIGH	Peer-reviewed, Australian-specific
19	Polesel et al. (2014)	HIGH	Peer-reviewed, Australian-specific
20	APPA (2013)	MEDIUM-HIGH	Survey data, professional association
21	Reggio Emilia approach	MEDIUM	Well-documented practice; limited quantitative research due to approach philosophy
22	Suggate (2012)	MEDIUM-HIGH	Published in edited volume; cross-national comparison

---

Appendix B: Cross-References to the OMXUS Research Series

This paper is part of a body of interconnected research. The factory model of schooling does not exist in isolation — it is one mechanism within a larger system of human enclosure. The following papers in the OMXUS Research Series address adjacent and overlapping domains:

Directly Connected

Paper	Location	Connection
Play Deprivation	`content/research/play_deprivation/`	Play is the primary biological mechanism for learning, social calibration, and stress regulation. The Prussian model systematically suppresses it. This paper provides the neurological evidence (Panksepp, PLAY circuit) and the clinical evidence (Brown, 6,000+ play histories) for what happens when play is removed. The education paper says the factory model destroys something. The play deprivation paper says what it destroys and why it matters.
Screens and the Attention Economy	`content/research/screens_attention_economy/`	The adolescent mental health crisis has two parallel timelines: smartphone adoption and educational intensification. This paper covers the smartphone side (Haidt, Twenge, Orben/Przybylski effect size debate). Read together with the education paper, the picture is of a generation caught between two systems — school and screens — neither of which was designed for human flourishing. The education paper documents the school contribution; the screens paper documents the technology contribution.
Environmental Determination	`content/research/environmental_determination/`	The underlying claim: environment shapes behaviour more than individual traits. Education is an environment. The factory model is a specific kind of environment — designed for compliance, structured for sorting. The environmental determination paper provides the broader theoretical framework within which the education critique sits.

Paper	Location	Connection
Human Enclosure	`content/research/human_enclosure/`	Schools are enclosures. They confine human beings in spaces designed for institutional convenience, not human development. The human enclosure paper examines what happens when any animal — including humans — is confined in environments that do not meet their species-typical needs. The factory school is a case study in human enclosure.

Thematically Connected

Paper	Location	Connection
Sleep Science	`content/research/sleep_science/`	Homework, early school start times, and test anxiety all disrupt adolescent sleep. Sleep deprivation is a well-established risk factor for anxiety, depression, and impaired cognitive function. The education system's schedule is misaligned with adolescent circadian biology.
Bullshit Jobs	`content/research/bullshit_jobs/`	Caplan's signalling model implies that much of schooling is a bullshit job performed by children — work done not because it produces value but because the system requires it. The connection to Graeber's analysis of meaningless adult work is direct: the factory model trains children for meaningless compliance, then places them in jobs that demand the same.
Labor Economics / 22-Hour Week	`content/research/labor_economics_22hr_week/`	If Caplan is right that 80% of education's economic value is signalling, then the 12-20 years consumed by schooling are partly wasted. The labour economics paper examines how automation has already done the work — the factory model is training children for a factory that no longer needs them.

Paper	Location	Connection
Community Policing Alternatives	`content/research/community_policing_alternatives/`	The factory model requires compliance with authority. The policing paper examines what happens when compliance with authority is the primary social skill — and what alternatives (CAHOOTS, community-based response) look like when people are equipped with cooperation, empathy, and self-regulation instead.
Drug Policy Reform	`content/research/drug_policy_reform/`	The factory model medicalises non-compliance (ADHD, oppositional defiant disorder). The drug policy paper examines the broader pattern of criminalising and pathologising human behaviour that does not serve institutional needs. Panksepp's finding — that ADHD medication suppresses the PLAY circuit — sits at the intersection of both papers.
Social Group Scaling	`content/research/social_group_scaling/`	The factory model places 30 children with one adult. Dunbar's 150 ceiling is discredited (Lindenfors et al. 2021: CI of 2-520). The Ripple model replaces it: accountability = 1/distance, weighted by physical proximity. Meaningful learning requires proximity-based relationships, not factory-scale classrooms.
Sanctuary Design Thesis	`content/research/sanctuary_design_thesis/`	The comprehensive synthesis. Education is one of the systems the sanctuary design thesis examines as part of the broader architecture of human flourishing.
Indoor Living / Nature Deficit	`content/research/indoor_living_nature_deficit/`	The factory model confines children indoors for most of their waking hours. The nature deficit paper examines the consequences of indoor confinement for physical and mental health.

The Pattern

These papers are not a collection. They are a map. Each one documents a different face of the same system — a system that was not designed for human beings but that human beings are required to inhabit. The factory school is one enclosure. The attention economy is another. The housing market is another. The justice system is another. The labour market is another.

The 14 goals are not 14 separate problems. They are 14 manifestations of one problem: systems designed for institutional convenience rather than human flourishing. Goal 12 — *every school is play, mastery, curiosity* — is the education-shaped piece of a larger puzzle. The other papers in this series are the other pieces.

OMXUS Research Series — Education, Paper 1 Alex Applebee and L. N. Combe March 2026